# 1967

# January

# **Volume No**

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record

1967

Vol. XIII

JANUARY No. 1

CONTENTS

**PAGES** 

## **AFGHANISTAN**

Vice-President's, Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming the King of Afghanistan

1

Reply by the King of Afghanistan

1

Vice-President's Speech at his Dinner to the King of Afghanistan

2

Reply by the King of Afghanistan

3

Speech by the King of Afghanistan at his Dinner to the Vice-

President

Reply by the Vice-President

5

## **INDONESIA**

Joint Communique on Shri M. C. Chagla's Visit

## TASHKENT DECLARATION

President's Message on the First Anniversary

7

Vice-President's Broadcast to the Nation

7

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation

7

Shri M. C. Chagla's Message on the First Anniversary

8

# MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

## AFGHANISTAN INDONESIA UZBEKISTAN INDIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **AFGHANISTAN**

Vice-President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming His Majesty the King of Afghanistan

At the invitation of the President of India, His Majesty King Mohammed Zaher Shah of Afghanistan, accompanied by Her Majesty Queen Homeira, arrived in New Delhi on January 28, 1967 on an eight-day State visit to India. On his arrival, the Afghan King was accorded a ceremonial reception at the Palam airport.

Welcoming His Majesty, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, said:

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies and friends,

It is with great pleasure that on behalf of the President I welcome Your Majesties among us today and in this I know that I am joined by the Government and the people of India. The happy memory of Your Majesty's earlier visit to us some years ago is still fresh in our minds and we are glad to be given this renewed opportunity of receiving Your Majesty in our midst once again.

We are particularly happy to have amidst us this time Her Majesty the Queen of Afghanistan. We welcome her most heartily. We trust she will have a happy and fruitful visit.

I recall with warmth and pleasure my visit to your beautiful land and its brave and noble people only some months ago and shall ever feel the richer for that experience.

The visit of Your Majesties reaffirms the tradition of exchange of visits between the two countries at the highest level that has served to constantly strengthen the friendship and close understanding that exists between our two peoples.

On behalf of the Government and people of India I once again extend to Your Majesty King Zaher Shah, to Your Majesty Queen Homeira and to Their Royal Highnesses a warm and cordial welcome to our country. I am sure that this visit will result in furthering the hopes and aspirations we share in common and strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two countries.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

# **AFGHANISTAN**

Reply by the King of Afghanistan

In his reply, His Majesty the King of Afghanistan said:

Your Excellency I sincerely thank you for your warm reception and very kind words of welcome.

Please, Mr. Vice-President, accept our thanks for the friendly invitation that His Excellency the President had extended to us to visit your great and beautiful country.

This visit of ours is part of a series of reciprocal visits by which the leaders of both our nations

become closely acquainted with the important changes taking place in each other's country and also provide an opportunity for them to exchange views on subjects of mutual interest.

His Excellency the President's indisposition has caused us deep regret and we express our sincere wishes for his speedy recovery.

Your Excellencies, I cherish the pleasant memories of my previous visit to this friendly country which took place nine years ago. His Excellency Dr. Radhakrishnan's visit to Afghanistan four years ago and your own recent visit to our country have left vivid and valued memories with us and the Afghan nation.

We are happy to meet Your Excellency once again and we feel that this opportunity to observe the further progress made by your great nation will serve to increase respect and admiration which we carry in our hearts.

I avail myself of this opportunity to convey the most sincere and cordial feelings of the people of Afghanistan as well as of myself and the Queen for the prosperity of the friendly nation of India

I hope our visit will play a useful role in further strengthening the bonds of friendship existing between our two countries.

1

AFGHANISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **AFGHANISTAN**

Vice-President's Speech at his Dinner to the King of Afghanistan

The following is the text of the speech made

by the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, at a dinner given by him in honour of Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Afghanistan at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi, on January 28, 1967:

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests and friends:

On behalf of the President and myself, I have once again the pleasure and honour to say how happy we all are to have His Majesty King Zaher Shah and Her Majesty Queen Homeira with us today. At the same time, I have to convey the President's deep regret and sorrow that due to indisposition he is unable to be present on this occasion to welcome our honoured and respected guests.

India is no stranger to Your Majesty, to your country or to your people. The present visit of Your Majesties is, indeed, a part of the continuing tradition of friendly exchange of visits between the two countries.

# HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL RELATIONS

Between our two countries, as Your Majesty knows, there has been a constant dialogue practically from the dawn of history. Across the Khyber Pass, Afghanistan has stood at the gateway of the Indian sub-continent. Through this gateway have come to India many a wave of enriching new civilisations and cultures. There has similarly been movement of people and ideas from India to Afghanistan. Thus the long and varied history of our two people abounds with shared experience and historical and cultural influences that have left their common imprint on the people of India and of Afghanistan. From the ancient Aryans, from whom we both derive much that is part of our national life today, through the millennium which saw the introduction from India of Buddhist influence into Afghanistan, the subsequent advent of Islam into Afghanistan and for the 60 million of our own countrymen who share this great faith with you, down to the days of our struggle against colonialism, the fabric of the history of our two countries has been woven with a common thread. When we therefore speak of ancient historical and cultural relations between our two countries, it is not a mere platitude but a relationship, the effect of which is still visible

in our art, culture, music and the various manifestations of our national life.

#### ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL REGENERATION

While our association in history and our ancient cultural intercourse is dear to us and we deeply cherish it and would like diligently to preserve it, today we must join hands to meet the new challenges of economic and social reconstruction, the challenge of shaping a life for our people which would be free from ignorance and poverty. We in India have watched with admiration the impressive programme of national development for economic and social regeneration which Afghanistan has embarked upon under the wise leadership of Your Majesty. We also know that without economic strength and social progress, independence is devoid of true meaning. We in India are also engaged upon the same task of building for our people a new world of economic prosperity and social progress of changing a traditional into a rational outlook on things, of transforming an empirical into a scientific technique and developing a static into a dynamic society. In furtherence of our common effort, India and Afghanistan have concluded a wide-ranging agreement in May last year covering welfare projects and economic, technical and scientific assistance in order to strengthen and give new dimensions to the historical and traditional ties which bind our two countries.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

In international affairs, India and Afghanistan have no problems but only a community of ideals ---a common faith in the principles of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and support for the United Nations. It is therefore no wonder that in foreign policy there has been the closest understanding and co-operation between our two countries. This was clearly evidenced during the time of our participation in the Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo Conferences in which representatives of both countries played a significant role in furthering the cause of world peace and the creation of increased mutual understanding and goodwill between the two countries as also among other countries of the world

India like Afghanistan firmly support the policy of non-alignment and has kept aloof from power blocs and military alliances believing that this is best calculated to secure world peace and promote mutual co-operation and goodwill among nations on the basis of equality and mutual benefit. Both countries desire to develop friendly relations and fruitful inter-change in various fields with all countries irrespective of their political faith. The support of both the countries to peoples and nations struggling for independence and the right to determine their own destiny is well-known. Both the countries are wedded to the belief in peaceful co-existence among nations and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. They believe that non-aligned countries

2

the world over must take concerted action to support the right to independence of people still under the bondage of colonialism and to further international co-operation and understanding.

#### FAITH IN U.N.

Both the countries have declared their full support to the United Nations in the belief that it represents the best hope of mankind for restricting areas of conflict and finally to bring in the reign of peace throughout the world as also in developing mutual co-operation and goodwill among nations. They believe that all countries have a right to join the United Nations if that Organisation is to effectively pursue its aims and objects.

Both countries agree that the problem of Vietnam can be settled on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreement enabling the Vietnamese people to determine their own destiny without any foreign interference.

Both countries believe that in view of the mounting difficulties being experienced by developing countries the world over, steps should be taken to further expand areas of mutual co-operation among developing countries in the fields of trade and development. We are therefore hopeful that the developing countries will effect a fruitful interchange of views and resolve to take concerted action to overcome their problems at the second U.N. Conference for Trade and Development.

May I ask you, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to rise and drink with me a toast to the health and happiness of His Majesty King Zaher Shah and Her Majesty Queen Homeira, for the prosperity and progress of Afghanistan and for enduring Indo-Afghan friendship and co-operation.

## AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA EGYPT VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **AFGHANISTAN**

Reply by the King of Afghanistan

In his reply, His Majesty the King of Afghanistan said:

Let me first of all thank Your Excellency on behalf of myself, the Queen and the Afghan nation for the kind words that you have addressed to us and the people of Afghanistan.

His Excellency the President's indisposition has caused us deep regret. The Queen and I sincerely wish for his speedy recovery.

Your Excellency, nine years ago, the hospitable people and the great leaders of India accorded me a warm reception in an atmosphere of cordiality and friendship just as in this distinguished gathering tonight. The memory of that reception and the expression of sentiments of friendship by the people of India for the people of Afghanistan, joined with the memories of dear friends who unfortunately are no longer amongst us and who gave their lives while serving their nation, especially that great leader of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, have left an everlasting impression in our hearts.

# SYMBOLS OF STRONG BOND

His Excellency the President's visit four years ago and the sentiments of cordiality expressed by our people for His Excellency as well as the close and friendly contacts made during that visit between His Excellency and our people and more recently your own visit to Afghanistan, are symbols of the strong bonds of friendship which have existed between our two nations for so many centuries and which have taken on new meanings since your great nation achieved independence and are constantly increasing in accordance with the wishes of both our peoples.

Cooperation between the representatives of both our countries in international organisations and their effective participation in the historic Conference at Bandung, Belgrade and Cairo played an important role in creating great mutual understanding and strengthening of relations between the two countries as well as in the maintenance of world peace.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT AND PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE

Afghanistan constantly pursues a policy of positive non-alignment and free cooperation based on equal rights among nations. The course of events in the world during the last few years has proved beyond doubt that the policy of non-alignment followed by a sufficiently large number of countries of this world has been most effective and useful not only for safeguarding their own interest but also for resolving all international disputes, for promoting peaceful co-existence and for maintaining world peace. It is, therefore, essential that non-aligned countries continue to cooperate in order to safeguard the independence of all States, to secure the right of self-determination for all peoples and nations, to further international cooperation and to maintain world peace as enunciated in the Declaration of the Belgrade and Cairo Conferences.

3

The endeavour of developing countries to improve their social, economic, cultural and political conditions as well as their firm determination to solve the problems they are facing due to these changes, will be written indelibly in the history of our present age. The people of Afghanistan, who have devoted their attention and energies towards national development and progress, look at the untiring efforts of the Indian people with great admiration and sincerely pray for their success.

We notice with great regret that as a result of an unfavourable world situation, the developing countries have to face ever-increasing difficulties despite their best efforts to exploit their natural resources. These countries can achieve the greatest success only when they establish more and closer cooperation amongst themselves. We, therefore, hope that the developing countries will have close exchange of views and will undertake joint efforts to resolve their common problems such as at the forthcoming Second U.N. Conference for Trade and Development.

Our people have come to realise that the countries of this region of the world can, by pursuing policies of mutual understanding and friendliness and by finding peaceful means for resolving mutual problems on the basis of realism and justice, prepare the ground for wider and more effective mutual cooperation. This is the best way through which these countries can devote their efforts for resolving their various vital problems and safeguarding their own interests as well as the interests of the region to which they belong and also the international peace in full conformity with the spirit of our time.

# UNITED NATIONS

Afghanistan believes that the United Nations Organisation remains the most suitable forum for all countries, both large and small, to cooperate in safeguarding peace and establishing equitable relations amongst States.

We believe that the world Organisation should include all the countries of the world to achieve greater success in her objects.

#### **VIETNAM**

The people of Afghanistan, while expressing their regret and concern over the recent events including the Vietnamese conflict which have caused tension in the present world situation and created grave dangers to international relations, express the hope that the countries concerned will take serious and effective steps in the spirit of mutual understanding with a view to finding peaceful solution to international disputes to minimise the prevailing tension and to remove the threat which is facing world peace and security.

In the end, we once again thank you for your warm reception and hope to see during our stay in this friendly country something of the great cultural heritage of ancient India as well as the new manifestation of the progress being made by your people in various fields of life.

I now request the distinguished gathering to join me in the toast which I propose to the health of His Excellency the President of India, His Excellency the Vice-President and Her Excellency the Prime Minister of India and distinguished guests and for the success and prosperity of the Indian nation.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA EGYPT INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA VIETNAM

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

## **AFGHANISTAN**

Speech by the King of Afghanistan at his Dinner to Vice-President Dr. Zakir Husain

His Majesty King Mohammed Zaher Shah of Afghanistan made the following speech, while proposing the toast at a dinner given by him in honour of the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, in New Delhi on January 29, 1967:

Your Excellency, we are pleased to welcome Your Excellency in this gathering and to find ourselves once again amongst our Indian friends.

Now at the conclusion of my stay in the capital during my state visit to this friendly country, I wish to express once again my sincere appreciation and that of the Queen to Your Excellency and to the great Indian nation for the warm and cordial hospitality accorded to us.

I am pleased that during this visit, I could exchange views with the Indian leaders on subjects of common interest in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding.

We have fortunately rediscovered that our desire to promote friendly relations and to expand cooperation continues.

Our exchange of views on the present world situation has supported our idea that concerted action by all countries of the world is essential to strengthen world peace and eliminate international tension.

This visit has provided us an opportunity to witness and admire the friendly Indian nation's tireless efforts made in the face of tremendous difficulties for the purpose of achieving the great objective of raising its standards of economic, social and cultural life.

4

I hope this visit in the series of mutual visits, which have been taking place over the past eight years between the two countries, will contribute to the further strengthening of the Indo-Afghan friendly ties.

I request the distinguished gathering to join me and the queen in a toast which I propose to the health of His Excellency Dr. Radhakrishnan, the Vice-President and the Prime Minister and to the prosperity and progress of the Indian nation.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **AFGHANISTAN**

Reply by the Vice-President

In his reply, the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain said:

Your Majesties, Your Excellencies and Friends, I wish to thank Your Majesty most sincerely for the generous feelings you have expressed for my country and people. I greatly cherish and value the kind things that Your Majesty has said about me. I know that, like myself, the Government and the people of India derive great pleasure and gratification from the visit of Your Majesties to us. We believe that your visit has given a powerful stimulus to the friendly feelings and brotherly sentiments between the people of India and Afghanistan.

Your Majesty's visit has provided an invaluable opportunity for a free and frank exchange of views and opinions between us. As Your Majesty has graciously observed, this cordial exchange has happily served to bring out once again the desire of both countries to strengthen the friendly ties that exist between us.

The review of the international scene undertaken in our talks gives continuing evidence of the close similarity of views held by our two countries on various international issues and the common realisation on our part that the urgent need of the day is for determined action by all nations to expand the areas of peace in the world and to bring about an increasing measure of cooperation, understanding and goodwill among the countries of the world.

May I now request you all to join me in drinking a toast to the health and happiness of Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Afghanistan; to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Afghanistan; and to everlasting friendship between India and Afghanistan.

AFGHANISTAN USA INDIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

**INDONESIA** 

Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, paid a visit to Indonesia from January 16 to January 20, 1967. At the conclusion of his visit, the following joint communique was issued:

At the invitation of His Excellency Mr. Adam Malik, Presidium Minister for Political Affairs/ Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia. His Excellency Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, Republic of India, paid a visit to Indonesia from January 16 to 20, 1967. He was accompanied by Shri T. N. Kaul, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs, and other officials of the Government of India, and was assisted in his talks by Shri P. Ratnam, Ambassador of India. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia was assisted in the discussions by Mrs. Artati Marzuki, Secretary-General of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ch. Anwar Sani, Director-General for Political Affairs of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Mr. M. Razif, Ambassador-designate to India

The Foreign Minister of India and his delegation called on His Excellency President
Sukarno, His Excellency General Suharto, Chairman of the Presidium/Presidium Minister for
Defence & Security/Minister Army Commander-in-Chief,
His Excellency Sri Sultan Hamengku
Buwono IX, Presidium Minister for Economic &

5

Financial Affairs, His Excellency Sanusi Hardjadinata, Presidium Minister for Industry & Development, His Excellency K. H. Dr. Idham Chalid, Presidium Minister for Social Welfare, the leadership of the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly and of the Gotong Rojong Parliament. He had frank and friendly discussions on matters of mutual interest with the leaders of Indonesia.

The two Foreign Ministers discussed the bilateral relations between the two countries and exchanged views on international problems of common interest. The talks were held in an atmosphere of great cordiality and mutual understanding, which is characteristic of the relations between

the two countries.

In reviewing the bilateral relations between Indonesia and India, both Foreign Ministers emphasized the need to make continuous efforts to promote the existing good relations between the two countries in various fields. They expressed their satisfaction at the steps already taken towards implementation of the principles they had agreed to during the visit of His Excellency Mr. Adam Malik to India during September last year. They welcomed, in this connection, the visit to India of His Highness Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX, Presidium Minister for Economic Affairs, and the visit of Shri Manubhai Shah, Commerce Minister of India, to Indonesia. They expressed the hope that economic, commercial and technical cooperation between the two countries would be further developed as a result of these visits.

They agreed in principle to maintain regular contacts at official level, annually, to review the progress in the strengthening of bilateral relations. They also agreed to re-activate the cultural agreement between Indonesia and India rati fied in 1958 and to work out detailed arrangements in this regard.

The two Foreign Ministers re-affirmed the faith in the policy of non-alignment as an instrument for strengthening peace and fruitful co-operation in the international community. They agreed that the ten principles enunciated in the historic Bandung Conference should be further strengthened for preserving the sovereignty and economic independence of developing countries and for the preservation of peace in Asia and the world.

The two Foreign Ministers condemned sub-version and the use, or the threat of use, of force as a means of settling bilateral or international disputes.

The two Foreign Ministers re-affirmed their resolve to further strengthen cooperation between their two countries in the United Nations, in UNCTAD and in other international bodies.

The two Foreign Ministers agreed that security in South-East Asia was, in the first place, the responsibility of the South-East Asian nations themselves and they did not approve of foreign intervention in the domestic affairs of the South-East Asian countries. Both sides viewed with concern the use of economic and financial assistance as an instrument of political pressure on developing countries.

The Foreign Minister of Indonesia reiterated his hope expressed in the joint communique issued in Delhi on September 6, 1966, that the outstanding problems between India and Pakistan would be solved through peaceful negotiations on the basis of the Tashkent Declaration.

The two Foreign Ministers reviewed the international situation, in particular the question of Vietnam, the struggle for independence of nations under the yoke of foreign domination, the policy of Apartheid in South Africa and the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The two Foreign Ministers noted with concern the escalation of hostilities in Vietnam. They re-affirmed their view that efforts should be continued to promote a peacefully negotiated settlement; they also agreed that the bombing of North Vietnam should be stopped unconditionally and immediately as a first step towards a peaceful solution.

The two Foreign Ministers reiterated their opposition to all forms of imperialism and colonialism. They re-affirmed their support to the struggle for independence of the peoples in so-called "Portuguese" Guinea, Angola and Mozambique.

The two Foreign Ministers strongly condemned the policy of Apartheid which is being pursued by the Government of South Africa in flagrant violation of world opinion and the Declaration of Human Rights.

The two Foreign Ministers expressed their profound regret that nuclear weapon explosions had recently occurred on the Asian Continent. With respect to a non-proliferation treaty, both sides were of the view that such a treaty should be comprehensive and must embody an acceptable balance of obligations between nuclear-weapon states and non-nuclear-weapon states.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed his sincere appreciation of and gratitude for the

warm welcome and generous hospitality accorded to him and his party during his visit to Indonesia. The Foreign Minister of Indonesia expressed his belief that this visit had further strengthened the mutual understanding, friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

6

INDONESIA USA MALI INDIA UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN VIETNAM SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### TASHKENT DECLARATION

President's Message on the First Anniversary

In a message on January 10, 1967 to mark the completion of one year of the signing of the Tashkent Declaration, the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, said:

A year ago the Tashkent Agreement was signed pledging Pakistan and India to work for peace and concord, forgetting all past rancour and bitterness. The tragic passing away, a few hours after the signing of this declaration, of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri came to us, indeed fo the whole world, as a cruel shock. Lal Bahadur's life was one of unostentatious dedication to our country, to the causes of peace and freedom, and to the alleviation of want and suffering. We must continue to strive to fulfil the great tasks to which Lal Bahadur ceaselessly addressed himself till the end of his life.

UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### TASHKENT DECLARATION

Vice-President's Broadcast to the Nation

The following is the text of a message broadcast on January 10, 1967 by the Vice-President, Dr. Zakir Husain, on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration:

The Tashkent Declaration was both an achievement and a promise; it ended a singularly unhappy phase in Indo-Pakistan relations which had been brought to a crisis in August 1965; and it provided the foundation for building up truly effective good-neighbourly relations for the future. The ties that link the peoples of the two countries are well-known; what is all too often forgotten is that these ties need to be sustained. The futile and unnecessary conflict which preceded Tashkent could have led to a total break in contacts which would have caused incalculable harm to the people of both countries. There are short-sighted people who seem to feel that such a cessation of contacts is desirable for the evolution of the two separate States in the Sub-Continent. Fortunately, the wisdom, foresight and humanity of Shastriji found a response at Tashkent from Pakistan which averted such a dismal prospect. The two peoples were given a fresh opportunity to develop the cordial cooperation called for by their past links and their future interests.

There are many problems between India and Pakistan. There is nothing extraordinary or even frightening in that. The historical evolution of States often confronts neighbours with difficulties, some of them most profound and seemingly intractable. Nevertheless, States rise above their difficulties for the common good of their peoples. The ties between the two sides which I have spoken of are far more important than the differences between them; they can indeed provide the means for overcoming the differences. This was the reality recognised at Tashkent a year ago. In rededicating

ourselves on this anniversary to the letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration, we re-affirm to the people of Pakistan our resolve to persist in seeking their cooperation in realising the aims of the Declaration, for the greater good of both sides.

## UZBEKISTAN USA PAKISTAN INDIA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### TASHKENT DECLARATION

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, broadcast on January 10, 1967 the following message to the nation on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration:

A year ago, through the goodwill of the Soviet Union, a historic agreement was signed in Tashkent. Today we pledge ourselves anew to the Tashkent Declaration and to the message of peace which it proclaims, almost the last act of a leader sadly departed from our midst.

7

At this moment the nation remembers Shastriji with special poignancy. We recall the tidings of death which shocked us at dead of night only a few hours after the news of peace from Tashkent.

Inspired by Lajpat Rai, Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru, Shastriji's life was spent in the cause of the people---and in the manner of his death he reaffirmed India's total dedication to peace. He has left us an example to cherish.

Shastriji's beginnings were humble. His life illustrates the kind of society we have, a democratic society in which opportunity is not necessarily

synonymous with wealth or social status. He rose to high position through his qualities and single-minded service to the nation. He was of the people, and in everything he did he thought of their interests and aspirations.

Tashkent. The name of this great Soviet city, like Shastriji's own name, has now become a symbol of reconciliation. It may be that events of the year since gone by, have not matched the expectations raised in Tashkent. But it should be our effort to mould reality to measure up to our hopes.

Our independence movement was based on non-violence and on the repudiation of methods of violence. In demanding an approach of peace and persuasion, I doubt if Gandhiji thought that we in India were more peaceful by nature. It was his belief that violent methods would greatly injure a nation so diverse as ours, confronted with such massive problems of poverty and ignorance. He believed also that for its survival mankind must eschew violence. Our outlook towards international affairs was well defined even before independence.

On this anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration, I should like to reaffirm India's commitment to peace and peaceful methods of settling international differences. Despite the irreversible events of history, the future of the peoples of India and Pakistan demands cooperation. We share so many affinities. Our task is to build a better life for our peoples. Discord will weaken us both and retard our progress. We can prosper only if we live in amity.

This is the true meaning of the Tashkent Declaration. It is a pledge on the part of both countries to resolve their differences peacefully, in an atmosphere of friendliness, cooperation and trust. While paying tribute to Shastriji, a man of quit greatness, let us this day reaffirm this resolve.

UZBEKISTAN USA INDIA PAKISTAN

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

## TASHKENT DECLARATION

## Shri M. C. Chagla's Message on the First Anniversary

The following is the text of a message given by Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration signed between India and Pakistan in Tashkent (USSR) on January 10, 1966:

The Tashkent Declaration constitutes not only an act of statesmanship but also an act of faith. It is to the credit of the Soviet Union that, by inviting President Ayub and Prime Minister Shastri to Tashkent, it tried to break down the barrier that continued to exist between India and Pakistan and was the cause not only of suspicion and distrust, but also of armed conflict. The Soviet Union's only concern was the cause of peace and overpowering necessity for the establishment of friendly relations between the two neighbouring countries in the sub-continent of India. Mr. Shastri showed great courage in concluding the agreement, which he knew might have adverse reactions in India, but which he also knew that the public opinion would ultimately accept in the larger interest of a lasting peace between the two countries.

The Tashkent Declaration emphasized that there should be no interference in the internal affairs of either country by the other; that all outstanding differences should be settled by peaceful means and that immediate steps should be taken to establish contacts at different levels. It ruled out any mediation by a third party and underlined the importance of the negotiations as well as the ultimate settlement being purely bilateral.

Since the signing of the Declaration, India has loyally abided by its terms. It has made various attempts to arrange meetings with Pakistani officials and Ministers. It has attempted to solve the problems emerging as an aftermath of the Indo-Pakistan conflict and also to improve

relations between the people of Pakistan and the people of India. It has evinced a genuine desire for the restoration of normalcy and further for the creation of an atmosphere of friendship and understanding.

Friendship cannot be brought about unilaterally; just as it requires two to create a quarrel, it also requires a friendly handshake between two persons to forget the past differences and to work for a better future.

At a time when we are celebrating the anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration, we must do our utmost to revive the spirit in which it was conceived and executed.

8

#### UZBEKISTAN INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Jan 01, 1967

# **February**

# Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. XIII

1967

FEBRUARY No. 2

**CONTENTS** 

**PAGE** 

**AFGHANISTAN** 

Joint Communique on King Zaher Shah's Visit to India

9

Afghan King's Message of Thanks to President Radhakrishnan 10 CANADA Indo-Canadian Agreement for Construction of Nuclear Power Station FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Indo-German Credit Agreement 11 **NETHERLANDS** Indo-Dutch Agreement for Technical Co-operation 12 UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS Joint Protocol to Indo-Soviet Shipping Agreement 12 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA Indo-U.S. Food Agreement 13 Indo-U.S. Contract for Aerial Survey 14 Indo-U.S Agreement for Exchange of Scientists 14 **VIETNAM** Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Cease-fire in Vietnam 15 MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

**DIVISION** 

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

AFGHANISTAN INDIA CANADA GERMANY USA VIETNAM

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **AFGHANISTAN**

Joint Communique of King Zaber Shah's Visit to India

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on February 6, 1967 at the conclusion of the visit to India of Their Majesties the King and the Queen of Afghanistan:

At the invitation of the President of India. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, His Majesty Mohammed Zaher Shah, King of Afghanistan, accompanied by Her Majesty the Queen, Their Royal Highnesses Princess Mariam Naim and Prince Mohammad Daoud Pashtunvar and Their Excellencies Mr. Ali Mohammad, Minister of Royal Court and Mr. Nour Ahmad Etemadi, Minister for Foreign Affairs, paid a State visit to India from 28th January to 1st February. Their Majesties the King and the Queen expressed their appreciation and pleasure at the warm and cordial reception accorded to them by the Government and the people of India. The present visit of Their Majesties is a part of the continuing tradition of friendly exchange of visits between the two countries. It is also a measure of the friendly relations and cordial sentiments between the two countries that Their Majesties will, at the end of their State visit, undertake an unofficial tour of places of historical, Cultural and scenic interest.

During their stay in New Delhi His Majesty the King had talks with president Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Vice-President Dr. Zakir Husain, the Prime Minister of India Shrimati Indira Gandhi on a variety of subjects which included in particular the present world situation and matters of mutual interest to their two countries and the developing economic and cultural relations between them. These talks were held in an atmosphere of complete frankness, mutual understanding and cordiality characteristic of the traditionally close friendship between the Governments and the people of the two countries and revealing a great similarity of views on many international issues.

Taking part in the talks on the Indian side were also Mr. M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, Mr. M. A. Husain, Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, General P. N. Thapar, Ambassador of India to Afghanistan, and Mr. A. N. Mehta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs.

Taking part in the talks on the Afghan side were also H.E. Mr. Nour Ahmed Etemadi, Minister of Foreign Affairs, H.E. Mr. Ataullah Nasser-Zia, Afghan Ambassador in Delhi, Dr. Ravan Farhadi, Director-General of Political Department of the Royal Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

Both sides commended the understandings reached last year between the two Governments for expanding the area of mutual economic and technical cooperation. They reaffirmed their desire to continue the tradition of exchange of visits between the two Governments at various levels and to further develop mutually advantageous economic, cultural and commercial relations.

Both sides reiterated their conviction in the continuing validity of the policy of non-alignment which has made a positive contribution to the cause of peace and international cooperation. They also stressed the importance of the acceptance of the principles of peaceful co-existence by the world community if international peace and security is to be safeguarded. They continue to be opposed to any form of imperialism, hegemony or monopoly of power and military alliances.

Both sides reiterated their firm opposition to colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms and manifestations, and deplored the alliance between forces of colonialism and racialism.

Both sides viewed with deep concern the continuance of the hostilities in Vietnam, which constitutes a direct threat to world peace and the danger of a wider war. They felt convinced that there was no military solution to this problem, and that an early settlement can best be found on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreements, so that the people of Vietnam may be free to decide their future without any foreign interference. They agreed that the unconditional stoppage of bombing of North Vietnam was an essential first step towards the cessation of all hostilities.

9

Both sides expressed their increasing concern at the intensification of the arms race which

poses a serious threat to international peace and security and urged an early agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They emphasised the serious dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and called for the early conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the U.N. General Assembly at its XX Session and reaffirmed at its XXI Session, in particular the principle of an acceptable balance of obligations and responsibilities between the nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear states. They expressed the hope that the Test Ban Treaty would be extended to underground tests as soon as possible.

Both sides agreed that the Tashkent Declaration was an outstanding example of positive steps towards finding peaceful solutions to differences between states, and a significant contribution to the cause of peace. The hope was expressed that the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration would lead to peace in the region and would also be in the larger interest of peace in the world. The President assured His Majesty the King of India's determination to implement the Tashkent Declaration in letter and spirit with a view to establishing good neighbourly relations.

His Majesty the King and the President attached great importance to the argent and imperative need for initiating practical steps for promoting among developing countries mutual trade and economic cooperation as a means of strengthening their national independence and self-reliance.

Both sides also discussed the concept of regional economic cooperation and agreed that countries of this region should work towards the achievement of such cooperation as an important contribution to peace and economic development not only in this region but among the world community as a whole.

Both sides expressed deep satisfaction that the visit of His Majesty the King of Afghanistan and the opportunity it had afforded for a friendly exchange of views has further strengthened the ties of friendship and understanding and mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations between the two countries.

# AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **AFGHANISTAN**

Afghan King's Message of Thanks to President Radhakrishnan

His Majesty King Mohammed Zaher Shah of Afghanistan sent on February 7, 1967 the following message of than, to the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, on is departure from India at the end of his State visit:

While leaving your beautiful country I wish to express my sincere appreciation and that of the Queen to Your Excellency for the warm and cordial reception accorded to us by yourself and the Indian people. I am pleased that during this visit I could witness the friendly Indian nation's effort for progress in all walks of life. I hope my visit will contribute to further strengthen the Indo-Afghan friendly ties according to the wishes of both nations. I avail myself of this occasion to express my sincere wishes for Your Excellency's personal health and the prosperity of the friendly Indian nation.

AFGHANISTAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **CANADA**

An agreement for a \$ 38.5 million loan financed through the Export Credits Insurance Corporation of Canada was signed on February 28, 1967 between the Government of Canada and the Government of India. The agreement was signed by Mr. Robert Winters, Minister of

10

Trade and Commerce on behalf of the Government of Canada and by Shri S. J. S. Chhatwal, Acting High Commissioner, on behalf of the Government of India.

This agreement is for the construction of a Candu-type nuclear power station located on the Rana Pratap Sagar dam across the Chambal river in Rajasthan. Power development known as the Rajasthan Atomic Power Project, includes two 200,000 kilowatt units each, similar to the Douglas Point unit in Canada, thus providing a total electric generating capacity of 400,000 kilowatt.

The loan agreement will cover the second stage of the project, the first stage having been undertaken with a previous similar Canadian loan of \$ 37 million. This loan will provide foreign exchange for procurement of capital equipment and specialised engineering services from Canada.

The Department of Atomic Energy in India will be responsible for the construction of the station. The Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will collaborate with the Department of Atomic Energy of India by providing consultancy services for the nuclear portion of the plant. Engineering and consultancy services for the conventional part of the plant will be provided jointly by an Indian consultancy firm and the Montreal Engineering Company of Canada.

This Candu-type nuclear power station will use heavy water as moderator and coolant and natural uranium as fuel. Power costs are expected to be competitive with power costs from conventional thermal stations in the region.

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Credit Agreement Signed

An Agreement was signed in New Delhi on February 28, 1967 for a credit from the Federal Republic of Germany totalling Rs. 45 crores (DM 240 million). This follows the pledge made by Germany at the Aid India Consortium, meeting in November 1966 and forms part of the assistance of a 900 million dollars made available to India through the members of the Consortium for the year 1966-67.

Shri S. Jagannathan, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and the Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, H.E. Baron D. von Mirbach signed the Agreement for their respective governments.

## UTILISATION OF AID

The economic assistance, under this agreement, of Rs. 45 crores will be utilised as follows:-

- (i) Rs. 33.75 crores (DM 180 million) as commodity aid for the purchase of goods and services. Of this, Rs. 5.62 crores (DM 30 million) will be utilised for the purchase of fertilizers.
- (ii) Rs. 7.5 crores (DM 40 million) for selected programmes.
- (iii) Rs. 3.75 crores (DM 20 million) for loans to small and medium undertakings by the Industrial Credit and

Investment Corporation of India, the Industrial Finance Corporation of India and the National Small Industries Corporation.

## TERMS OF CREDIT

The loans are repayable in 25 years (with a grace period of seven years) and carry an interest rate of three per cent per annum.

India has been importing, with German assistance, equipment for various industries like automobile, chemicals, engineering, power, steel, etc., and maintenance requirements for the economy.

German assistance to India by way of credits for India's development programme so far totals Rs. 750.98 crores (DM 4005.2 million). Out of this, Rs. 220.61 crores (DM 1176.6 million) was given during the Second Five Year Plan period and Rs. 483.12 crores (DM 2576.6 million) was provided for the Third Five Year Plan. The balance of Rs. 45.00 crores is for

11

the first year of India's Fourth Plan. In addition, a special credit of Rs. 2.25 crores (DM 12 million) was made available by Germany in 1966 for the import of fertilizers.

Among the important projects undertaken with German assistance are the Rourkela Steel Project, Rourkela Fertilizer Plant, Neyveli Briquetting and Carbonisation Plant, Neyveli Fertilizer Project, Durgapur Power Station (5th Unit), expansion of the Mysore Iron and Steel Works and its conversion into an alloy and special steel plant, New Government Electric Factory, Mysore, expansion of the Kalinga Pig Iron Plant, the Kargali Coal Washery Extension and the Saweng Coal Washery.

GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# Volume No

# **NETHERLANDS**

Indo-Dutch Agreement for Technical Co-operation

An agreement for the establishment of a Technical Teacher Training Centre for Polytechnics at Chandigarh was signed in New Delhi on February 14, 1967. H.E. Jhr. H.Th.A.M. Van Rijckevorsel, Ambassador of the Netherlands, signed on behalf of his Government and Shri S. G. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India.

Under this technical cooperation agreement, the Netherlands Government has agreed to provide, during a period of five years, the services of experts in various branches of engineering technology, fellowships for Indian trainees in the Netherlands and equipment worth about Rs. 8 lakhs for the Chandigarh Centre. The Government of India will meet the necessary expenditure in rupees for providing land and building, Indian teaching staff and other personnel, materials and equipment available in India and also bear the usual local costs of the Dutch experts.

INDIA THE NETHERLANDS USA

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Joint Protocol to Indo-Soviet Shipping Agreement

A joint Protocol to the Indo-Soviet Shipping Agreement, 1956 was signed in New Delhi on February 7, 1967 by Mr. D. K. Zotov, Deputy Minister of Merchant Marine, U.S.S.R. and leader of the Soviet delegation, and Shrimati Jahanara Jaipal Singh, Deputy Minister, Ministry of Transport and Aviation.

Both the countries have agreed to strengthen further the Indo-Soviet Shipping service in order to transport the trade moving between India and the U.S.S.R. according to the trade agreement.

The two delegations have agreed to provide jointly 64 sailings during 1967 in each direction. The number of ships employed in this service by the two countries would, as a result, go up considerably.

Another highlight of the Protocol, signed today, is the reaffirmation by both sides that complete equality would be maintained between the Soviet and Indian lines in sharing cargoes moving between the two countries, both in terms of tonnage and freight earnings.

The agreement also provides for a periodic review in this respect. The Protocol also deals with various matters relating to freight rates, outturn reports, cargo claims etc.

12

According to the Trade Agreement between the two countries, the volume of trade moving between USSR and India is likely to show a substantial increase from year to year during the Fourth Five Year Plan period. It is expected that by the next year, the volume of this trade may exceed a million tons.

The negotiations which have today concluded will strengthen further the close maritime relations which are already existing between India and USSR. The Shipping interests of the two countries concerned with the trades are likely to coordinate their efforts to achieve the best possible results and to give the maximum satisfaction to the shippers both in India and USSR.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# Volume No

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## Indo-U.S. Food Agreement Signed

The following is the text of a Press release issued in New Delhi on February 20, 1967 on the first agreement signed between India and the U.S.A. under the new U.S. Food for Peace Programme:

India and the United States today (Feb. 20) concluded the first agreement under the new U.S. Food for Peace Programme, thus assuring a further two million tonnes of foodgrains to meet India's urgent needs.

The agreement will implement the announcement made by President Johnson in his February 2nd message to the U.S. Congress on Food Aid to India. India will pay for the supplies in rupees.

The agreement is the first to be concluded under the new U.S. PL-480 legislation anywhere in the world.

Together with commodities available under earlier PL 480 agreements, the new agreement provides for the arrival in India during the first half of 1967 of 3.6 million tonnes of American foodgrains.

Under the bilateral agreement signed today for India by Shri S. Jagannathan, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, and for the United States by Ambassador Chester Bowles, India will obtain 1.2 million tonnes of wheat, 800,000 tonnes of milo (sorghum), and 30,000 tonnes each of soybean oil and tallow, altogether valued at \$ 135 million (Rs. 101.3 crores).

On the basis of payment assurance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the India Supply Mission in Washington began about February 10 to place orders for grain with American suppliers. Some of this grain is already on board ship, bound for India.

Twenty-two per cent of the rupees generated by the sale of the commodities will be granted by the United States to the Government of India ---twelve per cent for financing economic development projects and the remaining 10 per cent for programmes emphasizing maternal welfare, child health and nutrition, and family planning. This will be the first time since the May 1960 agreement that the United States will have extended a grant to the Government of India from PL 480 funds.

The two governments have further agreed that 65 per cent of the sales proceeds will be loaned by the United States to the Government of India to finance economic development projects. Although this loan provision closely resembles that in prior PL 480 agreements, there is, under the new U.S. law, a particular emphasis on agricultural development and food production.

Five per cent of the sales proceeds has been reserved for loans to private firms in which there is joint Indian-American collaboration---the well-known ``Cooley loans."

The last previous agreement reserved 20 per cent of the sales proceeds for U.S. Government uses. The present agreement allots only eight per cent for this purpose.

The new agreement will bring the total of foodgrains supplied to India since 1951 to 50 million tonnes, 47 million tonnes under PL 480 (Title I) Programmes, 2 million tonnes under the 1951 Wheat Loan, and the remainder under

13

various other arrangements. Together with cotton, dairy products, and other agricultural commodities, the total value of PL 480 supplies to India now exceeds \$3,800 million. Eighty-six per cent of the rupees arising from the sale of these commodities is being utilised for financing Indian development projects, including Cooley Loan projects.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

## Indo-U.S. Contract for Aerial Survey

A contract was signed in New Delhi on February 4, 1967 between the Government of India and Parsons Corporation, Los-Angeles, U.S.A., for undertaking aerial surveys and ground geological work under the ``Operation Hard Rock" programme.

The project aims at intensifying the search for base metals viz. copper, lead and zinc, which are essential to meet the country's industrial and defence requirements. Imports of these metals at present account for a substantial amount of foreign exchange.

The contract was signed by Shri R. N. Vasudeva, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Mines & Metals and Mr. Frank Halferty, Vice-Chairman, Parsons Corporation.

The programme envisaged under this project includes aerial surveys, followed by ground geological and geophysical work and diamond drilling in the Aravalli Region of Rajasthan, the eastern Cuddappah basin of Andhra Pradesh and the Mica Belt and Ranchi plateau of Bihar. The mineral zones will be delineated by air and the promising ones will be explored further. All the work will be conducted by the contractor under the strict supervision and control of the Ministry of Mines and Metals. The Parsons Group will be associated in this venture with Aero-Service Corporation of the U.S.A.

The programme also covers the establishment of a modern chemical and metallurgical laboratory, which will create a substantial potential for undertaking chemical analyses and metallurgical and ore-dressing studies. These will be of immense importance to the mining industry in India.

The entire operations will be completed within 30 months from the start of aerial survey flights and will cost about Rs. 4.5 crores, including a foreign exchange component of Rs. 2.5 crores (\$ 3.5 million). The foreign exchange cost is being met out of a U.S. AID loan.

This integrated programme employing the latest techniques of aerial surveys for the first time in the country, will mean a break-through in the field of geological exploration, which has hitherto been conducted on traditional and time-consuming methods. During the programme, over fifty officers of the Geological Survey of India will also get extensive training in modern methods of exploration.

USA INDIA

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement for Exchange of Scientists

An agreement between India and the United States providing for an exchange of scientists and engineers was concluded in New Delhi on February 14, 1967. Dr. Atma Ram, Director-General, Council of Scientific & Industrial Research, signed the agreement for India, and Ambassador Chester Bowles for the United States.

The new programme gives practical recognition to the growing importance in the two countries of a continuing exchange of scientific personnel and information. The plan calls for scientists and engineers from each country to visit the other for periods varying from two weeks to several months.

The new programme differs from the ones now existing between the two countries in that persons

of a more advanced professional level will be involved. On the Indian side there will be an emphasis on certain aspects of applied science to help in solving important national problems.

The two governments have agreed that the agencies responsible for carrying out this exchange programme within each country will be the Council of Scientific & Industrial Research for India and the National Science Foundation for the United States.

The proposed exchange of scientists will substantially augment the currently available means of exchanging the most up-to-date information between the scientific communities of the two countries.

14

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **VIETNAM**

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Cease-fire in Vietnam

Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, issued the following statement in New Delhi on February 8, 1967, welcoming the cease-fire on the occasion of the Vietnamese TET New Year festival:

Government of India welcome the cease-fire starting today (Feb. 8) on the occasion of the Vietnamese TET New Year festival and hope that the atmosphere of peace thus created will be fully utilised by all parties concerned to extend the cease-fire indefinitely and unconditionally. Government of India note with satisfaction the offer made in the statement issued by the Foreign Minister of the DRVN Government on 28th Jan-

uary, 1967, that talks between the US Government and the DRVN Government could start after the unconditional stoppage of bombing of DRVN territory. Government of India would like to appeal to the peace-loving Government and people of USA to stop the bombing of North Vietnam unconditionally and indefinitely in the firm belief that this would shift the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table, lead to early cessation of hostilities throughout Vietnam and a peaceful resolution of this tragic conflict which is resulting in avoidable loss of many human lives--both American and Vietnamese---and constitutes not only a serious threat to peace but is a disturbing factor in international relations. 15

VIETNAM INDIA USA

**Date**: Feb 01, 1967

# March

# **Volume No** 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1967 Vol. XIII MARCH No. 3

**CONTENTS** 

**PAGES** 

DISARMAMENT

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Non-proliferation of Nuclear 17

Weapons

**GREECE** 

Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income Ratified

# ROME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

19

### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on International Day of Elimination of Racial

Discrimination

22

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement on Peace-keeping Operations

22

# **IRAQ**

Joint Communique on Iraqi Foreign Minister's Visit to India

25

### **LEBANON**

Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation on Civil Aviation 26

### **NEPAL**

Press Note on Indo-Nepal Trade Talks

27

### **NORWAY**

Norwegian Assistance for Development of Fisheries in India

27

### UNION OF BURMA

Indo-Burmese Boundary Agreement 28

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement

28

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

GREECE ITALY INDIA IRAQ LEBANON NEPAL NORWAY BURMA USA

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

# DISARMAMENT

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Indian Parliament on March 27, 1967 on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons:

The General Assembly by its Resolution 1722 (XVI) appointed an Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, of which India is a member. The General Assembly recommended that the Committee should undertake negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

As the Honourable Members are aware, the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC), which in reality is a Seventeen-Nation Committee because of the absence of France, has been meeting in Geneva since 1962. Various measures collateral to the question of disarmament have been discussed in the Committee, and one of these is non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The ENDC has been giving particular attention to this subject since 1964, as it is recognised as a matter of some urgency.

Discussions in the Committee have revealed important differences of opinion, firstly, among the nuclear weapon powers themselves, and, secondly, between the nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon powers, The latter differences relate mostly to the question of mutuality and balance of responsibilities and obligations between the nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon powers.

The General Assembly in its Resolution No. 2028 (XX) of November 19, 1965, laid down the following as the main principles on the basis of which the Committee was to negotiate an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons:

(a) The treaty should be void of any loopholes which might permit nuclear or non-nuclear powers to proliferate, directly or indirectly, nuclear weapons in any form;

- (b) The treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear powers;
- (c) The treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and, more particularly, the nuclear disarmament;
- (d) There should be acceptable and workable provisions to ensure the effectiveness of the treaty;
- (e) Nothing in the treaty should adversely affect the right of any group of States to conclude regional treaties in order to ensure the total absence of nuclear weapons in their respective territories.

In elaboration of these principles, the views of the eight non-aligned non-nuclear weapon countries who are members of the ENDC, were submitted in a Joint Memorandum to the Committee on August 19, 1966.

After prolonged discussions lasting several months, the United States and U.S.S.R. are reported to have reached a considerable measure of agreement as to the terms of a non-proliferation treaty. An agreed text of a draft treaty has not yet been presented to the ENDC and, evidently, the two Powers have yet to reach agreement on some points. Neither of the Big Powers has formally handed to us the text of the draft treaty. They have, however, informally indicated to us the likely content of the draft treaty. There has been no occasion for us formally to take a stand on its reported provisions.

Our views on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons have been stated from time to time in the ENDC and at the forum of the United Nations. These views remain unchanged. We shall examine the text of any draft treaty submitted to the Committee in the light of the principles enunciated in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution No. 2028 (XX).

The Government of India share with the international community the anxiety arising from the proliferation of nuclear weapons. They favour

an early agreement on such a treaty and will be willing to sign one which fulfils the basic

17

principles laid down by the United Nations. They are of the view that any such treaty should be a significant step towards general and complete and, particularly nuclear disarmament, and must meet the points of view of both nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon powers. A non-proliferation treaty should not be a discriminatory or an unequal treaty. It is also the view of the Government of India that the non-proliferation treaty should be such as not to impede the growth of nuclear science and technology for peaceful purposes in the developing countrits, where the need for such development is great.

While welcoming a meeting of minds between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., which in itself is a good augury, the Government of India hope that after the draft treaty on nuclear nonproliferation is presented to the ENDC it will be thoroughly discussed and that the treaty as finally agreed would take a shape and form acceptable to all countries which are represented on the Committee, and, subsequently, to the international community in general. A satisfactory agreement on non-proliferation of nuclear weapon and non-nuclear weapon powers. A nonpeculiar circumstances in which certain countries are placed. So far as India is concerned, apart from its anxiety to see the conclusion of a nonproliferation treaty as a step towards achievement of general and complete disarmament and more particularly nuclear disarmament, India has a special problem of security against nuclear attack or nuclear blackmail. This aspect, which hardly needs elaboration, must necessarily be taken into full account before our final attitude to a non-proliferation treaty is determined.

INDIA FRANCE USA SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

## Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation of Income Ratified

Instruments ratifying the comprehensive Agreement for the avoidance of double taxation of income between India and Greece were exchanged in New Delhi on March 17, 1967 by Mr. John Phrantzes, Ambassador of Greece in India, and Shri R. C. Dutt, Secretary, Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue and Insurance). The Agreement had been signed by the representatives of the two Governments in 1965.

A Notification was issued today (March 17) by the Central Government to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement. With the completion of these formalities, the Agreement has come into force in both the countries. In India, the Agreement will be effective for the assessment year 1964-65 and later years.

The Agreement is based on the principles followed by India in similar Agreements with several other countries. It provides, in substance, that the country where the income arises will be primarily entilted to tax that income and that the country in which the taxpayer is resident will not charge tax on such income, although it may take it into account for the purpose of determining the rate at which tax is to be charged on the taxpayer's other income. However, income arising in either country to an enterprise of the other country from the operation of aircraft in international traffic will be exempt from tax in the country in which the income arises. In regard to profits arising to a shipping enterprise of either country from the carriage of cargo or passengers from ports in the other country, the Agreement provides that the latter country will reduce its tax on such profits to one-half thereof. The amount of the tax so reduced will be allowed as a credit against the tax payable on such profits in the country to which the shipping enterprise belongs in order to relieve double taxation of such profits.

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, delivered the following address to the Members of Indian Parliament on March 18, 1967:

Members of Parliament,

It gives me great pleasure to welcome you to this joint session of the two Houses of Parliament. I offer my congratulations to the newly elected and re-elected Members and my good wishes to those no longer with us.

Earlier, it was intended that the third Lok Sabha should have a final session this month mainly to pass a Vote on Account. Shortly after most of the election results were announced, many Honourable Members from different political parties approached us with the request that + should be the new Lok Sabha which should meet at this juncture to pass the Vote on Account and to transact other essential business. The Government agreed with this view and, on their advice, the third Lok Sabha was dissolved on the 3rd of March.

Our fourth General Elections have once again demonstrated the vigour and vitality of our democracy. There was a larger turn-out of voters than on any previous occasion, as well as a substantial increase in the number of women who cast their votes. Despite a few unfortunate incidents of violence and disturbance which have been universally condemned, the elections were orderly and peaceful. The Chief Election Commissioner and his staff deserve our congratula-

tions. So do the people, for the enthusiasm, maturity and dignity with which they have reaffirmed their faith in democracy and representative institutions.

For the first time since Independence, Governments of political complexions different from that of the Government at the Centre have been formed in several States. In a federal democratic polity, this is to be expected. Our Constitution has provisions defining and regulating the relationship between the Union and the States and their mutual obligations. Further, over the years, we have developed certain institutions for promoting co-operation, understanding and harmonious relations between the Union and the States, and between one State and another. The National Development Council, the Zonal Councils and periodic conferences of Governors and Chief Ministers are the more conspicuous examples of this nature.

The Union Government will respect the constitutional provisions in letter and in spirit without any discrimination and endeavour to strength the arrangements for a co-operative approach to our national problems. We are sure that all States will extend their co-operation in preserving these institutions and in making their deliberations increasingly fruitful and beneficial both, to the Union and to themselves. Strengthening the unity of the country, safeguarding its security, preserving democratic institutions, and promoting economic development and the wellbeing and happiness of all our people are the common objectives towards which the Union and the States must strive together.

Our Government have just taken office. While they will take a little time to place before you all the policies and programmes which they will pursue in accordance with the mandate of the electorate, they have already decided upon four major objectives in the economic sphere.

- (1) They have resolved to end our dependence on food assistance from abroad by the end of 1971.
- (2) They have resolved to do all that is possible to ensure that the rising trend in prices of the basic necessities of life is halted and conditions of stability

achieved in the shortest possible time.

- (3) They have resolved to attain and sustain an adequate rate of economic growth so as to eliminate the need for external economic assistance by 1976.
- (4) And they have resolved to pursue the national programme of family planning with the objective of reducing the birth rate from forty per thousand to twenty-five per thousand as expeditiously as possible.

19

These tasks are of such magnitude that they can be accomplished only with the active support, participation and involvement of the people and the co-operation of all parties. To secure these will be one of Government's primary objectives.

The food situation will be dealt with on an emergency basis. The measures already set in motion to fight the drought will be strengthened. We have to ensure that the available foodgrains in the country, whether indigenous or imported, are distributed equitably. Government are already in touch with State Governments, seeking their views and their co-operation in regard to the further steps that have to be taken on the food front.

Simultaneously, Government intend, in collaboration with the States, to make every effort to augment agricultural production. Our food import requirements must be reduced in each successive year. Towards this end, Government will pay special attention to the adequate availability of fertilizers and improved seeds and to the credit needs of the farmer. Greater emphasis will be placed on minor irrigation and energisation of wells. Efforts will be made to expedite the completion of major irrigation projects that are in an advanced stage of construction and to ensure the fullest utilization of the irrigation potential already created.

The upsurge in prices, particularly during the last two years, was primarily the result of the shortfall in agricultural production due to the failure of the monsoons. Industrial production

too was affected by the failure of the monsoons and the shortage of foreign exchange to import necessary raw materials. Deficit financing at the Centre and overdrafts by the State Governments on the Reserve Bank further aggravated the inflationary pressures. To deal with the situation, everything possible must be done to increase production in both agriculture and industry. The considerable potential and capacity in various sectors of the economy built during the past years must be more fully utilised. Simultaneously, a stricter financial discipline must be maintained. Economy is not inconsistent with efficiency and we must seek genuine economy in every field and in every sector of public expenditure.

Our Five-Year Plans have had the objective of making the economy self-reliant and capable of further development. To achieve this target by 1976, special attention will be paid in the Fourth Plan period to those industries which will contribute most to rapid development in the immediate future, particularly industries which will be helpful to our agriculture and exports. The greatest emphasis will have to be laid on higher efficiency in both the public and the private sectors. Substantial investments have been made in industry by the public sector in the first three Plans and it is important that these are now made to yield greater profits to sustain further development. The Draft Outline of the Fourth Plan was published some months ago. It is being reviewed in the light of adverse effects of the drought, the latest price trends, and the prospects of mobilising additional resources, internal and external, and it is proposed to take an early opportunity to discuss the Plan fully in the National Development Council and thereafter in Parliament

Our population has crossed the five hundred million mark. This is a danger signal which we can ignore only at our peril. Family Planning programmes will be strengthened at all levels with the co-operation of the States.

Although economic difficulties are at the root of much of the prevailing discontent, other factors too have contributed to a sense of frustration, particularly among the young. The new generation which has grown up since Independence has new aspirations and new ideas. We must respond to them. The educational system needs re-shaping in the light of the recommendations of the Edu-

cation Commission, on which we are awaiting the comments of the State Governments. A New scheme of national service at the University level is under active consideration.

The success of all our Plans and projects depends upon the efficiency and integrity of the administration. To ensure efficiency in performance, changes will be made in the administrative set-up. The Planning Commission will be re-organized. The working of controls will also be reviewed; those found unnecessary will be withdrawn and others re-adjusted as may be required to make them more purposeful and efficient. The Administrative Reforms Commission is expected to submit its recommendations on the re-organization of the Central Government fairly soon.

Integrity and impartially in public life, and in the conduct of the public servants, are the foundations of true democracy. The Administrative Reforms Commission has made an interim report bearing on this subject. Government agree, in principle, with the Commission's approach on the need for adequate and satisfactory institutional arrangements to deal with problems of corruption in high public office, whether political or administrative. They expect to finalize their proposals and place them before Parliament at an early date. They have already referred to the State Governments the recommendations of the Commission which concern them.

A National Commission on Labour has been set up under the chairmanship of Shri Gajendragadkar. The Commission will review and make appropriate recommendations on the whole field of the working and living conditions of labour of all categories, including rural labour, since

20

Independence. Legislation to give statutory recognition to the assurances given in regard to the official language of the Union will be shortly introduced in Parliament. A high-level committee will be set up to examine the question of a ban on cow slaughter in terms of the announcement already made. A committee will also be set up, as announced, to examine further the proposal for the re-organisation of the State of Assam in the light of the discussions held with the leaders

of Assam. The question of changing the financial year will be considered in consultation with the State Governments.

In a shrinking world, no country can remain isolated. India has a role to play in the counsels of the world. Our membership of the Security Council casts on us an onerous responsibility which we shall do our best to discharge.

The foreign policy of India has stood the test of time. The concept of peaceful co-existence, which India had done so much to sponsor, is now accepted by the leaders of the two groups. With both the United States and the Soviet Union we have the friendliest of relations. Our policy of non-alignment stands vindicated. Government will do everything possible to strengthen non-alignment and pursue the positive aspects of this policy with vigour and determination.

There are two dangers which confront humanity today. One is the widening gulf between the poor nations and the rich nations. The other is the rejection of the principle of peaceful coexistence by some countries.

Government's foreign policy will serve the twin objectives of furthering our national interests---economic, political and strategic---and of promoting international co-operation. Towards this end, we have succeeded in building up and maintaining the friendliest of relations with most countries of the world. It will be Government's special endeavour to strengthen India's relations with our Asian neighbours.

It is a matter of deep gratification that our Government have been able to sign an Agreement with the Government of Burma about the formal delineation and demarcation of our traditional boundary with that friendly country.

Government adhere to their policy regarding Vietnam which has been enunciated on several occasions.

Government most sincerely desire the friendship and co-operation of the Government and people of Pakistan. Nothing has distressed us more than the bitterness and conflict which have sometimes divided our two countries which have many common interests. Government will make every effort to achieve a relationship of the ful'est

understanding, goodwill and amity with Pakistan.

With China too we would like to live in peace. But the aggressive acts and postures of the People's Republic of China, coupled with their rejection of the concept of peaceful co-existence, continue to be the major obstacles to an improvement of our relations with China.

We are grateful to friendly nations of the world, as well as to international institutions and agencies, who have given us valuable assistance in our development programmes as well as in meeting our food crisis.

Developing countries can also strengthen their economies through mutual co-operation. The Tripartite Meeting between the leaders of three non-aligned countries, President Tito of Yugoslavia, President Nasser of the United Arab Republic and our Prime Minister, has laid the foundations of such an approach.

Another Head of State whom we had the pleasure of welcoming amidst us recently was His Majesty the King of Afghanistan, with whom we have had very friendly and cordial talks.

Members of Parliament, I have briefly touched upon some of the issues that confront us today. You will have an opportunity to get a fuller picture of the Government's policies and programmes in these and other matters in due course. Your present session will be a short one, confined to the transaction of certain essential financial and budgetary business. You will be meeting again shortly to consider further business.

Bills will be introduced in the current session to replace:---

- (1) The Mineral Products (Additional Duties of Excise and Customs) Amendment Ordinance, 1966;
- (2) The Essential Commodities (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 1966;
- (3) The Land Acquisition (Amendment and Validation) Ordinance, 1967; and
- (4) The Representation of the People (Amendment) Ordinance, 1967.

The Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill will also be introduced.

A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1967-68 will be laid before you.

It is a matter of distress to us that President's rule had to be introduced in Rajasthan. It is our earnest hope that it will not be necessary to continue this arrangement for long and that it will be found possible early to restore responsible government.

A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of Rajasthan for the financial year 1967-68 will also be laid before you.

I wish you success in your endeavours.

21

INDIA USA LATVIA BURMA VIETNAM PAKISTAN CHINA AFGHANISTAN

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Shri M. C. Chagia, Minister of External Affairs, issued the following statement on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (March 21, 1967):

The General Assembly in its Resolution of 26th October 1966, proclaimed 21st March 1967 as "International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination". This decision followed affirmation by the General Assembly that racial discrimination and apartheid were denials of human rights and fundamental freedoms and

constituted offences against human dignity. It recognised that whenever and wherever these evil policies were practised they became not only a serious impediment to economic and social development, but an obstacle to international cooperation and peace.

March 21 was chosen as it commemorates the anniversary of the massacre of peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination in SHARPEVILLE, seven years ago, when an African peaceful rally was fired upon by the Police killing 68 innocent persons and wounding 200.

The Sharpeville incident was a vitally important stage in the United Nations' consideration of the question of apartheid. It led to the adoption by the Security Council of a series of Resolutions and by the General Assembly of Declarations and covenants designed to promote respect for human rights and freedoms and to urge the erring government to abandon its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination. A sizeable group of persons of Indian origin settled in South Africa share the indignities and inhuman treatment meted out to the African people. Well before India became independent, Mahatma Gandhi reacted strongly against the policies of racial discrimination of the South African Government and, in the early years of this century, waged one of the most significant struggles in history---the passive resistance movement---for asserting human dignity and equality. Long before the UN Charter was written, Mahatma Gandhi led a non-violent movement to re-affirm faith in fundamental human rights in the dignity and worth of the human person and in equal rights for men and women, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

The Government of India raised the question of racial discrimination in South Africa from the very inception of the United Nations and has since then consistently led and supported all moves and causes in the General Assembly.

Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Human Rights Commission, Sub-Commission for the Protection of Minorities and Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, various Specialised Agencies of the UN and other International Organisations, designed to persuade the powers concerned to give up their policy of

racial discrimination. Although hitherto the war against racialism has met with wilful disregard, obduracy and obstinacy on the part of the racist powers, in the long run the will and the persistence of the peoples of the world for human dignity must prevail.

Welcoming the efforts of the United Nations, the Government of India avails itself of this occasion to re-dedicate itself to the cause of the total elimination of apartheid and racial discrimination from all parts of the world.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement on Peace-keeping Operations

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative at the United Nations, made the following statement at the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations on March 1, 1967:

Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I have taken the floor in the current series of meetings of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. I should like to take this opportunity to extend to you my heartiest congratulations on your unanimous election as Chairman of the Committee. The congratulations of my delegation go also to Mr. Klusak of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Ignatieff of Canada and Mr. Abdel-Hamid of the United

22

Arab Republic on their unanimous election to the Bureau. I have no doubt that, with the election of such able personalities to the Bureau, it will function effectively under your wise guidance to give a sense of direction and purposefulness to the

important deliberations to be undertaken by the Committee.

We are meeting here as Working Group A of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations in pursuance of the endorsement of the memorandum on the organization of the work of the Special Committee (A/AC.121/L.3) submitted by eleven non-aligned delegations, including India.

Working Group A has been charged with the study of the various methods of financing peace-keeping operations, with due regard to: (a) the special responsibilities of the permanent members of the Security Council; (b) the relatively limited capacity of the economically developing countries to contribute towards the cost of such operations; and (c) the necessity to give special consideration to the situation of any Member States which are victims of aggression and those which are otherwise involved in events or actions leading to a peace-keeping operation.

The terms of reference of Working Group A have been precisely defined and would appear to preclude any detailed consideration of the constitutional aspects of peace-keeping operations. However, as has become consistently apparent in this Committee in the past, the financial aspects of peace-keeping operations are organically linked with their constitutional aspects, and I would beg your indulgence and that of the Working Group for such references as I shall have to make to these constitutional aspects in elucidation of the views of my delegation on the basic question before this Working Group, namely, the various methods of financing peace-keeping operations. I would, at the same time, hasten to add that the tentative suggestions in regard to the financing of peace-keeping operations which I wish to place before the Working Group can and should be considered without prejudice to the views various members of the Committee may hold on the constitutional aspects of the question. Indeed any recommendation of this Working Group must be without prejudice to whatever recommendations the Special Committee itself might make in regard to the constitutional aspects.

The delegation of India has for quite some time participated in various groups and committees dealing with different aspects of the complex problem

of peace-keeping operations. The Indian delegation is consequently acutely aware of the extent of the frustration experienced by the entire membership of the United Nations in trying to work out solutions to the problem of peace-keeping. It is with the benefit of this experience that my delegation has come to the conclusion that past efforts were not devoted sufficiently to working out practical and mutually acceptable solutions. More particularly, it seems to us that it is the attempt made in the past to solve the problem in its entirety at one stroke which has led to failure and frustration. Against this background, it appears to my delegation that it may be more expedient and practical at this stage to divide the problem into its component parts and to try to study, discuss and settle one aspect of the problem at a time.

I believe I am right in saying that there is now universal agreement that the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and consequently the primary responsibility for the establishment of peace-keeping operations. This is not to deny such authority as the General Assembly has in this field. The differences that exist arise precisely out of attempts to define the exact authority of the Security Council and the General Assembly respectively. There is sizable support for the view that the General Assembly is vested with considerable residual authority particularly in situations in which the Security Council fails to act. There is, however, the opposite view that, while the General Assembly has the right, the authority, indeed the responsibility, to discuss any question, it cannot under any circumstances, take action within the meaning of Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter. The proponents of this view extend their definition of ``action" to cover even the dispatch of a single soldier to a troubled spot in the world. There is then the third point of view expressed by the delegation of France on more than one occasion. On 22nd November 1966, Ambassador Seydoux spoke in the Special Political Committee as follows, according to the summary record.

"In the French Government's view, the apportionment of functions between the Security Council and the General Assembly was based primarily on Article 11 (2) of the Charter. Moreover, that Charter provision could not be limited to the measures provided for in Articles 41 and 42, but also covered any measures involving

the creation of a military force, even if
the force was created with the agreement of the
States concerned and even if the actual use of
armed force was theoretically limited to certain
exceptional cases. Within those limits, the
Security Council had exclusive authority. The
General Assembly could undertake such operations
as observation, surveillance, or investigation,
provided that those operations were not
carried out by units placed under military
command and that the units were not responsible
for their own security.

### 23

"In other words, the concept of peace-keeping operations embraced two kinds of very different measures which must in no circumstances be confused. One kind involved an element of coercion and, therefore, under Chapter VII, had to be decided upon, organized and financed in accordance with the provisions of the Charter, in other words, with the unanimous agreement of the permanent members of the Security Council; the other kind came under Chapter VI and could therefore be undertaken on the initiative of the Security Council or the General Assembly." (A/SPC/SR. 522, page 5).

In my statement in the Special Political Committee of 25 November 1966, I had occasion to note that the delegations of France and India held similar, if not identical, views on this particular aspect of peace-keeping operations. It seems to us that there is little prospect of any progress being made in solving any aspect of the complex problem of peace-keeping unless an attempt is made to adjust positions in such a way as to secure universal support for some practical via media and the approach of the French delegation opens possibilities for a solution of this aspect of the question. At the same time, it would appear that, though this approach could form the basis of an equitable solution, it requires further elucidation and my delegation earnestly hopes that the delegation of France will elaborate its point of view on this particular aspect of the question in greater detail to enable the Committee to give serious consideration to the solution such a method of approach may produce.

I have dwelt at some length on the constitutional aspects of the peace-keeping problem only

to emphasize the fact that there is an area of broad agreement in this field. Efforts can separately continue to crystallize the precise area of agreement, namely, to settle which operations the Security Council alone can authorize and as to which residual powers the General Assembly enjoys in this field. In the meantime, as far as the deliberations of this Working Group are concerned, it appears to my delegation that, in accordance with the step-by-step approach I advocated earlier, it would be useful to confine our attention for the present to the area of broad agreement and to consider the financing of peace-keeping operations authorized by the Security Council.

It is recognized that the Security Council has the authority to take certain decisions on the financing of peace-keeping operations which it has authorized. The Security Council could decide whether or not the expenses on a particular peace-keeping operation should be met by the aggressor or the party responsible for the situation requiring the mounting of a peace-keeping operation, by contributions by countries directly concerned and involved, by contributions exclusively by the permanent members of the Security Council, which unquestionably have a special and greater responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, or by voluntary contributions. On this there is general agreement. It is only on the question of the authority of the Security Council to assume exclusive responsibility to tax the entire membership of the United Nations that differences of opinion have arisen. It is the firm belief of the Indian delegation that the Security Council does not have the authority to tax the entire membership of the Organization without their concurrence, and such concurrence can be obtained only through the General Assembly. If the Security Council decides to establish a peace-keeping operation and it is unable to make financial arrangements either under the provisions of Article 43 of the Charter or in any of the other ways in which it is in a position to take financial decisions for such an operation, it appears to the delegation of India that the possibility of the Security Council requesting the General Assembly to find appropriate methods of financing the operation deserves the careful consideration of this Working Group. The acceptance of such a proposal would undoubtedly involve certain

modalities and the formulation of detailed procedures. My delegation believes that these are issues which can usefully be discussed and negotiated.

This brings me to the final aspect of financing the peace-keeping operations. Once it is decided that the costs of a particular operation should be shared among the entire membership of the General Assembly, then it is necessary to work out an equitable system of assessments. It is clear and I need not dwell on this in any detail. that the membership of the United Nations falls into various categories depending upon responsibility and capacity to pay. Whereas the permanent members of the Security Council have the greatest responsibility and the capacity to pay and the economically developed Member States have greater capacity, the economically developing Member States of the Organization have a very limited capacity. There is also the question of aggression and the victims of aggression. It might be useful in this context for the Working Group to study document A/AC.113/18, popularly known as R-18, which contain the ideas of the developing Member States of the Organization, including India. The principles contained in that document deserve serious consideration because they reflect the views of the developing countries, and because they represent the most equitable method of sharing the cost of peace-keeping operations. My delegation has had occasion in the past to note that, while these principles could be applied with some degree of flexibility, it was important that it should be realized

### 24

that refusal to accept any one of them would seriously jeopardize the possibility of achieving a rational solution to the problem. It appears to us that this Working Group, which is examining the limited question of the financing of peace-keeping operations, should study those principles in detail and work out a rational scale of assessments based on those principles. The adoption of such a system would, in our view, go a long way to lay a solid foundation for the financing of peace-keeping operations on a truly equitable basis.

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

**IRAQ** 

Joint Communique on Iraqi Foreign Minister's Visit to India

His Excellency Dr. Adnan Al-Pachachi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, accompanied by Mrs. Al-Pachachi, arrived in New Delhi on March 3, 1967 on a six-day visit to India. At the conclusion of his visit, a joint communique was issued by the Foreign Ministers of Iraq and India in New Delhi on March 8, 1967.

The following is the text of the joint communique:

At the invitation of Shri M. C. Chagla, Foreign Minister of India, His Excellency Dr. Adnan Al-Pachachi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, accompanied by Mrs. Al-Pachachi, visited India from March 3 to March 8, 1967. During his stay in New Delhi, His Excellency the Foreign Minister called on the President, the Vice-President and the Prime Minister of India and had discussions with the Foreign Minister and the Minister of Commerce. These discussions covered a variety of subjects of common interest including in particular the present world situation and matters of mutual interest to their two countries and the developing economic and technical collaboration between them. The discussion took place in a cordial atmosphere and revealed a general similarity of views on the current international situation and contributed to bring about closer mutual understanding. The Foreign Minister of Iraq expressed his deep appreciation for the warm and cordial reception accorded to him and Mrs. Al-Pachachi. He also expressed his admiration for the great progress achieved by India in many fields.

The two Foreign Ministers reiterated their conviction in the continuing validity of the policy of non-alignment which has made a positive contribution to the cause of peace and international cooperation. They also stressed the importance of the acceptance of the principles of peaceful co-existence by the world community if international peace and security are to be safeguarded. They continue to be opposed to all forms of imperialism, hegemony or monopoly of power and interference, direct or indirect, by one State in the affairs of the other. They were opposed to military alliances and other groupings which stand in the way of international cooperation.

Both sides reiterated their firm opposition to colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms and manifestations, and condemned the alliance between forces of colonialism and racialism. In this context they expressed deep concern and anxiety at the deteriorating situation in Zimbabwe and demanded comprehensive mandatory economic sanctions and the use of force, if necessary, to put an end to the illegal racist minority regime in Zimbabwe. They expressed their full support for the struggle of the people of Aden and the Protectorates to attain freedom and independence and called for the speedy and full implementation of the U.N. Resolutions on Aden so that the present disturbed and tense situation in Southern Arabia may be brought to an end and that the territory may attain freedom and independence at an early date in accordance with the freely expressed will of the people, so that Southern Arabia joins the comity of nations as a truly independent State. Both sides viewed with deep concern the continuance and the recent intensification of hostilities in Vietnam which constitute a serious threat to world peace and the danger of a wider war. They felt convinced that there could be no military solution to this problem and that an early settlement can best be found on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Agreements so that the people of Vietnam may be free to decide their future without

25

out any foreign interference. They agreed that the unconditional stoppage of bombing of North Vietnam is an essential first step towards the cessation of all hostilities in Vietnam. Both Foreign Ministers expressed their increasing concern at the intensification of the arms race which poses a serious threat to international peace and security and reiterated their view about the necessity of an early agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They emphasised the serious danger inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and expressed the hope for the early conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the U.N. General Assembly at its XX session and re-affirmed at its XXI session, in particular the principle of an acceptable balance of obligations and responsibilities between the nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear States.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed India's determination to continue to make efforts to implement fully the Tashkent Declaration with a view to establishing good neighbourly relations. Both sides expressed the hope that the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration would create an atmosphere of mutual trust, understanding and cooperation conducive to the creation of good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan and the solution of all outstanding differences in accordance with the U.N. Charter in the best interests of both India and Pakistan and thus make a significant contribution to peace in the region.

The two Foreign Ministers reiterated the full support of their Governments for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people and their struggle for the realisation of their aspirations in accordance with the Declaration of the 1964 Cairo Conference of Non-aligned Countries.

Both sides attach great importance to the urgent and imperative need for initiating practical steps for promoting among developing countries mutual trade and economic cooperation, collaboration in the fields of industrial ventures, training in modern scientific research and technical skills, as a means of strengthening their national independence and self-reliance. In this context both sides considered the further development and strengthening of mutual cooperation in the scientific, technical, economic and cultural fields, and while expressing satisfaction with the progress made so far, desired that the Indo-Iraqi Joint

Committee should intensify their efforts towards the possibility of promoting further mutually advantageous cooperation.

The Foreign Minister of Iraq extended an invitation to the Foreign Minister of India to visit Iraq at a time mutually convenient. The Foreign Minister of India was happy to accept the invitation.

The two Foreign Ministers expressed deep satisfaction that the visit of the Foreign Minister of Iraq and the opportunity it had afforded for a frank and friendly exchange of views has further strengthened the ties of friendship and understanding and mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations between the two countries.

IRAQ INDIA USA ZIMBABWE VIETNAM SWITZERLAND UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN EGYPT

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

### LEBANON

Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation on Civil Aviation

An agreement between Lebanon and India was initialled in Beirut on March 2, 1967 by Shri R. C. Dutt. Secretary, Minister of Finance, on behalf of the Government of India. The agreement provides for the avoidance of double taxation on civil aviation.

The agreement was signed following the negotiations held between the delegations of the two Governments in Beirut.

26

LEBANON INDIA

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### **NEPAL**

Press Note on Indo-Nepal Trade Talks

The following is the text of a Press Note issued in New Delhi on March 31, 1967 at the conclusion of the trade talks held between the delegations of Nepal and India:

In accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding on matters arising out of the Treaty of Trade and Transit (1960) signed in Kathmandu on 27th December, 1966, the Inter-governmental Joint Committee, comprising the representatives of HMG Nepal and Government of India held their first meeting in Delhi from 27th March to 29th March, 1967. The Delegation of Nepal was led by Shri K. B. Adhikari, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, HMG Nepal and the Delegation of India was led by Shri B. D. Jayal, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Government of India. The talks were held in the spirit of cordiality, friendship and mutual understanding.

The main items discussed were the provision of facilities for Nepalese cargo in Transit through India, refund of central excise duty to HMG Nepal in respect of exports from India to Nepal, collection of statistics of Indo-Nepal trade, treatment of Indian goods in the tariff of HMG Nepal and deflection in trade in raw jute.

Studies have already been initiated in regard to arrangements which are in force for handling and movement of transit cargo to and from the ports of Rotterdam, Hamburg and Trieste to and from the points in land-locked States so that suitable action could be taken. It was decided that these studies may be expedited and thereafter a joint study made and the question of the additional facilities to be provided for the transit of Nepalese cargo could be considered as soon as the joint studies were completed.

It was agreed that the refund of central excise duty to HMG Nepal be made promptly and steps taken urgently to eliminate delays as far as possible. It was decided that the two Governments would consider the question of entering into an agreement relating to the movement of transport vehicles between India and Nepal. A procedure for the collection and exchange of trade statistics between India and Nepal was agreed to and it was also decided that trade statistics would be exchanged between the two Governments regularly. It was agreed that any discrimination in tariff which existed in respect of exports to and imports from India would be removed by Nepal. The two Delegations also discussed the question of deflection of trade in raw jute exported from India to Nepal.

NEPAL INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **NORWAY**

Norwegian Assistance for Development of Fisheries in India

An agreement was concluded in New Delhi on March 17, 1967 for further Norwegian assistance for the development of fisheries in India. It was signed by Mr. Haakon Nord, Norwegian Ambassador to India, Shri S. G. Ramachandran. Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Dr. John McDiarmid, Resident Representative of U. N. Development Programme.

The Government of Norway will, under this agreement, provide during a five-year period from April 1, 1967, grants and credits totalling 40 million Norwegian Kroner (about Rs. 4 crores). The amount will be utilised for procuring the services of Norwegian experts and the purchase of equipment and machinery not available in India and machinery etc. for vessels and

shore installations. The terms of credit will be negotiated separately between the two Governments.

The Government of India, on their part, will provide land, buildings, equipment and machinery available in India and will meet the recurring expenditure of the Project including local costs of the Norwegian personnel. The total Indian contribution over the five-year period is expected to be about Rs. 4.80 crores. The United Nations is expected to make available, at the request of the two Governments, such assistance as may be appropriate in accordance with its governing resolutions.

The Indo-Norwegian Fisheries Development Project was started in Kerala as a result of the tripartite Agreement entered into by the United Nations and the Governments of India and Norway on October 17, 1952 and subsequent three Supplementary Agreements signed in 1953. 1956 and 1961. The activities of the project were extended in 1961 from Ernakulam to Karwar, Cannanore and Mandapam in Mysore and Madras for achieving fully the objective of fisheries development by improving fishing methods, efficient distribution of fresh fish, improving fish products and the health conditions of the fishing population. The Government of Norway has assisted the project with Norwegian equipment and personnel. The present Agreement will result in continued cooperation for a further period of five years.

NORWAY INDIA

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNION OF BURMA

Indo-Burmese Boundary Agreement

The Government of the Union of Burma and the Government of India signed a boundary agreement on the 10th March, 1967, for the purpose of formally delimiting and demarcating the boundary between the two countries. The agreement was signed by Colonel Kyi Maung for the Government of the Union of Burma and by Shri K. M. Kannampilly for the Government of India.

The agreement provides for the establishment of a Joint Boundary Commission which will be charged with the task of planning and carrying out demarcation of the boundary between the two countries, with the preparation of boundary maps and with the drafting of a boundary treaty.

The agreement is subject to ratification, and the instruments of ratification will be exchanged in New Delhi within three months of the singing of the agreement.

The two Governments believe that this agreement will further strengthen the friendly relations between the two countries.

BURMA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Loan Agreement

The Governments of India and the United States concluded in New Delhi on March 14, 1967 an agreement providing for a line of credit of Rs. 288.4 crores from P.L. 480 funds to India. The Government of India will draw upon this credit to finance economic development projects mutually agreed upon by the two governments.

Shri S. Jagannathan, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, and Dr. John P. Lewis, Minister-Director. U.S. Agency for International Development (U.S.A.I.D.) Mission to India, signed the agreement.

28

USA INDIA

**Date**: Mar 01, 1967

# **April**

# Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1967

Vol. XIII APRIL No. 4

**CONTENTS** 

PAGES
BELGIUM
Indo-Belgian Air Agreement
29

**GREECE** 

Indo-Greek Trade Agreement Extended 29

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on President's Address 30

**KUWAIT** 

Joint Communique on Shri Chagla's Visit 31 NEHRU AWARD FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING President's Speech Presenting the Award to U Thant 32 Reply by U Thant 33 Prime Minister's Speech at the Presentation Ceremony 35 Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet to the Secretary-General 36 Reply by the Secretary-General `37 **SUDAN** President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming the Sudanese President 38 Reply by the Sudanese President 39 President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Dinner to the Sudanese President 39 Reply by the Sudanese President

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

BELGIUM GREECE KUWAIT SUDAN INDIA

Indo-Sudanese Joint Communique

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

42

### **BELGIUM**

Indo-Belgian Air Agreement

An air agreement between the Government of India and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium was signed in New Delhi on April 6, 1967. Shri S. Chakravarti, Secretary, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India and H. E. Mr. Jean Leroy, the Belgian Ambassador in New Delhi, signed on behalf of his Government.

The Air-India will run, under this agreement, a weekly service through Brussels on the route Bombay-Delhi-Teheran-Rome-Brussels-London.

Belgium is the 24th country with which India has signed agreement relating to air services. The agreement contains the terms and conditions under which the airlines of the two countries will operate air services. It is subject to ratification by the two Governments.

The agreement is expected to facilitate and promote closer contact between the two countries and further contribute to the existing friendly relations between them.

BELGIUM INDIA USA ITALY UNITED KINGDOM

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

# **GREECE**

Indo-Greek Trade Agreement Extended

Letters were exchanged between Shri D. K. Srinivasachar, Joint Secretary, Union Ministry of Commerce, and His Excellency Mr. John Phrantzes, Ambassador, Royal Greek Embassy, in New Delhi on April 3, 1967 extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between India and Greece up to 31st December, 1967.

The Trade Agreement was first signed on the 14th February, 1958 and has since been extended from year to year.

The Indo-Greek trade which stood between Rs. 55 to 75 lakhs prior to the Agreement, has steadily moved upwards since then. During the calendar year 1966, the trade rose to Rs. 190 lakhs as compared to Rs. 150 lakhks in 1965.

Among the Indian exports to Greece are: Jute fabrics, spices, coir varn and coir goods, raw hemp, mica and iron ore. Indian imports from Greece include natural abrasives and gum resins.

29

**GREECE INDIA** 

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **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 foreign affairs in the course of her reply to the debate in the Lok Sabha on April 5, 1967 on the motion of thanks to the President for his address to the Members of Parliament:

...I should like to say a few words about foreign affairs and our relations with foreign countries, whether they be our neighbours or whether they are situated far off. Many members have touched upon this. The hon. member, Shri Masani, said that we are friendless. I think it is very difficult to judge who is whose friend. I do not think that we are friendless. In times of need, countries with different systems, different

persuasions, have come to our help; I think the list of our friends, if we are to go into detail is a fairly comprehensive one and it covers practically all continents.

Foreign relations are governed only by considerations of national interest and the nation's security and are rooted in the firm belief that mankind is one family and that to exist we have also to co-exist. That is why we have tried always to further our national interests both from the economic, political and strategic points of view and secondly to promote international co-operation and peace. This was our aim in the past and this is what will guide us in the future.

I want to assure members about one thing. Some of them have a feeling that we pursue a particular policy merely because it has been a declared policy. All policies are constantly under review, because if they do not serve the purpose of today, there is naturally no point in continuing with the same policies. If we continue a particular policy today, it is because after reviewing and retesting, we feel that it meets the needs of today, that it meets the needs of national interests.

We also have a fundamental dedication to championing the cause of all people who are fighting against racialism and colonialism. Some people feel that may be this is un-necessary or it is not our business, but we know from our own experience how much it meant to us when we were fighting for our freedom when there were people in other countries who appreciated our fight, and if they could not help us in any other way at least they could give moral support. That freedom is indivisible. Therefore, we are deeply concerned with the rights of the people of South Africa, of Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, Southern Rhodesia, Aden and other countries which have yet to attain freedom.

There are few thing which are more dangerous than the consequences of racial war, and that is why we have opposed the policy followed in South Africa.

### **PAKISTAN**

Some members have talked of the need for a more positive policy towards Pakistan. Government entirely agree. We have always stated our point that it is necessary, in fact it is vital, for India and Pakistan to work in co-operation on as many issues and as many spheres as possible, because we are neighbours, because we share the same problems and difficulties and we shall certainly continue to make every effort possible. To have greater understanding and goodwill with Pakistan. It distresses us deeply that our relationship should not have been one of amity, and that there should be considerable distrust between these two neighbours.

### **CHINA**

With regard to China also, our policy is well known, and here again, we have no quarrel with the Chinese people, and we would certainly like not to have a rigid attitude in this, but we feel that some indication should come or some situation created in which we can get out of our present rut. This has been completely lacking, but we do not believe that we should close the door for that matter.

An hon. Member said that we have been silent on Vietnam. There are other members who are constantly telling us that we talk too much about Vietnam. So, actually, I do not think we are silent, nor have we overstated the case. We have expressed our view whenever it was necessary to do so. The house knows the Government's views on this, and we fervently hope that peace

30

will return to Vietnam soon. We have welcomed the various peace moves which have been made, including the one by the Secretary-General, U Thant, whom we shall have the pleasure of welcoming amidst us some time next week, and it is our hope that the problem can be taken away from the battle field and brought to the conference table.

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **KUWAIT**

Joint Communique on Shri M. C. Chagla's Visit

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued at the end of the Minister of External Affairs, Shri M. C. Chagla's three-day visit to Kuwait:

In response to an invitation from His Excellency Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmed Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the State of Kuwait, His Excellency Mr. Mohammedali Currim Chagla, Foreign Minister of India, paid an official visit to Kuwait from the 15th to the 17th of April, 1967.

This visit gave His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India and the members of his delegation the opportunity of witnessing Kuwait's achievements in various fields under the leadership of His Highness the Amir. The Foreign Minister of India expressed his admiration for the rapid progress of the country and the efforts which continue to be made in this direction. He also expressed his deep appreciation for the warm and cordial reception accorded to him

During this visit His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India had the honour to be received in audience by His Highness the Amir and His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister.

Official talks were held between the esteemed guest and Their Excellencies the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Commerce and Industry and the Minister of

#### Education.

His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India and His Excellency Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmed Al-Jaber Al-Sabah reviewed with satisfaction the friendly relations prevailing between the two countries and reaffirmed their determination to further develop these relations so that they could cover all aspects of mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries.

Inspired by this spirit His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India conveyed to His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Kuwait the decision of the Government of India to appoint a Resident Ambassador in Kuwait. The Foreign Minister of Kuwait welcomed this decision of the Government of India.

The two Ministers reiterated their conviction in the validity of the policy of non-alignment which has made a positive contribution to the cause of peace. They also stressed the importance of peaceful coexistence between all countries to safeguard world peace and expressed their opposition to military alliances and also to any other blocs which stand in the way of international co-operation.

The two Ministers reiterated the full support of their Governments to the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their struggle for the realisation of their aspirations in accordance with the Declaration of the 1964 Cario Conference of Non-Aligned countries.

They also expressed their full support for the struggle of the people of South Arabia so that they may attain freedom and independence in accordance with the resolutions of the United Nations at an early date so that South Arabia joins the comity of nations as a truly independent state.

The two Ministers expressed their deep concern at the intensification of the arms race which constitutes a serious threat to world security and reaffirmed the necessity of an early agreement on general and complete disarmament and the conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation in accordance with the principles approved by the United Nations General Assembly at its 20th session and reaffirmed at its 21st session.

Both sides expressed the hope that the differences between India and Pakistan would be resolved peacefully by direct negotiations without any external interference in accordance with the Tashkent Declaration for the mutual benefit of both countries with a view to establishing good neighbourly relations.

His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India extended a cordial invitation to the Foreign Minister of Kuwait to visit India which invitation was accepted with pleasure.

In the talks which took place between the Foreign Minister of India and the Minister of Commerce and Industry of Kuwait, both sides expressed their satisfaction with the results of the deliberations of the second meeting of the Indo-Kuwait Joint Committee held in Kuwait from the 9th to the 15th April, 1967, which was marked by a keen desire on both sides to enhance the area of cooperation between the two countries. They noted with satisfaction that it was agreed in principle that detailed feasibility surveys would be conducted by an expert Indian agency in respect of industrial ventures which appear to hold promise. The Indian Delegation also offered to make available to the Government of Kuwait upon request the services of Indian technicians and experts together with training facilities for Kuwaiti personnel in India. The two delegations agreed upon the procedure to be adopted for the utilisation of these services and facilities. The possibility of collaboration between India and Kuwait in the field of production of fertilizers was also examined and in the light of this examination it was agreed that further consideration would be given by the Government of India. The two Ministers felt that there was considerable scope for development of trade and

economic cooperation between India and Kuwait which have complimentary economies and a longstanding tradition of friendly relations. They agreed that periodic meetings of the Indo-Kuwait Joint Committee served a valuable purpose in promoting mutual understanding and that these meetings should take place every six months.

His Excellency the Foreign Minister of India discussed with His Excellency the Minister of Education of Kuwait the possibilities of extending cultural exchanges and cooperation in the development of the educational programme of Kuwait and agreed that the varied opportunities available should be utilized.

The Foreign Minister of India conveyed to Their Excellencies the Minister of Commerce and Industry and the Minister of Education a cordial invitation to visit India which invitation was accepted with pleasure.

KUWAIT INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

#### NEHRU AWARD FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

President's Speech Presenting the Award to U Thant

His Excellency U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, paid a State visit to India from April 10 to April 16, 1967. On April 12, the President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, presented to U Thant the first Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding at a ceremony held in Vigyan Bhavan, New Delhi.

While presenting the Award, President

#### Radhakrishnan said:

We are all happy that U Thant is selected for the first Nehru Award for International Understanding. His outstanding work in this direction as Secretary-General of the United Nations has inspired confidence. All

32

these years he has been engaged in a passionate quest for peace and his selection for the award has evoked universal aclaim.

Nehru wrote on September 3, 1936 to Sheila Grant Duff a letter in which he said, 'I do not want war even for the sake of Indian freedom or perhaps it should be more correct to say that I do not look forward to any real freedom for India as a result of devastating conflict all over the world. It is all complicated. We are forced to look deeper down and examine the roots of the evil and try to remove them, avoiding, as far as we can, the destruction of the good that we have.' In other words, the deeper causes of war within ourselves are our ignorance and misunderstanding of one another. The Roman playwright Terence put it in the mouth of one of his characters: "I am a human being, so there is nothing human that is not my concern." The avoidance of war is the main concern of all mankind today.

Peace is the harmonising of men in their differences; it is giving battle to distrust and prejudice. This is the meaning of international understanding of human reconciliation. The use of force in settling these differences is not only bad morals but is bad policy as well.

There is a certain duplicity in human nature which makes us do things even when we recognize them to be wrong. When Pontius Pilate pronounced Jesus innocent and yet handed him over, he did what we all do, say one thing and do another. People, who in their private lives are honourable and decent, are prepared for the possibility of a nuclear war, which will end in the destruction of civilization, if not of all life.

Brotherhood of man requires the recognition of common purpose and human-co-operation. Love must penetrate the hearts and minds of people everywhere.

The achievement of stable peace is a longer and more complicated process than the relatively simple one of making war. We are aware of the ceaseless efforts which U Thant has been making, in spite of obstacles and discouragements, for settling the problem of Vietnam and ending that senseless slaughter of innocent men, women and children. The scheme of cease-fire in Vietnam followed by preliminary talks leading to the re-convening of the Geneva Conference, takes account of world opinion. We hope that it may be possible to implement this scheme with any small modifications, if necessary. As a true Buddhist U Thant aims at peace, without victory or defeat for either side, but with reconciliation.

In this fast dissolving world, it is well to remember that our security is in abiding spiritual values which we should seek to preserve with complete dedication.

Buddhist humanism starts with the idea that human existence necessarily involves suffering. The way to put an end to it is by stopping greed. It emphasises the universality of all mankind. Self-scrutiny and international discipline are essential for safeguarding peace.

It is a pleasure to present the award to this great servant of peace and understanding.

INDIA USA OMAN VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

#### NEHRU AWARD FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Reply by U Thant

The following is the text of the speech U Thant made on receiving the Nehru Award:

I am most grateful to His Excellency the President for his very gracious words about me and for his wise observations on the human situation today. I also wish to thank Her Excellency the Prime Minister for her kind and generous remarks, and especially for her reiteration of India's full support of the United Nations and its efforts towards world peace. May I also express my appreciation to the Honourable Minister for External Affairs for his warm words of welcome, and to Mr. Rahman for the citatior which he has just read. To be the first recipient of the Nehru Memorial Award would be a special honour for anyone, but for a Secretary-General of the United Nations it has a particular significance. The award is given 'for outstanding contribution to the promotion of international understanding, good-will and friendship among the peoples of the world.' To receive such an award in memory of Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru adds inspiration and encouragement to the honour.

Mr. Nehru was a towering figure in the years of transition which transformed the world after World War II. His greatness did

33

not spring from physical power or political manoeuvering, but primarily from the depth and wisdom of his own nature. He saw the modern world, with all its changes, promises, dangers and problems in the clear light of his own intellectual and spiritual calm. The belief that an ethical approach must be taken to all aspects of life, including large-scale public activity, and a deep respect and love for the dauntlessness of the human spirit, allowed him to face the risks, disappointments and difficulties of public life. both national and international, with calmness and courage. On one occasion he said:

"How amazing is the spirit of man! In spite of innumerable failings, man throughout the ages has sacrificed his life and all he held dear for an ideal, for truth, for faith, for country and honour. That ideal may change, but the capacity for self-sacrifice continues, and because of that much may be forgiven man, and it is impossible to lose hope for him. In the midst of disaster he has not lost his dignity or his faith in the values he cherishes, at the mercy of nature's mighty forces, less than a speck of dust in this vast universe, he has hurled defiance at the elemental fires and with his mind, cradle of revolution, has sought to master them."

Mr. Nehru, for all his great stature, was not, of course, entirely immune to the occupational dilemma of all public men, and so there were times, as there are for all national leaders, when his actions had to be adjusted to the needs of political realities. Mr. Nehru was, after all, human like the rest of us.

In the international world Mr. Nehru, in a period of great tension, played a leading role as a statesman, in the best sense of the word. Under his leadership India assumed the pre-eminent place in the councils of the world which she has enjoyed ever since. He could be relied on to raise his voice in strong support of peace, of common sense, of decency and of international cooperation. He was one of those statesmen of deep and firm conviction, whose service to his own country was combined and enhanced by his service to the international community as a whole.

In the United Nations Mr. Nehru was known as a great internationalist, and as one of the most eloquent exponents and one of the most authoritative interpreters of the theory of non-alignment. Everyone remember the speech he made at the United Nations General Assembly in November 1961, shortly after I had assumed my present responsib lities. He said then:

'More and more we live under a kind of regime of terror. Terror of what? Terror of some kind of catastrophe like war descending upon us? Some kind of disaster when nuclear weapons are used and the future of the world's survival is imperilled. The choice today before the world is a choice of self-extinction or survival. Many people think and talk about escaping the disaster of a nuclear war by burrowing into the earth and living like rats in a hole. Surely it's a strange commentary on our times that we should be driven to this conclusion instead of diverting all of our energies and all of our strength to the prevention of the catastrophe.

`The essential thing about this world is co-operation and, even today, between coutnries that are opposed to each other in the political or other field there is a vast amount of cooperation. Little is known, or little is said, about this cooperation that is going on, but a great deal is said about every point of conflict, and so the world is full of this idea that the conflicts go on and we live on the verge of disaster. Perhaps it would be a truer picture if the cooperating elements of the world today were put forward and we were made to think that the world depends upon cooperation and not conflict.'

#### And he went on to suggest that:

'perhaps this Assembly might resolve to call upon all countries of the world to devote a year, not to speeches about peace, I do not think that is much good, but to the furtherance of cooperative activities in any field, political, cultural, or whatever fields there may be, and there are thousands of fields.'

It was following this speech that the United Nations decided to observe the year 1965, the twentieth year in the life of the United Nations, as International Co-operation Year.

Mr. Nehru did not confine himself to mere words in support of the principles of the United Nations Charter. Under his leadership India, whatever her own difficulties might be, gave strong practical support as she continues to do, to many United Nations programmes and efforts. In particular I must mention Mr. Nehru's support

#### 34

of United Nations peace-keeping operations in the Middle East and in the Congo. His decision to provide a brigade in March for the Congo operation--a decision which was far from popular at home and was, as he knew full well, liable to misinterpretation in some quarters abroad--was a turning point in the history of the United Nations Congo operation.

Before I conclude, let me present a thought which has a direct bearing on the award which I have been privileged to receive. The award is very significantly named 'Jawaharlal Nehru Award for International Understanding.' Although the obvious meaning of the word 'Understanding' is clear to all of us, I would like to go a little more deeply into its true meaning. This word has been used time and time again as denoting an indispensable attribute for those who seek an amicable cooperation among peoples as well as among nations. A well-known writer once pointed out the nature of the 'understanding' between the spider and the fly. They understand each other only too well, but do not achieve amity. Clearly a more extensive type of understanding is necessary in order to achieve the desired ends which we all have in mind.

We should ask ourselves what kind of understanding the world really needs in order to achieve peace and amity among nations. One thing is clear: the understanding that we need is not simply 'to know' or 'to have knowledge about.' It is rather 'to have sympathetic acquaintance and to establish communication.' We need to differentiate betwen knowledge about a man or a country and the understanding that would

reveal their true nature. It is not enough to know a man or a country; it is necessary to understand them in their own terms. To foster international cooperation and human solidarity, which is one of the aims of all great religions as well as the objective of the United Nations itself, our understanding of each other must therefore include respect-respect for the person and respect for the culture or society he represents. The will to understand implies open-mindedness and sympathy. It is clear from his actions, his writings and his sayings that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru was a prime exponent of this comprehensive kind of understanding.

That is one of his many attributes which this award especially commemorates. In receiving it, I join all the people in India and in the world at large who revere his memory and are resolved to continue to work in his spirit and towards his ideals.

USA INDIA CONGO LATVIA

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## NEHRU AWARD FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Prime Minister's Speech at the Presentation Ceremony

The following is the text of the speech made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at the Presentation of the Nehru Award to U Thant on April 12, 1967:

May I welcome U Thant, a dedicated champion of united and peaceful world. The United Nations represents the hopes of mankind to evolve something higher and better and much of what the United Nations is and can become depends on the secretary-General on his own personal faith and his

conception of the duties of his office.

May I congratulate the Nehru Prize Committee on choosing U Thant. No choice could be more apt. May I thank you, Sir, for accepting the honour. It is not only vivid proof of his regard for Nehru and India, but binds India and Burma and India and the United Nations closer. Distinction and achievement come from within, not only from extraneous factors but from what a person does to develop his potentiality.

I would like to draw attention to three strands in U Thant's life and personality. He is a Buddhist. All great religions are a record of man's attempt to refine himself. But Buddhism is a religion which speaks not so much of the majesty of the godhead as of the supremacy of compassion, of peace, of right thought, right attitude and right action.

U Thant began his life as a teacher. He has a teacher's faith in the possibility of improving mind and heart. He has a teacher's infinite patience. He has a teacher's gift of pouring out his all so that others may grow. The teacher's quality has stood him in great stead in his work as Secretary-General. He has been a fighter for freedom. He played a notable part in Burma's emergence as a free nation. There can be no peace without freedom and equality. Love of freedom and of peace connect U Thant with Jawaharlal Nehru. Jawaharlal Nehru believed, and proclaimed, that free-

35

dom was the first condition of peace. There could be no peace so long as one nation ruled over another or claimed superiority by virtue of military might or race. To Jawaharlal Nehru the end of colonialism and racialism was essential for enduring peace among nations.

Years ago, Gandhiji drew attention to a remarkable feature of Nehru's thought-that his nationalism was matched by his internationalism. Neither Gandhiji nor Jawaharlal Nehru ever said ``My country right or wrong". Through his study of history, Jawaharlal Nehru was fully aware of the limitations of nationalism and the dangers of a chauvinistic outlook. He was particularly suspicious of any alliance between nationalism and religious fanaticism, or of militarism and nationalism. He often said that it was an irony that the new nations had to come at a time when nationalism itself had been rendered obsolete by the march of science and technology. This anomaly was due to imperialism. Jawaharlal Nehru wanted nations to rise above circumstance and look ahead. Attlee called Jawaharlal Nehru the first statesman of the new world. Jawaharlal Nehru was conscious of the conflicts between nationalism and internationalism--but his efforts were all directed towards resolving the conflict. Through his well thought-out foreign policy he proved that India's national interest lay in working ceaselessly for international peace.

Asoka has been described as the greatest king in the world. He proclaimed that the only true conquests were those of peace. Jawaharlal Nehru, conditioned by Gandhiji's stress on truth and non-violence and by his own study of history, had a repugnance of militarism. He spoke with his whole being when he endorsed UNESCO's declaration that ``the defences of peace are built in the minds of men" or when he quoted Euripides to disapprove of the ``hand uplifted in hate". As heirs to Gandhiji and Nehru it will be our efforts to work for the fulfilment of their ideals. Jawaharlal Nehru had great faith in the United Nations. He saw it as a notable effort towards achieving the unity of man, and upholding the destiny of man.

In the presence of the U.N. Secretary-General, I reaffirm India's full support of the U.N., in its work for world peace. We shall always be active in the furtherance of U.N. objectives. We stand for peace and for the settlement of disputes through negotiation, for the gradual reduction of the burden of armaments, old and new. We stand for freedom from colonialism and racialism, for closer cooperation between countries, especially between the continents of want and

## affluence.

The Nehru Award is in commemoration of a votary of peace, and a great believer in the destiny of man. The first award has gone to a remarkable person, one whose prayer, passion and daily endeavour is peace. I thank him for the honour he has done us in travelling all the way from the Headquarters of the United Nations to accept the award. I give him my own and India's best wishes for the success of his mission

BURMA INDIA USA

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### NEHRU AWARD FOR INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet to the Secretary-General

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech, proposing a toast to His Excellency the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, at a banquet given in his honour in New Delhi on April 10, 1967:

Your Excellency,

On behalf of the Government and people of India and on my own behalf it gives me great pleasure in welcoming you. You are no stranger to this country and we welcome you not only as the Secretary-General of the United Nations but also as an old friend who comes from a neighbouring country with which we have the most friendly and cordial relations.

Last year we heard of your reluctance to accept a second term as Secretary-General

of the United Nations, and I appealed to you to reconsider your decision. We were all glad when you did so.

As Asians we take pride in the fact that you have the unanimous support and confidence of the United Nations family. As an international civil servant you have functioned with devotion and worked with dedication and sincerity for the good of mankind. With patience, skill, impartiality and

36

uncommon candour you have discharged your important and trying responsibilities and have contributed in such great measure in maintaining peace.

We wish you every success in your patient and persistent endeavours to maintain peace everywhere. We have admired your efforts to bring peace to the unfortunate people of Vietnam. On several occasions, peace in that land appeared to be within reach but has so far eluded all efforts. Yet we are not discouraged. You put your finger on the problem when you said in your annual report to the United Nations General Assembly last year that ``the basic problem in Vietnam is not one of ideology but one of national identity and survival (of the Vietnam people). I see nothing but danger in the idea so assiduously fostered outside Vietnam that the conflict is a kind of holy war between two powerful ideologies." There is, indeed, no alternative to a continuing and collective quest for peace and it is our earnest hope that the leading role which you have been playing in this, will produce the results that we all so anxiously desire.

Your profound concern for the welfare of mankind has shown itself in the many suggestions you have made for bettering the condition of man, the improvement of his environment and the equitable enjoyment of the fruits of his labours. We share these objectives and I assure you of our full cooperation in working together for their attainment.

Coming as you do from a peace-loving

country, you are naturally concerned with the problems arising out of the danger of nuclear proliferation. If our planet is to survive then it must be saved from a nuclear holocaust. For that we have to evolve a solution that will really and truly prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons among both nuclear and non-nuclear countries, and will lead ultimately to nuclear disarmament. To be effective and meaningful, such a treaty must take into account the fears and anxities of all nations without exception and be a meaningful step towards disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. We are against proliferation of nuclear weapons and hope that the deliberations in the Disarmament Committee in Geneva will result in an acceptable and balanced treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in conformity with the principles laid down by the United Nations.

Mr. Secretary-General, the problems and the perils that confront the world are indeed staggering and we are acutely aware of the stupendous difficulties which confront the United Nations. However, we have confidence in your courage and determination and we believe that your efforts will, in the long run, be crowned with success. So far as India is concerned, we shall continue to give our fullest support to the world organisation.

May I propose a toast to your health, happiness and success and also to the success of the Great Organisation you represent and of which we have the honour to be a founder-member.

INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

In his reply to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, U Thant said:

Hon'ble Prime Minister, Hon'ble Ministers, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gandhi, U Thant said:

It is a particular privilege for me to have been the gust of the Government of India on this occasion as on previous occasions and to be the recipient of such gracious words from you Madam Prime Minister.

You have mentioned my decision late last year not to offer myself for the second term and I remember with happy memories our meeting in New York and you were among the first to induce me to reconsider my decision. I am very grateful to you and your Government.

You have also alluded to the very tragic conflict in Vietnam. As Your Excellency is aware, this has been one of my obsessions for the last many years. I have said on previous occasions that it seems to me this is one of the most barbarous wars in history, although the UN has been impotent for a long time, for reasons, known to all of you. The basic issue in the Vietnam war, it seems to me, is to be clear about the objectives. What should be the objectives? In my view, the objectives should be the implementation of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. What are the Geneva Agreements of 1954? In a nutshell, there are only twin objectives. One is independence. Another is non-alignment. I think, first of all, the

37

participants have to agree on the objectives. If there is an agreement on the objectives, I think a solution will be nearer.

Then, about the causes of the conflict in Vietnam, of course there are conflicting views. The United States maintains that all the trouble started with the invasion of South Vietnam by the North, and North Vietnam, on the other hand, maintains that the trouble started with the massive introduction of the United States troops in South Vietnam. Whatever the divergence of opinions may be, my personal feeling is it is a very unequal combat. It is a very tragic war. It has potentialities of widening into a larger war with prospects of spilling over the frontiers. And that is why I have been advocating the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam as a first preliminary requisite which alone can create conditions for the conduct of meaningful negotiations. I am glad to be able to find myself in complete agreement with your Government, Your Excellency, in this particular respect.

Secondly, Your Excellency, you have referred to the nuclear disarmament and the current topic of non-proliferation which is a matter before the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. Since it is a subject before one of the main committees of the General Assembly, I do not want to project my own personal views on the subject. But in this context we should ponder a little over the human situation today. I think it is worthwhile recalling that human history is just a million years old. In the course of these million years, man has created tremendous things. Man has achieved tremendous accomplishments in the field of art, science, architecture, poetry, literature, religion, philosophy, engineering and so on and so forth. All these wonderful creations of man are in danger of obliteration under a shadow of the hydrogen bomb. This is the real stark fact facing human society today. I think it should be the concern of every one of us about these potentialities that in one brief moment all these wonderful creations of man can be wiped out with these terrible weapons of mass destruction. So, from this point of view, I think we all should strive towards the noble objective of complete nuclear disarmament. Of course, this is not a practical proposition in the context of the human society today but in any case I agree with you, Your Excellency, when you say that any non-proliferation treaty must take into consideration the real facts of life, facts of the international situation and the safety and security of the small countries which are non-nuclear for the moment.

INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **SUDAN**

President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Palam Airport. Welcoming the Sudanese President

His Excellency Sayed Ismail El Azhari, President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan, arrived in New Delhi on April 28, 1967 on an eightday State visit to India. The President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, received him at the Palam airport.

Welcoming the Sudanese President and his party, the President of India said:

Mr. President,

We welcome you and members of your party. We are glad you are able to accept our invitation and be with us here for a few days. We are bound by experiences similar in the past and hopes for the future which are more or less the same. You were also politically emancipated a few years ago and took a leading part in the struggle for freedom and also acted as Prime Minister immediately after that.

38

You are a multi-lingual, multi-racial, multi-religious society. You are experiencing the same problem of integrating all

these people into citizens of one common nation Sudan. You are struggling to build up your economy which is the basis of any kind of political stability. There again, without economic opportunities and wellbeing, you cannot have political stability at all.

I am glad in larger international questions, you stand for peace, you stand for non-alignment, you stand for fight against imperialism, colonialism and racialism. In all these matters, we are bound by the same ideals, experiences, similar in the past and more or less, same for the future. It is therefore possible for us to work together both in the domestic and international fields and we hope to have your collaboration in all these matters.

#### SUDAN INDIA USA

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **SUDAN**

Reply by the Sudanese President

Replying to the welcome speech by the President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, His Excellency Sayed Ismail El Azhari said:

Your Excellency,

It is my greatest pleasure to find myself once again amongst hospitable and generous brothers and in your great country, with its vast heritage of culture and civilisation. I am indeed grateful to you for having afforded to me this opportunity. To you, Dear Brother, to the Government and the people of India I convey the hearty greetings of the people and the Government

of the Republic of the Sudan, and their sincere and best wishes for the advancement and prosperity of your country.

Your Excellency, I have had the pleasure of meeting the zealous and patriotic son of India, the late Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, a man of great statemanship and wisdom. Together and with other brothers, we had the privilege and honour to make history at Bandung. It has been the lofty ideals and principles of that conference that have guided Sudan-Indian relations, characteristically governed by genuine cooperation and sincere friendship.

In meeting you, we wish to affirm our belief and determination to maintain and preserve those principles and sustain them to achieve the ultimate goal not only for our people but for humanity as a whole. The world today is torn by developments and happenings which command serious concern and it is our duty that we exchange views in an endeavour to solve them.

Your Excellency, both myself and my colleagues have been deeply touched by your warm welcome to us and I wish once again to express our profound thanks.

SUDAN USA INDIA INDONESIA

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

**SUDAN** 

President Radhakrishnan's Speech at Dinner to the Sudanese President

The following is the text of the President Dr. Radhakrishnan's speech at a Dinner given by him in honour of H. E. Sayed Ismail El Azhari, President of the Supreme

Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan:

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests and friends: I should like to express to you and the members of your party our most cordial welcome in which the people and the Government share. It is our earnest hope that you will have a pleasant time while you are here.

I looked at your career as a fighter for freedom as Prime Minister and as President. I thought what was the secret of it all. I learn today that you were for 25 years a teacher and, therefore, you were able to manage your colleagues and your officials well. They were more or less under your tutelage for a long time.

Your country occupies a very significant place in the world. You are a bridge so to say between the Arab and the African regions. You are members of the Arab League as also the Organisation of the

39

Africal Unity. Both these things you share. You try to understand each other's point of view and bring about a kind of comradeship between your African and Arab neighbours. That is what you are in a position to achieve. Your religions also are many and though you are largely Muslim, you have Pagans, you have Christians, you don't adopt the attitude "unless you adhere to my creed you will suffer from spiritual destitution and perish". You all reach the same goal whatever religion you may practise. That is the position which we hold and in that matter we both are alike. We have also the same problem of integrating our peoples speaking different languages, practising different faiths, occupying different regions, of different ethnical background. To make them all feel that they are part and parcel of the one Sudanese community is a problem which faces you. Something similar though on a vaster scale is facing us also. So by understanding and toleration it will be possible for you to bring about that kind of thing.

Again you are a parliamentary democracy. You brought it into effect two years ago and you are now trying to work out a Constitution for your country. This day, at this hour perhaps, they are discussing whether you want a parliamentary or a presidential system. That is what I was informed. Today you are discussing this particular problem---will you be better off with the presidential system or will you be better off with parliamentary system. That is a problem which you are debating and we will await results with interest.

You also adopt more or less the same kind of doctrine with regard to pursuit of wealth, economic progress, etc. Somebody said: "Communism is a system where poverty is shared equally. Capitalism is a system where wealth is unequally distributed". But a true system is one where you are committed to human decency to human freedom. That is what we are aiming at. That you are also aiming at, I suppose.

So, Sir, in several ways there are points which bring us together. Our parliamentary system of democracy, our interest in social redistribution of wealth and property, also our capacity or challenge to bring our people together and make them feel that they belong to one whole single community, all these are matters which bring us two together. You came here on the last occasion from the Bandung Conference. It is the Bandung spirit, of understanding, noninterference, respect for each other, which should also guide us in our international relations. If we seriously and sincerely adopt this and don't adopt an attitude of immaculate self-righteousness, that we are better people and others are inferior to us, we will be able to work out harmony in this world. That is the spirit of Bandung which will carry us forward in the years to come.

I think, Sir I have said enough to tell you how much there are items which bind us together and it is my earnest hope that our relations which are cordial, which have been lasting for some centuries, will grow.

Intellectual cooperation and technical cooperation, so to say, is the thing in which we are sharing each other. You told us many of our experts are employed there and you want them to continue as long as possible. We also wish them to be there as long as possible so long as our interests do not conflict. So taking all these into account, the Indo-Sudanese relations are things which we are happy about and we want them to continue in the future. May I request you ladies and gentlemen to drink to the health of the President of Sudan and for Indo-Sudanese friendship.

### SUDAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA INDONESIA

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **SUDAN**

Reply by the Sudanese President

In his reply, the Sudanese President, His Excellency Sayed Ismail El Azhari, said:

Mr. President,

Allow me to express to Your Excellency my deep thanks and those of my colleagues and of he people and Government of the Sudan for your kind words of welcome and for the good wishes to our people and Government.

As you have rightly pointed out, Mr. President, the Sudan occupies a most important place in the world. You have rightly pointed out also that the Sudan is a bridge between Arab and Africa.

Sudan is a large country of million square miles. It is composed of different ethnic and religious groups.

Our admiration of India is an old one. It dates back to 1938 or before that. When we started to take interest in politics, we established the Congress after the Indian fashion. It was a miniature of what you had in India.

The Indian Congress achieved independence and freedom for India; the Sudan Congress achieved independence and freedom for the Sudan.

Our responsibilities after independence are even greater. They constituted a challenge. It is our belief that India is doing a lot of good work to boost the national economy in the interest of the people. We are doing the same.

Twelve years ago, I had the pleasure of meeting the Indian people and leaders. The friendly welcome I received from them and the fine memories I carried home with me still live in my heart. Also the memorable visit of the late great Indian leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, to the Sudan in 1957, and the fruitful cooperation in all fields stand as landmarks in the friendly relations between our peoples and governments.

Many principles are shared between our two Nations; of these are the desire of our people for freedom and liberty and their struggle against imperialism and backwardness. Our two peoples have crowned their struggle and determination with victory and will lay the foundation of dignity and advancement.

The conviction of our peoples, Mr. President in democracy as a way of life, a system of government, and a means of progress, springs from their belief in the principles of peace and co-existence, from their endeavour to make progress and friendship reign over the human society. It gives me pride to note that the views of our two countries coincide on the major international issues and that our delegates

in the international arena work hand in hand guided by common determination and desire to hoist the banner of peace and freedom, to achieve for humanity, dignity and liberty.

Sudan and India played a positive role at the historic meetings in Bandung. Cairo and Belgrade, the meetings which laid down the basis of independence and world peace and created a hope ever since looked at as a minarette for the people struggling for their independence.

Sudan follows a policy of non-alignment, not because it is the only guarantee for the sovereignty and interests of the developing countries, but also a guarantee for the promotion of peaceful co-existence and cooperation among nations of the world. It is with this aim in mind that we always underline the importance of the cooperation of the non-aligned countries to enable them to play their vanguard role in the maintenance of international peace.

The continuation of the war in Vietnam constitutes a danger that threatens world peace and security more than any time before. We believe that the only solution to this problem is negotiations on the basis of the 1954 Geneva Conference. The valuable efforts that India has rendered and continues to render to establish peace in Vietnam are appreciated.

Sudan, in the heart of the Continent of Africa, fully supports with all its means and resources the African struggle movement striving to clear the continent of the remnants of colonialist and racist pockets. We support the struggle of the Zimbawi people against the racist minority rule. We look with great concern at the failure of Britain towards its duties and pledge to unseat the rebel racist minority Government in Rhodesia. Now that economic sanctions have failed, we call upon Britain to use force to topple this abhored regime in Rhodesia. We fully support the struggle of the people of Angola and Mozambique against Portuguese barbaric rule. And we demand the removal of the racist mandate

over the region of South-West Africa and support the right of its people for freedom and independence. We call upon all peaceloving people, all the forces of progress and humanity to condemn the racist regime of South Africa, which is a blemish in the history of the human race.

In the Arab world, Sudan follows a policy of unifying the Arab front to play its role in holding high the principles of world peace. Zionist-occupied Palestine, as you are well aware, is a victim of intrigue, colonialism and racism. The people of Palestine, driven out of their land by Zionist terrorists and imperialists motives are banking on the conscience of all nations in their legitimate demand to return to their homes. Our generation will be doomed if we cannot help restore the rights of the people of Palestine by simply enforcing the

#### 41

resolutions of the United Nations Organisation.

The development of your country in all fields since Independence is a pride to you and a further proof of the huge responsibilities of the developing countries and their determination to build their national economies. We support the results of the successful Summit Conference held in New Delhi and attended by India, Yugoslavia and U.A.R. We support it because it is our belief that cooperation among the developing countries is of paramount importance, and will ultimately lead to the prosperity and welfare of the developing nations.

At the same time, it gives me great pleasure to convey to your goodself, and to the Government and people of India the best wishes and greetings of the people and Government of the Sudan.

I wish Your Excellency a long and healthy life, as you have become, with your rich knowledge and deep understanding, a symbol of the greatness of the Indian nation and Indian heritage.

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **SUDAN**

Indo-Sudanese Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued at the end of the visit to India of His Excellency Sayed Ismail El Azhari, President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan:

At the invitation of the President of India, His Excellency Sayed Ismail El Azhari, President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan, paid a State visit to India from the 28th April to the 5th May, 1967. He was accompanied, among others, by H. E. Sayed Ibrahim El Mufti, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, H. E. Sayed Hamza Mirghani, Minister of Finance & Economics, and H. E. Sayed Izz El Din El Sayed, Minister of Industries & Mines and Acting Minister of Commerce and Supply. The President and his party received a warm and cordial welcome from the Government and the people of India. This reception was a symbol and a manifestation of the deep mutual desire to foster closer understanding, cooperation and friendship between the governments and the people of the Sudan and India.

During his last visit to India in 1955, as the first Prime Minister of the Sudan, President Ahari visited various places of historical and cultural interest and also saw projects for development in progress. On the present occasion, President Azhari visited Aligarh, Hyderabad and Bangalore and saw more of India's cultural heritage, present progress and future plans. President Azhari expressed his admiration for the strengthening and consolidation of India's parliamentary democracy and planned evolution towards a welfare state in accordance with the principles of social justice, political freedom, and equality before the law of all communities and of all faiths.

During his stay in New Delhi, President Azhari had talks with President Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi and other members of the Government of India on the present international situation and on matters of mutual interest, particularly the developing economic and technical cooperation between them. These talks were held in an atmosphere of frankness, understanding and cordiality and revealed a similarity of views on many international issues and contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of mutual respect and friendship between the leaders and the peoples of the two countries.

Taking part in the talks on the Sudan side were also H. E. Sayed Ibrahim El Mufti, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs, H. E. Sayed Hamza Mirghani, Minister of Finance and Economics, H. E. Sayed Izz El Din El Sayed, Minister of Industries and Mines and Acting Minister of Commerce and Supply and H. E. Sayed Ahmed Salah Bukhari, Ambassador of India to the Sudan.

Taking part in the talks on the Indian side were also Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of Commerce, and Shri P. L. Bhandari Ambassador of India to the Sudan.

Both sides reiterated their faith in the continuing validity of the policy of non-alignment which has made a positive contribution to the cause of peace and international cooperation. They also stressed the importance

of the acceptance of the principles of peaceful co-existence by the world community if international peace and security are to be safeguarded. They stressed in particular the importance of the principle that the threat or use of force as a means of settling international disputes must be renounced. They continue to be opposed to all forms of imperialism, hegemony or monopoly of power and interference, direct or indirect, by one State in the affairs of another. They were opposed to military alliances and other groupings which stand in the way of international cooperation.

The President of India expressed India's determination to continue its earnest efforts towards the implementation, in letter and spirit, of the Tashkent Declaration with a view to establishing good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan. The President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan expressed his faith in the goodwill and ability of both countries to reach an honourable and peaceful settlement of all the outstanding problems between them in accordance with the U.N. Charter and the Tashkent Declaration and thereby help to establish good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan.

Both sides noted with renewed satisfaction that the laws of the two countries guaranteed freedom of worship and equality of status to all their citizens.

Both sides reiterated their firm opposition to colonialism and neo-colonialism in all their forms and manifestations, and condemned the alliance between forces of colonialism and racialism. In this context, they expressed deep concern at the deteriorating situation in Zimbabwe and agreed that the measures so far taken have proved to be ineffective and therefore stronger measures including the use of force can no longer be avoided to put an end to the illegal racist minority regime in Zimbabwe. They also condemned the inhuman and immoral policies of apartheid pursued with increasing brutality by the racist minority regime in South Africa. They hoped that all states

would extend their unreserved cooperation and support to the United Nations in all its efforts to compel the Government of South Africa to abandon such policies which are a threat to peace and security. They expressed the hope that the full weight of international public opinion and authority of the United Nations would be brought to bear without any further delay in securing to the people of South West Africa their just and legitimate right of self-determination. They also declared that the denial of freedom and fundamental rights to the people of Angola and Mozambique and other Portuguese colonial territories was wholly contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and the repeated resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council.

Both sides reiterated their full support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people and their efforts for the realisation of their rights in accordance with the Declaration of the 1964 Cairo Conference of Non-aligned countries.

Both sides also expressed their full support for the struggle of the people of Southern Arabia so that they may attain freedom and independence in accordance with the resolutions of the U.N. forthwith.

Both sides viewed with great concern the situation in Vietnam which constitutes a continuing serious threat to world peace and the danger of escalation leading to a more serious conflagration. They were convinced that the Vietnamese problem is basically political and that there could be no military solution to this problem. They both agreed that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 provided a suitable basis for the settlement of the problem of Vietnam. The people of Vietnam should be free to decide their future without any foreign interference. President Azhari expressed the appreciation of the efforts of the Indian Government towards a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem.

Both sides expressed their concern at the unabated arms race which poses a serious

threat to international peace and security and urged an early agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They emphasised the serious dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and called for the early conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the U.N. General Assembly at its XX Session and reaffirmed at its XXI Session, in particular the principle of an acceptable balance of obligations and responsibilities between the nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear states.

Both sides attached great importance to the urgent and imperative need for initiating practical steps for promoting among developing countries mutual trade and economic cooperation, collaboration in the fields of industrial ventures, training in modern scientific research and technical 43

skills, as a means of strengthening their national independence and self-reliance. They expressed the hope that such cooperation and collaboration would be given a further stimulus at the forthcoming meeting nomic cooperation, collaboration in the be held in September this year. In this context, they also reviewed with satisfaction the cooperation that already exists between their two countries. They discussed various proposals for mutual cooperation and expressed confidence in the further development of mutually advantageous trade and other economic relations.

The President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan extended an invitation to the President and the Prime Minister of India, which were accepted with pleasure.

Both sides expressed deep satisfaction that the visit of the President of the Supreme Council of State of the Republic of the Sudan and the opportunity it had afforded for a friendly exchange of views has further strengthened the ties of friendship and understanding and mutually bene-

ficial economic and cultural relations between the two countries.

44

SUDAN INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN ZIMBABWE SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE EGYPT VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Apr 01, 1967

# May

# Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1967 Vol. XIII MAY No. 5

CONTENTS

**PAGES** 

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in Eighteen-Nation Committee on

Disarmament

45

INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in Security Council on West

Asia 51

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in General Assembly on South

West

Africa

52

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on

Peaceful

Uses of Outer Space

55

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament on his Visit Abroad

56

**MALAYSIA** 

Joint Communique on Shri Chagla's Visit

59

**SINGAPORE** 

Shri M. C. Chagla's Visit to Singapore

60

Joint Communique

62

WEST ASIA

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament

63

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA USA MALAYSIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

**Date**: May 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament

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 plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament in Geneva on May 23, 1967:

At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I should like on behalf of the Indian delegation to offer its warm welcome to you. We have the most pleasant and rewarding memories of working in close cooperation with you during the sessions of the General Assembly, and we are happy that the Indian delegation will again have the privilege in the Eighteen-Nation Committee of continuing that co-operation with the delegation of Mexico under your distinguished leadership.

Apart from making a few short comments on some emergent matters, the Indian delegation has not spoken at length during the meetings of the Committee this year. Its only regret on that score has been its inability so far to express formally its welcome to the distinguished leaders and alternates of the delegations of Bulgaria, Burma, Czechoslovakia and Nigeria who have joined us in our task. I should therefore like to take this opportunity of my first intervention in this Committee to convey to them and to their delegations the warm welcome of the Indian delegation and its pledge of full co-operation with them.

The Indian delegation is happy that the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament has now resumed its work after a long and extended recess. In addition to its continuing responsibility to conduct negotiations with a view to reaching agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control, for which it has been established, the Committee's mandate was further reinforced by the twenty-first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, which made specific recommendations for its programme of work. We have therefore before us a heavy agenda and a heavier responsibility.

Since the historic session of the Disarmament Commission in April-June 1965, the United Nations has reaffirmed through unanimous and near-unanimous resolutions that the task of the Committee remains unchanged. The General Assembly has asked us once again (A/RES/ 2162(XXI)C, ENDC/185) to pursue new efforts towards achieving substantial progress in reaching agreement on the question of general and complete disarmament and on collateral measures, and in particular on two such measures--an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of underground nuclear weapon tests. More specifically, the Committee has been called upon to give high priority to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in accordance with the mandate contained in resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161). On tests, among other things, the Assembly asked the Committee to elaborate without any further delay a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests. That was nearly six months ago. The Indian delegation is distressed to find that, despite the continuing exhortations of the United Nations over the years, our Committee has not been able to pursue any special efforts, old or new, in achieving progress, small or substantial, towards a treaty on general and complete disarmament. The delegations of Sweden, the United Arab Republic and India offered some constructive ideas in this behalf. Those ideas have not been pursued nor have they led to any alternative suggestions. The Committee has also made no serious efforts to elaborate a treaty banning nuclear weapon tests underground, not to mention the demand made upon it by the General Assembly to do this without any further delay. It seems to have been forgotten that the partial test ban Treaty (ENDC/ 100/Rev. 1) is an extremely fragile instrument and cannot endure for long if it is not universally adhered to and if its five-year old preambular commitment for disarmament and for prohibiting underground weapon tests remains only a plati-

The delegation of India does not propose to deal this morning with the issues of general and complete disarmament, or with the high priority problem of suspension by all countries of all tests in all environments, or with several other related

#### 45

and collateral measures of arms restraint. limitation and control. In its first intervention in the Committee this session it would like to concentrate on the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which has dominated our discussions for a long time. At the same time the Indian delegation would emphasize, as it has done in the past, that an international treaty preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons can be a purposeful instrument only if this negotiating Committee of ours conceives of that measure in the over-all and universal concept of disarmament and not as a simple exercise in imposed non-armament of unarmed countries. Progress in evolving a treaty on general and complete disarmament, measures of disarmament of a collateral nature and, above all, cessation of all nuclear weapon tests by all, countries---those are of the utmost urgency, not only because the

United Nations has been demanding them, not only because they have their intrinsic benefit in the reduction of tension and strengthening of international peace and security but also because, as pointed out by the Disarmament Commission two years ago, they are of crucial value in facilitating agreement on a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

What is particularly fundamental is that a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will be much easier to negotiate and draft if it is taken not as an isolated measure but as one which forms an integral and co-existent pattern with measures of nuclear restraint and disarmament such as the nuclear weapon test ban and a freeze on all nuclear delivery vehicles. We are all unhappy that there has not been more rapid progress in negotiating a non-proliferation treaty which can be acceptable to all concerned and particularly to non-aligned non-nuclear nations. As many commentators have emphasized, however, that is due in no small measure to the fact that there is no progress in reaching agreement on such related measures as the nuclear weapon test ban and a freeze on nuclear delivery vehicles.

The United Nations General Assembly laid down categorically as one of the vital principles on which an acceptable treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be based the principle that that treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament and more particularly, nuclear disarmament. That was not meant merely as a pious preambular platitude, not just as an insubstantial incantation to be retreated occasionally as a simple magic charm, but as envisaging a concrete programme of specific action. It has to be a real and meaningful principle, one which has to form the foundation, the very basis of a non-proliferation treaty.

Fairly early during the last session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, we were all informed that the two super-Powers had come closer together on a matter which concerned them intimately within the context of a non-proliferation treaty, namely, the question of nuclear-sharing arrangements within a military alliance, and we expressed our gratification at that welcome rapprochement.

It is the understanding of the Indian delegation that agreement was in fact reached at the beginning of this year between the major Powers and their allies on that particular issue. The Indian delegation would have been happy if, soon after the settlement of that alliance obstacle, the Committee as a whole, consisting of the members of the two alliances and the eight non-aligned delegations, had been able to negotiate the drafting of an adequate and acceptable treaty. If necessary, they could have had a drafting committee--- a committee of the whole if you will---for after all that is the mandate of the Committee.

The super-Powers and their allies, however, continued to undertake further negotiations among themselves on other matters concerning the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The representative of the United States, Mr. Foster, told us at the first meeting after we reconvened that he hoped that the delegations of the United States and the USSR would soon be able to make a joint recommendation to the Committee (ENDC/PV. 297, p. 21, Provisional).

Any progress in the direction of agreement between the United States and the USSR gives us great pleasure. It was during the memorable session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960 that Jawaharlal Nehru moved a draft resolution on behalf of the delegations of Ghana, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic. Yugoslavia and India, which were then led by the Heads of State or Government of those countries, suggesting a meeting between the leaders of those two great nations. As Nehru said:

"Our idea in sponsoring the resolution was not that the USA and the USSR should discuss international problems or solve them, but that it would help to bring about an element of flexibility in the situation which could be taken advantage of at a later stage."

The Indian delegation sets great store by this element of flexibility and hopes that after this extended period of inter-allied consultations and accommodation, the Committee will now revert to the considerations expressed in the memoranda of the non-aligned delegations and in the resolutions of the General Assembly. Without that, we

shall be unable to fulfil the responsibility entrust-

satisfactory international treaty in accordance with the mandate contained in General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX).

Our urgent task is thus to prepare a draft non-proliferation treaty which the General Assembly would consider as adhering strictly to the principles laid down by it. The draft treaties which are formally before us are the United States draft treaty of August, 1965 as amended (ENDC. 152/Add. 1) and the USSR draft treaty of September, 1965 (ENDC. 164). The non-aligned delegations commented on those drafts in the Committee and in the General Assembly. Several nonaligned delegations also offered constructive comments and specific suggestions during the meetings of the Committee this year.

The Indian delegation believes that it is useful at this stage to quote some relevant observations on those draft treaties from the non-aligned memorandum of August, 1966. The memorandum states:

"The eight delegations...recognize that the two draft treaties were submitted before the adoption of Resolution 2028 (XX) and, therefore, could not pay full attention to the principles laid down in it".

"The eight delegations regret that it has not so far been possible to arrive at an agreement on a treaty acceptable to all concerned. They are deeply conscious of the danger inherent in a situation without an agreement that prevents proliferation of nuclear weapons. They view with apprehension the possibility that such a situation may lead not only to an increase of nuclear arsenals and to a spread of nuclear weapons over the world, but also to an increase in the number of nuclear weapon Powers, thus aggravating the tensions between States and the risk of nuclear war." (ENDC/178, p. 2).

The Indian delegation trusts that the joint recommendation promised by Mr. Foster will remedy the lacunae of the earlier drafts and adhere strictly to the principles laid down by resolution 2028 (XX), in particular principles (b) and

(c), namely, that the treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual obligations and responsibilities of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers and that it should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament, and more particularly nuclear disarmament.

The Government of India has long maintained that prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons---the real prevention of all proliferation of nuclear weapons---is one of the most urgent and important tasks facing humanity ever since the unfortunate advent of this evil weapon of terror and blackmail. Discussions and negotiations on this and allied subjects have gone on since the days of the Baruch plan and the Gromyko plan of 1946. The relevant issues have been explored in depth in various forums of the United Nations in the past, particularly in the United Nations sub-Committee on Disarmament in the `fifties. Then, as today, the emphasis---to quote the significant phrase in the historic resolution 2028 (XX)---was on a `balance of mutual obligations and responsibilities of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers" (ENDC/161). What was then advocated by a few is now being held to be essential by all of us.

The Indian delegation has elaborated in detail on many occasions the elements that should be embodied in a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in compliance with the principles of balance and mutuality. It is a treaty of this nature which, in the words of the non-aligned memorandum and the General Assembly resolution, can be "acceptable to all concerned and satisfactory to the international community" (ENDC/178) and which would prevent three facets of proliferation: (i) an increase in nuclear arsenals; (ii) a spread of nuclear weapons over the world; and (iii) an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon Powers. An acceptable and effective treaty, therefore, is one which prohibits existing proliferation among nuclear-weapon Powers, the dissemination of nuclear weapons and weapon technology from one country to another and further or possible proliferation among hitherto non-nuclear weapon Powers.

The delegation of India is happy that the problem of dissemination now presents no difficulty and that we may soon have an agreed formulation in regard to transfer and receipt of

weapons and weapon technology---a formulation which is balanced and mutual---providing that no State will transfer nuclear weapons and weapon technology to any other State and that no State will receive nuclear weapons and weapon technology from any other State. One hopes at the same time that this joint formulation will deal only with weapons and will not prohibit pursuits of peace.

At this stage I should like to say a word or two on the peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly on the question of peaceful nuclear explosions. The Foreign Minister of India stated in our Parliament on 17 March:

"It is the view of the Indian Government that the non-proliferation treaty should be such as not to impede the growth of nuclear science and technology in the developing countries where the need for such development is great".

On the question of peaceful nuclear explosions the Indian delegation expressed its views fully in the First Committee of the General Assembly on 31 October last year. As it said then, it agrees with President Truman that ``no nation could

#### 47

long maintain or morally defend a monopoly of the peaceful benefits of atomic energy". The civil nuclear Powers can tolerate a nuclear weapons apartheid but not an atomic apartheid in their economic and peaceful development.

The Indian delegation agrees entirely with what the representative of Brazil said at our last meeting:

"Nuclear energy plays a decisive role in this mobilization of resources. We must develop and utilize it in every form, including the explosive that make possible not only great civil engineering projects but also an ever-increasing variety of applications that may prove essential to speed up the progress of our peoples. To accept the self-limitation requested from us in order to secure the monopoly of the present nuclear-weapon Powers amount to renouncing in advance boundless prospects in the field of peaceful activities."

To us, this is a matter of vital principle. The Indian delegation does not deny that the technology involved in the production of a nuclear weapon is the same as the technology which produces a peaceful explosive device, although a weapon has many characteristics which are not present in a peaceful device. Moreover, as far as fission technology is concerned, it is known to a large number of countries. But that, in any case, is not the issue. As the Indian delegation pointed out in the United Nations last year, technology in itself is not evil. Dynamite was originally meant for military use. Aeronautics, electronics, even steel fabrication---those are technologies which can be used for weapons as well as for economic development. That does not mean, therefore, that only the poor and developing nations should be denied all technology for fear that they may use it for military purposes.

Centuries of history have proved to us that the use that people make of their skills is entirely a matter of will. It is completely wrong to deduce that what is evil is science and technology, skill and progress. Jawaharlal Nehru said in the Indian Parliament as early as May 1954:

"In the last generation or two there have been certain explorations of the remotest frontiers of human knowledge which are leading us to many strange discoveries and strange consequences. Max Planck's Quantum Theory and, later on, Albert Einstein's Theory of Relativity changed the whole conception of the universe. Soon came the atom bomb with its power to kill. The human mind and human efforts are unleashing tremendous powers without quite knowing how to control them. They cannot be controlled by a mere desire or demand for banning them. One of the political problems of the day is how to approach this problem of control which is of vital consequence. Such an approach presupposes some measure of lessening of tension in the world, some measure of mutual confidence on the part of great nations, some agreement to allow each country to live its life". Referring specifically to the question of control he said:

"Let us understand, without using vague phrases and language, what it means. Certainly we would be entitled to object to any control which is not exercised to our advantage".

He added that India accepted control in common with other countries ``provided we are assured that it is for the common good of the world and not exercised in a partial way and not dominated over by certain countries, however good their motives".

In other words, to quote a phrase which a great Power used twenty years ago in the context of a comprehensive plan for the control of atomic energy, we are not interested in the establishment of an atomic commercial super-monopoly.

As the Indian delegation stated in the United Nations General Assembly last year, it recognizes that such explosions must be adequately safeguarded. The safeguards must apply equally to all nations and the Indian delegation is prepared to work with others in evolving a system of regulation which could be accepted by all States. As Ambassador Correa da Costa pointed out at our 297th meeting, the solution of the problem must not be sought in the renunciation of the sovereign right of unrestricted development of the new source of energy by some countries only; and mainly by the developing countries. We must not throw the baby away with the bath water.

Coming back to the question of the treaty, the two other facets of proliferation are equally amenable to a balanced and mutual solution similar to that of the problem of dissemination--a solution which provides for obligations and responsibilities of nuclear-weapon Powers and non-nuclear-weapon Powers alike, as repeatedly demanded by the United Nations. An article in the treaty stipulating that no country should henceforth manufacture nuclear weapons would not only satisfy the criterion of balance and mutuality and of the assumption of responsibilities and obligations by both the nuclear and the non-nuclear-weapon Powers but also solve the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons correctly and comprehensively. It would also obviate other pitfalls, both political and mechanical, particularly those relating to control, which

would be bound to arise in a discriminatory and unbalanced treaty.

The Indian delegation has stressed repeatedly that future proliferation or further proliferation is only the consequence of existing or continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons by the nuclear weapon Powers. Disregard of this self-evident truth led to proliferation in the past and we can disregard it now only at our peril.

History tells us that what is described as further proliferation or further spread of nuclear weapons took place in the past only among a few countries belonging to military alliances. Those countries have indicated the reasons which led to their decision to embark on a nuclear weapons programme. It is our duty as members of a group of experts to investigate those reasons and to ensure that in the solution that we propose we eliminate them as far as possible.

The powerful members of military alliances which went in for further proliferation in the past have given two reasons for their action---status or prestige and national security. Firstly, they wanted to be at the top table. They felt somehow or other that possession of nuclear weapons gave them prestige and power, authority and influence. Secondly, they said that they could best safeguard their security by an independent nuclear deterrent. If, therefore, any serious efforts are to be made by this Committee to prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons, those efforts must be directed towards meeting those two considerations of prestige and security.

Unfortunately, no real or effective effort is being made to deny prestige to possession of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, reports indicate that the nuclear-weapon Powers are being given an overwhelmingly privileged position in the propositions which are being elaborated these days. As time goes on, the nuclear-weapon Powers are apparently contemplating ever-increasing provisions of discrimination. The unbalanced aspects of the earlier draft treaties are being embellished further and attempts are being made to construct the most perfect structure of imperfection. The nuclear-weapon Powers now want comprehensive controls over the peaceful activities of civil nuclear Powers, without, of course,

any control whatsoever over their own activities, peaceful or warlike. They even want to prohibit the civil nuclear Powers from undertaking peaceful explosions purely for their economic development even if such peaceful pursuits take place under international supervision.

All these projects will, however, have just the opposite effect. A discriminatory treaty which gives a privileged licence to the existing nuclear-weapon Powers to proliferate at will and which heaps ever-increasing prohibitions on non-nuclear Powers will in itself be the strongest incentive to a new country to embark on a nuclear weapons programme.

The second consideration, that of security, which was advanced by the existing nuclear-weapon Powers to explain why they embarked on a nuclear-weapons programme, is even more germane. As far as the question of prestige is concerned, countries like India would be happier with the prestige of a civil nuclear Power. However, security is a much more vital consideration.

To be sure, this is not a matter which concerns only the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The terms of reference of our Committee stipulate that all measures that we negotiate "should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all" (ENDC. 5, para. 5). Even apart from measures of disarmament, however, the very facts of political life of today demand that nations, and particularly a nation like India which is exposed to nuclear blackmail, take full account of the needs of national security. The question of security is a much wider issue and is relevant irrespective of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The great Powers, which possess in their ever-expanding armouries the most destructive power ever known to mankind, have not yet, however, given any effective and credible consideration to the security needs of the non-nuclear countries, and particularly the non-aligned countries. Referring specifically to the question of a non-proliferation treaty, these powerful nuclear-weapon nations say that the non-nuclear nations would safeguard their security by forswearing nuclear weapons for ever in the midst of mushrooming

proliferation by the nuclear-weapon Powers themselves.

This is, however, not the precept which they have themselves followed, and in fact they rejected it for themselves when it was time for them to decide. Moreover, as we know, various disarmament forums have been discussing questions of disarmament and particularly of nuclear disarmament since 1946. To diverse proposals put forward on the subject from time to time, either by one side or the other or by non-aligned nations like India, the answers given by the great Powers have been that they cannot accept this or that proposal of nuclear restraint or reduction because it would adversely affect their security. But when they address themselves to non-nuclear Powers, the nuclear-weapon Powers argue that nuclear weapons provide no security and that the best way the non-nuclear nations

## 49

can safeguard their security is to sign a discriminary treaty---a treaty which will at the same time give unfettered licence to five Powers to proliferate.

On the other hand, the General Assembly of the United Nations has advocated the right approach and has laid down two basic principles, namely, that the treaty should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclear Powers, and that the treaty should be a step towards the achievement of general and complete disarmament, and more particularly nuclear disarmament. As the Indian delegation has pointed out before, this can be achieved by adequate and effective provisions in an appropriate treaty and I should like to recapitulate them at the risk of repetition.

On the question of dissemination, a balanced provision would require that no State shall transfer nuclear weapons or weapon technology to another State and that no State shall receive such weapons or technology from another State. Similarly, on the question of proliferation, a balanced article would stipulate that no State shall henceforth manufacture nuclear weapons. This would incidentally obviate all invidious distinctions of prestige between States possessing nuclear weapons

and those not possessing them and curious concepts like the fixation of dates for the duration of the nuclear-weapon era or for the closing of the list of membership of an exclusive club.

That still leaves the problems of what the representative of Brazil described as the possession in the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon Powers of ``a capacity for nuclear strike many times superior to their security needs---the `overkill'..". (ENDC/PV. 297, p. 24). It is a matter of vital concern to India that one of the lesser nuclear Powers, in particular, is feverishly building up its arsenal of weapons and developing its delivery capability.

Those immense stockpiles of mass destruction in the possession of nuclear-weapon Powers pose a real threat to the security of nations and a nonproliferation treaty of universal arms restraint cannot in itself reduce that threat or its potentiality for blackmail unless it also embodies a provision dealing with those menacing stockpiles. It is for that reason that the General Assembly has maintained that one of the basic principles of a non-proliferation treaty is that it is a step towards nuclear disarmament. As has been pointed out by many non-aligned delegations, a non-proliferation treaty must accordingly embody an article of solemn obligation under which the States possessing nuclear weapons would negotiate a meaningful programme of reduction of existing stockpiles of weapons and their delivery systems. This provision cannot be merely a pious preambular platitude like the unfulfilled 'determination" in the four-year old partial Test Ban Treaty (ENDC/100/Rev. 1).

Increasing references are being made these days to the question of control and means of safeguarding observance of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The delegation of India agrees with the principle of the General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX) that there should be acceptable and workable provisions to ensure the effectiveness of the treaty. These provisions must necessarily be balanced and mutual and should apply to the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers alike.

As the Committee is aware, the question of control has been debated right from the beginning of international discussions on matters concerning atomic energy and disarmament. The

problem then debated is as relevant today as it was at that time. The Government of India has always believed that control and disarmament must go together. There can never be a question of one coming before the other, particularly if it is to be genuine disarmament or genuine control.

The second consideration that the Government of India has continued to advance throughout is that the control should be universal and that it should be exercised in a non-discriminatory and objective manner; otherwise, as the Indian representative stated in the Preparatory Commission of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it would be tantamount to a new form of economic colonialism.

It is in the context of those two considerations that we have to view the question of a control provision in a non-proliferation treaty. One thing is certain: control can never be used merely as an instrument of imposing non-armament on unarmed countries nor, as the leader of the Indian delegation to the International Atomic Energy Agency said in the General Conference last year, ``as a lever for achieving the political objectives of non-proliferation".

I should like to quote in this context one of the greatest living experts on disarmament matters, the Nobel Peace Prize winner, Mr. Philip Noel-Baker. He said:

"In any case, the Western Governments cannot leave things where they are today. Either the 'safeguards' of IAEA inspection will become the instrument of control for nuclear disarmament for the world at large; or it may soon become a farce. It cannot be used to keep the non-nuclear Powers disarmed, while the nuclear Powers continue to pile up or to retain great stocks of atomic and hydrogen weapons, large and 'small'. The purpose of IAEA, and the purpose of the cut-off which the Western Governments propose, is to demilitarise

50

atomic energy; either that purpose must be fully and speedily achieved, or IAEA, and the hopes built upon it, will all fail."

The Indian delegation realizes that the question

of control is a complex problem. Many of those complexities need not arise, however, in the context of a genuine treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. If all of us, and particularly the big Powers, agree that there should be a provision in the treaty dealing with safeguards and control, we must eschew all notions of discrimination and provide for objective measures which apply equally to all. An adequate treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will prohibit the manufacture of nuclear weapons by all States. Whatever provisions are necessary, therefore, to ensure that the production of all fissile material by all States is used henceforth only for peaceful purposes will thus be in full conformity with the General Assembly resolution 2028 (XX). What is more, we would have fulfilled one of the terms of reference of the very first resolution of the United Nations, resolution 1 (I), namely "control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes".

We are a negotiating Committee and the Indian delegation trusts that the views expressed by it will be considered fully by all delegations, and particularly by the Great Powers, during these negotiations. Earlier I quoted a statement made by our Foreign Minister in the Indian Parliament on March 17. I should like to continue that quotation. Mr. Chagla went on to say: ``While welcoming a meeting of minds between the United States and the USSR, which in itself is a good augury, the Government of India hope that after the draft treaty on nuclear non-proliferation is presented to the E.N.D.C. it will be thoroughly discussed and that the treaty as finally agreed would take a shape and form acceptable to all countries which are represented on the Committee, and, subsequently, to the international community in general. A satisfactory agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will have to take into account the peculiar circumstances in which certain countries are placed."

INDIA SWITZERLAND MEXICO BULGARIA BURMA NIGER NIGERIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA USA SWEDEN GHANA INDONESIA YUGOSLAVIA BRAZIL RUSSIA

**Date**: May 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on West Asia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on May 29, 1967 regarding the West Asian situation:

At the 1341st meeting of the Council on May 24, I had expressed the view that the Security Council should await a report from the Secretary General on the result of his discussions in Cairo before proceeding with the consideration of the matter on the agenda. We felt---and subsequent events bear out this conclusion---that no useful purpose would be served by a public airing of the issues while the Secretary-General was engaged in delicate diplomatic negotiations on the same issues.

My delegation would like to pay a most sincere tribute to U Thant on his untiring efforts in the cause of peace and the discharge of his onerous responsibilities in a fair and impartial manner. We admire his dedication to the purposes and principles of the United Nations and the statesmanship which he has displayed in the current crisis.

In his report of May 26, (Document S/7906) the Secretary-General has dealt with a number of issues relevant to the present situation in West Asia and has suggested a number of steps that could help reduce tension. He has also alluded to other possible steps which could be taken by mutual consent of the parties.

Mr. President, this Council is meeting to deliberate on vital issues affecting war and peace in West Asia. Tensions have existed in the area for many years, but now they have become critical. We are deeply concerned at this situation.

There are several issues in the area which can endanger peace. They are set out in the Secretary-General's report but it is important to realise that these problems have to be viewed in the perspective of the tragic history of the area.

The Council is charged under the Charter with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace. It is the view of my delegation that our immediate endeavour should be to work for restraint and reduction of tensions in order to gain, in the words of the Secretary-General, a breathing spell'. The time thus gained can be

## 51

utilized by the Council to work for a detente and seek ways and means to consolidate peace in the area.

The Secretary-General in his report to the Security Council of 26th May, 1967, has given an indication of the possible course of action which might contribute substantially to the reduction of tension. He has stated that, and I quote, "It would most certainly be helpful in the present situation if the Government of Israel were to reconsider its position and resume its participation in the EIMAC".. Similarly, in paragraph 16 of the report, the Secretary-General has repeated his earlier suggestion, and I quote, "It would be very helpful to the maintenance of quiet along the Israel-Syria line if the two parties would resume their participation in ISMAC, both in the current emergency session and in the regular sessions". My delegation lends its support to these valuable suggestions. It is a matter of record that while the ISMAC has not been able to achieve any concrete results, the EIMAC has not functioned at all since 1956. Both ISMAC and EIMAC as well as other mixed armistice commissions were established under the provisions of the general armistice agreements signed between Israel and her Arab neighbours. We believe that the provisions of the various general armistice agreements should be fully observed by the parties concerned.

The Council can play particularly a useful role in this connection by strengthening the machinery of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organisation.

The position of my Government in regard to the basic issues is well-known and was stated in Parliament on 25th May, 1967. At this stage I do not wish to go in detail on questions of substantive nature, but would only briefly re-state my delegation's position:

First---in asking for withdrawal of UNEF the United Arab Republic was only exercising its sovereignty. The Secretary-General acted correctly and wisely in agreeing to this withdrawal. The Minister for External Affairs of India said in the Parliament on May 25, 1967, and I quote, ``India could not be a party to any procedure which would make the UNEF into an occupation force nor could the Government of India agree to the UNEF's continued presence in the UAR in the absence of the latter's consent, and in any case Indian troops could not remain part of the UNEF without the UAR's approval".

Second---we understand the reasons for certain precautionary measures of preparedness taken by the United Arab Republic and note that they are of a defensive nature. In this context it is relevant to note paragraph 9 of the Secretary-General's report of May 26, 1967.

Third---all parties should fully observe the provisions of the General Armistice Agreements between Israel and Arab States.

Fourth---in regard to the Gulf of Aqaba, the Minister for External Affairs of India stated in the Parliament on May 25, 1967, and I quote, "So far as the Government of India are concerned we had taken the position as far back as 1957 that the Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea and that entry to the Gulf lies within the territorial waters of the UAR and Saudi Arabia. We adhere to this view". It is our view that no state or group of states should attempt to challenge by force the sovereignty of the UAR over the Strait of Tiran. A modus vivendi is most desirable, but any arrangement that is worked out must be within the framework of the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic.

Finally---it is our earnest hope that peace in the area will be preserved. It is our duty to encourage efforts by the Secretary-General and all member states to work for a detente which alone can lead to consolidation of peace in West Asia.

Mr. President, we earnestly wish to see a reduction of tension and the establishment of peace in this area as in other areas of the world. There are, no doubt, many obstacles, but we share the Secretary-General's belief that in spite of all these difficulties the United Nations can and must persevere in its endeavours to find reasonable, peaceful and just solutions to these problems. Towards this end my delegation is ready now and in the future to extend its full cooperation to all efforts to secure and maintain peace in West Asia. What is required at this stage is the exercise of utmost restraint by all parties concerned to enable the Secretary-General and the Security Council to take steps to maintain peace.

INDIA EGYPT USA ISRAEL SYRIA SAUDI ARABIA IRAN

**Date**: May 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on South West Africa

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Fifth Special Session of the General Assembly on May 4, 1967 on the question of South West Africa:

Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to associate my delegation with the tributes that have been paid to you by previous speakers on your unanimous election to this high office. It is a matter of gratification to all of us that in dealing with the important and intricate issues in this special session we shall have the benefit of your wise guidance and leadership.

The United Nations has reached a crucial stage in the course of developments which followed the fateful and unfortunate decision of the International Court of Justice of 18 July 1966. The world community was rightly indignant at what appeared to be an evasion of responsibility on the part of the World Court in not dealing with the substantial issues before it. Though the verdict of the Court came as a great disappointment to most of us, it nevertheless produced one good result. Resolution 2145 (XXI) would not have been possible but for the atmosphere generated by the decision of the World Court. My delegation, along with almost the entirety of the Afro-Asian Group, believes that the problem of South West Africa has to be tackled on an urgent basis. This sense of urgency is shared by a vast majority of the delegations represented here. The General Assembly took a momentous decision at its last session, and it is now imperative for all of us to co-operate to give practical effect to the decision contained in resolution 2145 (XXI).

It may be recalled that at the last session of the General Assembly the Afro-Asian Members were not in favour of any action, such as the appointment of the Ad Hoc Committee, which would further delay the achievement of the ultimate objective of ensuring freedom and indepedence for the people of South West Africa. The Afro-Asian community, however, agreed to the appointment of the Ad Hoc Committee and the convening of a special session in a spirit of co-operation, thus amply demonstrating their goodwill and their willingness to proceed in unity with the other groups. The Ad Hoc Committee convened, and in a surprisingly small number of meetings produced a report which has become the basis of our discussions at this special session. The Ad Hoc Committee, whose specific task was to recommend practical steps for the administration of the Territory, and not to go into any generalities, has not presented the Assembly with a concrete set of recommendations. Instead, the Committee has left it to the General Assembly either to adopt one of the three sets of proposals contained in its report or, if necessary, to prepare a wholly new plan of action. It is now our collective responsibility to decide on the further course of action.

Our friends in the Western Group have once again counselled patience to us. Let me make it

clear that we in the Afro-Asian Group have no patience with such counsels. In fact, we do not accept the charge that we are advocating a hasty or ill-considered course of action, precipitating confrontation between the United Nations and South Africa, without even trying to have a dialogue or negotiations with the South African Government. For more than twenty years we have tried to reason with South Africa, to plead with it and to come to some understanding with it so that the problem can be resolved in a peaceful manner. In the very first resolution on the subject---resolution 65 (I) of 14 December 1946---the General Assembly invited the South African Government to place the Territory under the Trusteeship System. It is needless to enumerate in any detail the failure of the various attempts by the General Assembly to make South Africa comply with its obligations under the Mandate. Those accusing us of not trying to negotiate with South Africa seem to have forgotten that the General Assembly set up an Ad Hoc Committee as early as 1950 for the purpose of entering into negotiations with the racist regime of South Africa. That Ad Hoc Committee, was followed by various other advisory and good offices Committees, all of which met with the same defiance and arrogance from South Africa. Those familiar with the history of the consideration of the question in the United Nations cannot and should not, therefore, level unsubstantiated charges against us who have been pressing for the restoration of the lawful rights of the people of South West Africa by peaceful means.

In this connexion we should like to ask a question of those who are advocating negotiations with South Africa: Have they received any indication at all of a change of heart on the part of South Africa? What is it that leads them to think that one more attempt at negotiations with South Africa would yield fruitful results? If they have received such an indication my delegation, among others, would be happy to be informed of it. Our own belief is that the racists of South Africa have no intention whatever of giving up their attitude of defiance towards the United Nations. On the contrary, we have reason to believe that South Africa is intent on pursuing its aggressive and predatory designs. We have at least two important indications in support of our belief.

First, there is the declaration of the South African Minister for Bantu Administration concerning Ovamboland. The manoeuvres to detach Ovamboland from the rest of the Territory, in flagrant violation of General Assembly resolution 2074 (XX), provide one more example of the utter contempt which South Africa has for the World Organization. This is positive proof that South Africa regards the Territory as its own and is not willing to accept counsel from any source, however noble and non-partisan. My delegation strongly condemns such manoeuvres of the South African Government.

The second indication of the hardening of South Africa's attitude is provided by the recent conference between the defence chiefs of Portugal and South Africa which took place in Lisbon early last month. According to the report in The

#### 53

New York Times of 9 April 1967, the Defence Ministers of Portugal and South Africa have proclaimed their common objective to pursue resolutely the defence of their positions in Africa.

We are all of us, of course, aware of the existence of the unholy alliance between the forces of colonialism and racism in southern Africa. My delegation has referred to it on a number of occasions. The unholy alliance has now become official and public. To refer again to The New York Times of 9 April, it reports in its dispatch from Lisbon:

"...during the current visit here of Mr. Piet Botha, the South African Defence Minister, emphasis was placed on common aims and close co-operation between the two countries. For the first time the two Governments publicly alluded to co-operation on defence matters." (page 7)

The Portuguese Defence Minister is reported to have said that the visit of the South African Defence Minister should facilitate the reinforcement of indispensable co-operation in essential and opportune matters between the two countries. Mr. Botha is said to have declared:

"Our task has been greatly facilitated by the strength and resolution of our Portuguese neighbours in Angola and Mozambique." (ibid.)

These declarations of intent and purpose should provide enough proof to all, particularly those sceptical of our belief, that South Africa has no intention of giving up its uncompromising attitude.

We have been advised to be realistic. We submit that it is not we who are not taking a realistic view of things but those who refuse to face the grave reality of the problem and offer various pretexts for not supporting the Afro-Asian plan for the implementation of resolution 2145 (XXI). The capacity of the United Nations to deal with equally difficult situations has been proved more than once in the past. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the United Nations is not capable of dealing with the problem. What is indeed true is that some Members of the United Nations which happen to be the most powerful and the most influential countries in the world do not wish, for their own different reasons, to face the facts and agree on a firm line. The Charter of the United Nations has placed primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the Scurity Council in general and on the permanent members in particular. It is sad to note that the permanent members, in varying degrees, have shown unwillingness to shoulder their responsibility to deal with the explosive situation in southern Africa. Resolution 2145 (XXI) received near unanimous support of the General Assembly. Not a single delegation, with the usual two exceptions, voted against the historic resolution. Even though resolution 2145 (XXI) did not satisfy us fully, in the sense that it postponed the taking of concrete steps to achieve our objective, we showed patience by accepting it in a spirit of compromise and solidarity. It is essential that all the delegations, at least those which voted in favour of resolution 2145 (XXI), should now accept the consequences and responsibility flowing from that resolution.

I should like, in particular, to deal with the point made by several delegations, mostly Western, that even the remotest possibility of negotiating with South Africa for the peaceful transfer of the administration of South West Africa to the United Nations should not be lost sight of. I

would make bold to say that not a single member of the Afro-Asian community is fearful of negotiations with South Africa provided, of course, that they are conducted on the proper basis. Is it fair, however to propose negotiations when South Africa has proclaimed from the housetops that South West Africa belongs to it and that no one dare dispossess South Africa of South West Africa? Despite the intransigent declarations of South Africa, let us suppose that the Afro-Asian community were still willing to give another opportunity for a peaceful solution of the problem. What would be the basis for such negotiations? Obviously, the basis to which the United Nations is committed is resolution 2145 (XXI), and negotiating on that basis can only mean the fixing of the time and date for the withdrawal of South African authority from South West Africa. Those who are in favour of giving a last opportunity for negotiations, would they, in their turn, in those circumstances, give a formal commitment to this Assembly that if South. Africa refused to fix the time and date for withdrawal from South West Africa, say by 31 August 1967, they would support to the hilt at the twenty-second regular session of the General Assembly the Afro-Asian plan for the implementation of resolution 2145 (XXI), as contained in document A/L.516? Would they give such a gurantee? In the absence of such a guarantee. my delegation believes that there would be no purpose in delaying the concrete action that has been proposed by fifty-eight Members of this Assembly. For negotiations to be realistic they must be backed by the Afro-Asian community Without such a backing, which can only be in terms of the present draft resolution, South Africa would not treat the negotiations seriously or realistically. That is the crux of the matter.

As far as my delegation is concerned, we believe that the Afro-Asian proposals contained in draft resolution A/L.516 provide the most comprehensive

#### 54

and meaningful approach to the problem. The various other proposals submitted to the Ad Hoc Committee, while individually containing some merit, lack the essential elements which have to be taken into account to deal with the problem. I do not propose to comment at length on the various provisions of the draft resolution

since that has been done very ably by my friend and colleague, Mr. Adebo, and other sponsors of the draft resolution. I should merely like to clarify one particular point which seems to be causing concern to some of our colleagues from other groups. I refer to operative paragraph 2 in section IV.

Fears have been expressed that the word "ensuring" in paragraph 2 gives rise to the interpretation that the United Nations council for South West Africa would have powers to take all necessary measures, including those of a coercive nature, to ensure the withdrawal of South African police and military personnel. I should like to remove any such misapprehension. What the sponsors have in mind in paragraph 2 is that in case South Africa agreed to withdraw its law enforcement machinery from South West Africa, the United Nations Council for South West Africa should make sure that the South African police and military forces did physically vacate the Territory. Paragraph 2 is not meant to give any enforcement authority to the United Nations Council. Such action, if it became necessary, could only be taken by the Security Council. A provision for action by the Security Council, if such a contingency arose, is made in paragraphs 3 and 5 of section IV.

My delegation and my Government attach the highest importance to the solution of the problem before us. The people of India have repeatedly expressed their solidarity with their African brethren in the fight for the eradication of the ugly cancer of apartheid and racial discrimination from southern Africa. If I may be permitted to recall, it was the Indian delegation which first raised the matter in the United Nations twentyone years ago. Ever since then we have lent and shall continue to lend our full support to the noble cause of freedom and independence for which our unfortunate brothers in South West Africa are fighting. We urge all the Members in this Assembly, particularly those on which there is a special responsibility in such matters, to rise to the occasion by supporting the draft resolution without any reservation, thus showing their concern for the cause of justice and humanity.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE

**Date**: May 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly on Peaceful Uses of Outer space

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Fifth Special Session of the General Assembly on May 23, 1967 on the question of the postponement of the U.N. Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

I should like, first of all, to express on behalf of my delegation our sincere sympathies to the United States and Soviet delegations on the accidents which involved the deaths of outstanding and brave astronauts. Those astronauts sacrificed their lives in their pioneering activities so that humanity might benefit from the new discoveries made in outer space.

My delegation has the honour to move draft resolution A/L.518 on the question of the postponement of the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The resolution would have the General Assembly decide that the Conference should now be held in Vienna from 14 to 27 August 1968, dates which are convenient to the host country.

The General Assembly, by resolution 2221 (XXI), had unanimously decided to hold this Conference in September 1967. That was the result of extensive deliberations by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and by the First Committee. However, the need for and desirability of postponement of this Conference by approximately one year was brought up at the first meeting in February of this year of the Panel of Experts, which was set up by General Assembly resolution 2221 (XXI) to discharge certain necessary tasks in connexion with the preparation and conduct of the Conference.

The Panel of Experts, after careful deliberation under the Chairmanship of Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, recommended to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space that it consider the suggestion that the postponement of the Conference by a period of one year might allow for a better preparation of the Conference.

The Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space considered the recommendation of the Panel of Exports at its meeting on 13 February 1967, and unanimously agreed to recommend to the General Assembly the postponement of the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space by approxima-

55

tely one year after its initial date of September 1967.

Now, the General Assembly has to take a decision on the postponement of the Conference to 1968. My delegation would commend to the General Assembly the acceptance of this unanimous decision of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and the approval of the draft resolution, which has been tabled by my delegation, together with twenty-two other delegations, to postpone the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space from the planned date of September 1967 to 14-27 August 1968.

My delegation would urge the participants, particularly the countries which by virtue of their experience, have most to contribute to the deliberations of the Conference, to take the postponement of the proposed Conference in terms of the additional time available to them for fuller and better participation in the Conference. We also hope that this postponement would provide an opportunity for better preparation for a Conference of such great importance and magnitude, thereby improving the results of the Conference for all participants. We would, therefore, request all Member States to redouble their efforts and start preparing for the Conference in right earnest to ensure the maximum benefit to the participating countries.

The Conference would examine the practical benefits to be derived from space research and exploration on the basis of technical and scientific achievements and the extent to which nonspace countries, especially the developing countries, may enjoy these benefits, particularly in terms of education and development, as well as the examination of the opportunities available to non-space Powers for international co-operation in space activities. It is the view of my delegation that the proposed Conference will be of use to all participating countries, irrespective of the size of their outer space programmes or the effectiveness of the research conducted by them. History has demonstrated that the real social and economic fruits of technology go to those who apply them through understanding. Therefore, a significant number of citizens of every developing country must understand the ways of modern science and of the technology that flows from it.

India, as one of the developing countries deeply interested in the results of the peaceful exploration of outer space and in an examination of the opportunities available to non-space Powers for international co-operation in space activities, has been looking forward to participating in the proposed Conference. The Indian delegation would appeal to all Member States, in view of the significance and importance this Conference will have on the development of science and technology, to participate as effectively as possible in the proposed Conference.

The United Nations has made efforts for meeting the challenges posed by the great advances made in this field in a short time, for harmonizing the interests of the countries concerned and also for providing opportunities to all countries to benefit from the exploration and peaceful uses of outer space. The proposed Conference is a notable effort in this direction by the United Nations. The Conference would be unique in its history. My delegation is confident that the developing countries are looking forward to the tremendous opportunities the Conference would afford them.

INDIA USA AUSTRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: May 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Shri M.C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament on his Visit Abroad

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in Parliament on May 22, 1967 on his visit to Kuwait, Iran, Geneva, Malaysia and Singapore:

During the months of April and May, I paid a visit to Kuwait, Iran, Malaysia and Singapore. The visits to these countries were made in response to invitations from the Foreign Ministers of these countries, and in pursuance of our policy of developing personal contacts and strengthening our existing friendly relations with these countries.

I also paid a visit to Geneva where I had the opportunity of meeting and discussing the question of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty with the representatives of various Governments who are members of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. I had also an informal meet-

56

ing with the Swiss Foreign Minister, Federal Councillor Spuhler in Berne.

#### **KUWAIT**

With Kuwait, India has had a long tradition of friendly relations. I had the opportunity of meeting and exchanging views with His Highness the Amir, His Highness the Crown Prince and Prime Minister, the Foreign Minister, the Minister of Commerce and Industry and other leaders. My talks with them revealed a large measure of agreement, both on international issues and on the need for developing naturally economic cooperation between the two countries.

Kuwait is a non-aligned country and stands for peaceful co-existence between all countries and opposition to military and other blocs which stand in the way of international cooperation. On matters relating to disarmament, non-proliferation treaty and nuclear weapons, we found that Kuwait and India held similar views. The leaders of Kuwait share our hope that the differences between India and Pakistan would be resolved peacefully through direct negotiations without any external interference and in accordance with the Tashkent Declaration for the mutual benefit of both countries.

In regard to economic cooperation, it was agreed that there were a number of fields which held promise of joint industrial ventures. Feasibility surveys in regard to these are to be conducted by the National Industrial Development Corporation. We have also offered the services of Indian technicians and experts together with training facilities for Kuwait personnel in India.

In order to further strengthen our relations, I informed the Foreign Minister of Kuwait that we had decided to appoint a resident Ambassador in Kuwait. This decision was welcomed and we hope that in a few months' time, a resident Ambassador would be in position in Kuwait. I believe that this visit has further increased mutual understanding and will result in still closer cooperation between the two countries.

## **IRAN**

After Kuwait, I visited Iran. Here, I had the privilege of meeting His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah of Iran, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister of Iran, and other Iranian leaders. In view of some misunderstandings which had arisen as a result of certain attitudes adopted by Iran during and after the Indo-Pakistan conflict in 1965, it was important to make known to the Iranian leaders our views and to recreate understanding between the two countries. I expressed the hope, which the Iranian leaders shared, that Iran's relations with other countries would not come in the way of Iran's friendship with India or be to the detriment of India.

I was assured by the Iranian Government that

Iran would not let its friendship with Pakistan affect its relations with India. On my conveying to them the apprehension in India that Iran was giving military support to Pakistan against India, I was assured that Iran had no such intention. I should add for the information of the House that, on my return to India, I stated this to the Press. The Iranian Government told us that they would be obliged to help Pakistan in the event of aggression against her. There is, of course, no question of India committing aggression against Pakistan. Any such thing is totally unthinkable and against our entire policy of peace and peaceful co-existence, and, therefore, any such contingency does not arise. It is obvious that what I was referring to was a conflict between India and Pakistan brought about by Pakistani aggression, such as we were subjected to in 1965. The House will recall that at the time of the signing of the Tashkent Declaration, Iran was among the many countries that welcomed it. The Iranian leaders have also from time to time stressed the importance of settling the problems between India and Pakistan peacefully. It would indeed be unfortunate if military support were given to Pakistan against India by Iran on the basis of assurances and obligations made in a different context.

Iran and India, as the House is aware have had age-old trade and cultural contacts and in recent years, most encouraging economic cooperation has developed. I may mention in this connection the agreement between the two countries on joint off shore oil exploration and the establishment of the oil refinery in Madras. The programme of development of industrial capacity and infra-structures in Iran and the stage of industrial and technological growth achieved by India have opened new avenues for the rapid increase of trade and industrial and technological collaboration between India and Iran. It is hoped that with the exchange of delegations, further progress would be made in the expansion of trade and exploration of the possibilities of cooperation in further joint economic ventures.

It is my hope that the friendly and frank exchange of views I had with Iranian leaders would help to create better understanding for the future.

MALAYSIA AND SINGAPORE

My discussions with the Prime Ministers of Malaysia and Singapore and other leaders revealed a closeness of views between us and them on most matters of common and mutual interest. In particular, both Singapore and Malaysia welcomed the idea of greater economic rela-

#### 57

tions with India and the possibilities of technical assistance from our country. Both countries expressed a desire to send more students and trainees to India for further education and it was agreed for this purpose to have mutual recognition of degrees so that students and trainees of these countries with Indian degrees will be able to find useful employment when they go back home.

Apart from the bilateral relationships, during our discussions we exchanged views on the prospects of multilateral technical co-operation with the countries of South-East Asia. As the House is aware, from the time of our Independence we have always recognised that we have community of interests born out of historic affinities and present similarity in economic and political problems with the countries of Asia. I pointed to the active interest which India has always taken in a variety of regional international institutions under the auspices of the U.N., such as the ECAFE, and some outside it such as the Colombo Plan. The leaders of Malaysia and Singapore pointed to the need for intensifying regional and sub-regional economic co-operation as a means of strengthening the political and economic independence of all our nations. Our view was that India would like to associate herself with any new constructive initiative which seeks to promote economic co-operation amongst these countries. It is, of course not the Indian purpose to seek any selfish advantage or to promote any hegemonistic ambitions, nor to appropriate aid or resources which are earmarked for the countries of South-East Asia. Recognising the common problems, the Indian association, if it is desired, would be for the purpose of contributing to the extent possible by providing technical and other assistance towards national and multilateral developmental projects. If it was the wish of the majority of the countries that a wider regional grouping would serve the individual national as well as common interests, India would gladly join in such a venture. The idea of a Council of Asia, either as a new organisation or as an adjunct to ECAFE, came up in our discussions; such a proposal would of course have no political undertones but will be geared merely to economic co-operation. I also made it clear that should it be the wish of the countries concerned, India would co-operate with smaller existing or new sub-groupings, regardless of their political, social or economic system. This, indeed, would be in accordance with our traditional policy of peaceful co-existence and mutual co-operation. The House will recognise that the form and nature of the co-operation required detailed examination and close consultations with the countries concerned. We are intending to undertake such a study and ascertain the views of these countries, so that the countries in South-East Asia all march in step to serve their own and the broad common interests.

I also discussed with the leaders of the two countries the position of people of Indian origin and was glad to find that our people who have made Singapore and Malaysia their homes are making valuable contribution to the social and economic development of these countries. Both Singapore and Malaysia are, like us, multiracial, multi-cultural and multi-religious societies and appreciate the secular policy that India is following. Both countries are also aware of the danger of outside interference, sabotage, subversion, infiltration, etc., and believe, like us, that economic viability is the best guarantee of political stability. They are in agreement with us about our policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence and respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries

I was glad to find that relations between Indonesia and Malaysia are being normalised and they have just signed a trade agreement. I congratulated the leaders of these two countries on the wisdom and statesmanship shown by them. I also explained Indo-Pakistan relations and our repeated efforts to normalise our relations with Pakistan on the basis of the Tashkent Declaration through peaceful and direct negotiations. Both countries expressed the hope that problems between India and Pakistan would be resolved peacefully.

We also discussed the urgent need for general disarmament and nuclear disarmament in particular and the draft nuclear non-proliferation treaty. There was complete identity of views on these subjects as is reflected in the joint communiques issued in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the friendship, sympathy and support shown to us by both Singapore and Malaysia in times of our difficulty. It is important for us to develop closer and more friendly relations with all countries of South East Asia and our neighbouring countries in particular. I am, therefore, glad that I was able to visit both Singapore and Malaysia and establish personal contacts with the wise and enlightened leaders of both countries who are most friendly towards India.

#### **GENEVA**

During my visit to Switzerland, I had discussions in Geneva with representatives of Governments on the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. The discussions were most useful, firstly, as a general exchange of views and, secondly, for projecting India's points of view

58

and concern at the terms of the proposed nuclear non-proliferation treaty. I explained in detail India's main objections to the non-proliferation treaty under contemplation. I made it clear that the draft treaty in the form in which it was understood to have been drawn up would be unacceptable to us. If, however, as a result of discussions in the Disarmament Committee it emerges in another form which took account of India's interests, it would be for us to take a decision as to whether we should subscribe to such a treaty.

I further explained that we were against discriminatory provisions as between the nuclear and non-nuclear powers and the inhibitions proposed on the development and use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

# KUWAIT IRAN MALAYSIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE SWITZERLAND USA INDIA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN SRI LANKA INDONESIA MALI

**Date**: May 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **MALAYSIA**

Joint Communique on Shri Chagla's Visit

The following is the text of the joint communique issued at the end of the visit of Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, to Malaysia on May 13, 1967:

At the invitation of the Government of Malaysia, His Excellency Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, Government of India, paid a visit to Malaysia from May 10th to 13th. He was accompanied by Shri T. N. Kaul, Secretary to the Government of India in the Ministry of External Affairs. He was also assisted in his talks by H.E. Shri M. A. Rahman, High Commissioner for India in Malaysia.

During his stay, the Foreign Minister of India and his delegation were received in audience by His Majesty the Yang di-Pertuan Agong. The Foreign Minister of India also called on the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and other members and officials of the Government of Malaysia.

The very friendly discussions which took place between the Foreign Minister of India and members of the Malaysian Government reflected the ancient and modern ties which link the two countries and their close co-operation in the international field. The discussions covered a wide range of subjects of mutual interest, including a general survey of the international scene, measures for strengthening further the close relations between the two countries and the problems of the Asian region.

The Ministers reaffirmed their faith in the policy of peaceful co-existence and peaceful cooperation for mutual and common benefit. They agreed that the principles enunciated at the Bandung Conference should be further strengthened for preserving the sovereignty and promoting the economic independence of developing countries, and for the maintenance of peace and stability in Asia and the world. Both sides also reaffirmed their belief in the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and their determination to continue their opposition to apartheid and to all forms and manifestations of colonialism and imperialism. Both governments support the aspirations of colonial territories to become independent, and they strongly condemn any effort of the colonial powers to prolong their rule over these territories.

They reiterated their view that for peace and good neighbourly relations among States it was essential for all States scrupulously to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity. They stressed the importance of economic cooperation to strengthen the forces of peace and stability in the region, based on equality and mutual benefit.

The two sides exchanged views on the current situation in Vietnam and noted with concern the grave situation that developed in the area. They reaffirmed their belief that no effort should be spared to bring about a peaceful settlement.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed the determination of the Government of India to normalise relations with Pakistan in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. The Prime Minister of Malaysia expressed his appreciation of the wisdom and statesmanship shown by India and Pakistan in signing the Tashkent Declaration and expressed the hope that the problems between the two countries would be resolved peacefully.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed his happiness at the progress of normalisation of relations between Malaysia and Indonesia and congratulated the leaders of the two countries for their wisdom and statesmanship.

In regard to the non-proliferation treaty, currently under consideration, both sides were of

the view, that such a treaty should be in accordance with the principles embodied in the United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2028 (XX) and that it should be comprehensive and

## 59

non-discriminatory, must embody an acceptable balance of obligations between nuclear and nonnuclear power and should not inhibit the development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. They emphasised the urgent need to pursue the objective of general and complete disarmament and of nuclear disarmament in particular through all possible channels.

The two sides expressed their resolve to further strengthen co-operation between the two countries in organisations like the United Nations, UNCTAD and other international bodies. They reaffirmed their faith in the policy of multi-racial, multi-religious and multi-cultural harmony followed by both Governments.

In reviewing bilateral relations between Malaysia and India, the two sides were agreed that continuing efforts should be made to promote further the existing good relations in various fields. They expressed satisfaction at the wide range of relations that already exist and agreed that close consultations between representatives of the two countries from time to time would help in further promoting these relations. They agreed to hold annual meetings between senior officials of the two governments alternately in New Delhi and Kuala Lumpur. They expressed their determination to promote greater economic, commercial and technical cooperation as also co-operation in the cultural. educational and scientific fields between the two countries as a result of this visit of the Foreign Minister of India and his colleagues to Malaysia.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed his sincere appreciation and gratitude for the warm welcome and hospitality which he and his delegation received during the visit. He extended, on behalf of the Government of India, a cordial invitation to the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister to pay an official visit to India. The Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister thanked the Foreign Minister of India for the kind invitation which they were most pleased to

#### MALAYSIA INDIA USA INDONESIA VIETNAM MALI PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: May 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## SINGAPORE

Shri M. C. Chagla's Visit to Singapore

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, paid a visit to Singapore from May 8 to 10, 1967. On May 9, the Foreign Minister of Singapore, Mr. Rajaratnam, gave a dinner in honour of Shri Chagla.

Speaking on the occasion, Shri Chagla said:

Mr. Foreign Minister, Your Excellencies and Gentlemen:

You don't know how deeply touched I have been by the warmth of my reception. My only regret is that my stay has been so short.

I have found here a free atmosphere, a cosmopolitan atmosphere which makes me feel that Singapore has a great future before it. We have an abiding friendship which arises from common objectives and common ideas.

When I met your Prime Minister today, one of the most brilliant and dynamic persons I have come across, a man full of ideas, a man who takes a long view of the world situation, he told me something which deeply touched me. He said: "As far as friendship between India and Singapore is concerned, it is for all time."

Politics is an ephemeral thing; today you are friends, tomorrow you are enemies. Power-politics change from time to time. But the two countries have certain basic ideas, certain basic values, certain basic objectives. Then these two

countries remain friends notwithstanding the political changes which may come about in the world. That is the situation as far as India and Singapore are concerned.

What are the basic principles which we have in common? Mr. Foreign Minister, you have referred to non-alignment. You have rightly said non-alignment does not mean neutrality, non-alignment does not mean sitting on the fence, non-alignment does not mean you are not committed to certain important principles. Nonalignment means that you do not belong to military blocs. You eschew military alliances. But, at the same time, you reserve yourself the right to pass judgment on world situations as they arise and you also are deeply committed to certain principles.

Singapore and India are committed to peace.
They are committed to disarmament. They are committed to non-intervention in each other's affairs. We both believe that each country has the right to have its own policy, its own ideology and no country has the right to intervene or interfere with other countries. Therefore, notwithstanding non-alignment, there is a commitment, a deep commitment, a deep involvement in certain important principles and objectives.

Mr. Foreign Minister, I am one of those who believe that peace of Asia largely depends upon a strong south-east Asia, south-east Asia which

60

is economically strong, which is highly developed and which can stand all types of threat of subversion or sabotage. It is also my view that Singapore will play a very important role in this south-east Asia which I am envisaging. A country must not be judged by its physical size; Singapore is small physically but I think it is very important strategically. It occupies the most strategic position in South-East Asia. I think the development of Singapore is extremely important from the point of view of all South-East Asian countries and also from the point of view of India itself.

India feels that the strength of South-East Asia is her own strength. And I assure the Foreign Minister that the strength of Singapore is the

strength of India. I also want to assure the Foreign Minister that India is prepared to give massive aid to the development of Singapore.

Singapore is a much richer country than India. I think its per capita income is much larger than ours. We are not an affluent society. I think Singapore can be called an affluent society. But India can make some contribution. It has technology, it has got expertise, it has got skill, it has got men who have been trained in science. And I wish to make this commitment as the Foreign Minister of my country that whatever assistance we can give to Singapore for its development, for its industrialization, for its advancement, India will unhesitatingly give it to Singapore.

Mr. Foreign Minister, you spoke about regional cooperation. That is a matter which is agitating the minds of all of us today. And here again I want to make the position perfectly clear. We believe that we should have bilateral arrangements with different countries. We will be very happy to have bilateral arrangements with Singapore with regard to trade, with regard to commerce, with regard to economic cooperation. But if Singapore chooses to join any regional cooperation we will be very happy to join such a regional grouping if other members want India to do so. If the other members want to have a smaller grouping India will be very happy to remain outside and help such a grouping. But one thing I wish to assure the Foreign Minister about: India does not want to dominate any regional grouping. The only objective India has is to make her contribution to the success of such a regional grouping. As I said, whatever technological knowledge India has, whatever expertise it has, it is prepared to place at the disposal of such a regional grouping.

Therefore, any regional group that may be formed need not have any apprehension that India would either dominate such a regional group or that India would seek to derive any benefit for herself from this regional group. Far from deriving any benefit, India wants to make her own contribution, humble as it may be, small as it may be, because India realises, as I said, that it is absolutely necessary that we must have a strong economically viable South-East Asia.

May I say a word about secularism. To my mind the greatest bond between Singapore and India is this belief in secularism. Singapore has problems similar to those which we have in India. Singapore has got different races, different cultures, different languages. So has India. And to me the definition of secularism is the art of living together. Singapore has learnt that art. it is living together. You will permit me to say that India has also practised this art for a long time.

You were good enough to mention the election of Dr. Zakir Husain as President of India. Dr. Husain has been elected President not because he belongs to any community but because he is a very distinguished Indian and he has been elected because he has those qualities which the President of India should have.

Therefore, I do not look upon Dr. Husain's election as the election of a person from the minority community. I look upon Dr. Zakir Husain's election as the election of a distinguished Indian who was worthy to hold this high office as an Indian. But where secularism comes in is that our country has not disqualified him from holding this office because he belongs to a minority. And I think that is equally true of this country. I think it is a very happy situation that both my friend the Foreign Minister and myself come from the minority communities.

Secularism has another aspect. If you learn to live together in your own country, the next step is that you learn to live together with other countries. That is the international aspect of secularism. What is it that the world is suffering from today? It is lack of understanding, lack of tolerance, lack of this art of living together or peaceful co-existence as we describe it. When the day dawns when all nations in this world learn to live together peacefully allowing each nation to develop in its own way then we shall reach the millennium.

Therefore, if a country is secular within its own domestic sphere, if a country knows how to teach its people to live together, people who belong to different communities, different regions, different languages, that country will also help international cooperation.

There are one or two other things I should like to mention which, I hope, the Foreign Minister will consider as further cementing our relationship and our friendship.

One announcement I would like to make is that the Government of India has authorised me to inform the Government of Singapore that they will be very happy to present to the Singapore

61

Government our training aircraft, manufactured in India. This is an aircraft made entirely by India. I hope with the help of this aircraft you will be able to train your civilian pilots and your flying club members to fly an aircraft.

The second announcement I would like to make is that when your Prime Minister came to India and when he was in Delhi he was very much impressed by the President's bodyguard and he happened to mention that he would like to have a bodyguard like this in Singapore. I am very happy to tell you that we have decided to provide Singapore with 80 of our best horses. We have also decided to send with these horses two or three men who will be able to train horsemen so that you will have a bodyguard similar to the bodyguard that the President has in New Delhi.

Mr. Foreign Minister, I shall always remember this visit and if my visit has contributed even in a slight degree to further cement and strengthen the bonds between our two countries, I shall leave Singapore tomorrow a very happy man indeed.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date**: May 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

**SINGAPORE** 

Joint Communique

The following is the text of the joint communique issued in Singapore on May 9, 1967 at the end of Shri M. C. Chagla's visit to Singapore:

At the invitation of the Government of Singapore, His Excellency, Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs of India, paid a visit to Singapore from May 8th to the 10th, 1967. He was accompanied by Shri T. N. Kaul, Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of External Affairs. He was also assisted in his talks by His Excellency Shri Surendra Sinh Alirajpur, High Commissioner of India to Singapore.

The Foreign Minister of India and party called on His Excellency Inche Yusof Bin Ishak, President of the Republic of Singapore, and had discussions with His Excellency Mr. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister, His Excellency Dr. Toh Chin Chye, Deputy Prime Minister and His Excellency, Mr. S. Rajaratnam, Foreign Minister of Singapore.

The discussions were held in an atmosphere of mutual friendship and understanding and revealed a general identity of views.

Both sides reaffirmed their adherence to the policy of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence between differing political, economic and social systems. They emphasised the need for scrupulously avoiding interference in the internal affairs of other States and the use of threat or use of force, subversion or sabotage in solving international problems.

In regard to the situation in Vietnam, they expressed their great concern over the prolongation with possibilities of escalation of the conflict. They felt that statesmanship and restraint were necessary to enable a move towards the processes of peace. An immediate stoppage of the bombing in Vietnam was necessary as a first step to the cessation of all hostilities and to make a start towards a peaceful solution of the Vietnam problem within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

The two sides reviewed the situation in South

East Asia and agreed that it was necessary to improve the social and economic conditions in this region in order to create political stability.

The two sides recognised that there was a wide field for greater cooperation among the countries of the Asian region in the economic, commercial and cultural fields. Such cooperation would be beneficial in raising the living standards of the people and giving greater meaning and substance to their political independence. Such cooperation should be on the basis of equality and mutual benefit without the domination of any one or more countries.

The two sides reaffirmed their faith in the principles of secularism and multiracial and multilingual integration followed by both countries.

The Foreign Minister of India informed the Foreign Minister of Singapore about the efforts India had made and was making towards normalisation of Indo-Pakistan relations on the basis of the Tashkent Declaration. The Foreign Minister of Singapore noted these efforts and expressed the hope that these two countries could find a basis for resolving their differences by direct discussion without any outside interference as peace between the two countries would contribute to the prosperity and happiness of the peoples of India and Pakistan.

Both sides felt that no effort should be spared to move towards complete and general disarmament and nuclear disarmament. In particular, in regard to the problems of nuclear proliferation, the two sides agreed that any treaty in this regard should be in accordance with the principles laid down in the U.N. Resolution No. 2028 providing for mutuality of obligations and nondiscrimination as between nuclear and non-nuclear powers and that it should not inhibit the development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

There was an exchange of views about the possible effects of British entry into the European

62

Common Market. They hoped that the British Government would clarify its stand and take

necessary measures during their negotiations with the E.E.C. to ensure that the interests of the Asian Commonwealth countries are adequately safeguarded.

The two sides recognised that one of the major problems of the present day was the widening gap between the developing and the developed countries. They expressed the hope that during the forthcoming second conference of UNCTAD to be held in New Delhi, the developed countries would adopt a more positive and helpful attitude to enable the developing countries to move towards the reduction of the present disparity and help the developing countries to stabilise their economy and improve their participation in world trade.

The two sides recognised that there was considerable scope for improving further the bilateral exchange of students and educationists and cultural relations between the two countries. They were of the view that a cultural agreement between the two countries would assist further in formulating a scheme for such exchanges. Both sides agreed that periodical consultations between the officials of the two Governments would be mutually beneficial and agreed that such meetings be held.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed his deep appreciation of the cordial reception and hospitality accorded to him and his delegation. Both sides recognised that the visit had helped to strengthen further the mutual understanding and cooperation between the two countries and reaffirmed their determination to strengthen bilateral relations in every possible way. The Foreign Minister of India expressed India's willingness to extend economic and technical assistance to Singapore in its development plans.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND MALI PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: May 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

#### Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Parliament

Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in both the Houses of Parliament on May 25, 1967 regarding the recent developments in West Asia:

The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries. From time to time, the tension has erupted into incidents of varying degrees of seriousness. After the aggression on the U.A.R. in 1956, a United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) was set up to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities between Egypt and Israel. The UNEF had contingents supplied by Brazil, Canada, Denmark, India, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia. Israel has all along refused to let the UNEF be stationed on or enter the Israeli side of the border. UNEF, therefore, operated only from the U.A.R. side with the consent of the U.A.R. Government.

In recent weeks serious tension has developed between Syria and Israel. The Israeli Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and Chief of Army Staff were quoted as saying that they would teach Syria a severe lesson and even march upto Damascus. At the same time, there were reports of Israeli troop concentrations near the Syrian border. The Syrians, apprehending an imminent attack from Israel, held urgent consultations with the United Arab Republic under the U,A,R,-Syrian Mutual Defence Agreement signed in November, 1966.

On May 18, a letter was received by U Thant from the U.A.R. Foreign Minister asking for the removal of UNEF entirely from U.A.R. territory and the Gaza strip. After again having consultations with the U.N. Advisory Committee on UNEF, the Secretary-General decided to terminate UNEF's presence as requested by the U.A.R.

The Government of India have always supported the UNEF's activities and believe that its presence on the Israeli---U.A.R. border has helped in maintaining peace in the area. We would, however, like to state clearly that we appreciate the reasons which have impelled the U.A.R. to ask for the withdrawal of UNEF. When the UNEF was stationed in the U.A.R., it was with the consent of the U.A.R. Government and the UNEF could not continue to remain in U.A.R. territory without that Government's continuing consent. India could not be a party to any procedure which would make UNEF into an occupation force; nor could the Government of India agree to UNEF's continued presence in U.A.R. in absence of latter's consent and in any case Indian troops could not remain part of UNEF without U.A.R.'s approval. This is also in keeping with customary international law, the U.N. General Assembly resolution on the subject and the understanding reached between the late Mr. Dag Hammarskiold. then U.N. Secretary-General, and the U.A.R. Government.

On the question of UNEF's removal, I would like to refer to the reasons given by U Thant, United Nations Secretary-General, in his report dated May 18, 1967, to the U.N. General Assembly. U Thant has said:---

63

- "(a) The United Nations Emergency Force was introduced into the territory of the United Arab Republic on the basis of an agreement reached in Cairo between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the President of Egypt and it, therefore, has seemed fully clear to me that since United Arab Republic consent was withdrawn, it was incumbent on the Secretary-General to give orders for the withdrawal of the force. The consent of the host country is a basic principle which has applied to all United Nations peace-keeping operations.
- (b) In practical fact, UNEF cannot remain or function without the continuing consent and cooperation of the host country.
- (c) I have also been influenced by my deep concern to avoid any action which would either compromise or endanger the contingents which make up the force. The United Nations Emergency Force is, after all, a peace-keeping and not an enforcement operation.
- (d) In the face of the request for the withdrawal

of the force, there seemed to me to be no alternative course of action which could be taken by the Secretary-General without putting in question the sovereign authority of the Government of the United Arab Republic within its own territory."

The Government of India fully endorses the position taken by the U.N. Secretary-General.

I may here refer to the incident on May 18, 1967, regarding the plane carrying General Inderjit Rikhye, Commander of the UNEF. General Rikhye was flying inside the Gaza strip when two Israeli aircraft buzzed his plane, fired warning shots and tried to force the aircraft to enter Israeli territory over the Mediterranean. General Rikhye refused to be intimidated and proceeded to his destination. We consider this incident a highly provocative one. It is, however, understood that the Israeli authorities have conveyed their apologies in this connection to the U.N. authorities. The coolness and courage of this officer who belongs to our Armed Forces deserves commendation.

On May 18, 1967, the Prime Minister received a verbal message from President Nasser communicated through our Ambassador in Cairo. The message referred to the various statements recently made by the Israeli Prime Minister, Foreign Minister and the Chief of Army Staff, indicating that preparations were being made for an attack on Syria. The Message indicated that the Israeli intention was to change the Government in Syria through pressure and even by invasion. In the circumstances, the UAR wanted to declare openly that it would come to Syria's help if the latter was attacked by Israel. The UAR had consequently taken necessary measures to deter the Israelis from any aggressive designs against Syria.

The message added that UAR was not interested in increasing tensions in the area, but considering their past experience, especially during the Suez crisis, they felt it necessary to take precautions against any possible Israeli attack on an Arab country.

A reply was sent to President Nasser's message through our Ambassador in Cairo on May 19, 1967. The reply expressed the deep concern of the Government of India at the dangerous situation which had developed and our anxiety at the nature of statements recently made by the Israeli leaders. The reply added that we shared with the UAR adherence to the principle that no country should interfere in the internal affairs of another country. We said that we fully appreciated the reasons why the UAR has had to institute precautionary measure. We expressed the hope that peace would be maintained and we noted with gratification that it was not the intention of the UAR to increase tension in the area but that the measures taken were in the interest of preparedness and precaution against a possible attack on an Arab country. This message reiterated the respect and regard which we have for President Nasser personally and for our friendship for the U.A.R.

On May 21, 1967, the U.N. Secretary-General flew to Cairo for discussions with the U.A.R. leaders.

News has been received of the U.A.R. decision to close the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping and to other shipping carrying strategic goods for Israel. So far as the Government of India are concerned, we have taken the position as far back as 1957 that the Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea and that the entry to the Gulf lies within the territorial waters of UAR and Saudi Arabia. We adhere to this view.

I would like to impress on the House the gravity of the hour and the need to be exceedingly cautious in expressing views in a fast developing situation. The interests of West Asian countries, the interests of India and the interests of the world as a whole make it imperative that there should be peace and stability in this entire area of West Asia. U Thant is on a delicate mission. He has the fullest support of the Government of India in his efforts to maintain peace.

64

USA ISRAEL EGYPT BRAZIL CANADA DENMARK INDIA NORWAY SWEDEN YUGOSLAVIA SYRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SAUDI ARABIA

**Date**: May 01, 1967

## June

# **Volume No**

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record

1967

Vol. XIII

JUNE No. 6

#### **CONTENTS**

**PAGE** 

**CANADA** 

President's Visit to Canada

65

President's Speech at Ceremonial Reception on Parliament Hill

65

President's Speech at Luncheon by the Prime Minister of Canada

66

President's Speech at Dinner by the Mayor of Montreal

67

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the General Assembly on West Asia

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the Security Council on Cyprus

72

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speeches in the Security Council on West

Asia 73

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shri Surendra Pal Singh's 'Statement in Rajya Sabha on Farakka Barrage

Project

78

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Explosion of Hydrogen

Bomb by China

78

Shri M.C. Chagla's Statement on Withdrawal of Diplomatic Status from

79

**WEST ASIA** 

Prime Minister's Statements in Parliament

81

ZAMBIA

President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming President Kaunda

83

President Kaunda's Speech at Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Zakir

Husain 84

President's Speech at his Dinner to Dr. Kaunda

84

Reply by President Kaunda

86

President Kaunda's Speech at his Dinner to President Zakir Husain

88

Reply by President Zakir Husain

89

Joint Communique

90

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CANADA INDIA CYPRUS USA PAKISTAN CHINA ZAMBIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

CANADA

President's Visit to Canada

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, paid a visit to Canada from June 26 to June 30, 1967. On June 26, the Governor-General of Canada gave a dinner in honour of the President.

Speaking on the occasion, President Zakir Husain said:

Your Excellency, you have been as generous

in what you have said as in your hospitality and I thank you warmly on both counts.

You and I have both assumed only recently and practically at the same time our present offices. May I say that I admire---and envy---the finesse and aplomb with which you have taken to the ceremonial duties which go with these offices. I am afraid I still have to catch up with you. But it makes it easier to do so in the midst of such friendliness.

There are two aspects of my visit which are particularly pleasing to me: that my first visit abroad in my new office should be to Canada and that it should be to take part in the very happy celebrations of Canada's centennial. As I said earlier today, Canada and India have been very close to each other in the years since my country became independent. We have had earlier links, not least those forged by the several thousand citizens of Canada whose origins are in India. But it is the co-operation which we have developed in the last 20 years which is particularly impressive. I am confident that that co-operation will increase in a spirit of amity and mutual understanding. To this I know, Mr. Governor-General, that you, whom we had the pleasure of having amidst us, will richly contribute.

If I may say so, Canada is fortunate to have you as Governor-General. I can certainly add that India is fortunate to have you as Governor-General of Canada also. We in India have the happiest memories of the time you and Mrs. Michener spent with us when you were your country's distinguished High Commissioner.

Along with my personal greetings I bring to the people of Canada the friendship and goodwill of the people of India. Both our countries dedicated to the ways of democratic priciples and ideals of peace and brotherhood have much to learn from each other and much to do together. I look forward to the most friendly co-operation between us in ever increasing fields. May it continue to contribute to the strengthening of the bonds between our two countries and to the good of the world community.

Between good friends there is always a great deal of understanding which does not require constant reaffirmation. Let your next hundred years be even more vigorous than the last centennial. Let the friendship of our two countries also grow in warmth and strength. Our good wishes are always with you and those who so wisely guide your affairs.

CANADA USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **CANADA**

President's Speech at Ceremonial Reception on Parliament Hill

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, delivered the following speech in Ottawa on June 26, 1967, replying to the welcome by the Governor-General of Canada at a ceremonial reception on Parliament Hill:

Your Excellency the Governor-General, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The welcome which has been extended to me is a measure of the warm friendship that has developed between our two countries. That friendship has resulted in close co-operation in many fields which has, I know, been beneficial to India and, I believe, been fruitful for the world community. The assistance which Canada has so generously given us in our efforts to develop our economy and, most particularly in meeting food difficulties created by our unprecedented droughts, has evoked deep and lasting gratitude among our people.

65

The role that Canada has played in the evolution of the United Nations and in the maintenance of international peace has evoked our admiration and respect. I am very glad that my first visit abroad as President of India should bring me to your shores and give me an opportunity to convey to you personally the greetings and friendship of our people.

This centennial year which you are celebrating is not only an occasion for national rejoicing. The progress of Canada which can be so proudly reviewed at such a time is an example to the world. What is more, what happened 100 years ago was an important landmark in the growth of the Commonwealth of Nations to which we both belong. The contribution of Canada in this respect cannot be over-estimated. It is no exaggeration to say that Canada has played a decisive part in the shaping and direction of the Commonwealth.

#### PERSONS OF INDIAN ORIGIN

There is one aspect of the links between us which I must particularly mention. Since 1904 people from my country have come to Canada to participate in your development and some have stayed on to become Canadian citizens. Today your population includes about 15,000 Canadians whose origins are in India and it is a matter of pleasure to us all that they also form part of the fabric of Canada. If I may, I take this opportunity to send them my greetings and good wishes.

#### **EQUALITY OF RACES**

Our world today and increasingly in the future must recognise and respect many different peoples of different races, creeds and cultures and at different stages of economic and technological development. I have referred to differences but in the sense simply of variety and not of contention.

If the world is to move away from conflict and bigotry towards harmony and richness of spirit as well as of material things, such differences must be accepted and indeed valued. All people have to contribute to our future. The United Nations with its universality of membership and purposes and principles can best promote generation of such harmony and spirit. In a smaller sphere the Commonwealth of Nations, of which there are members from five continents.

symbolizes the ideals of the United Nations and helps in fostering harmony between nations of different tradition, race and colour. The need for greater understanding among nations is great. The gap between richer and poorer nations is widening. Resentments born of consciousness of colour or of economic disparities can lead to even greater dangers at the international level than within individual countries. All of us have to bring great patience, understanding and imagination to bear on these problems so that the family of man develops in peace and goodwill. The role that Canada has played in this respect has brought her very close to us; it encourages the finest hopes for the future of our one but multiform world.

My visit here will be a memorable one for me personally. I shall consider it a privilege if it helps to renew the feelings of cordiality which have made us both work so well together so far and which can greatly strengthen our co-operation for the future.

I would like to thank you again for your invitation which has given me an opportunity to visit Canada to see something of your country, to refresh old friendship, to make new ones and to convey personally to you warm greetings from India. I wish the people of Canada success, happiness and prosperity for the future.

CANADA USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **CANADA**

President's Speech at Luncheon by the Prime Minister of Canada

President Zakir Husain was the guest of honour at a luncheon given by His Excellency the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Lester Pearson, at the County Club in Aylmer across the Ottawa river on June 27, 1967.

Speaking on the occasion, Dr. Zakir Husain said:

Mr. Prime Minister and friends, I am glad to have another opportunity to thank your Government and the people of Canada for the very fine welcome and hospitality you have extended to us. I already feel as though I am among old friends; and this, if I may say so, is specially true of you, Mr. Prime Minister.

Though this visit is the first opportunity I have had of actually meeting you, you are no stranger to my country and people. All of us, including myself, have long been familiar with the remarkable contribution you have made to peace and to the evolution of the family of the United Nations. The ways in which you have worked for greater co-operation and under-

66

standing among different peoples of our world community, the human values you have upheld and your repeated services to the cause of peace have not only won you great personal admiration, they have added considerably to the great respect with which the voice of Canada is heard everywhere in the world.

#### SENTINELS OF PEACE

Our present-day world never seems to be without crises. All too frequently crises erupt to threaten the future of peace, jeopardising the welfare of nations. In the years since the Second World War, India and Canada have worked together in many such crises in the cause of peace. Canadian and Indian forces have stood shoulder to shoulder as sentinels of peace under the United Nations flag; we have also worked together in the same way outside the United Nations. Perhaps we have not always agreed in every respect, but we have done so in essentials. This is because we have been bound by common ideals and have worked for common ends. Above all we have shared a sincere dedication to the cause of peace of which you, Mr. Prime Minister, have become a symbol. We look forward to continuing co-operation between our two Governments to our mutual benefit and in the service of peace and of the rights of nations.

#### ABUNDANT HELP

Bilaterally, India and Canada have enjoyed an exemplary relationship. You have contributed most valuably to our efforts to move forward into an age of prosperity and technological achievement. I would like to convey to you our very deep sense of appreciation for all that you have done and are doing in such abundance. In particular, we are deeply grateful for the promptness as well as generosity which you have moved to assist us in shortages of food which two severe and successive droughts have inflicted on us. These are all acts of more than friendship and our people will always be beholden to you for them.

I ask you all to join me to toast to the continuing welfare and prosperity of the Canadian people.

CANADA USA INDIA **Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **CANADA**

President's Speech at Dinner by the Mayor of Montreal

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, was the chief guest at a dinner given in his honour by the Mayor of Montreal at the City Hall on June 27, 1967.

The following is the text of Dr. Husain's speech in reply to the Mayor's speech of welcome:

Your Worship Mayor Drapeau, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen: It gives me great pleasure to be today in your hospitable and friendly city of Montreal, the most ancient and certainly one of the most cosmopolitan cities in North America. The selection of Montreal as

the site for Canada's imaginative centennial concept---EXPO'67 shows me once again with what care this concept was conceived. I cannot think of another place where the beauties of nature combine so harmoniously with the more mundane necessities of civilization that go to make up a modern city. The natural advantages are provided by the Almighty but the rest have to be the work of man and it is abundantly clear to us all, Your Worship, that in this respect Montreal is most fortunate. I feel sure that much has been achieved in your own term as Mayor.

While the main purpose of my presence in Montreal is to visit your centennial exposition and inaugurate the India Week, the opportunity to visit a city, and later a province which draws its culture from two distinct sources, is something that is of considerable interest to me. As you know, my own country India, has also throughout its ancient history drawn on a number of cultures and gaining strength from this diversity, has forged a unique unity.

I am also as an educationalist taking the opportunity of visiting the McGill University as an institution known and respected throughout the world and one of the brightest stars in your city's diadem. Many of my fellow countrymen are working there as indeed they are at other vocations in the city of Montreal. When I met a group of them at a function this afternoon I was happy to find how hospitably they had been treated and in what affection they held you and your fellow citizens.

May I thank you and all those associated with you, Mr. Mayor, for the warm friendship you have shown me. We wish you and the citizens of this beautiful and vital city all good wishes for the future and I know that with men like yourself in charge Montreal will go from strength to greater strength.

67

CANADA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the General Assembly on West Asia

Shri Mohamedali Currim Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, delivered the following speech in the Fifth Emergency Special Session of the General Assembly on June 21, 1967 on West Asian crisis:

Mr. President, we have met here in this emergency special session of the General Assembly to discharge the responsibilities of the United Nations, in what you yourself, in your opening statement called "a crisis of world proportions". It is significant that ten Heads of Government and eighteen Foreign Ministers from all over the world have considered it their duty to come to the United Nations Headquarters at a very short notice. Even in this gloomy hour it should perhaps hearten us that the international community has so spontaneously, and with such a measure of unanimity, agreed that the United Nations is the proper forum for arriving at decisions which ensure that the principle gets established that in the second half of the twentieth century, aggressors are not permitted to retain the reward of their aggression, however successful on the field of battle they might be. It would be an understatement to say that peace in West Asia is in peril. Barely a week ago, a short but savage war in that area was brought to a halt, by continuous and persistent efforts of the Security Council, and unless the world community can arrange---and arrange firmly and speedily---a durable and just peace, it is not inconceivable that a world conflagration may follow. We, therefore, hope that the return of peace to the area, will be such as to guarantee that there shall be no recurrence of war again; that the human problems created by this war, further compounding the tragedy which already existed in the area as a result of the happenings in 1948

and 1956, will be redressed with the help of all men of goodwill, all over the world, and through the instrumentality of the United Nations.

Conditioned by the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi during our struggle for independence, and conditioned earlier, through the centuries. by the tradition of the deep and abiding philosophy of humanism, centuries that produced Buddha and Ashoka, our land has been a crucible for integrating people of different faiths and diverse ethnic origins. For centuries, people have lived in India who practised all the major religions of the world: Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Zoroastrianism. To us, therefore, the philosophy of tolerance, peace and coexistence, is natural and the ideas of violence and war repugnant. Settlement of international disputes through peaceful means, respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty of States, the right of all nations to live in freedom and enjoy fruits of freedom, are all cherished articles of faith with us. Where peace is threatened, or aggression committed, we find it impossible to remain silent and passive. We have, therefore, voiced our sincere and wholehearted sympathy for and solidarity with the Arab peoples in their hour of trial and tribulation.

During the weeks preceding the outbreak of hostilities, it was our constant and earnest effort to counsel restraint to all the parties to this strife and to all the other States which, one way or the other, were involved in this crisis. It was our hope that there would be no headlong rush towards an Armageddon, and that peace in West Asia would be preserved. When U Thant made his noble, and nearly successful effort to gain a breathing spell, during which quiet diplomacy could help solve the crisis, India stood stolidly behind him. While those efforts were going on, and while the crisis itself was under examination and consideration by the Security Council, Israel struck a lightning blow against its Arab neighbours. Once hostilities broke out our effort was directed towards a restoration of peace and the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the lands they had occupied. The establishment of the various cease-fires between Israel and its Arab neighbours followed, haltingly, almost hesitatingly. And just then Israel mounted an invasion of Syria annexing further territory even as an uneasy cease-fire settled down in other theatres of war. I should like to recall that we had repeatedly urged in the Security Council that cease-fire will not be effective unless it was coupled with withdrawals. We adhere to our

68

belief that the cease-fire itself, cannot be considered complete as long as an alien armed force occupies large areas of land belonging to its neighbours, and as long as large masses of Arab peoples live and suffer in subjugation in those occupied areas. The foundation of a lasting peace in the region can be based only on total, immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israel from the areas now under its occupation, and rightly belonging either to the United Arab Republic or to Jordan or to Syria. We must distinguish between peace and mere cessation of fighting.

The fact that Israel struck the first blow is incontrovertible. The concept of a pre-emptive strike or a preventive war, is contrary to the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter. Nobody denies that there are many disputes between Israel and its Arab neighbours, and that those have remained unsolved through the last two decades. Was it those disputes, perchance, that Israel was trying to solve through a war of its choosing? If it was, then, its attack was as much on the Arabs as on the principles enshrined in Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter.\*

The Charter states unequivocally in Article 2, paragraph 4 that:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State."

The only permissible exception to this prohibition is in case of armed attack, as provided in Article 51. And, as I have just indicated, the circumstances for Article 51 being operative in favour of Israel certainly did not exist in the present instance. What Israel has done is to confront the world with a fait accompli, to attempt to impose a new status quo and to achieve a new balance of power in that region. In these circumstances, Israel now demands a new Middle East

settlement on its own terms. Its terms, it claims, must be accepted in advance, if a peace settlement in the area is to be arrived at. If its demands are not accepted, it threatens to consolidate its ill-gotten territorial gains. These manoeuvres of Israel are intended to force the international community to acquiesce in what must be called a perpetuation of this new status quo.

We have no quarrel with the people of Israel, and our record shows the objective attitude that we have adopted towards the State of Israel. But it is also a matter of record and deep regret to us that Israel has, over the years, through violations of General Armistice Agreements, strengthened its position, added territory to its area, and used its modern powerful military-machine to expel Arabs from their lands and homes. It has ignored United Nations resolutions and has been censured by the Security Council for violation of the General Armistice Agreements.

I shall not dwell, in detail, on this sorry record. But I wish to refer to one tragic consequence of the disregard of General Assembly resolutions in respect of Palestine refugees. It has neither allowed them to return to their homes nor compensated them. But must dwell at some length on Israel's attitude to the United Nations Emergency Force, which is relevant to the present crisis. Having refused to allow the stationing of a United Nations force on its soil, and having later enjoyed the full benefits of its presence on Egyptian territory for more than ten years, Israel has now proceeded to defame the United Nations and to criticize Secretary-General Thant's correct decision to withdraw UNEF, on the ground that he did not first consult Israel. What are the facts?

On 18th May 1967, the Secretary-General agreed to a request from the Government of the United Arab Republic asking for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force. The presence of the Force in the region had been made possible in 1956-57 by the United Arab Republic Government agreeing to have UNEF based on its soil. This had been done at a time when Israel had refused to have any United Nations peace-keeping force on its own soil. As the Assembly will recall, the original proposal in this context, at that time, had been to locate

elements of an international emergency force on both sides of the Armistice Demarcation Line, that is, both on the soil of the United Arab Republic and that of Israel. U Thant's report to the Security Council, dated 26 May 1967, in its paragraph 7 makes the situation clear. He says there:

"If UNEF had been deployed on both sides of the Line as originally envisaged in pursuance of the General Assembly resolution, its buffer function would not necessarily have ended. However, its presence on the Israel side of the Line has never been permitted. The fact that UNEF was not stationed on the Israel side of the Line was a recognition of the unquestioned sovereign right of Israel to withhold its consent for the stationing of the Force. The acquiescence in the request of the United Arab Republic for the withdrawal of the Force after ten and a half years on United Arab Republic soil was likewise a recognition of the sovereign authority of the United Arab Republic."

(S/7906, para. 7).

\*Mr. Solomon (Trinidad and Tobago), Vice-President, took the Chair.

69

The Secretary-General recognized that any United Nations force could remain on the territory of a Member State as long as this consent continued, a position with which my Government is in complete agreement both on legal and practical grounds.

I am proud to represent a country which has contributed the largest single national contingent to UNEF for all the ten years from its inception to its withdrawal. I am, therefore, speaking in the name also of those gallant Indian sentinels of peace who served in the Middle East and died at their posts as martyrs. We supported the position of the Secretary-General that UNEF, by staying on in the region once the consent of the United Arab Republic to its presence had been withdrawn, might have become an army of occupation. On this point, speaking in the Indian Parliament on 19 November 1956, the late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru said:

"We made it clear that it was only if the Government of Egypt agreed that we would send them"---the Indian Contingent to the UNEF---"We are not prepared to agree to our force or any force remaining there indefinitely...."

He added that the position stated by him was in consonance with the agreements arrived at by the Secretary-General of the United Nations with the Egyptian Government. It is on this basis that my delegation deplores the Israeli criticism which our Secretary-General, U Thant, was compelled to rebut in his statement yesterday. We fully support the stand taken by U Thant. I am sure the Assembly will endorse what he has stated.

The extraordinary charge has been made that the withdrawal of UNEF precipitated the recent conflict. This is baseless. It is in this context that we have to look at the problem of Sharm El Sheikh which overlooks the Strait of Tiran. Once UNEF was withdrawn, the task of ensuring the security of Sharm El Sheikh and wherever else UNEF had been located became once again the sovereign responsibility of the Government of the United Arab Republic. From this arose the so-called question of free passage through the Strait of Tiran. The United Arab Republic has always maintained that the Strait of Tiran is part of its territorial waters. India, along with a number of other countries, has supported this position for a decade and more. There are other Member States, however, who have maintained that the Strait of Tiran constitutes international waters in which the right of innocent passage must be respected. Immediately before hostilities broke out in the Middle East, some rather hasty suggestions were canvassed that this latter claim could perhaps be asserted, through a show of might by the maritime Powers. However, better counsels prevailed and no such action was taken.

The point to examine now, therefore, is whether the control of the Strait of Tiran by the United Arab Republic in itself could justify the use of force against several Arab States by Israel. In considering this, we in this Assembly, must keep the following points in view.

First, the United Arab Republic is not a party

to any agreement recognizing the Gulf of Aqaba as an international waterway or guaranteeing the freedom of passage to Israeli ships.

Second, there is no universally recognized rule of international law on freedom of navigation applicable to such bodies of water as Aqaba.

Third, the status of this body of water is still a matter of controversy. I should like to refer to a recent publication of the United States State Department, the Digest of International Law, released by the Department of State in April 1965, (Volume IV, page 233) containing a letter from the Secretary of State, dated 15 January 1963, to the Attorney General, setting forth the views of the Department regarding the extent of territorial waters and the closing width of bays. On Agaba, the letter states as follows: "The Gulf of Agaba---the exact status of this body of water is still a matter open to controversy". I am sure there are many international lawyers in this august gathering and I make them a present of this quotation, from an authoritative American textbook.

Fourth, even under the Geneva Convention, which is being quoted often, innocent passage of foreign ships through the territorial water of another State, is not an absolute right, but remains subject to the security requirement of that State.

Fifth, the General Assembly did not recognize, much less accept, the conditions which Israel attempted to attach in 1957 to its withdrawal from Sharm El Sheikh.

From what I have stated very briefly above, it is not established that under international law there is a right of free passage through the Strait of Tiran. And, therefore, there is no warrant for asserting that this is a right which could be enforced by the arbitrament of arms.

Leaders of Government, the armed forces and public opinion of Israel have recently made public statements to the effect that some of the territories of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan which they occupy now will not be vacated by them under any circumstances whatsoever. As regards certain other territories, also at present under their occupation, they

have graciously indicated that they would be prepared to consider vacating them, but only after certain conditions have been met by the Arab Governments, and indeed by the international community. The latest and the most defiant in this series of statements is that by Mr. Eban, Foreign Minister of Israel. I think it was already quoted this morning, but I will quote it again. He told the Jerusalem Post:

"If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the Armistice Lines tomorrow, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision. This has been made clear to major Powers."

On 12 June 1967, in a policy speech made in the Knesset, but quite explicitly addressed to `all nations of the world", Mr. Eshkol, Prime Minister of Israel, said:

"Be under no illusion that the State of Israel is prepared to return to the situation that reigned up to a week ago.... We are entitled"--- says the Prime Minister--- "to determine what are the true and vital interests of our country and how they shall be secured."

All this bears out what the Permanent Representative of India had said on 9 June 1967, in the Security Council:

"You, Mr. President, and all my colleagues in the Council here, have read enough history to know what to expect next. The aggressor, having occupied all its military vantage positions, all its objectives---Sharm El Sheikh, Gaza, Jerusalem, the western bank of the Jordan River, and now the heights of Galilee ---will, after a show of reasonableness in negotiations, offer to split these gains half and half, perhaps."

#### (S/PV. 1352, p. 49-50).

It is a universally recognized and honoured principle of law that the rewards of aggression must not be permitted to remain with the aggressor. The United Nations was based on this principle. The founding fathers of its Charter

had not written the Charter so that the scourge of war should be considered as an investment by anyone who was strong enough to overcome his neighbours. Faith in the cardinal principle that disputes can be solved only through peaceful means must not be allowed to be eroded. The international community, therefore, cannot acquiesce in Israel keeping the fruits of its conquest. We have indicated clearly in the Security Council how the path towards a composite ceasefire-cum-withdrawal resolution was blocked. The General Assembly now must, therefore, ensure that Israel vacates immediately the vast territories which it has overrun. First things must come first. We must not allow ourselves, in the General Assembly, to be confused and befuddled by the attempts of Israel, which is raising anciliary issues before agreeing to the withdrawals. There are some problems which have to be settled, but they must await their turn. The first thing to be insisted upon, and to be implemented, has to be withdrawals, total and unqualified, immediate and unconditional, of all Israeli forces from all Arab territories. This. I submit, is the only position which this Assembly can justly, prudently and appropriately take. Resolution 233 of the Security Council, which was the first one of the series of resolutions on cease-fire, adopted by the Security Council, in the context of the strife in the Middle East, explicitly stated that cease-fire was merely a first step---I must emphasize, a first step---which should lead immediately to the next most important step, which is the withdrawals.

Reference has also been made both here and in the Security Council to the other measures necessary to strengthen and ensure lasting peace in the area. Our ideas in this respect were first set out by my delegation in the Security Council on 9 June. While summarizing them briefly, I should like to caution that none of these ideas can be singled out for immediate application without relating them to the most important step, which is withdrawals. The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization will have to be enlarged and strengthened in order to ensure strict compliance with the various provisions of General Armistice Agreements. A special representative of the Secretary-General may also be appointed to help reduce tension in the area and to assure the safety and security of the civilian Arab population under Israeli occupation, and

facilitate the return of those who were forced to leave their homes.

We are second to none in desiring a return to peace in the area, and it must be a lasting one. It is important for us to remember, however, that an enduring peace can be established in West Asia and elsewhere only if in this world body we can all act together to ensure strict adherence to certain basic values and fundamental principles of international law, practice, morality and behaviour.

I shall attempt to summarize some of these cardinal principles. First, it is not open to a country to start a war merely because it feels that a threat to its security exists. If it thinks that such a threat exists, the Charter prescribes various courses of action open to it, through peaceful means. And of course it can come to the Security Council. But it is, in the spirit and letter of the Charter, illegal to deal with a threat which one State thinks is being held out by a neighbouring State through recourse to arms. Secondly, no aggressor can be permitted

#### 71

to retain the fruits of aggression. Thirdly, it is not permissible for a country to acquire territory of another State in order to be able to bargain from a position of strength. Fourthly, rights cannot be established, territorial disputes cannot be settled, boundaries cannot be adjusted, through armed conflict.

In this second half of the twentieth century, after we have passed through the holocaust of two world wars and after we have succeeded in painfully building up a fabric of international conduct under the United Nations Charter, we must consider any attack on the four principles which I have just mentioned as an attack on the international community. This Assembly can do no less, in the present situation, than to declare unequivocally that no country can be permitted to end or solve its own disputes through recourse to war, for that would be a return to the law of the jungle and that also would be an end of the international rule of law and morality.

If we acquiesce today in the proposition that a victor in an armed conflict can defy the United Nations mandate, can violate the basic principles of the Charter, then we might as well tear up the Charter and admit to ourselves that the idea of a world community living in peace was only a dream and the reality is that might is right, that the strong and victorious shall prevail, and that justice and right must submit to the behests of the party to a military conflict which has been victorious in the field of battle.

I make no apology in emphasizing again that the duty of this Assembly is to recommend immediate withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Arab territories. This is the central issue which we have to face and decide. We should further request the Security Council to take necessary and adequate steps forthwith to effect these withdrawals.

INDIA USA ISRAEL SYRIA JORDAN EGYPT TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO IRAN SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri M. C. Chagla's Speech in the Security Council on Cyprus

The following is the text of the Minister of External Affairs, Shri M. C. Chagla's speech in the Security Council on Cyprus question on June 19, 1967:

Mr. President, I am grateful to you for your kind words welcoming my presence here in the Security Council. The Permanent Representative of India, Ambassador Parthasarathi, has made it amply clear that India wishes to use its membership in this high organ of the United Nations for one purpose only: to promote peace and peaceful relations among all countries, based on the renunciation of the use of force in dealing with international disputes and the protection of the political independence and territorial inte-

grity of all States. This will be our basic approach in dealing with the grave problems of war and peace that will come up before the Council. I cannot let this occasion pass without paying a sincere tribute to you, Mr. President, for providing the leadership both in formal meetings of the Council and in informal consultations.

There is much that the delegation of India and I personally can say on the question of Cyprus, but this is neither the time nor the occasion to expound at any length the political and legal principles involved in the question. For years now, the brave people of Cyprus have been engaged in a struggle against colonialism and foreign domination of one sort or another. Their determined struggle against colonialism and foreign domination had culminated in 1960 in the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. Unfortunately, that was not the end of the story. For four years now, the Government and the people of Cyprus have been facing very difficult problems. We, in India, view with the utmost sympathy the efforts of the Government of Cyprus to maintain the unfettered sovereignty, independence and unity of the State of Cyprus. As the members of the Council are no doubt aware, the Cairo Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries had something to say on the question of Cyprus. India was a party to the Declaration adopted by that Conference. It declared:

"Concerned by the situation existing with regard to Cyprus, the Conference calls upon all States in conformity with their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular under Article 2, paragraph 4, to respect the sovereignty, unity, independence and territorial integrity of Cyprus and to refrain from any threat or use of force or intervention directed against Cyprus and from any efforts to impose upon Cyprus unjust solutions unacceptable to the people of Cyprus.

"Cyprus, as an equal Member of the United Nations, is entitled to and should enjoy unrestricted and unfettered sovereignty and independence, and allowing its people to determine freely, and without any foreign intervention or interference, the political future of the country, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations." (A/5763, p. 18)

The Secretary-General has made available to the Council, as is characteristic of him, a forthright and detailed report in which he has touched on many facets of the functioning of the United Nations Force and the work of his Special Representative in Cyprus. One of the main objectives of the United Nations operation in Cyprus is to prevent a recurrence of fighting and, according to the Secretary-General's report, all efforts have been made by the United Nations Force during the last six months to achieve this objective. The presence of United Nations troops in sensitive areas has restrained all concerned from having recourse to arms, and the Commanders have done their best to avert clashes. The Secretary-General and his Special Representative have been exercising their good offices, which is worthy of commendation. It is also a matter of gratification that the Government of Cyprus has acted with the utmost restraint.

In view of the considerations I have just mentioned, the delegation of India has joined in cosponsoring the draft resolution contained in document S/7996. I would commend it to the Council for adoption unanimously.

INDIA CYPRUS USA EGYPT

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Speeches in the Security Council on West Asia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made a number of speeches in the Security Council on West Asian situation during the month of June, 1967.

The following is the text of his speech on June 9.

Before I turn to the most dangerous situation in the Middle East may I, with your permission, Mr. President, say a few words about the further killing by Israelis of Indian soldiers serving with UNEF. The Secretary-General has informed the Council that another Indian soldier has been killed and seven others wounded. In addition, it is reported that twelve Indian soldiers are missing, bringing the total casualties to forty-one: nine killed, twenty wounded and twelve missing.

There can be no doubt that the strafing and shelling by Israelis of Indian soldiers serving with UNEF was unprovoked and deliberate. What other conclusion can we draw from the series of cowardly attacks on the defenceless Indian contingent except that they have a purpose known only to the attacker? The least that this Council can do is vigorously to support the Secretary-General's protest to the Government of Israel and censure Israel for these dastardly attacks on Indian soldiers serving the cause of peace.

I take this opportunity to offer my most sincere condolences to the Government of Ireland for the loss which it has sustained in the death of a valiant and dedicated member of its armed forces who was also serving the cause of peace in the area. Our condolences also go to the Government and the people of the United States, in connexion with the ship which yesterday was the target of an Israeli attack, resulting in heavy casualties. We share the grief of the United States. While the Government of Israel has promptly apologized to the United States, my delegation still awaits a sincere and clear apology to the Government and the people of India.

Only a few days ago we had fervently hoped that peace in West Asia would be preserved. We raised our voice in support of the Secretary-General's efforts to gain a breathing spell during which the Council could work for a detente and seek ways and means of consolidating peace in West Asia. Instead of getting a breather, peace has been choked. Our hopes were rudely smashed by Israel's move to start massive military action in the air and on the land, action which is war, stark and naked. The Council has deplored this in all but a formal statement, and

it is clear that the responsibility for the grave situation presently prevailing in the Middle East is that of Israel. The Council finds itself confronted with yet another fait accompli on the heights of Galilee, through a sudden and surprise attack by Israel, even though the Foreign Minister of Israel twice in as many days declared before this Council his Government's acceptance of the cease-fire and even though Syria ceased fire last night.

My delegation has closely and carefully followed the events of the last three weeks and has actively participated in informal consultations with members of the Council. Attempts were made by some members to pass a resolution supporting one party's claims of the passage of ships through the territorial waters of another State. The endeavour of my delegation, as of several others, was to work for a resolution that would have provided for a breather and which would have enabled a modus vivendi within the framework of the United Arab Republic's sovereignty.

#### 73

We regret that a largely juridical dispute on shipping rights was allowed to spark off a tragic conflagration. Attempts were made here---and all of us know that those attempts continued right up to the day of the outbreak of hostilities ---to pass a resolution in the Council that was meant mainly to support Israel's claims for passage of its ships through the Gulf of Aqaba. The main purpose of such a resolution was to deny, albeit in oblique terms, the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic over its territorial waters.

Some of us tried hard to bring a modicum of reality and fair-play into the discussions, but our efforts were blocked by those who, for their own reasons of policy, were bent upon asserting claims which their most ardent supporters cannot claim to be sanctioned by international law, but only occasionally conceded in international practice. In a word, their effort was to acknowledge the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic, but to deny to it its exercise.

There are many disputes among nations. There are also disputes between Israel and its Arab neighbours which have existed for many years.

It should not be impossible to settle them, given time. The point, however, is not the existence of disputes, but how they are settled---through the use of arms or through the means of peaceful negotiations. But today we witness a different situation. Unleashing offensive armed action, indeed a blitzkrieg. Israel has occupied vast territories in the United Arab Republic, Jordan, and now within Syria too. Can anyone in this Council claim that this action is in accordance with the principles of the Charter, of international law and practice, or even of international morality? The central issue before us today is this: can a country first invade and occupy the territory of other countries and then demand a new settlement on its own terms?

It is over sixty hours since we adopted resolution 233 asking for an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East. It is nearly forty hours since the second resolution, resolution 234, was passed by the Council and the time-limit imposed by the Council expired. It is almost eighteen hours ago that we heard the Secretary-General make the welcome announcement that the Government of the United Arab Republic had accepted the cease-fire. Last night, Syria made a similar announcement. This morning news has come of the massive invasion of Syria by Israel. As I have already mentioned, their objective obviously was the heights overlooking the Sea of Galilee and taking over the supporting terrain.

Why is it that despite assurances that the agressor will stop its predatory moves and cease further action, the cease-fire has not become fully effective in the Middle East? Is it not perhaps because the original resolution adopted at 8 p.m. on Tuesday was unrealistic? There were delegations here which had said in the Chamber that a simple resolution calling for cease-fire could have been adopted on Monday morning and that the Council had been involved in an unnecessary waste of time---nearly thirty-six hours---before such a resolution was passed. There is an attempt to put the blame on those, including India, who would have preferred, and who indeed worked very hard for ensuring, that any resolution passed by the Council should contain a provision for withdrawal to position prior to the outbreak of hostilities.

My delegation categorically refutes those insi-

nuations. Indeed, the fact that the cease-fire has not so far become effective is due to the attempts ---successful attempts---of those who wanted a favourable solution of the question of the Gulf of Aqaba through a resolution whose primary purpose was to bring the conflict to an end; I mean, of course, a solution favourable to themselves. The course of events in the last three days, the statements made by the leaders of Israel, for which, it is evident, there is not only a great deal of sympathy but even overt support outside, amply prove that the aggressive action taken by Israel was motivated by a desire to occupy positions on the field which would enable it to impose a new status quo more favourable to its claims. Is that a fair and proper way of dealing with the urgent problem we face of stopping the war and restoring peace in the area? Would it not have been appropriate first to take steps to end the war and provide for the withdrawal of forces of both sides behind the Armistice Demarcation Lines, and then discuss the other problems relating to the so-called underlying causes? This is a course of action my delegation has continued to urge consistently, both in the Council Chamber and in informal consultations.

The responsibility for the gave situation now prevailing in the Middle East must be placed squarely on Israel. The Prime Minister of India, speaking in the Indian Parliament on 6 June 1967, said:

"I do not wish to utter harsh words or strong language. But on the basis of information available there can be no doubt that Israel has escalated the situation into an armed conflict which has now acquired the proportions of a full-scale war."

The nature of the war unleashed on the morning of 5 June, especially the air strikes made by Israel, confirm, if confirmation is necessary, that Israel's design was to launch a surprise attack and face this Council with a fait accompli.

Early in the morning of 5 June, when all of us were summoned here to deal with the situation created by the outbreak of hostilities in the

74

Middle East and when, according to the most

eminent practice of this Council itself, the issue had to be one of simultaneous cease-fire and withdrawal, the Council found itself faced with a most obstinate refusal on the part of those very members to deal with the question of withdrawal. India, among others, would have preferred---and events have vindicated our stand since---to follow the established practice of the Security Council and ask for a cease-fire and withdrawal to positions occupied by the respective forces at the outbreak of hostilities, that is to positions held on 4 June 1967. That is the issue on which the informal consultations among the members of the Security Council came to be deadlocked for quite some time.

There was a piece of paper which some people called the Indian draft. That in fact enjoyed the support of many members of this Council. It contained a provision for a simultaneous withdrawal. Other members of the Council, however, felt, indeed insisted, that the Council must do no more than ask for a simple cease-fire. We were told that a provision for withdrawal in a ceasefire resolution would complicate matters and prevent the cease-fire being implemented. We argued that in our judgement a call for ceasefire without their being a simultaneous provision for withdrawal of armed forces would make the acceptance of a cease-fire much more difficult, if not impracticable. Our judgement was based not only on the realities of the situation, but on the well-known and time-honoured principle that the aggressor must not be allowed to enjoy the fruits of aggression. The spectacle we are all watching now---and some of us had even expected that this would or might happen---is one of the aggressor quickly occupying position of military vantage and then offering to negotiate with and talk to his victims.

You, Mr. President, and all my colleagues in the Council here, have read enough history to know what to expect next. The aggressor, having occupied all its military vantage positions, all its objectives---Sharm El Sheikh, Gaza, Jerusalem, the western bank of the Jordan River, and now the heights of Galilee---will, after a show of reasonableness in negotiations, offer to split these gains half and half, perhaps.

Indeed, there would be little meaning in Article 51 of the Charter if all this Council were ex-

pected to do in such circumstances was merely to ensure a cessation of hostilities even while the aggressor sat astride the territory of the victim of aggression. That really would be an acquiescence by this Council, and more particularly by the great Powers, in continuance or aggression by way of continuance of enjoyment of the fruit of aggression by the aggressor. What is happening today is that the Arab States, having received setbacks due to the surprise attacks and having lost territory to the Israelis, will naturally have to insist that there be the full backing of the Council to withdraw to positions occupied by various armed forces on 4 June 1967. No purpose would be served by putting the blame on those who have resisted and are resisting aggression despite the call for a cease-fire by the Council. The Council should ponder on whether the prescription which it has given is an adequate one.

On questions of war and peace India's attitude has been clear and is unwavering. Only recently I reiterated it in meetings of the Council. For this reason we have supported and will continue to support resolutions calling for a cease-fire; the flames of war must be put out. It is with this objective that we have supported the resolution that the Council has just adopted. However, it seems to us that even at this stage the Council should deal with the problem in a practical manner, that is, link the cease-fire with withdrawal to positions occupied by the respective armed forces prior to the outbreak of hostilities. Such an approach, we are confident, will lead to the desired result: the restoration of peace.

If I may briefly indicate the views of my delegation: First, the Council should reinforce its call for cease-fire and immediately order withdrawal of all armed forces to positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. Second, it would be necessary to reactivate and strengthen the United Nations machinery in the area to enforce the cease-fire and secure withdrawal on the lines proposed by the Secretary-General in his report of 26 May. Third, the Council should consider whether the Secretary-General should not be requested to depute a personal representative to the area to help in reducing tension and restoring peaceful conditions. The special representative should also ensure the safety and security of the civilian Arab population in the areas overrun by Israel. Fourth, when

withdrawals have been completed and the aggression has been vacated the Council should consider earnestly the steps to be taken to stabilize peace in the area. Solutions to be worked out would have to be within the framework of the sovereignty of the States concerned and the just and immemorial rights of the Arab people.

75

The following is the text of Shri Parthasarathi's speech on June 6:

I should like to make a very brief explanation of my delegation's vote.

Speaking in Parliament in New Delhi earlier today, my Prime Minister said:

"The world today faces a disastrous war in West Asia. The armed forces of Israel and those of the United Arab Republic and other Arab countries are locked in combat and the situation becomes graver by the hour. If not stopped, this war is likely to expand into a much wider one, drawing into its vortex other countries and developing, perhaps, into a world war.

"World peace is in grave peril. It is our solemn duty to help in the restoration of peace in the present perilous situation. It is the bounden duty of all countries, large and small, to work towards this end."

It is in the spirit of what my Prime Minister said, which is in accord with our consistent policy of peace, that we welcome the unanimous decision just taken by this Council ordering an immediate cease-fire in the Middle East. We note that the resolution states clearly and unambiguously that the cease-fire is only a first step, although a most important first step. It is well known that my delegation, among others, would have preferred a resolution which called upon the Governments concerned for a withdrawal of armed forces to positions held by them prior to the outbreak of hostilities, that is as on 4 June 1967, along with the cease-fire. Such a linking of the cease-fire with a withdrawal would be in accordance with the practice which this Council has evolved in the past. This practice is obviously based upon the sound principle that the aggressor should not be permitted by the international community to enjoy the fruits of aggression. This is also a most important tenet of international law and practice indeed, and is the only basis on which lasting peace can be built in the troubled area of the Middle East.

My delegation is of the opinion that the Council should take up on an urgent basis the question of withdrawal.

May I take this opportunity, Mr. President, to express our appreciation of the admirable manner in which you conducted the consultations with all delegations, and of your untiring efforts to bring about a unanimous decision by the Council.

I should like now to refer to another tragic aspect of the conflict in the Middle East. Yesterday we were shocked to learn from the Secretary-General that three Indian soldiers had been killed and nine wounded in an attack by Israeli aircraft on an Indian convoy of the UNEF. Subsequently to what the Secretary-General stated in the Council yesterday, I have learned that two more Indian soldiers were killed and one injured in shelling by Israeli artillery yesterday. This morning I was informed that three more Indian soldiers have been killed and three injured in further shelling by Israeli artillery. We reiterate our strong protests against these treacherous and dastardly attacks on withdrawing Indian forces.

We must ask for an unqualified guarantee for the safety and security of those portions and elements of UNEF which continue to be in the area where for ten long years they laboured so hard and so selflessly as keepers of the peace. In this context, we have noted with appreciation, from the Secretary-General's report contained in document. S/7930, that he has already addressed a formal note of protest to the Government of Israel regarding what he himself has characterized as "tragic and unnecessary loss of life among UNEF personnel" (S/7930, para. 11). We note also that the Secretary-General has asked the Israeli authorities "to take urgent measures to ensure that there is no recurrence of such incidents". (Ibid.)

The Secretary-General's report makes it clear ---clearer than ever---that the loss of life wantonly

caused by the Israeli armed forces was unnecessary, cruel and tragic.

May I be permitted to quote from the statement made earlier this morning by my Prime Minister in our Parliament in New Delhi:

"Honourable Members have no doubt learned with deep resentment of the wanton Israeli attack and subsequent strafing by Israeli aircraft, resulting in the death and injury of a number of personnel of the Indian UNEF contingent in Gaza. These attacks appeared deliberate and without provocation, in spite of clear and unmistakable UN marking and identification of our contingent. I have addressed a message to the Secretary-General of the United Nations on this subject expressing our grief and indignation at these incidents and I have asked for effective steps to be taken to ensure their safety and early evacuation from the area of hostilities.

"There can be no justification for Israeli armed forces to have attacked our contingent, whose whereabouts, identification markings and intention to withdraw were clearly known to the Israeli authorities. I am sure the House

76

will unreservedly condemn this cowardly attack on our men who have been sentinels of peace in West Asia."

I must thank the Secretary-General for the expression of his deep regret at the heavy casualties which the Indian contingent has suffered. As he rightly points out, they had no means of defending themselves. I shall, of course, transmit to the Government of India and to the families concerned his deep condolences and sympathies.

May I also express my appreciation for the efforts he is making to arrive at an arrangement for the earliest possible repatriation of the Indian contingent.

I would also like to thank the representatives of the United Arab Republic, Ethiopia, the United Kingdom, Argentina, Canada, Brazil, Japan, Bulgaria and Mali for their moving expressions of sympathy, which I deeply appreciate. May I, in my turn, convey to the delegation of Brazil my deepest sympathy for the loss they have sustained in the death of a member of their contingent.

The following is the text of Shri Parthasarathi's speech on June 14:

We have, in the past few days, in this Council, spoken about various aspects of the problems which face the international community in the Middle East. Now we find ourselves in a situation where though war has been contained, tensions are still high and peace has not been restored. Though the cease-fire has been insisted upon and at last made really operative by this Council, withdrawals have not yet been ordered. This has resulted in an intruding army finding itself in control of large chunks of land and large masses of population rightfully belonging to countries which are the victims of aggression.

This uphappy situation brings to the fore the human problem of the population of the occupied territories which was mentioned, in the most poignant terms by the representative of Jordan, in the 1355th meeting on 10 June 1967, and also subsequently. We note with appreciation the sympathetic comments made by the representatives of the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Canada, Ethiopia, Japan and the United States of America. I, myself, at the meeting on 8 June only briefly touched upon the subject because we were even then daring to allow ourselves to hope that the cease-fire would be followed by an immediate withdrawal. We dared to be so optimistic because we believed, and continue to believe, that all the great Powers, and not merely one or two of them, will consider it their solemn duty to insist on withdrawals.

Unfortunately, this has not happened. Hence the urgent need for the draft resolution contained in document S/7968/Rev.2, which has just now been introduced in such moving terms by my colleague and friend, the representative of Argentina. We must pay a tribute to our colleagues of Brazil, Argentina and Ethiopia for their initiative, because every day that passes without the Security Council taking any action itself or laying down any course of action to be taken by the one Government which holds large areas of alien soil, and controls large numbers of people who

are citizens of other lands, brings fresh items of disturbing news. These news items give grim details of the suffering of both civilians and armed forces that have been cut off. Reports appearing in the world Press---including the Press of countries which have not been all that friendly to the Arabs recently---of helpless Arab soldiers and civilians wandering in the middle of the Sinai desert, with neither food nor water to sustain them. There are also reports of people---civilians, men, women and children---who were pushed out of their home and hearth in Jerusalem and other towns of Jordan, on the west bank of the Jordan River.

Our Secretary-General, U Thant, whose passion for peace and humanity is well known, has already taken prompt action in making his recommendations to the Government of Israel, in his letter of 13 June, addressed to the Permanent Representative of Israel (S/7930/Add.6).

In the circumstances, the present draft resolution is, to my mind, a necessary guideline and a reminder to the Israeli authorities to act with humanity. The draft resolution before us, which we support, is an anxious expression of the universal conscience which rebels against these palpable and obvious results of the scourge of war. Flesh and blood are cheap in war, but we should urge, plead and appeal in the name of our common humanity for the humane treatment of those who are victims of the conflict, ensuring their safety and welfare.

77

INDIA USA ISRAEL IRELAND SYRIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JORDAN ETHIOPIA ARGENTINA BRAZIL CANADA BULGARIA JAPAN MALI

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shri Surendra Pal Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Farakka Barrage Project

Shri Surendra Pal Singh, Deputy Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Rajya Sabha on June 24, 1967 regarding the Farakka Barrage Project:

The Government of India are not yet in possession of the text of the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in the Pakistan National Assembly on the 15th June 1967. The same has been called for from our Mission in Pakistan and on its receipt, due consideration will be given to it. Reports which have appeared in Indian and Pakistani newspapers mention that, in a statement laid on the Table of the House, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has charged India with pressing ahead with the Farakka Barrage Project, to present Pakistan with a fail accompli, thus foreclosing the possibility of, what he called, a reasonable solution. The Pakistan Foreign Minister is also reported to have assured the House that his Government would do his best to prevent India from proceeding with the Project.

The facts relating to the Farakka Barrage Project are already well known to the House. This is a simple Project, to save the premier port of Calcutta from a process of a sure extinction and has no element of irrigation or power. Farakka Barrage Project has not been conjured up overnight, but has been the result of a continuous search for ways to save the port of Calcutta, spread over more than a century. Starting from Sir Arthur Cotton, who as far back as 1858 planned a Barrage across the Ganga, to Dr. Walter Hensen, an expert German engineer, a century later, a galaxy of engineers who devoted their attention to the problem of Bhagirathi-Hooghly has unanimously asserted that the construction of a barrage with the objective of supplying additional water into the Bhagirathi-Hooghly system, was the only measure by which the alarming rate of deterioration of the Hooghly approaches to the port of Calcutta could be arrested. This project is of national importance to India and will not be detrimental to Pakistan.

Pakistan's objections to the construction of the Barrage are also not new, but have been continuing for the last several years. It was with a view to allaying the fears of the Government of Pakistan that the government of India bad agreed to the exchange of technical data, relating to river projects of mutual interest to the two countries. For this purpose, four meetings of water resources experts of both the countries were held between June, 1960 and January, 1962. The Government of India had written to the Government of Pakistan in 1965 to arrange the filth meeting of the experts, but the outbreak of hostilities between the two countries stood in the way of such a meeting being held and this proposal is still pending with Pakistan.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA LATVIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on Chinese Explosion of Hydrogen Bomb

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of Defence, made the following statement in Parliament on June 21, 1967 on behalf of Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, regarding the explo-

78

sion of hydrogen bomb by China:

On the 17th June: China announced the explosion of its first Hydrogen Bomb. This was the 6th nuclear explosion by China in defiance of world public opinion. When the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was signed in 1963, it was recognised that further conduct of nuclear tests in the atmosphere would pose a grave danger to the health of human beings through increased radio-active fall-out. China did not sign this treaty. This repeated violation by China of the collective will of the international com-

munity has naturally evoked strong criticism, and great concern especially among China's neighbours. The latest explosion of the Hydrogen Bomb is further evidence of China's callous indifference to the opinion of the rest of the world. The Government of India view this development with grave concern.

The nuclear policy of China and its impaction our security has been under study by our concerned authorities from time to time and it will continue to engage our most careful attention. I would like to assure the House that all practicable ways and mom of ensuring our security are constantly under examination.

We have steadfastly adhered to the policy of developing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The effect of this policy on our security is also kept under constant review.

As Hon'ble Members are aware, there exists today the serious problem of ensuring the security of non-aligned and non-nuclear weapon countries against nuclear attack or threat of such attack. This problem, situated as we are, is of vital importance from our point of view. It acquires a fresh sense of urgency as a result of the latest Chinese Hydrogen Bomb explosion.

The question of security of non-nuclear countries, who are also non-aligned, is under the consideration of the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva. The Government of India have been exchanging views on this subject with the leading nuclear weapon Powers and also with some non-nuclear non-aligned countries and we shall continue these consultations.

CHINA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Minister of External Affairs, Shri M. C. Chagla, made the following statement in Parliament on June 13, 1967 on the withdrawal of the recognition of the diplomatic status of Shri K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in the Indian Embassy in Peking:

The action of the Chinese Government in withdrawing recognition of the diplomatic status of Shri K. Raghunath, Second Secretary in our Embassy in Peking, and declaring that he will not be allowed to leave China before "the Chinese judicial organs take sanctions against his crimes" is a flagrant violation of all known principles of international law and the norms of civilised behaviour among nations. The list of alleged spying activities of Shri Raghunath prepared by the Chinese Government is a tissue of lies hastily put together to defend themselves against the very reasonable and moderately worded protest note which has been sent by our Embassy to the Chinese Foreign Office of June 5th, that is, the day after the incident in which Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay were unreasonably detained in a ruined temple in the Western Hills of Peking.

The details of this incident as conveyed to us by our Embassy in Peking are as follows:

At 1-30 p.m. on June 4th, Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, Third Secretary in the Embassy, Peking which is a well-known beauty spot and which is open to foreigners. On their way there they stopped for a moment near a ruined temple and proceeded to take photographs of the temple. Then they were surrounded by some people who accused Raghunath of taking photographs of a military installation which was allegedly situated near-by. In spite of Raghunath's protestation that he was merely photographing the ruined temple, the Chinese crowd forced the two diplomats to go to the near-by building where after some delay the officer of the Security Bureau arrived under whose orders the camera and films were forcibly taken away and the absurd allegation immediately made that the development of the film had shown that Shri Raghunath had photographed prohibited objects. Curiously enough, however, these so-caled photographs were not shown to either of the diplomats. The Western

79

Hills are not out of bounds to foreigners. It is an area covered over with Buddhist temples and has been one of the most popular tourist resorts within the reach of Peking. For the last 18 years diplomats of all nationalities have been allowed to go along the way and visit these spots and photograph the old temples. There is nothing unusual or extra-ordinary in the actions of Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay.

In spite of the repeated requests the diplomats were allowed to telephone to the Embassy only at 5 p.m. when the Embassy officials tried to get in touch with the Foreign Office and the Security Bureau. They were told that nothing could be done until the next day. Two officers of the Embassy reached the spot at about 9 p.m. and were not permitted to go into the building or see the diplomats and were asked to return since it was claimed to be a prohibited area, even though it was on the highway. Finally the diplomats were allowed to return at 9.30 p.m. after a detention for a period of 8 1/2 hours. The Embassy made further efforts the same night to protest to the Protocol Department of the Foreign Office but could not get an appointment in spite of best efforts.

A note giving the details of this incident and protesting against the unlawful detention of both the diplomats, namely Shri Raghunath and Shri Vijay, was sent to the Foreign Office the next day but was returned three hours later. It may be noted that Shri Vijay had not been concerned in the photographic incident. The note had also specially protested against the unhelpfulness of the Foreign Office in the matter.

This latest development by which the Chinese Foreign Office has gone to the unprecedented action of accusing Shri Raghunath of spying seems to indicate that the Chinese are not merely anxious to utilise this incident for propaganda purposes but have a guilty conscience and want to manufacture some excuses to still further damage relations with India.

The accusations against Shri Raghunath are trivial to the point of absurdity. The accusation against him of committing espionage is based on the flimsiest grounds, namely that he has been trying to collect political and military intelligence by attending gatherings of Red Guards etc. These are the usual Chinese lies to concoct a case against a diplomat. On the other hand, Shri Raghunath has, on more than one occasion, been the victim of Chinese harrassment. Once, while buying Red Guard newspapers in a Peking street, he was taken by some Red Guards to a public Security Bureau. Such Red Guard newspapers have been sold in the streets all these months and purchased by foreigners without any objection. However, when Shri Raghunath was told that these newspapers were not to be read or purchased by foreigners, he readily agreed to abide by this new rule.

Shri Raghunath is a young and promising diplomat who has conformed to the best traditions of our diplomatic service. In making him a victim of its nefarious designs, the People's Republic of China no doubt wishes to tarnish the name of India and has deprived him of diplomatic immunities and privileges which is un precedented in the history of diplomatic relations between nations. The Government of India have taken a very serious view of the Chinese action. The Chinese Charge d'Affaires, who was summoned to the External Affairs Ministry at 5.00 A.M. this morning was asked to convey to his Government our strong indignation at this malicious, unjust and illegal action. A protest has been made to the Charge d'Affaires against this totally unprecedented and gross violation of international law and practice. We have also demanded that no interference be made with the diplomatic status of Shri Raghunath, that the false charges levelled against him be withdrawn, and that suitable amends be made by the Government of China. It has also been explained to the Charge d'Affaires that unless this is done, the Chinese Government will have to bear the consequences of their action, and the Government of India reserve to themselves the right to take such action as they deem fit and proper.

According to a message received this morning from our Embassy in Peking, the Embassy has been informed that a public trial has been

arranged for Shri Raghunath at 2.30 P.M. (12 noon IST) today, and that he be produced before the Peking Branch of Supreme People's Court. This shows utter disregard of all norms of civilised international behaviour by the Chinese Government. The trial, of course, will be an absolute farce. We have every confidence that our Charge d'Affaires and his colleagues will react to this crisis with courage and dignity.

80

#### CHINA USA INDIA RUSSIA MALI

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

#### **WEST ASIA**

Prime Minister's Statements in Parliament

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made a statement in the Lok Sabha on June 6, 1967 on the West Asian situation. She also made a similar statement in the Rajya Sabha on June 7 on the same subject.

The following is the text of the Prime Minister's statement in the Lok Sabha on June 6:

Nearly two weeks ago, my colleague, the Minister of External Affairs, made a statement in this House giving Government's assessment of the explosive situation in West Asia and expressing our deep concern at the developments that were taking place there.

Since then, our efforts in the Security Council as well as outside have been concentrated on counselling moderation and lessening of tension and preservation of peace in that area. Our representative in the Security Council in consultation with the non-permanent members of the Council and others made earnest endeavours

to formulate a resolution which might be acceptable to the Council. The resolution aimed at supporting the Secretary General's recommendations contained in his reports to the Council and earnestly appealing to all parties concerned to exercise restraint in order to avoid actions which might aggravate tension. Our representative met with favourable response and it was hoped that in the next meeting of the Security Council, significant progress would be made in this regard.

While these efforts were still continuing, news came yesterday morning of an outbreak of hostilities between Israel and the U.A.R. and other Arab countries.

The Secretary General of the United Nations made a report to the Emergency Meeting of the Security Council yesterday, in which he gave an account of various reports by the UNEF Commander and the U.N. Observers on the U.N. Truce Supervision Organisation and the Mixed Armistice Commissions, of attacks by Israeli aircraft on U.A.R. and Syrian territory.

I do not wish to utter harsh words or use strong language. But on the basis of information available there can be no doubt that Israel has escalated the situation into an armed conflict, which has now acquired the proportions of a full-scale war.

The world today faces a disastrous war in West Asia. The armed forces of Israel and those of U.A.R. and other Arab countries are locked in combat, and the situation becomes graver by the hour. If not stopped, this war is likely to expand into a much wider one, drawing into its vortex other countries and developing perhaps into a world war. World peace is in grave peril. Our own national interests are bound up with peace and stability in West Asia. I do not need to expand on this or to describe the horrors and consequences of such a war in West Asia. It is our solemn duty as a Government as also that of the Hon'ble Members of Parliament to help in the restoration of peace in the present perilous situation. It is the bounden duty of all countries, large and small, to work towards this end.

In the Security Council we are making earn-

est efforts for a cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions they occupied on June 4th. We shall persevere in these efforts.

Hon'ble Members have no doubt learnt with deep resentment of the wanton Israel artillery attack and subsequent strafings by Israel aircraft resulting in the death and injury of a number of personnel of the Indian UNEF contingent in Gaza. These attacks were deliberate and without provocation in spite of clear and unmistakable UN markings and identification of our contingent.

I have addressed a message to the Secretary General of the United Nations on this subject, expressing our grief and indignation at these incidents and I have asked for effective steps to be taken to ensure their safety and early evacuation from the area of hostilities. Five of our soldiers have died and several have been wounded. There can be no justification for Israel armed forces to have attacked our forces, whose whereabouts, identification markings and intention to withdraw were clearly known to the Israeli authorities.

Government will naturally give adequate compensation to the families of five soldiers who have lost their lives, and we shall make sure

81

that the amount is not less than what they would have received had these men lost their lives in active combat. Meanwhile, I am sending a sum of Rs. 25,000, i.e. Rs. 5,000 per family, by way of immediate assistance to the bereaved families from the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund.

I am sure the House will unreservedly condemn this cowardly attack on our men, who have been sentinels of peace in West Asia. The Secretary General has lodged a strong protest with the Israel Government. I should like, on behalf of the whole House, to convey our deep sympathies and condolences to the bereaved families of our soldiers who have gallantly laid down their lives in the service of humanity and in the cause of peace.

The following is the text of the Prime Minis-

ter's statement in the Rajya Sabha on June 7:

....Nearly two weeks ago, my colleague, the Minister of External Affairs, made a statement in this House giving Government's assessment of the explosive situation in West Asia and expressing our deep concern at the developments that were taking place there.

Since then, our efforts in the Security Council as well as outside have been concentrated on counselling moderation and lessening of tension and preservation of peace in that area. Our Representative in the Security Council in consultation with the non-permanent members of the Council and others made earnest endeavour to formulate a resolution which might be acceptable to the Council. The resolution aimed at supporting the Secretary General's recommendations contained in his reports to the Council and earnestly appealing to all parties concerned to exercise restraint in order to avoid actions which might aggravate tension. Our Representative met with favourable response and it was hoped that in the next meeting of the Security Council, significant progress would be made in this regard.

While these efforts were still continuing, news came in the morning of June 5 of an outbreak of hostilities between Israel and the U.A.R. and other Arab countries.

The Secretary General of the United Nations made a report to the Emergency Meeting of the Security Council on June 5, in which he gave an account of various reports by the UNEF Commander and the U.N. Observers on the U.N. Truce Supervision Organisation and the Mixed Armistice Commissions, of attacks by Israeli aircraft on U.A.R. and Syrian territory.

I do not wish to utter harsh words or use strong language. But on the basis of information available, there can be no doubt that Israel has escalated the situation into an armed conflict, which has now acquired the proportions of a full-scale war.

The world today faces a disastrous war in West Asia. The armed forces of Israel and those of U.A.R. and other Arab countries are locked in combat, and the situation becomes

graver by the hour. If not stopped, this war is likely to expand into a much wider one, drawing into its vortex other countries and developing perhaps into a world war. World peace is in grave peril. Our own national interests are bound up with peace and stability in West Asia. I do not need to expand on this or to describe the horrors and consequences of such a war in West Asia. It is our solemn duty as a Government as also that of the Hon'ble Members of Parliament to help in the restoration of peace in the present perilous situation. It is the bounden duty of all countries, large and small, to work towards this end.

In the Security Council we have been making earnest efforts for a ceasefire and withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions they occupied on June 4. We have just now received the news that the Security Council has unanimously adopted a simple resolution calling for, as a first step, a Cease-Fire. Evidently, in view of the gravity of the situation a consensus emerged in this Council in favour of bringing about immediate cease-fire leaving other steps to be taken up later. This is a hopeful development. However, the resolution does not mean that troops are not to withdraw to positions as on June 4. Our representative in the Council has stated our position and this matter of withdrawal will necessarily have to be taken up in the Council without delay.

Hon'ble Members have no doubt learnt with deep resentment of the wanton Israel artillery attack and subsequent strafings by Israel aircraft resulting in the death and injury of a number of personnel of the Indian UNEF contingent in Gaza. These attacks were deliberate and without provocation in spite of clear and unmistakable U.N. markings and identification of our contigent.

I have addressed a message to the Secretary General of the United Nations on this subject, expressing our grief and indignation at these incidents and I have asked for effective steps to be taken to ensure their safety and earlier evacuation from the area of hostilities.

We have now learnt from our representative that the U.N. have alerted most of the Shipping Companies round the world to provide a ship

immediately to withdraw our contingent from the Gaza beach.

82

According to latest reports, in addition to the five killed and 10 injured earlier in two attacks as a result of further shelling that took place, 3 more were killed and 3 other injured making total loss of 8 killed and 13 known to be injured so far.

Government will naturally give adequate compensation to the families of eight soldiers who have lost their lives, and we shall make sure that the amount is not less than what they would have received had these men lost their lives in active combat. Meanwhile, I am sending a sum of Rs. 40,000 i.e. Rs. 5,000 per family, by way of immediate assistance to the bereaved families from the Prime Minister's National Relief Fund.

There can be no justification for Israel armed forces to have attacked our forces, whose whereabouts, identification markings and intention to withdraw were clearly known to the Israeli authorities. The Secretary General in his message of condolence which that "it is a tragedy that these officers and men who came from India to serve the cause of peace in the Near East should through no fault of their own have lost their lives in a situation where they had no means of defending themselves and at a time when they were about to return to their home country". While conveying this message, the Secretary General has paid tribute to India's noble and generous contribution to peace keeping operations in West Asia and elsewhere.

USA ISRAEL SYRIA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

**ZAMBIA** 

The President, Dr. Zakir Hussain, made the following speech at the Palam airport welcoming His Excellency the President of Zambia, Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, and Madame Kaunda on June 14, 1967:

It gives me special pleasure to welcome Your Excellency, Madame Kaunda, and other members of the party this morning. We are deeply sensible of the honour you have done us in the Government and the people of India by so graciously accepting our invitation to visit our country. When last year Your Excellency had to postpone your visit because of the critical circumstances created by the illegal unilateral declaration of independence by the racist minority regime in Rhodesia, we were naturally disappointed, though we fully understood and were appreciative of reasons for the postponement. We are glad that you have found it possible to come now, in spite of the continuing difficulties confronting the whole of South Africa and especially Zambia.

Though a long distance separates us, our hopes and ideals bring us close to each other. We share an instinctive abhorrence of the pernicious doctrine of apartheid, of the hateful policies of racial discrimination so arrogantly followed in South Africa and by the illegal regime in Rhodesia and of continuing colonial oppression by the Portuguese in parts of East and West Africa as also the alliance between the forces of colonialism and racialism.

We are also in complete accord on certain fundamental principles such as non-alignment and peaceful co-existence, non-intervention in other people's affairs, territorial integrity, equality, mutual respect and helps to one another. These fundamental principles bind us together.

We greet you today, Sir, as the Head of a liberal, forward-looking democratic State dedicated to the establishment of a multi-racial society enjoying without discrimination on grounds of colour or creed, equal rights and equal opportunities, even as we have, since our independence striven, not unsuccessfully, if I may say so, to

establish a multi-religious and multi-linguistic society in India. Your visit, Sir, to our land has a special significance, particularly at this juncture, as it will help to emphasise our common belief in and concern for the dignity and the freedom of the individual in a democratic society.

I hope that during the short time you will be spending with us, you will get to know a little more about our people and see something of our efforts to raise living standards. We shall also have the privilege of exchanging views with Your

83

Excellency on many aspects of the problems confronting humanity in this trouble world of ours. Our leader, the late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, said a few years ago: "My heart goes out to what is happening in Africa. The whole world owes it to the African people not to hinder them, but to help them in freedom in every way. To gain freedom from the morass of colonial domination has been difficult, but the other task of building themselves up is going to be much more difficult requiring the cooperation of all countries. So far as India is concerned, all our thinking and emotions are with you." These were the words of the First Prime Minister of India. May I crave Your Excellency's indulgence and say that these sentiments continue to animate the thinking of myself and my Government and that we extend to you our cooperation in the fullest measure of our capacity, politically as well as in the field of economic development. I am sure that much cooperation will be mutually beneficial. Believe me, Sir, we shall march together, arm in arm, and in good fellowship, in our common quest for peace, progress and development. May the close bonds of friendship between our two peoples endure for ever.

Once again we extend to you, to your charming wife and to your distinguished colleagues, our heartiest welcome.

ZAMBIA USA INDIA SOUTH AFRICA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### ZAMBIA

President Kaunda's Speech at Palam Airport Replying to Dr. Zakir Husain

In his reply, His Excellency Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, said:

Your Excellency, Madam Prime Minister, Honourable Minister, Ladies and Gentlemen:

May I first of all thank you very much indeed for the very warm welcome you have accorded my colleagues and myself this morning and may I assure you that my colleagues and I would take the first impression of the Republic of India back home to our people.

Secondly, may I take this opportunity to reiterate in a few words the noble pronouncements you have made, Mr. President. It is true to say that we in Zambia believe in the importance of man just as you do in India. I remember with gratitude the kindness that I received from the great man, the late prime Minister of India and before him, Mahatma Gandhi, a great man whom most of us have been privileged only to read about. Indeed, it is a privilege to read about his activities and his work. Though he is not physically with us, after he took up the leadership of this great sub-continent, we saw enunciated by him important policy matters, that were not only pronounced but I think also practised. Through him we have seen peace based on nonalignment in positive and constructive ways. Through him we got encouragement, all of us who were struggling for independence. Today, we hold ourselves responsible not only for our affairs in independent Africa, but we try to imitate what your great leader did by trying to help those who are struggling for independence.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to say that we have constantly before us the danger of war. This country is known not only for its stand for peace but also in the international front. This we appreciate.

Indeed, I am looking forward, Mr. President, to discuss with you and your Government many important things about international peace---peace which the common man needs and which we all need to develop, without which there is nothing doing on earth.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to keep you here very long. May I say I have been looking forward to be in this great country, a country which has produced so many important leaders, those leaders who are not any more with us but who, through their pronouncements, live for as long as man survives.

ZAMBIA USA INDIA

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **ZAMBIA**

President's Speech at his Dinner to Dr. Kaunda

The following is the text of President Zakir Husain's speech at a Dinner given by him in honour of the President of the Republic of Zambia, H.E. Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi, on June 14, 1967:

Mr. President, Madame Kaunda, Hon. Ministers, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests: As I rise to speak on this happy occasion, may I first convey to you, Mr. President, Madame Kaunda and members of your party a cordial

84

Welcome on behalf of the Government and the people of India. I hope you and the members

of your party will enjoy your stay with us. I believe this is the first time your charming lady is visiting India. I hope the gracious First Lady of Zambia will carry with her favourable impressions of the role which women in India play in the social and political life of the country.

We have been looking forward to this visit for a long time and your presence here with us, Mr. President, is doubly welcome because pleasure postponed is always pleasure multiplied. The ties of friendship between our two countries are not of the formal kind; they are unbreakable ones, being based on identical historical experiences and commonly-held interests and ideals. I recall with gratification the great role that you yourself, Sir, have played in forging these close bonds of friendship between our two countries. During your freedom struggle, we watched with admiration and with feelings of joy your undeviating emphasis on truth and nonviolence in the struggle for freedom. Through this eschewing of violence even to win freedom, you demonstrated the efficacy of non-violence, even as the Father of our Nation did some 20 years previously when India threw off her shackles and, at the stroke of midnight on August 14, 1947, became free.

#### SPECIAL KINSHIP

As you yourself have described, this winning of independence represented the triumph of a man-centred society over a power-centred society. You will, therefore, allow me to say that we in India feel a special kind of kinship with Zambia and her people. Like the great men of our land, in ancient times as well as in modern, you epitomize in your person the high ideals of simple living and high thinking. The example which you personally have set in seeking to forge a harmonious society comprising different racial groups and religious sects, enjoying freedom and equality of opportunity under the rule of law, has evoked the highest admiration in our country.

Moreover, our economic goals and international policies are in many ways similar. The principal accent in both our countries is on economic development and the establishment of a welfare state.

But neither India nor Zambia ras been allowed to concentrate undisturbed on this primary task of making independence meaningful for the masses of our people, in terms of food, clothing and shelter, in terms of educational opportunities and adequate medical facilities. Our energies and our resources have for some time now had to be partially diverted away from our national plans for economic development, Unfortunately, today we, in India, and Your Excellency's Government in Zambia, have had to concentrate our efforts on strengthening ourselves for the defence of our countries.

Considering the low standard of living of people in the developing countries generally and the great leeway still to be made up, no two people can have a greater interest in the maintenance of international peace and in the growth to full freedom of areas still under one form of colonial domination or another. And yet, by a curious irony of fate, difficulties, not of our own making, have been thrown in our path.

#### PROMOTION OF WORLD PEACE

Every country has to strengthen its defences in situations like the ones that confront you in your country and us in this land. Nevertheless, the illustrious son of India, our first Prime Minister, used to say, our basic outlook of peace remains, and we shall always try to solve our problems and our conflicts by peaceful methods because no other methods are enduring.

This is the lesson which history teaches us, so we shall strive to promote peace in the world and peace even with those who may be opposed to us today. This was the spirit in which we subscribed to the Tashkent Declaration and which impelled us to accept the Colombo proposals. We continue to cherish the hope that these moves will pave the way to lasting peace.

#### NUCLEAR BOMB

It is tragic that even after the experience of two terrible wars, the development of the nuclear bomb and the use of it and the continuing development of nuclear weapons casting its shadow of horror all over the world that there should still exist pockets of bigotry and tyranny in some parts of the world. In this age, when Man is on the threshold of reaching the stars, he has not yet learnt the wisdom of human fellowship and of banishing man's inhumanity to man. As the poet has said, God hath made all things great and small and he prayeth best who loveth best all things, both great and small. Nowhere is this basic truth so contemptuously disregarded as in white-ruled Southern Africa where the pernicious doctrine of apartheid and the soul-corrupting practice of racialism still flourish unchecked; where a small minority continues to impose, with brute force, and in the name of civilisation and progress, their will on the majority population, professing the Christian faith the racist minority are in their daily lives breaking everyone of the precepts of the Testament and where the common man, the son of the soil, is by reason only of the colour of his skin, deprived of his land,

#### 85

his right to work and indeed of his right to live unmoiested in his own country. INDIA OWES POLITICAL GANDHI TO AFRICA It is perhaps appropriate for me to say here that it was in this very milieu of race hatred, oppression and tyranny that Gandhiji fashioned his weapon of Satyagraha in South Africa during the closing decades of the last century---a weapon which he was later to use with such signal success in winning India's liberation which, when achieved, helped to further the cause of freedom in many other lands. In a sense, therefore, India owes the political Gandhi to Africa; not only India but the whole of the world; for, as you, Mr. President, have said in one of your writings, Gandhiji was one of the greatest social peace-makers who taught us fundamental truths about life in community.

I do not, therefore, need to tell you, Sir, long and deeply imbued with the central teaching of Gandhiji, that the rigid inequalities of the world are a constant shame upon mankind, we have been building up opposition against the policy of apartheid and espousing with all our strength, at the United Nations and at other forums, the cause of freedom for countries still under colonial domination. You are also aware of our deep and unceasing concern over developments in Rhodesia and the numerous problems they have created for Zambia. Our delegations to the United Nations, to the Commonwealth

conferences and to other international gatherings have expressed clearly and unequivocally the view of my Government which is in agreement with your own, that it is primarily the responsibility of Britain to put down the rebellion in Rhodesia. The developments since U.D.I. have confirmed India's view and belief that the answer to the grave question whether Africa would be a continent of peace or a scene of racial conflict would depend on a speedy, bold and successful solution to the problem of Rhodesia. We know that you hold the same view. We hope and pray that wiser counsels would still prevail and a speedy solution ensuring the fullest political rights for the people of Zimbabwe, including the right to mould their destiny in accordance with their freely expressed wishes, may soon be found.

I know that there is a sizeable community of Indian origin engaged in trade and commerce in your country, and that in recent years, some of our people have been working in your country as teachers, doctors and engineers. Some of your young men and women have been coming to India for their studies in our educational establishments and centres of learning. Indeed, I was particularly happy to learn that your most eminent colleague the Foreign Minister spent some years in India as a student. I hope that in the future there will be an increasing flow of people between our two countries and that such cooperation will cement still further the cordial relations which so happily exist between us.

As one who has spent a life-time in the educational world, I was immensely glad to read of the great advance made in Zambia during the last three years, in the field of education. It is platitudinous to say that, in developing countries, the prime need is to develop educational facilities and opportunities on sound lines so that the battle against ignorance, disease and poverty may be waged successfully. But platitudes sometimes carry eternal truths. So, I was glad, as I was saying, to note that great progress has been made in the setting up of new primary and secondary schools in Zambia, and that the University of Zambia is now functioning in its second year, with the enthusiastic support of the Zambian people. May I venture to express the hope that in the years to come there may be exchange of visits by academicians and men of learning between the University of Zambia and the Universities in India.

May I now ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the health of His Excellency the President of the Republic of Zambia, Madame Kaunda and of our other distinguished guests and to the happiness and prosperity of the people of Zambia.

ZAMBIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN SRI LANKA SOUTH AFRICA ZIMBABWE

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### ZAMBIA

Reply by President Kaunda

Replying to the toast, H. E. Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia. said:

Mr. President, Mr. Vice-President, Madam Prime Minister, Hon'ble Ministers, Your Excellencies, honoured guests, ladies and gentlemen:

May I begin, Sir, by thanking you most sincerely for a very careful and well-reasoned address to my colleagues, my wife and myself this evening on behalf of your great country and indeed on your own behalf.

Words that I know would ever remain enshrined in my own mind and indeed in the minds of my colleagues on this trip and feel honoured to take back home to the common man where they belong.

86

Mr. President, in your moving address you raised a number of important questions---questions that ranged from the philosophy of the

importance of man to things that are happening on the continent of Africa, and indeed in other parts of the world. I would, I think, be making a mistake if I tried to cover up these rather important statements not on philosophy but on facts. I do hope that you will bear with me if I take this opportunity to say one or two points not so much to comment on what you have said but rather to agree.

First of all, it is true to say that although Zambia stands separated by thousands of miles from this great country, we have followed with great interest not only the events that used to take place here before independence but also after. Indeed, in our own struggle, we were happy indeed to try to emulate some of the methods that the great leaders of India, in which I include yourself and others around the table who participated in this struggle, used against the British colonialists. This I deem a pride and indeed we thank in humbleness to God.

We realise that in building a nation we had to stretch from the time of struggle, we could not find the end of the struggle and the beginning of independence. These two are inter-related. In your struggle here, Mahatma, indeed Panditji, and all of you stressed the importance of the common man. This you did not only talk about, you acted in accordance with your philosophy. For this, not only Zambia but the rest of the world must remain thankful to a group of people who had been oppressed for hundreds of years, rose above the tide of oppression, began to reason beyond the realm of ordinary man's possibility of thinking. For this again, as I said, Mr. President, we are grateful.

Now, what is this common man that we are talking about so much. What is it that you leaders of India tried to place on the rest of the world, troubled world, the importance of man. At home, Sir, we have said we believe in the importance of the common man not because we want to escape from the challenge of the times, take something that was more popular, perhaps more commonly used, but because we have believed in this most sincerely.

Sir, we say that the same God who made the same man, who made the black man, he is the same God who made the white man, the brown

man, the yellow man. Therefore, we come to a common denominator that all of us are one family, human family made by the same Creator. We may believe in Hinduism, we may believe in Islam, we may be Christians, we may be Pagans, it still remains that all of us have a soul, all of us know what pain is, when pain is inflicted on us; all of us know what joy is when there is something to rejoice about. What, therefore, is there on this earth to stand for---that what brings joy and happiness to the common man. He is found everywhere. Sir, if we can claim from God's creation many coloured flowers, I am quite sure that the ladies and gentlemen who are preparing these flowers, perhaps consciously or unconsciously, know for certain that no one type of flower will give us the beauty that we require, the eyes require. And so it is that each time the people who make flowers are going into their job, know that only many coloured flowers give us the beauty that we need, that the physical eyes need. If we can claim from God's creation. then obviously the napkin we have been using clearly shows that the young lady who made the napkin had it in mind. But if she stitched white cotton only on this white piece of paper, there will be nothing but all white and no beauty could come out. So she made many colours. So if we claim from God's creation, at least in our own sub-conscious mind we are to admit that various colours give us the beauty that we desire. So, Mr. President, we are convinced from what we are able to see around us, from what other greater souls than ourselves have done before us as the cause of the common man is very wide and it is only the correct path. If we deviate from this path there is coming a catastrophic war, a war to eliminate all wars but a war that would end in the elimination of the man himself. We, therefore, agree with you, Sir, that in this non-alignment we are trying to create a new situation in our troubled world, a situation in which we will say to the Russians: Russians you are right here; we say to the Americans: Americans you are right here; we say to the Chinese, Chinese you are right here; we say to the British, British people you are right here or we say you are wrong here without fear for anything at all. If we align ourselves with any special group on this earth, we will be saying that you are always right and never wrong and the others are always wrong and never right. So, in this, your leaders in this country have always

given great thought and we in Zambia, agree entirely with you, Sir.

Mr. President, you touched over the question of Rhodesia. I hope to cover this sometime when we have an opportunity to address the Parliament and so perhaps you forgive me if I do not say anything about this, lest you think it was not so precious to us in Zambia. As you know, we are surrounded by this country where oppression and suppression of feelings of the man is the order of the day.

I may mention Angola, Mozambique, South Africa and Rhodesia, with all of which we have common boundaries.

87

Mr. President let me end perhaps with a rather happy note and this is that when you were elected to this highest post of this land I sent you a message of congratulations. It is my greatest pleasure to be able to repeat this message to you. Sir, this evening on behalf of not only myself and my wife but on behalf of the rest of my fellowmen in Zambia. When I say my fellowmen as you mentioned we have some white people there, brown people there, the only one we have not yet are the blue people. We are hoping if we do have them in our way we will accept them.

So, on behalf of the people of Zambia, please accept our very hearty congratulations and may I invite now the rest of the members round this table to drink to the health of the President of the Republic of India.

ZAMBIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA INDIA RUSSIA ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **ZAMBIA**

President Kaunda's Speech at his Dinner to President Zakir Husain

His Excellency the President of the Republic of Zambia, Dr. Kenneth David Kaunda, made the following speech proposing a toast to the President of India, Dr. Zakir Husain, at a dinner given by him in his honour in New Delhi on June 17, 1967:

Mr. President, Madame Prime Minister, Honourable Minister, Excellencies, friends:

Tomorrow, my visit comes to an end. It is unfortunate that I have to leave so soon, since there is so much to see and to learn; so much to talk about and on which to share views concerning problems of mutual concern. Neverthless, the objective has been achieved. I think we have been able to chart the course of our mutual cooperation in future. Having established this personal contact, it must be followed up, not only because it must be followed up, but because contacts of this kind are vital for continued harmony between nations pursuing a similar course in life. Following a common course in turn ensures greater possibilities for understanding and understanding is the mother of peace and cooperation, which, in turn are vital preconditions for stable progress and development in the international community.

Let me, therefore, express my profound appreciation and gratitude for the warm and fraternal welcome given by you, the Government and by the Indian people and for the hospitality extended to me, my wife and my party on this visit. The friendly disposition of the people of this capital and of other areas I have had the pleasure to visit testifies to the fund of goodwill which India has for Zambia. The weather conditions which, by the way, your High Commissioner in Zambia was so apprehensive about initially has not been a problem. In any case, we seem to have brought with us some showers of rain.

Mr. President, the memories of this visit cannot but remain indelibly recorded in our hearts. To us, this visit is only the beginning on the long road to greater and more effective cooperation between Zambia and India. There are many areas where mutual cooperation is possible and

we must at all times endeavour to enlarge this dimension in our relations both in the bilateral and multi-lateral fields.

The discussions which we have had with your Prime Minister have helped much to enlighten both of us on problems confronting our two countries in our effort to build a strong foundation for peaceful progress within our own respective nations, while ensuring greater and more effective contribution to the peace and security of the world. In this respect, I spoke in my address to your Parliament yesterday about the threat to world peace and security which the Southern Africa situation poses today. In view of the convening of the emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly to discuss the Arab-Israeli conflict, it is necessary for me to restate my Government's position clearly.

I believe that negotiations cannot be successful, that a permanent settlement is inconceivable unless all the parties to this conflict return to the positions they occupied before the outbreak of the unfortunate war. Furthermore, my Government remains convinced that unless the big powers take a positive stand in this matter and on peace in general, the atmosphere in the Middle East will remain tense, unstable and dangerous for humanity. It will not be the nationals of the big powers who will suffer the consequence of war, it will be the innocent people, the common man in the battle ground.

Mr. President, I must make an observation on the importance of cultural heritage since yesterday in my speech to Parliament I referred briefly to the cultural interaction in Zambia as an imperative necessity for nation building. In the first place, I always think of culture as a pattern of life, a pattern of all those complicated but well-knit arrangements, material or behavioural, by which a particular society achieves for its members greater satisfaction than they would otherwise. Such arrangements and patterns of life

88

include social institutions, knowledge and experience, beliefs, morals and habits acquired by members of the society.

Having been entertained to Indian music and

having visited your national museum and Taj Mahal, I am reminded of the vital part played by culture in the development of personality and, therefore, of the ``national character". Although ``cultural determinism" is a controversial subject, it is, however, true that among the factors that condition the life of any nation today are its cultural background and education. It is my conviction that cultural education, that is, education that promotes culture, helps the nation prepare fully for duties of citizenship, which is the foundation of nation-building. Education which merely prepares the student for earning a livelihood does not serve that aim.

Cultural activities or traits clearly define in practical terms the ideals of a nation. During the colonial period in Zambia this side of nation-building was deliberately undermined. Today, it is one of our major preoccupations.

In this world of interdependence and cooperation, the understanding of national behaviour of a particular state can be achieved in several ways. One way is the appreciation of the cultural background and behaviour. The cultural dimension, therefore, has today become an instrument of diplomacy. International competitions in sport, exhibitions of items of culture, dancing troupes, all help maintain harmony among nations. We must, thus, maintain and encourage more of this cultural interaction at the international level in our attempt to muster every instrument for peace in harmony, for development in happiness, for all our citizens—for humanity.

Mr. President, once again on behalf of my wife, my party, my Government and people of Zambia, I would like to thank you, your Government and the people of the Republic of India for your cordial welcome and for your magnanimous hospitality. It is perhaps opportune for me finally to recall the invitation once extended to your predecessor to visit Zambia. This invitation remains open, so are our hearts in fraternal friendship, friendship for peace and development.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I now ask you to be up and stand to toast to the health of His Excellency the President of the Republic of India.

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **ZAMBIA**

Reply by President Zakir Husain

Replying to the toast proposed by President Kaunda, Dr. Zakir Husain said:

Your Excellency,

I thank you, Mr. President, for your inspiring speech and in particular for your very kind words about us. It is indeed a matter of considerable satisfaction to me personally, and to the leaders in the Government of India that, in spite of the difficulties, the serious difficulties, that have been created for Zambia, particularly in the wake of the Rhodesian U.D.I., great progress has been achieved in Zambia since independence in various spheres of nation-building. As I was listening to you, Sir, the thought flashed across my mind that developing countries like yours and mine, have to work against time, so that we might catch up with the deficiencies of the wasted years of alien rule. We could, therefore, have wished for a period of peace after independence, enabling us to devote our energies and resources solely to the tasks of development.

But in our complicated world, the impact of events in other lands affects us, affects the unfolding of our policies and our dreams for our people vitally. The impact is the greater when reinforced by history and geography. The challenges posed must inevitably be met. Nevertheless, the work of development must also go on apace. We are glad that you are going ahead with your plans for the economic development of Zambia, undeterred by the difficulties created by the Rhodesian crisis, even as we are attempting to do so in our own country. To the extent we shall succeed, in our respective countries, in mobilising

the energies and the enthusiasm of our people, both to meet the challenges of our times and to carry out our development programmes, we shall have deserved the confidence and the faith reposed in us by our people.

As I said the other day, the policies followed under your dedicated leadership by your country in respect to many of the issues of international significance are closely akin to those followed by us in this country. Whether it be Rhodesia or South West Africa, Vietnam or non-proliferation of nuclear weapons or an international economic order providing for more equitable exchanges of commodities, goods and services between countries, whether it be the maintenance of peace in the world or the upholding of the U.N. Charter, both your Government and mine hold similar views. We share these views not out of an exclusive regard for our national self-interests but

#### 89

because we are convinced that they are grounded in the aspiration for international peace, morality and order; because in fact they have the sanction of our conscience. The kind of narrow nationalism that is typified by "My country, right or wrong" has rightly no appeal for either of our countries. It is, therefore, not surprising that one of the principal aims of Zambia's foreign policy and India's is the peace and well-being of the world community. We both envisage the day when a new world order will be ushered in, in which Man, regardless of caste, colour, creed or race, will be at the centre of all human activity.

Mr. President, may I once again thank you for the gracious terms in which you have spoken of India's contribution to this ideal and of the manner in which we have endeavoured to enlarge the area of international cooperation and human happiness. You, Sir, have been with us only a short while, but in that short space of time you have captivated our hearts. We salute you as a courageous leader of your people, as one of the foremost leaders of resurgent Africa, and above all as a man of God. We hope that you and your colleagues have enjoyed your stay in India and will carry the good wishes of the Government and the people of India for the welfare and progress of the people of Zambia.

May I now ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the health of His Excellencies the President of the Republic of Zambia, Madam Kaunda and to the happiness and prosperity of the people of Zambia.

#### ZAMBIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **ZAMBIA**

Joint Communique

The following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on the occasion of the visit to India of the President of Zambia, Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, from June 14 to 18, 1967:

At the invitation of the President of the Republic of India, the President of the Republic of Zambia, H.E. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, and Mrs. Kaunda paid a State visit to India from June 14 to 18, 1967. The President of Zambia was accompanied by the Hon. Mr. Elijah Mudenda, Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. H.D. Banda, Minister of Co-operatives, Youth and Social Development, and Mr. Josy Monga, Minister of State, Barotse Province, and other officials and advisers. In keeping with the historic bonds of friendship existing between the peoples of India and Zambia, the President of Zambia and his party received a most cordial welcome from the Government and people of India.

During his stay in New Delhi, President Kaunda had talks with President Zakir Husain and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and exchanged views on a variety of subjects, in particular, the present world situation, matters of mutual interest and the development of economic and technical co-operation. The discussions were held in an atmosphere of complete frankness, mutual understanding and cordiality and revealed a great identity of views on many international issues.

Taking part in the talks on the Zambian side were also the Hon. Mr. Elijah Mudenda, Minister of Agriculture, the Hon. Mr. H.D. Banda, Minister of Co-operatives, Youth and Social Development, and Mr. Josy Monga, Minister of State, Barotse Province and Mr. A. Chalikulima, Assistant to the Minister of State, Western Province. Taking part in the talks on the Indian side were also Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister for External Affairs, Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister for Commerce, Shri S.P. Singh, Deputy Minister, Shri M. A. Husain, Secretary, Minishtry of External Affairs, and Shri S. Krishnamurti, High Commissioner for India in Zambia.

Welcoming the visit of the President of Zambia the President of India paid tribute to the courage and determination of the Zambian people in meeting the challenge posed by the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Rhodesia and expressed the desire of the Government and people of India to extend all assistance within their means in overcoming the difficulties confronting Zambia in the wake of UDI. The President paid a special tribute to President Kaunda's dedicated leadership at this critical time and his outstanding contribution to the cause of African unity and the promotion of understanding and amity between African States.

The President of Zambia recalled India's vital role and contribution in pioneering the movement for the liberation of all dependent peoples and liquidation of colonialism under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He noted with satisfaction India's continuing support to the Liberation Movements in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world. He

90

also expressed his appreciation of the role played by India in promoting international peace and security in the world.

Recalling the Bandung principles and the declaration made by non-aligned countries in 1964. the two Presidents reiterated their conviction in the continuing validity of the policy of non-alignment, which most of the newly independent countries of Africa and Asia have adopted, and which has made a positive contribution to the cause of international peace and co-operation. They stressed the importance of acceptance by the world community of the principles of peaceful coexistence, if international peace and security are to be safeguarded. They continue to be opposed to military alliances and other groupings which stand in the way of international co-operation.

The President of India expressed India's determination to continue its earnest efforts towards the implementation in letter and spirit of the Tashkent Declaration. The President of Zambia expressed the hope that India and Pakistan would reach an honourable and peaceful settlement of all outstanding problems between them in accordance with the Tashkent Declaration and thereby help to establish good neighbourly relations between the two countries.

The President of India reiterated India's faith in African unity and expressed appreciation of the progressive developments in Africa, especially the formation of the OAU as a historic step signifying the emergence of Africa as a powerful new factor for peace and international co-operation and for promoting solutions to African problems without outside interference.

Both sides reiterated their strong opposition to all forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism and expressed their whole-hearted support for the peoples of Asia, Africa and other parts of the world who are still struggling for the achievement and consolidation of their independence. In particular, they extended their full support to the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea still struggling against Portuguese colonialism.

They expressed deep concern at the deteriorating situation in Zimbabwe and agreed that the measures so far taken had proved to be ineffective and, therefore, stronger measures in the form of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Articles 41 and 42 of Chapter VII of the UN Charter should be immediately enforced. They however, reaffirmed their view that the only effective and speedy way of putting an end to

this illegal racist minority regime in Zimbabwe was through the use of force by Britain.

They expressed the fervent hope that all possible assistance would be made available by friendly countries in support of Zambia's courageous efforts to meet the challenge posed by the alliance between colonialism and racialism in Southern Africa. The two sides strongly condemned the racialist policy of apartheid pursued by the Government of the Union of South Africa. They agreed that South Africa had forfeited her legal authority in the administration of South West Africa by the adoption of the UN Resolution terminating her mandate over that territory. They urged all member nations of the world body to honour their obligation by implementing expeditiously this Resolution and affecting a U.N. presence in South West Africa.

Both sides discussed the situation in West Asia, arising from the recent military conflict in the area. They expressed their satisfaction at the ceasefire which they hoped would now immediately be followed by withdrawal of forces to positions before the hostilities. They urged that there should be no denial of human rights to the civilian populations in the areas which have recently been the scene of conflict. They expressed the hope that peace will prevail in West Asia and a just solution will be found.

Both sides expressed concern at the unabated arms race which poses a serious threat to international peace and security and urged an early agreement on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. They emphasized the serious dangers inherent in the spread of nuclear weapons and called for the early conclusion of a comprehensive treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in accordance with the principles approved by the UN General Assembly at its XX Session and reaffirmed at its XXI Session, in particular, the principles of an acceptable balance of obligations and responsibilities between the nuclear weapon States and non-nuclear weapon States and the principles relating to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

The two Presidents viewed with great concern the serious situation in Vietnam as a continuing threat to world peace and security. They were convinced that Vietnam was basically a political problem for which a political solution must be found. They both agreed that the Geneva Agreements of 1954 provided a suitable basis for a solution in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the people of Vietnam for freedom and independence. The people of Vietnam should be free to decide their future without any external interference.

In their discussion on matters concerning relations between the two countries, the two Presidents expressed their satisfaction with the progress in the development and the expansion of

91

co-operation between them. Both sides attached great importance to the urgent and imperative need for initiating practical steps for developing and strengthening commercial and economic relations and technical co-operation to the benefit of both countries. Both sides expressed their conviction that in all matters and more especially in the economic field, developing countries should rely increasingly on themselves and help each other through mutual assistance and co-operation. In this context, they welcomed the holding of the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi early in 1968 and shared the view that the Conference would be of historical significance in that it would focus world attention on the vital economic problems of today, particularly those affecting the developing countries.

Both sides expressed deep satisfaction that the visit of the President of the Republic of Zambia and the opportunity it had afforded for a friendly exchange of views had afforded for a friendly exchange of views had further strengthened the already very close relations existing between the two countries and would lead to mutually beneficial co-operation in all matters of mutual interest.

92

**Date**: Jun 01, 1967

## July

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. XIII

1967

JULY No. 7

**CONTENTS** 

**PAGE** 

**CANADA** 

Indo-Canadian Agreements for Mineral Exploration

93

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Economic and Social Council 93

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha initiating Debate on Foreign Affairs 98

Shri M. C. Chagla's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 101

**PAKISTAN** 

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Forcible Occupation of Indian Territory

by Pakistan

109

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indian Detenus in Pakistan 110

UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid Loan to India

111

**WEST ASIA** 

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly

#### MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

DIVISION

#### GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

CANADA INDIA PAKISTAN USA

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

## Volume No

1995

#### **CANADA**

Indo-Canadian Agreements for Mineral Exploration

The Indian High Commissioner in Canada, General J.N. Chaudhuri, and Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Paul Martin, signed two development loan agreements in Ottawa on July 28, 1967 under which Canada provides \$ 19 million for India's mineral exploration and fertilisers.

The two loans, which are for a period of 50 years with a ten years' grace period are free of interest commitment, fees or levy charges. The loan for mineral exploration is for nine million dollars to be used for supplying various types of equipment for the Geological Survey of India which has undertaken systematic mapping of mineral deposits and exploration and drilling. This includes mining, drilling, prospecting and other types of geophysical equipment used for the exploration of minerals.

The project of the Geological Survey of India provides for a concentrated programme of geological exploration to uncover commercially usable deposits of such minerals as copper, zinc, nickel, lead, bauxite, asbestos and manganese. While the location of deposits is generally known their commercial feasibility has yet to be determined. Development of these mineral resources

will strengthen the country's industrial base.

The second agreement signed today was for ten million dollars for supply of fertilisers and fertiliser components as part of Canada's expanded long-term agricultural aid programme to India this year. This expansion is in accordance with the suggestion made by the Aid India Consortium this spring. The consortium meeting where donor nations and institutions under the chairmanship of the World Bank discussed India's economic requirements, had suggested more emphasis on food supplies and agricultural development. This is in accordance with the wishes of India which is determined to attain self-sufficiency in food production by early 1970's.

CANADA INDIA USA **Date**: Jul 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement in Economic and Social Council

Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of Commerce, made the following statement at the 43rd Session of the Economic and Social Council in Geneva on July 13, 1967:

Mr. President,

In a world sharply divided between the small minority which possesses the bulk of the financial and technological resources and the vast majority which requires them desperately---in a world in which economic, social and political inequities and inequalities have engendered strife---the Economic and Social Council has a vital role to play. It has to arrange for an orderly transfer of some of these resources from those who command surpluses to those who face shortages, so that violence and conflict can be avoided. The Council

must equally create the climate in which the developing countries can themselves make the maximum use of their capital and talent so that

93

they can give meaning and content to the lives of millions of their peoples who are now living merely at the margin of human subsistence.

The Secretary-General has suggested how in this world the continuity of international co-operation in the field of economic development exists side by side with arrogance of power and temptation to use force. There are still many areas where armed conflicts continue. And there are areas where basic human rights continue to be denied. Just recently the world has witnessed one other explosion born out of these trends. I join U Thant in hoping that the future of humanity will be determined by the excellence of ploughshares, and not by resort to the sword.

I wish also to pay a warm tribute to the distinguished Secretary-General for the excellent analysis of the world economic situation in his statement which was read to us by Mr. Phillipe de Seynes on Tuesday morning. The Secretary-General has once again expressed concern at the disappointing trends of the past two years and at the strong possibility that even the modest target of the Development Decade will not be attained. While the developing countries have been making all possible efforts for the mobilisation of their own resources in order to achieve rapid economic growth, these efforts have been seriously hampered by an unfavourable external environment. There is, therefore, urgent need for the developed countries to adopt favourable policies towards the developing countries, both in the fields of trade as well as aid, so as to enable the latter to stand on their own feet.

To my mind the primary task before this session of the Council is to give this opportunity to the developing countries to make the best use of their own resources. In the context of the present situation, when the flow of external resources to developing countries is threatening to become almost self-cancelling, it is clear that they remain entirely dependent on their export proceeds to finance their essential requirements of capital equipment and raw materials. Yet, it

is in the field of trade that the developing countries, instead of gaining ground, have been losing it to the developed countries. Over the last 15 years, while the share of the developed countries in the world exports has substantially increased, the share of developing countries has fallen from 1/3rd of the total world exports to less than 1/5th.

The Secretary-General has rightly referred to the successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations as an important event which has marked a vital step forward in international co-operation. He has also rightly warned us that the danger of a relapse of the world into protectionist trading blocs has not been completely eliminated. When the Kennedy Round negotiations were launched, our hopes were raised that the problems of the developing countries would receive the highest priority. We performed an act of faith in participating in these negotiations. Although some benefits would accrue to the developing countries, it is a matter of concern, as pointed out in the Secretary General's statement, that the benefits for the developing countries are likely to be much less than those for the developed countries. As mentioned in the joint statement of the developing countries at the conclusion of the Kennedy Round, they were not in a position to share, to the same extent, the satisfaction of the developed countries at the achievements of the Kennedy Round, because the most important problems of the developing countries in the field of trade have still remained unresolved. This unfinished task of the Kennedy Round should not be allowed to be forgotten. May I suggest that this task be completed by the end of 1967.

In addition, Mr. President, new initiatives would need to be taken to encourage the developing countries to realise from their export earnings sufficient foreign exchange receipts, which should be commensurate with the needs of their economic development. We have been greatly encouraged by President Johnson's statement in Punta del Este in April 1967 with regard to the possibility of preferential tariff advantages for all developing countries in the markets of all developed countries. We are heartened that the legitimate plea of the developed countries which has remained pending for so long, may now be accepted and that non-discriminatory generalised

preferences may be granted to them by industrialised countries. Action in this field should not be delayed any further. To those who have any doctrinnaire attachment to the most-favoured-nation rule between the developed and developing countries, it must be pointed out that this rule has already been greatly eroded by the formation of ever-increasing regional groupings. It has been estimated that if additional developed countries enter the regional economic groupings among the developed countries, as they have announced their intention of doing, then more than half of the developed countries' manufactured and semi-manufactured imports would flow outside the most-favoured-nation system. In such a situation, the formal application of the most-favoured-nation rule to the developing countries, in effect, amounts to granting the least-favoured-nation treatment to them. It is important that these economic groupings should contribute in a positive way to the expansion of the trade of the developing countries by granting to their products duty-free entry on a preferential basis.

In the field of primary commodities also, the need for new initiatives for solving the trading

#### 94

problems of the developing countries is equally urgent. We would urge the rich consuming countries to make all possible efforts in a spirit of co-operation and to conclude commodity agreements to mitigate the hardship of the producing countries.

There is also considerable scope for the expansion of the mutual trade among the developing countries. It is my hope that the developing countries will bend their energies to promote their mutual trade not only within their respective regions, but also with developing countries of other regions. Fortunately, the necessary framework for exploring the possibilities of the expansion of trade among developing countries is now available and it is to be hoped that their efforts will soon bear fruit. In a recent meeting between the Presidents of Yugoslavia and UAR and the Prime Minister of India, we have pledged to explore possibilities of further expansion in technical, commercial and industrial fields. We have also agreed that the arrangements arrived at among the three countries would be extendable

to other developing countries on a basis of mutual advantage.

Mr. President, the resources that can be mobilised in the developing countries are not sufficient to complete the urgent task of their economic development. Their efforts in this direction have, therefore, to be supplemented by external assistance. The subject of the flow of external resources from the developed to the developing countries was discussed in depth at the 41st session of the Council during which the need for urgent measures to increase the volume of the flow of assistance to developing countries and to ease its terms and conditions was emphasised. I had then urged for some specific 4 measures such as increase in the overall volume of aid; and particularly in the relative volume of non-project aid; long-term commitments in the flow of aid to ensure continuity in the development process; the need to ensure that aid was granted on economic considerations only; the untying of aid from particular source of supply; the lowering of rates of interest and increase in periods of repayment, the need to accept repayments in the form of goods exported by the repaying countries; the re-scheduling of past debts of developing countries etc. Now I must reiterate the need for taking urgent action along the lines of the recommendations made by the Council at its 41st session which were subsequently endorsed by the General Assembly. It might be said that it is perhaps too early to assess the progress in the implementation of these recommendations. since the target with regard to the volume of external assistance is to be achieved by 1970. But the developed countries, instead of moving towards this target, have, in effect, moved away from it. Unless this trend is reversed by determined action on their part, there is a serious danger that the target may not be attained even by 1970. This pessimism is confirmed by the latest report of the Secretary General on flow of resources to developing countries. We find that the net flow of external resources to developing countries as a percentage of the Gross National Product of the developed market economies, which recovered somewhat in 1966 after a steady decline in the previous three years, appeared to have receded further from the peak figure recorded in 1964. The report also shows that in 1965, only two of the developed market economy countries provided resources to

the developing countries to the extent of more than 1% of their Gross National Product and it is significant that both these countries were providing even higher percentage in 1961 than they are doing today. It is, however, heartening to note that there was a marked rebound in the credit commitments of the centrally planned economies which rose from \$595 million in 1965 to almost twice that amount in 1966.

It is a matter of concern that the overall terms of development loans continue to remain too hard and the trend towards the softening of the terms has recently suffered certain setbacks. The indebtedness of the developing countries is becoming a serious problem and threatens to lead to a significant diminution of the net transfer of resources to them. It has been estimated that if the gross flow of loans to developing countries were to continue at the present rate and the present average terms and conditions were maintained, there will be a paradoxical situation after 1975 when there will actually be a net transfer of resources from the developing to the developed countries. There is, therefore, obvious need for urgent international action to forestall what the Secretary General has described as the onset of debt service crises.

We welcome the mention for the first time in the Secretary General's report of the transfer of resources among developing countries. Despite her own difficulties. India has endeavoured to play an important role in assisting other developing countries with economic and technical assistance. We have so far provided about 2,700 placements under the Colombo Plan and about 1,200 placements under the United Nations programmes of technical co-operation in various sectors of our economy for the training of nationals of other countries. We have also provided the services of a large number of our experts for serving in other countries. We have been co-operating with some countries, both on a bilateral and multilateral basis, and we shall be happy to extend further the area of co-operation to the mutual advantage of all participating countries.

95

One of the issues of major importance on which the Council will be focussing attention at

this session, relates to economic planning and projections. There is now universal recognition of the important role of planning in the attainment of rapid economic growth. For the developing countries in particular, planning is recognised as an indispensable instrument for the regeneration of their economic life.

The World Economic Survey, 1966 contains a detailed analysis of the various aspects of plan implementation in developing countries in the light of the experience of several countries. While the survey deals exhaustively with the efforts which the developing countries themselves are making and should make in formulating and implementing their development plans, it does not, in our view, devote sufficient attention to the role of the external environment in which such efforts are made. As the Committee for Development Planning has pointed out in its report, the successful implementation of plans in developing countries is conditional, to a substantial extent, upon favourable trade and aid policies of the developed countries. I would like to draw attention to the important recommendations in the Committee's report with regard to external technical and financial cooperation to assist national planning efforts. In the view of my delegation, the greatest emphasis must be placed on such cooperation.

One of the difficulties encountered by the developing countries while framing their economic plans relates to the projections of their exports and imports. Greater attention should, therefore, be paid to the improvement of the tools for the projections of balance of payments. It is desirable that projections should also be made of the capacity of the rich countries to provide external resources to the poor countries. Such projections will help to ensure better resource allocation among the countries of the world, more effective planning in the developing countries and rapid growth of the world economy. They will also help in identifying the avenues for the expansion of trade among developing countries.

My delegation is happy to note the emphasis placed by the Committee for Development Planning on the need for formulating a practical plan of action for the next decade. It has been suggested that specific and more concrete targets

should be set for attainment by the developing countries. However, it is clear that it is not sufficient to fix targets for the performance of the developing countries alone. Definite commitments should also be made by the developed countries with regard to the expansion of international trade and aid to supplement the efforts of the developing countries. It is in this context that we await with interest the further recommendations of the Committee. The Committee has rightly emphasized the need for concerted action during the next decade, both by the developed and the developing countries with a view to securing a more rapid advance in the income and welfare of the latter. Such action would obviously be in the interest of developed countries as well.

Mr. President, please permit me to say a few words now about our own experience. Planned economic development in India began over a decade and a half ago when we launched our First Five Year Plan. We have set for ourselves a trinity of goals to be achieved through economic planning within the democratic framework. These goals are: (i) To raise the living standard of the people through an increase in the real per capita income, (ii) to set in motion a continuing and self-sustaining economy and (iii) to attain a viable balance-of-payments within a specified period. The guiding principles which have determined the Indian strategy of economic development are selectivity and interdependence. Selectivity has been dictated by the supreme need to ensure the most economical use of the scarce domestic and external resources in order to secure optimum benefits. The principle of inter-dependence has been adopted to ensure a smooth and harmonised growth of the different sectors of the economy. Our national plans envisage important roles both for the public as well as the private sectors.

The planning efforts in India have been seriously hampered by the inadequacy of external resources. We are indeed grateful to the many friendly countries who have assisted us. This assistance might appear substantial in absolute terms, but it is grossly inadequate to meet the urgent and minimum developmental requirements of over 500 million people. The annual per capita inflow of official loans and grants to India has been among the lowest in

the world; it is only about \$2 per person, as against over \$30 in the case of some other countries.

I turn now, Mr. President, to the problem of multilateral food aid. It is only appropriate that this session of the Council should devote special attention to this problem. Insufficient growth in agricultural production combined with rapid increase in population is causing grave and widespread concern on the food front today. We are glad to note the emphasis in the Secretary-General's progress report on this subject on the urgent need for increasing food production in developing countries. We feel that the transfer of foodgrains from surplus to deficit areas to meet shortages, although essential in the short run for combating hunger and malnutrition can

#### 96

only be a temporary expedient. The time is fast approaching when the fullest utilization of agricultural capacity by surplus countries will become inadequate to fill this gap. The only long-term solution lies in enabling the deficit countries to bring about a spectacular increase in their food production by revolutionizing their agriculture. Though the basic efforts in this regard will have to be made by the developing countries themselves, the international community also must play its part by assisting their efforts.

It must be stressed that agricultural development cannot be separated or isolated from the development of the other sectors of the economy. This point has received well-deserved emphasis in the Secretary-General's report. The urgent need, therefore, is to assist the developing countries in their efforts to diversify their economies in all sectors. They should also be enabled to increase their import capacity, so that the foreign exchange required for food purchases does not have to be diverted from their development needs.

My delegation welcomes the further development of programmes of multilateral food aid. We have benefited in the past from the assistance provided by the World Food Programme which though small in comparison with our needs, nevertheless made a significant contribution in

meeting our urgent requirements. However, it is important that any increase in multilateral food aid should be supplementary to bilateral aid which will have to continue to play an important role.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the 4.5 million tonnes scheme for multilateral food aid which emerged from the Kennedy Round negotiations. Our main concern is with the level of the minimum and maximum prices. We hope that countries like India with balance of payment difficulties will not be asked to give a guarantee of any commercial purchases. Furthermore, it seems to us that the quantity of 4.5 million tonnes is inadequate to meet the need of the developing countries and will have to be substantially increased. We also hope that this quantity will be in addition to and not in substitution of other bilateral and multilateral assistance. As regards the criteria for the grant of aid from any multilateral food aid programme, I must emphasise that the needs of the countries concerned should be the dominant consideration.

I cannot leave this subject, Mr. President, without making some mention of the agricultural situation in my country. When food aid or food shortages are discussed, India is very much in people's minds. This is understandable because India is a big country with a large population and when there is shortage caused by natural calamities, its magnitude in absolute terms is very great. 1965 and 1966 witnessed unprecedented droughts which were unfortunately preceded by the failure of the monsoons in 1964. This resulted in widespread crop failure and a shortfall in the production of foodgrains of several million tonnes. However, I must hasten to correct any erroneous impression which may have been created that India has not made much headway in agricultural development. During the first 14 years of our planned development, in terms of foodgrains alone, we increased production from 55 million tonnes to 89 million tonnes and we have resolved to reach a production target of 120 million tonnes by 1971 when we expect to become self-sufficient in food. To this end we are taking various measures, including sizeable increase in the production of fertilizers, extension of irrigation facilities and provision of other necessary inputs.

In this context, Mr. President, we are very heartened that the Secretary-General placed special emphasis in his statement on the population problem. My delegation wholeheartedly welcomes the establishment of the Trust Fund for U.N. work in this field. I am happy to say that my Government is ready to make a suitable contribution to this Fund. I trust that other countries will also contribute to it generously. We further support the proposed increase in budgetary appropriations in this field to enable the U.N. to embark on a bolder and more effective programme of action as envisaged by the General Assembly.

I now refer to the problem of coordination which appears to grow more complex as the activities of the UN system of organisations multiply to meet the ever increasing needs of the developing countries. There has been growing concern, of late, over the need for greater efforts to avoid duplication and waste and to ensure the most effective utilization of scarce international resources to the best advantage of developing countries. This concern is reflected in the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee of Fourteen, in the establishment of the new Committee for Programme and Coordination and in the decision of the General Assembly to undertake a general review of the entire range of the activities of the UN system of organisations in the economic, social and human rights fields.

It must, of course, be clearly recognised that the major responsibility for ensuring coordination within the UN family has been entrusted to this Council under the Charter of the United Nations. If the Council has not been able to discharge this responsibility effectively, this is largely because it did not have adequate machinery to do so. The establishment of the Committee for

#### 97

Programme and Coordination has removed this lacuna. This Committee has now commenced its work and we hope that it will evolve its working procedures to enable it to carry out its complex task of assisting the Council in the effective discharge of its obligations as the central coordinating agency. The joint meetings between this Committee and the Administrative Committee for Coordination also play a useful role.

We shall, at this session, be considering for the first time the report of the Industrial Development Board. As this was the first session of the board, it was necessarily preoccupied with organisational matters such as UNIDO's move to its new headquarters, the adoption of the rules of procedures etc. In spite of this it was able to adopt a very comprehensive resolution on the future programme of work and activities of UNIDO. We hope that early implementation of the recommendations contained in this resolution will enable the organisation to play effectively the central role which has been assigned to it in the field of industrial development by intensifying international effort in assisting the developing countries in this field.

Mr. President, let us now look to the future. In about six months' time, my country will have the privilege of hosting the second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. This Conference will provide a unique opportunity not only for looking back at the past but also for setting our sights for the future. A constructive discussion for setting the future goals can take place only against the background of the achievements and not the disappointments of the past. It is, therefore, essential that even now, in the time available till the second UNCTAD, international community should undertake concerted action for the achievements of objectives already established.

We place high hopes in what the Secretary General has described as the New Delhi Round, which, in our view, should concentrate exclusively on providing practical and meaningful solutions to the urgent problems of the developing countries. Let New Delhi finish what was started at Geneva and begin what is to be done later.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA PERU RUSSIA YUGOSLAVIA SRI LANKA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE LATVIA

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Speech in Lok Sabha initiating Debate on Foreign Affairs

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, delivered the following speech in the Lok Sabha on July 17, 1967 initiating the debate on Foreign Affairs:

Every time there is a debate on foreign policy, one has to say something which one has said repeatedly. I would have liked to avoid saying them this time, but some Hon. Members of the Opposition have again talked on the same points and, therefore, it becomes necessary to give the correct perspective once again.

#### FOREIGN POLICY

Foreign policy is conditioned by the objectives of any country's internal policy, and internal policy in turn is a manifestation of the people's aspirations and political philosophy. Our foreign policy has to be governed by what we ourselves have gone through. We have been subjected to foreign domination and we, at least my generation, cannot forget the arrogance---or the humiliation --- of the domination. Therefore, it is natural for us to speak out when we see similar things happening to other people. Even when we were fighting for our own independence, we spoke out for other independence movements; we spoke out for the oppressed of all other lands. I think, that in turn gave us strength and helped our movement. Today also we cannot isolate our policy in this; we cannot isolate our lives from what is happening elsewhere. It is said many times: why are we bothered with what is happening outside when there are so many problems within India? But at no time in history was any country fully isolated. Certainly, in this century and in this part of the century, there cannot be isolation, when we are also closely linked with what is happening in other countries. It may be all right for some small countries who are not so closely linked with various streams, who have not been through a freedom struggle; who have

not got the racial memories, to keep aloof but it is not possible for India, it is certainly not possible for this Government, to keep aloof from what is happening in the rest of the world. Whenever we have not spoken out loudly, it is the members of the Opposition who have accused us then of sitting on the fence and of not speaking as loudly as we might have.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

Much has been said about non-alignment. I have, here in this House and outside this House, repeated time and again that non-alignment at no stage has meant neutrality. There are only two ways: either you are non-aligned or you are aligned. I would like to ask my hon. friends of the Opposition this: when they criticise non-alignment, does it mean that they wish us to be aligned and if so, with whom, with which alliance, with which country? Of those who speak against non-alignment, we have a right to ask this question, we have a right to have an answer to it from them.

When there were two main Blocs, the object of non-alignment was to achieve a detente. My hon. friend opposite, accused us yesterday of preventing such a detente between the two super powers. I would like to tell him that, far from preventing it, if today there is a blurring of these blocs, if there is a tendency for them to talk more and to be a little closer together, it is largely because of the policy of non-alignment followed not only by India but by an increasing number of countries all over the world. This is not merely my opinion; it is the opinion of many people in the world, including some of the people whom the Hon. Member admires.

Today it is not just a question of people coming together. We still believe in the necessity of peace, and when I said earlier that we could not remain isolated from what was happening, this was one of the main reasons. Whenever there is a war, it affects us; it affects our economy; it affects not only the Government's policy but it indirectly affects the lives of all the people of this country by pushing up prices, by making the availability of certain things difficult and so on, so that we have a stake in peace. It is not that we are just talking about a high ideal, but it is something which is very essential to our survival,

to our existence and to our development. So, we are interested in these countries coming together. But we have to see on what issues they are coming together, how that is going to affect us, how it is going to affect our national interests.

We are idealistic in our thinking certainly, but I do not think that our idealism is in any way divorced from the interests of our people.

As I was saying just now, not only India but most countries in Africa and Asia have gone through long periods of foreign domination. We have not yet recovered from that. It is not fair to compare what is happening here, in a vast country of such diversities and such different levels of development with what a small country has achieved and with an enormous amount of foreign aid. We the people of Asia and Africa have to guard our common interest very zealously. We must oppose any move to damage our sovereignty, whether these moves are in the form of direct external pressure or take a more subtle disguised form. Sometimes, emotional responses are deliberately engineered to damage the balance of our policies or to push us into a frame of action which is not really in our interest.

Hon. Members must consider, as I said earlier, which pact we should join? Would we have greater freedom if we belong to any one side or would it limit our freedom of action or freedom of judgment? Secondly, would the big powers give us anything we want merely, if we sign a piece of paper? I think it would be extremely naive to think so.

Joining a pact would impose limitations on our policies, both external and internal because our action would be conditioned by the obligations of these pacts or treaties. What is the state of alliances today? I think Hon. Members know that there is considerable re-thinking about both CENTO and SEATO. The blocs are dissolving and several centres of power are crystallising. There are also very subtle nuances in the relationship of the super-powers and their partners. There are significant contradictions and there are also certain parallelisms.

Whatever attitude we take is governed by the ultimate effect of it. Today, one nation may have won a war. But what will be the result of it long

afterwards? We know that the war has bred tremendous bitterness, and it is not bitterness that can be wiped out by a word. If we take sides or we assure our support to somebody, it is not just for taking up an attitude or shouting out aloud, or, as an Hon. Member said, because we like the sound of our voices, but it is because we feel that in that situation, speaking out will help that situation, will help to draw attention to something which could help the situation or lessen the bitterness. It is up to the Hon. Members of the Opposition to feel that in all these twenty years, India's voice has not counted. They are free to say so. But it does not alter the historical facts. It does not alter the fact that on many occasions it is India's voice and it is India's quiet, persistent efforts at the UN and at other international forums which have produced good results in the end.

#### 99

For instance, when the Korean fighting was on, India produced a resolution. We were blamed by both sides, right and left, who said that it was a very wrong thing to do and we were letting down everybody and so on. And yet that resolution formed the basis of the settlement which later came about.

So, it is not possible, just sitting at this distance, to judge exactly what tremendous work goes on behind the scenes at the UN or how we are able to influence or change the stream of events there. It does not mean that we always succeed. Nobody has always succeeded. I would like Hon. Members to tell me whether there is a single big power today in the world which can say that its foreign policy has always succeeded. There is not, and it cannot be possible. But I think that by and large we have succeeded; of course, we may make mistakes; we are not infallible, but by and large our efforts have made some little dent and we have been able to create the right atmosphere. If you were to go to the UN, you will know, and I hope that my colleague the Foreign Minister will tell you of his own recent experience, how people are anxious to know what India is thinking. I know about it. I have not been to the UN, but I have functioned in UNESCO for five years, and I saw how much weight people put on India's opinion. In fact, it even happened once that the delegate of a country

telephoned his Government to find out what stand he should take on a particular issue, and the reply, to his surprise, was 'Please find out what India is going to do'. It was not a communist country, it was not even an Asian country.

An Hon. Member: Is the object of our foreign policy to see whether we influence the world or not or to defend our own country's interest? What is the main object of our foreign policy?

Prime Minister: It is both.

The Hon. Member: The first object should be to save our own interest.

Prime Minister: Both are connected. This is what I have been trying to explain. Both are very closely connected. You cannot separate the two. We want to influence world events in such a way as will be in our national interest, as will help us in the long run and in the short run too. (interruption)

#### **WEST ASIA**

I do not want to go into the West Asian crisis, because I have talked about it on an earlier occasion, and I do not want to go into the details of any particular issue here. But I do not think that the manner in which some Members make an equation rather facetiously, if I may say so, about little Israel threatened by the aggressive

Arabs reminds me in a way of what people in other countries talk similarly of tiny Pakistan facing a huge India. The history of these problems, the psychology of peoples, the tragic use of small but dangerous military establishments against larger independent neighbours must be kept in view when deciding our attitudes.

As I said, we are very much concerned with what is happening in these areas and we look at them not only from the point of view of what is happening today but also from the point of view of how it affects the future of our country.

An Hon. Member tried to compare our capture of the Haji Pir and other points with the Israeli aggression, but he forgot that Haji Pir is our territory at this moment.....

An Hon. Member: She is treating on very dangerous ground.

Prime Minister: It is not at all dangerous ground. We have temporarily come back from there because we made a treaty.

It is not only Haji Pir, which is today under Pakistani occupation, but a great deal more of Indian territory is there on that side....

We have not separated Haji Pir from the rest of that land. We do not accept Pakistan's occupation of that land; Pakistani occupation of our land covers a great deal more than just those two or three points.

An Hon. Member: In action she has accepted that.

Prime Minister: We did accept it for a particular purpose. If there was time, I could go into the whole thing, the Tashkent Declaration etc. ... The point is that all these events are not isolated and we have to assess their total impact on ourselves...

I visit Ladakh (recently) not because of any immediate danger, but because I have taken an interest in our border areas and our security forces who are stationed there right from 1962, and have been visiting these areas every year since then. I must tell the House that it is always a pleasure to go there and see the fine spirit of our people, of our forces who are living in such extremely difficult conditions. It is difficult to imagine what hardships they face unless one goes there oneself and sees for oneself.

#### DISARMAMENT

I talked earlier about an Hon. Member's point concerning a detente. We are certainly

100

interested in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but we feel that by itself this does not solve any problem. That is why the 18-nation Commission, not the non-proliferation commission, but the Disarmament Commission is there. We believe in total disarmament and we think we should work towards it.

#### NUCLEAR SHIELD

The Hon. Member also dwelt at great length on a nuclear shield and blamed us for not following it up. Actually we did take the initiative. The Hon. Member knows that Shri L. K. Jha went to various places in that connection. Earlier on, President Johnson had made a statement. However that was a unilateral declaration and it did not really call for any application on our part. We welcome what President Johnson said. But what we would like to see, and what one must have also, is a guarantee given by all the nuclear powers or at least as many of them as would find it possible to do so and belonging to the different camps, to the non-nuclear countries that if nuclear weapons are used against any of them by a nuclear power, the others will rally to their support. This would act as a deterrent to any nuclear power....

We must realise that in the final analysis the effectiveness of any such shield in the field of security would depend not on the spirit in which the protected power accepts such a shield but on the national and vital interests of the giver.

The Hon. Member: Could she tell the House what has been done after April to follow up the initiative that she quite rightly took when Shri Jha was sent along? What has happened since then?

Prime Minister: I do not think it is for us to keep on taking the initiative. We have made our position clear. We have not really had any positive reply.

An Hon. Member: You will neither make an atom bomb, nor accept a nuclear shield. What is the positive policy followed?

Prime Minister: We should work towards certain objectives. If there is no such shield forthcoming for all the non-nuclear powers, we should go a step further which would lead to the banning of the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries, in the same way as the use of poison gas has been, by treaty, declared unlawful. That is the only way in which it would help. That is the whole point about the non-proliferation treaty, that it seeks to stick to

the status quo. It tries to have a freeze. The status quo cannot exist once China is a nuclear power and would not any how be a party to such a treaty.....

I have spoken rather generally about certain matters because I felt that this whole question of foreign policy has to be put in a certain perspective. I would have liked to go in greater detail into certain matters. But I am sure that my colleague, the External Affairs Minister, will do so ably, specially as he has been in very close touch with the leaders of the delegations from other nations at the UN and knows exactly what has been happening there. But I would like to repeat that when it is a question of our security, when it is a question of defending ourselves--of course the Army is very important, it is the first defence---the unity of the people and the impression that we are all solidly behind the Army, is equally important. I do not often agree with Dr. Lohia, but I do agree with what he said with regard to equating poverty and the conditions in the country, with defence and foreign policy. It is a very relevant point and that is why Government's policy in this or in other matters is directed towards taking things in a particular direction which makes it stronger, step by step. We are today not perhaps as strong as we would wish ourselves to be, but we are making every effort to gain that strength, both amongst the people and also in regard to the defence forces. It is this united strength of the people, of the defence forces backed by a united and disciplined people, that will carry us through. I say this about discipline because although Hon. Members opposite would like us to be strong, they are not equally keen on discipline sometimes. But I do not think you can have strength unaccompanied by discipline. So if we take these things together, we will march forward and achieve the objectives of our foreign policy.

USA INDIA KOREA ISRAEL PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

#### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

#### Shri M. C. Chagla's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on July 18, 1967 in reply to the debate on Foreign Affairs:

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the external relations of every country must be based on certain principles, and these principles must be accepted and adopted, taking into consideration the history,

101

the culture, the traditions of that country and also the national interests, security and integrity of the country. Foreign policy is the policy which implements these principles. I agree that these principles must be kept constantly under review. They are not immutable, and when the principles are found, not to conform to national interests, not to conform to the security of the country, not to conform to the integrity of the country, then the principles must be changed. But I do submit that the principle of non-alignment has been basic to our policy.

#### NON-ALIGNMENT

My friend Shri Nath Pai, I think, rather inappropriately used the expression that nonalignment has become a sacred cow. This is a well-known English expression, but it is not at all applicable to India. The cow is very sacred to this country, and if he means that non-alignment was a sacred cow, in that sense, I accept it, but when you look at the results of non-alignment since the freedom of our country, you will agree with me that it has been the right policy.

It is flattering that those friends of mine who used to attack us for pursuing a non-aligned policy are now quarrelling with us for departing from it. There can be no greater tribute to the policy of non-alignment than this type of criticism from the opposite benches.

We were almost the first country to propound this doctrine. I think the greatest contribution that our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru made to political thought was this contribution with regard to the doctrine of non-alignment.

At that time. May I remind the House, ours was a voice in the wilderness. Let us remember what the famous American Secretary of State Dulles said about non-alignment, which he mixed up, as many hon. members opposite have done, as I shall presently show, with neutrality. He said, neutrality was immoral. He could not understand any country being nonaligned. According to him, every country should belong to one bloc or the other.

In the beginning of our independence, the world was polarised between the USSR and the USA. Dr Swell is right in saying that that polarisation is coming to an end. Let us cast our mind back to those years when the world was polarised between the USA and the USSR, the allies of the USA and the allies of the USSR. Today the situation is changing. But in those days, it required courage, independence, a sense of confidence in one's own country, not to belong to either of those two blocs. It was very difficult and yet. India had the courage and the statesmanship to refuse to be inveigled into one bloc or the other. Because of our refusing to join the USA, the USA armed Pakistan, because Pakistan joined the SEATO and CENTO. We said, our people are a determined people; we can rely on our own strength and we will not join either of the two blocs merely to receive arms. Throughout this time, we remained friendly with both the blocs. Non-alignment did not mean that we should show any hostility either to the western bloc or to the eastern bloc, because one of the inevitable concomitants of non-alignment is peaceful co-existence. It flows logically from the doctrine of non-alignment. While we believe in non-alignment, we also believe in maintaining friendly relations with all countries and all blocs. There is nothing more difficult than the art of living together. It is a difficult art....

It is difficult among individuals and within a family. It is difficult in a nation. It is even more difficult in the international field. We are trying to practise that are domestically and internationally. Our principle of secularism is based

on the same principle. In this great country, a country of diversities and different religions, we have tried to live together. Throughout these years, we have tried to live together internationally.

The scene has changed. Today, as has been pointed out by many speakers, there is a detente between the two blocs and they do not want allies. The result has been a process of gradual dissolution of blocs like SEATO, CENTO, even NATO and the Warsaw Pact. They are all in the process of dissolution. With the detente between these two blocs, the necessity for alliances has largely disappeared. Therefore, I said the scene has changed.

What does non-alignment mean? I am sorry that there is a tendency to use that word as if it were synonymous with neutrality. My friend, Mr Madhok, did the same. He said, we were not non-aligned in the dispute between Arabs and Israel. What he was really meaning was, we were not neutral. Neutrality and non-alignment are entirely different concepts. It is very necessary, in order to understand the Government's policy, to realise the fundamental distinction between these two concepts. Neutrality is passive. a withdrawal from the world outside into our own shell, a folding up of our tents and going into isolation. Non-alignment, on the contrary, is positive and dynamic. Being non-aligned, we have the independence to judge world events on merits and in accordance with our own national interest. Therefore, whatever decisions we may arrive at, they may be right or wrong, you may agree with them or not, you may criticise them or may not criticise them, but there is this assurance that our judgments, our decisions and policies are independent and not prescribed by any power; they are not arrived at because we belong

#### 102

to some bloc or because we are the allies of some country. It is a matter of pride to me and it should be a matter of pride to every member of this House that when we look back and think of the contribution that India has made in 20 years in international affairs---(interruptions).

I vividly remember the year 1946 when India sent its first really Indian delegation to the UN. It was selected by the late Prime Minister

Jawaharlal Nehru. I had the honour of being a member of that delegation. It was for the first time in the UN that the voice was raised against apartheid. We condemned the policy of South Africa and that resolution was carried by one vote, although it required a two-thirds majority in a House of 54 members. I make bold to say that since 1946, India has raised her voice constantly, continuously, emphatically and unequivocally against colonialism, against apartheid and in favour of peace. We have fought battles in the forum of the UN and in other forums too.

I have just come back from the United Nations and I want to assure this House that India should feel proud of the honour and respect in which India is held in that organisation. I have seen it for myself. The non-aligned countries and other countries look up to India for guidance and leadership. They look up to India as elder brother and if we are giving guidance and leadership they are prepared to accept it. Yet, here we are saying that our influence is sliding and we have lost all prestige in the international world. Shri Nath Pai said that we have reduced the importance of the United Nations. If any country has tried to uphold the dignity, the usefulness and prestige of the United Nations, that is India. Even in the last crisis, I shall point out as I go along, India did her best to see that the influence of the United Nations was in no way removed or reduced. The Secretary-General has the greatest confidence in India; the Secretary-General consults India's representative very often. We have supported and cooperated with the Secretary-General at various stages of this unfortunate conflict. To say that India is reduced to the level of impotence is defamatory of the Government, I will not say of the country.

#### WEST ASIAN CRISES

The Hon. Member also said that India has failed to uphold peace. I shall again prove, through documentary evidence I have, the steps which India took from time to time and from stage to stage in this crisis which will satisfy the House, that all along we were trying to ask both the parties to exercise restraint---(interruptions).

Let us see what has been happening. Just before Mr. Kosygin came to New York, he went

and saw President Nasser. The President of the USSR was consulting President Nasser while the United Nations Assembly was sitting in New York. Important Russian officials and Ministers had been visiting President Nasser. President Nasser sent his Special Envoy to meet the Prime Minister; President Tito sent his Special Envoy to meet the Prime Minister. This is a return visit to the U.A.R. and to Belgrade. See the situation in which we find ourselves today. The United Nations is deadlocked; the Suez Canal is closed. No compromise seems to appear on the horizon. It is time for us to consult people who are vitally interested in these matters. When I was in New York, Mr. Ezan came to see me, I saw him and I heard his point of view for one hour. I am accessible to everybody; I do not shut my ears to any side.

We have often been told: why don't we keep quiet; how does West Asia concern us; how does Vietnam concern us; how does this country or that country concern us? Let us not forget that India is a member of the Security Council. As a member of the Security Council, it has got to review and pass judgment on world events. Is it suggested that as a member of the Security Council it should take no notice of what is happening in different parts of the world? Injustice, aggression, breach of faith or confidence, tyranny, colonialism are all the concern of India and will always remain so. I think it is wrong for anybody to say that India should keep quiet when things are happening which call for our judgment, our decision and our appraisement. I would, therefore, ask the House to judge the West Asian conflict in this context. May I preface this by saying that although we are non-aligned, although our West Asian policy was not dictated by any power---it was our own independent policy---we could not remain neutral. We had to pass judgment and it is for the House---after I have stated the facts ---to judge whether our judgment was right or wrong.

Let us first come to the most important question on which the House has taken up such a strong attitude about Israeli aggression. Let us see what President de Gaulle says. On June 2, a statement was issued in the name of President de Gaulle after a French Cabinet meeting in which it was stated that the country which is the first to use arms, whichever that be, will neither have our approval, that is, the French Government's approval, nor French support.

In another statement issued on the 22nd June, after a French Cabinet meeting. President

103

de Gaulle said:

``France condemns opening of hostilities by Israel."

That is President de Gaulle's view. That is not all.

Let us come to the paper which is very dear to the hearts of many, the American publication. the Time. It says:

"Israel scarcely bothers to deny any longer that it started shooting first. On the day before the guns opened up, the Israeli Cabinet met secretly to discuss whether to launch a preemptive attack before the gathering Arab armies struck. Mr. Abba Eban argued for further diplomatic efforts. Defence Minister Mr. Dayan insisted that the safety of the nation could not permit delay. Mr. Dayan carried the day. The attack was authorised by a vote of 16 to 2....the only ways being cost by the left-wing Socialists."

Here is the evidence of 2 completely detached objective witnesses, President de Gaulle and an American publication like the Time.

Then, Mr. Masani said, in the course of his interesting speech, that we are isolated. Mr. Nath Pai said that we have lost our influence and we are isolated. May I for the information of the House point out which countries, apart from the socialist bloc, apart from the Arab bloc, voted for the non-aligned nations' resolution? It is very revealing.

The basis of the non-aligned nations resolution was the aggression committed by Israel and the resolution wanted Israel to vacate the aggression, to give up the fruits of aggression, and to go back to the line of the 4th June from where they started. It is worth seeing who voted with us.

Were we alone in the camp? Were we isolated or was there a large volume of world public opinion on our side? Look at the countries who voted with us---Spain, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Camaroons, Ceylon, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, France, Greece, Indonesia, Iraq, Japan, Malaysia, Mauritannia, Nigeria and Pakistan...

There are two significant and important facts about the Israeli aggression to which I wanted to draw the attention of the House. The House will remember that President Johnson told President Nasser that he wanted to send vice-President Humphrey to confer with him and the reply that President Nasser gave was that he would not like to receive Vice President Humphrey, but he would send his Vice-President, Mr. Mohiuddin, to meet President Johnson to discuss the ways and means of settling this problem. Vice President Mohiuddin was to have left for the United States on the 5th June and before he could leave, before he could confer with President Johnson, Israel struck the blow.

The second important fact to which I wanted to draw the attention of the House is that Mr. U Thant had gone to see President Nasser after the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and withdrawal of UNEF. They were discussing the ways and means of settling the Aquaba problem; they were discussing how the Gulf of Aqaba could be used, what would be the modus operandi within the sovereign framework of Egypt. While the discussions were going on, Israel struck the blow, which made any settlement impossible.

It has been said, and I think erroneously, that a pre-emptive strike, a preventive war, is permissible. I say that it is a complete violation of the Charter; it is not open to a country to indulge in a pre-emptive strike or a preventive war, and the most that the advocates of Israel say is that this was a preventive war in which Israel indulged.

I am surprised at some Hon. Members comparing the Indo-Pakistan conflict with the Israel conflict. In saying this, does the House realise that we are accepting the Pakistani propaganda? What does Pakistan say? Pakistan says that we committed aggression..(Interruptions).

I am telling you what Pakistan says. Pakistan

says that we committed agression because we crossed the international line, taking the date of the conflict, as if it was the date, on which we crossed the international line, forgetting completely what happened before. The House knows full well what the facts are. The facts are that infiltrators were sent by Pakistanis to Kashmir. Then their Army marched towards Chhamb, they wanted to cut off our life-line to our armies in Ladakh. It was at that stage that we crossed the international line and our armies marched towards Lahore and Sialkot... How can you compare this with the Israel conflict? Did Egypt march her troops into Israel? Did she send infiltrators? (Interruptions).

I now turn to the pleasant subject introduced by Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha. I was surprised to hear from her that no aggression could be committed because Israel and Arab States were in a state of war. This is an astounding proposition to make that they were in a state of war. It means that the Armistice had not been followed by a peace treaty. According to Mrs. Tarkeshwari Sinha, it was open to Israel to attack the Arab countries and this attack would not constitute an aggression. It is absolutely opposed to every principle of international law and international relations. Two countries stop fighting; they may have an armistice; they may not have concluded peace treaty. It is not open, while the armistice is there and there is no conflict going on, for a country to attack another...

#### 104

Mrs. Sinha pleads her case with very persuasive advocacy. But, if I may say so, there is one shortcoming. Once she has got hold of an idea, she fondles it, she plays with it, she nibbles at it, she does not let it go even after the idea has lost all its substance. One of the ideas she has caught hold of and which she has repeated on several occasions and at several places is that the whole trouble is due to the first sentence in my statement. Let me read out this classic sentence which, according to Mrs. Sinha, has created the trouble, I will read and explain it. This is the sentence:

"The creation of Israel has given rise to tension between Israel and the Arab countries."

It is a factual statement. Any one who knows

the history of the Middle East knows the feelings of the Arabs aroused by the creation of Israel because they felt that the Palestinians were driven out and the Jews were put in the place of the home of Palestinians. As a matter of fact, tension was created. But does it mean what it has been suggested to mean that we have not recognised Israel or that we agree that there should be tension. We have recognised Israel...That is not the question. I am only saying this. What is wrong in this sentence? It is factually correct.

The other part to which Mrs. Sinha has referred is what I said in the statement about the Gulf of Aqaba. This also will answer the question about the closure of the Gulf of Aqaba being a casus belli.

#### We said only this:

"News has been received of the UAR decision to close the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping and to other shipping carrying strategic goods for Israel. So far as the Government of India are concerned, we have taken the position as far back as 1957 that the Gulf of Aqaba is an inland sea and that the entry to the Gulf lies within the territorial waters of the UAR and Saudi Arabia. We adhere to this view".

Two views have been put forward. Is the Gulf of Aqaba within the territorial waters of the UAR? Or is it an international waterway? (Interruptions).

Now, may I read out what Mr. Dulles had said about it in 1957, that is, about the Gulf of Aqaba. Mr. Dulles had said:

"I think that it is the fact that a certain amount of shipping is or shortly will be passing through the Straits of Tiran; although I also think that it is important to get a decision by the International Court of Justice as to what the legal rights of the parties are. It would be very helpful, I think, and it should be helpful also from the Egyptian standpoint to get a decision on that matter, and consideration is now being given to ways and means of seeking an advisory opinion on that matter from the International Court of Justice".

So, it is clear that on the 26th March, 1957, the

Secretary of State of the United States had said that it was not a settled question, and he had wanted the opinion of the International Court of Justice.

This is what Mr. George Brown, British Foreign Secretary, says ten years later in the House of Commons:

"I am bound to say that there is a case which the Arabs can deploy; it is a case which has not only plausibility but legality and force".

Now, in the face of this, how could it be said that when Egypt exercised her sovereign rights, which according to her are sovereign rights, in closing the Gulf of Aqaba which she said was within her territorial waters, it constituted a casus belli for Israel? How could it be said?...

Let me satisfy this House as to what steps we took in the Security Council in order to preserve peace. It was largely at our instance that U Thant went to see President Nasser to try and see if some settlement could be arrived at, and we wanted the Council to be adjourned till he came back with a report. We felt that to have the Security Council without the presence of the Secretary-General would be like enacting Hamlet without the Prince of Denmark.

Then, we wanted---and this is very important---a holding resolution to be passed asking parties to exercise restraint. We actually moved it; it was not carried, but we said, call upon both parties to exercise restraint, let there be quiet diplomacy, let there be a breathing spell. We were urging the Members all the time to accept a resolution of this character.

Then, on the 5th June, Israel started hostilities against the Arab countries, and on the same day, we proposed a resolution for cease-fire and withdrawal. On 5th June we did not know how the fortunes of war had gone. We did not know who was winning and who was losing. But on principle we said that if armed conflict broke out it was necessary for the parties immediately to have a cease-fire and to withdraw. This was the resolution we moved on the 5th June.

Ultimately as the House knows, on the 6th June, a simple cease-fire resolution was passed as a first step. Then came the emergency session.

Why have we supported the non-aligned resolution on withdrawals? We supported it because our view is, and I want the House to endorse this because this is an important matter from the point of view of not only this conflict but of the future, that no aggressor should be permitted to retain

105

the fruits of aggression, that no aggressor should be permitted to negotiate from strength derived as a result of military conquest. And we said that both in logic and in sequence of time, the second step was to be withdrawal. We did not say that the other matters should not be discussed, such as the navigation of the Suez Canal, the navigation of Aqaba, the recognition of Israel, the question of refugees etc.; we said that all those should be discussed, but first thing should come first, and the next step after cease-fire was the withdrawal of troops.

Now, may I read a passage from the statement I made in the General Assembly. And I would ask the House's endorsement of what I said there because, as I have said, it has important repercussions with regard to the future. This was what I said on the question of withdrawal:

"Mr. President, we are second to none in desiring a return to peace in the area but it must be a lasting one. It is important for us to remember, however, that an enduring peace can be established in West Asia and elsewhere only if in this world body, we can all act together to ensuring strict adherence to certain basic values and fundamental principles of international law, practice, morality and behaviour...

I will attempt to summarise some of these cardinal principles. First, it is not open to a country to start a war merely because it feels that a threat to its security exists. If it thinks that such a threat exists, the Charter prescribes various courses of action open to it through peaceful means, and of course, it can come to the Security Council. But it is in the spirit and letter of the Charter illegal to deal with a threat which one State thinks is being held out by a neighbouring State through recourse to arms.

Secondly, no aggressor should be permitted to retain the fruits of his aggression.

Thirdly, it is not permissible for a country to acquire territory of another State in order to be able to bargain from a position of strength.

And finally....
--and this is very important-...rights cannot be established, territorial disputes cannot be settled, boundaries cannot be adjusted through armed conflict".

All that we say is that first you must go back. You cannot remain in some others territory and try to settle your dispute through military force or military acquisition. Just see what would happen. All over the world, there are boundary disputes, in Africa, in Asia. Are you going to permit a country to march its troops into the territory of another country, sit tight on it and then say 'Now negotiate; till you negotiate, I will not withdraw'.

What is happening today in West Asia? The. Israelis are there on the territories of the Arabs. It they remain there, they are in violation of the principles of the, U.N. Charter. What we are trying to see is to prevent violation of the principles of the Charter.

Another result of this, as you must have seen, is that Israel goes on consolidating her strength. She has annexed Jerusalem. Their Prime Minister said the other day that she wants to annex the Gaza Strip. I do not know where this matter will end.

Therefore, it is of the utmost importance that there should be withdrawal of the Israeli troops... I have been told that this policy is not in consonance with our national interests. Fortunately, the policy we have followed in West Asia is in consonance with both right and justice and also our national interests. May I point out what our national interests are? It is absolutely necessary in our national interest that we should have a friendly Middle East, It is a strategic part of the world. It is the cross-roads of the world, and strategically it is of the utmost importance for India to see that we have a friendly Middle East. We have trade of a hundred crore of rupees with

the Middle East.

We have got 50,000 Indians residing there, engaged in gainful occupations and professions. It is, essential from our point of view that the Suez Canal should be in friendly hands. It is essential from our strategic point of view that oil, which we import from the Middle East, should come from countries which are, friendly to us; and it is also in our national interest that the Persian Gulf, because of strategic reasons, should be in friendly hands. Therefore, as I said, the justice of the Arab cause and our own national interest dictated the policy we pursued...

Some Hon. Members said that the friendship between Prime Minister Nehru and President Nasser was the basis of our friendship with Egypt. Foreign policies are not evolved out of personal friendships, and the reason why India stood by Nasser, and stands by Nasser, is because he represents in the Arab world certain forces which we must support. These are the forces of progress, of socialism, of non-alignment, of secularism...As I said, he represents the forces, of progress. He was opposed to Muslim fanaticism; he was opposed to the, Muslim brotherhood and, therefore, it was in the interest of India to support and strengthen the causes for which Nasser stood.

Now, one more thing about West Asia and I have finished with that. I am surprised that my hon, friend, Shri Madhok, should not have said

106

one word of condemnation of Israel about the 14 brave and gallant Indian soldiers in the UNEF who were killed...

Shri Madhok suggested that we are guilty in not evacuating them by air, that we were carried away because of some considerations of economy (Interruptions). That is not so. I have got the document. The UNEF continued to remain as an organisation under the orders of UNO upto the 17th of June.

The UN had drawn up a programme of evacuation till 17 June of the various countries contingents. Six countries were involved, With regard to Canada, because of sonic reason, President Nasser asked the Canadians immediately to get

out, and they were evacuated by that country. In our case and in the case. of the countries like Brazil, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia, a time schedule was laid down. Till the evacuation was completed, our contingent was entirely under the orders of the UNO. Therefore, this is no excuse or explanation for the action of Israel.

#### NUCLEAR UMBRELLA

I agree that our security should be one of the most important aspects of our policy. Shri Masani suggested that we should get under somebody or other's nuclear umbrella and we should sign the non-proliferation treaty on the dotted line. Now, I disagree with both these propositions (Interruptions).

An Hon. Member: What did the Prime Minister say?

Minister of External Affairs: The Prime Minister said the same thing. I wish to make it clear that a guarantee depends upon its credibility, not credibility today but credibility when the guarantor is called upon to implement the guarantee. We do not know what the alignments of power might be after four or five years. Therefore, before we accept a nuclear guarantee or come under anybody's nuclear umbrella, we have to consider what effect it will have on our defence and security.

I think Shri Masani is also wrong and is not fair to our scientists when he said that the nuclear gulf between China and India is so wide, and is widening every day, that it was impossible for our scientists to bridge it. It is not that we cannot manufacture the bomb. We will not manufacture the bomb as, a matter of policy. I have great faith in our scientists, and if we determine upon a different policy, our scientists can do what we ask them to do.

As regards the, nuclear treaty I gave an answer at some length in this House yesterday. I do not want to repeat it, but I want to make this clear that the question of guarantee should not be mixed up with the question of signing the non-proliferation treaty. The two questions stand apart.

**CHINA** 

I will briefly deal with some other questions about China and Pakistan. China's explosion of the hydrogen bomb has naturally added a new dimension to our defence problem, and we have to carefully consider what effect it is going toil have on our defence strategy and also on our policy decisions.

It is not right for me to comment on the internal affairs of another country. The cultural revolution of China is its own affair, but when that cultural revolution impinges upon our own security and threatens our security, it is but right that we should comment on it and consider its implications. There is no doubt that recently the Chinese. note has taken on a greater bellicocity and a greater belligerency. She is more and more interfering in the internal affairs of other countries including our own, and her whole attitude seems to be that she wants to subvert the governments of independent countries through setting up revolutionary bodies in those countries with dissatisfied elements, seditionist elements, rebellious elements, so that the Governments could be overthrown. It is happening now in Burma, they are threatening Nepal, Malaysia has its own problems, Indonesia has its own problems.

#### SOUTH EAST ASIA

In our opinion, the best way to meet the Chinese threat is economic strength. We have to see that the South East Asian countries are friendly to us and are strong. We are very happy in our relations with these countries. Burma is on the best of terms with us. We have just signed a boundary agreement. Nepal is an the best of terms. So are Ceylon and Afghanistan. As regards South East Asia, we have friendly countries in Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia, and our policy is to have bilateral agreements with them, to have economic co-operation with them, to strengthen them economically, so that they are in a position to resist Chinese subversion.

I also agree with Mr. Madhok that we should have stronger cultural ties with South Fast Asia. Indian culture, Sanskrit culture, has spread to all these countries. In Malaysia, they had the finest ballet depicting stories from the Ramayana. Malay-

sia has got a large number of Sanskrit words in its language and there is a great deal of Sanskrit culture, and we should try and see that these cultural ties are strengthened.

The question was also raised about Indians who have accepted foreign citizenship. Our

107

policy on this is quite clear. When Indians accept foreign citizenship, we tell them that they must show loyalty to that country of which they have become citizens. They may have cultural ties with India, but they must show an involvement in the affairs of their own country, join economic ventures, invest money, because they have become citizens of those countries. As far as those who are Indian citizens who have not given up their citizenship are concerned, we accept the responsibility and we try to took after them.

#### **PAKISTAN**

Coming to Pakistan, I am sorry to report to this House that, as the House knows, not-withstanding all our efforts, relations between Pakistan and ourselves are not good, and all our attempts at implementing the Tashkent Declaration have so far failed. Mr. Madhok said we should not show any appeasement towards Pakistan. I agree. But settling with Pakistan without sacrificing national interests is not appeasement, but statesmanship, and I assure the House that whatever agreement we may arrive at with Pakistan, assuming we do, would not be at the sacrifice of our national interests.

Pakistan should realise that we have no design on her territory. Pakistan should realise that however much some of us might deplore the partition of 1947 we have accepted this as a fact of history, we recognise Pakistan, and therefore it seems to us that there is no reason why Pakistan should increase her armed strength. Against whom is she arming except against us, because she has no other country except India whom she looks upon as her enemy.

But Pakistan's alliance with China adds a new dimension to our relations with Pakistan. There is no doubt that the two countries are acting in collusion. My colleague, the Defence Minister, said the other day that both countries are helping the Naga hostiles, the Mizo hostiles and other rebels and secessionists on our frontiers, and, as I said, this adds a new dimension to our relations with Pakistan, because, let us not forget that China is interested in seeing that there is no settlement between India and Pakistan. She was the only country that denounced the Tashkent Agreement, and she desires nothing more than the fact that conflict between India and Pakistan, or the bad relations between India and Pakistan, should go on.

#### **VIETNAM**

One word about Viet Nam. I do not think that Mrs. Pandit was fair to the Government when she said that apart from stating from time to time that we wanted an unconditional cessation of bombing Government had not done any thing in the matter. I assure the House that ever since this conflict started, India through diplomatic channels and other channels has been working for it settlement.

An Hon. Member : Have you condemned aggression in unequivocal terms ?

Minister of External Affairs: We have said what we thought was right. I was meeting Mrs. Pandit's point that we have done nothing in the cause of peace, of settlement. I assure her that we have supported U Thant's mission, and we are constantly in touch with various countries diplomatically to see how this terrible conflict can be brought to an end.

One word and I have finished, and this is about what Mr. Madhok said, I am sorry he said it, about the lobbies in the External Affairs Ministry. I wish he had not said it. He said there were Pakistani lobbies, Arab lobbies, American lobbies, Russian lobbies, in the External Affairs Ministry, but not Indian lobbies. I wish to assure the House that since I became External Affairs Minister and since I have seen the work of my officers, I am absolutely convinced that no Minister could have had a body of more dedicated and devoted people than the officers of the External Affairs Ministry. Their patriotism is beyond all doubt and dispute. They might have different opinions and they ex-

press them, which they should. Do not forget that it is the Minister who decides. I must take the responsibility for their action. Do not blame the officers behind me. You attack me; I will face it. But do not attack people who cannot come here and defend themselves. You are undermining the morale of a very fine service. And it is not right that these allegations should be made-baseless allegations. Why don't you attack me if anything goes wrong? After all, the officers give us advice, and we Ministers are ultimately responsible. That is the meaning of ministerial responsibility. In Parliament. the Minister takes responsibility for the action of his officers. I take the full responsibility. If there is a wrong decision, if a wrong act is done, you may attack me and say I am wrong. But please do not say that this is due to a lobby or is due to want of patriotism on the part of the officers of the Ministry.

I am sorry I have taken such a long time, but the debate has been long and there were some interruptions, and so it took me some time. As somebody has said, I wish our foreign policy is bipartisan, and is the foreign policy of the nation and the whole nation should accept the foreign policy of the country. It strengthens the Government when everybody is agreed with the

108

foreign policy. I hope that by and large not only those behind me but those opposite me will support the foreign policy of the Government and say that the Government has done its best to enhance the prestige of the country, to improve the image of the country and to fight for jug causes, the cause of freedom, the cause of peace, the cause of anti-colonialism and the causes which have always commanded our respect and our loyalty.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN POLAND ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SOUTH AFRICA RUSSIA YUGOSLAVIA VIETNAM FRANCE AFGHANISTAN SPAIN BURMA CAMBODIA CONGO CUBA CYPRUS GREECE INDONESIA IRAQ JAPAN MALAYSIA NIGER NIGERIA EGYPT SAUDI ARABIA IRAN DENMARK CANADA BRAZIL NORWAY SWEDEN CHINA NEPAL REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Forcible, Occupation of Indian Territory by Pakistan

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on July 13, 1967 about the forcible possession of 748 bighas of Indian territory by Pakistan:

The Chief Minister of Assam, while answering a question in the State Assembly on 6-7-1967, had stated that approximately 748 bighas of land in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area of Assam had been occupied by Pakistan. The Chief Minister was referring to a working arrangement which has been arrived at between India and Pakistan in the Lathitilla-Dumabari area. The circumstances under which this working arrangement was arrived at are given below:

The dispute concerns the interpretation of the Radcliffe Award in respect of five villages known as Putnigaon, Karkhana Putnigaon, Borputnigaon, Lathitilla and Dumabari in the Cacher-Sylhet sector of the Assam-East Pakistan border. The total area of these five villages is 1.84 sq. miles. The dispute arose due to divergence between the description of the boundary line in the Radcliffe Award and the map showing the line accompanying the description. Pakistan considers that the description and the map agree inter se whereas India holds that the description in the Award does not tally with the line drawn on the map and consequently the line is not acceptable in terms of the specific proviso made by Sir Radcliffe himself that "in the event of any divergence between the line as delineated on the map and as described the written description is to prevail.

As a result of this difference of interpretation of the Radcliffe Award, this area became the scene of border firings on quite a few occasions

in the past. After some negotiations, a military working boundary was agreed upon by the two countries in this region in 1959, it was agreed that until the demarcation has been completed, civilian jurisdiction in the area will vest in the Assam Government. However, Pakistan started violating the status quo through intrusions and encroachments into the villages in question since January 1962. By November, 1962, Pakistan had occupied the entire Lathitilla. village and by July, 1963, she had extended her forcible occupation to part of Dumabari village as well.

Efforts made to bring peace to this area did not succeed, and Pakistan maintained the tension by resorting to periodic firings.

In an effort to reduce tension in this area, an offer was made to the Government of Pakistan through diplomatic channels in August, 1933, for a crash demarcation of this area by the Central Surveys of India and Pakistan. Two meetings were held between the Surveyors-General of India and Pakistan at Dacca and New Delhi in December, 1963 and January, 1964. These meetings, however, proved infructuous and Pakistanis did not even agree to sign the minutes of the meetings.

No further progress in regard to the settlement of this dispute could be made despite our efforts. The intermittent firings continued. The September, 1965 conflict intervened meanwhile.

109

After the signing of the Tashkent Declaration, the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, Eastern Command of India and the General officer Commanding, 14th infantry Division of Pakistan met on February 1, 1966 with the object of finding ways and means of reducing tension on the Eastern borders with Pakistan. In pursuance of the agreement reached at this meeting, the Sector Commanders of India and Pakistan held a meeting at Lathitilla on February 8, 1966 at which a military working boundary in respect of these five villages was agreed upon. According to this working arrangement, Pakistan retained possession of about 249 acres (approx. 748 bighas) of various types of land belonging to 4 out of the 5 villages referred to earlier. The village Putnigaon was not affected

by this working boundary.

The above, working boundary agreement betwow the Sector Commanders is only a temporary arrangement, and does not bestow any permanent rights on either side. This fact has been clearly mentioned in the agreement itself. it will hold good only as long as the border in this area is not permanently demarcated by the Survey officials of the two sides.

I may state here that the Directors of Land Records & Surveys of Assam and East Pakistan are meeting periodically to draw up programmes for demarcation of the Assam-East Pakistan border. The demarcation in this area is yet to be jointly carried out and that would finally settle the matter and possession duly transferred to the concerned States.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA UZBEKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **PAKISTAN**

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on Indian Detenus in Pakistan.

The following is the text of the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs, Shri M. C. Chagla, in the Lok Sabha on July 11, 1967, regarding repatriation of Indian nationals detained in Pakistan:

On the outbreak of hostilities between India and Pakistan in September, 1965, a total of 3,886 Indian nationals living in Pakistan were interned by the Government of Pakistan on various charges. These persons were detained in a large number of camps--both in West and East Pakistan. After the cessation of hostilities, repatriation of these Indian nationals was arranged by air, land and sea routes and by 16-2-1966,

most of them were repatriated.

As for the Indians still remaining in Pakistani jails, the Government of Pakistan were requested by us to give their complete particulars, such as the charges levelled against them, the terms of imprisonment, the places of detention etc., to enable us to bring them back to India. They did not give us this information. Later on, however, they gave us on a number of occasions lists of persons who had completed their terms of imprisonment and were available for repatriation to India. After ascertaining the Indian nationality of such persons we asked our High Commission in Pakistan to make arrangements for their repatriation. In all such cases, officials of our High Commission escorted the repatriates up to the border and the State Governments concerned made necessary arrangements for their travel. to their home towns in India after they crossed the border.

So far a total of 228 persons who were released from the Pakistani detention camps have crossed into India in five different batches. According to information made available to the Government of India by the Government of Pakistan, there are still 77 persons undergoing detention.

The Government of India have been making persistent efforts to persuade the Government of Pakistan to release the persons who are still in detention. The living conditions in these detention camps are reported to be very bad. The Indian High Commission officials in Pakistan try to visit such detention camps in order to interview the detenus and keep their relatives in India informed of their condition. Special efforts are being made by us to secure the release of certain innocent persons, a few of whom are actually minors who inadvertantly crossed into Pakistan. Unfortunately, we have not succeeded in our efforts so far.

110

PAKISTAN INDIA USA **Date**: Jul 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid Loan to India

An Indo-British agreement for a loan of (pond)12 millions (Rs. 25.2 crores) was signed in New Delhi on July 21, 1967 by Shri S. Jagannathan, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. John Freeman, British High Commissioner in New Delhi.

As in the case of other British loans to India in recent years, this loan will also be for 25 years free of interest, with repayments beginning after the seventh year. Most of the loan will be used to refinance service payments which fall due in the first half of the financial year on aid loans given in the years 1958 to 1962. The balance of the (pond) 12 millon loan is being given as general purpose aid for the purchase of goods and services from the U.K.

The present loan is the second from Britain to India this year. The first loan, of (pond) 7 millions (Rs. 14.7 crores), was signed on June 19 and was for non-project aid for British-oriented industries in India. The present loan completes the commitment of the advance offer of Z 19 millions (Rs. 39.9 crores) by Britain as part of her total aid pledge to India for 1967-68, at the meeting of the Aid India Consortium in Paris in April this year.

As a further measure, Britain has agreed to re-allocate to general purposes some (pond) 1.7 millions (Rs. 3.5 crores) of past aid loans originally earmarked for projects which remain undisbursed; this money can, therefore, be immediately used by India.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **WEST ASIA**

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the General Assembly

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on July 4, 1967 on West Asia:

Our deliberations in the General Assembly have shown that the United Nations is anxiously concerned about the grave situation in West Asia. A great number of delegations have clearly supported-and none has challenged---the cardinal principle of the Charter that force shall not be used in settling disputes and that the United Nations will not recognize any advantage, territorial or otherwise, pined through force.

We are deeply interested in bringing about conditions for the establishment of a just and durable peace in the entire region of West Asia. My delegation is aware of the existence of a number of serious problems and issues in West Asia and does not minimize their complexity, but we are not pessimistic about the possibilities of a peaceful resolution of those difficulties. It is our firm belief that these problems can be dealt with on the basis of first things coming first. We have been accused of giving a prescription for renewed hostilities; on the contrary, what we have been proposing is a recipe for the restoration of peaceful conditions and the establishment of a durable peace. As

111

we conceive it, there should be reversion to the Armistice Agreements, respect for which should be ensured by UNTSO.

We are convinced that once the central issue of withdrawals is tackled, all other problems will fall into their proper perspective and can be dealt with in their turn. However, to make withdrawals conditional on the settlement of long standing and complex disputes, in an atmosphere of tension, can only place an intolerable strain on the efforts at peaceful settlement and will come in the way of the establishment of lasting peace.

As representatives are aware, India is a cosponsor of the draft resolution contained in document A/L.522/Rev.3. We co-sponsored this draft resolution because, in our view, as was explained by the Foreign Minister of India on 22 June, 1967, the first and most essential step to bring about peace and stability in West Asia is the withdrawal of Israeli armed force,; to the positions they held prior to the outbreak of the recent hostilities. That is the one and only step which the General Assembly can take, leaving the rest of the issues to the Security Council for solutions and adjustments.

My delegation's attitude to the other draft resolutions and amendments will be governed by the principle I have just mentioned.

My delegation appreciates the concern of our Latin American colleagues and their sincere efforts in putting forward draft resolution A/L. 523. Nevertheless, we must frankly state that the Latin American draft falls short of the accepted principle and the primary objective which I mentioned earlier. It couples withdrawals with the settlement of complicated issues, and thus it becomes a formula for bargaining from a position of strength by Israel.

We have given very careful consideration to the draft, and our view is that it would lead to a deadlock because it does not give primacy to the central issue of immediate withdrawals. No State Member of the United Nations, particularly no small State, could ever agree to negotiate so long as alien armed forces remain on its soil and it is subjected to duress.

We have in the last twenty-four hours tried hard with our Latin American colleagues to find a basis for a common approach, but regrettably we have failed because of a profound disagreement on the necessity of bringing about immediate withdrawals before consideration could be given to any other issue. This is an issue of principle for us, and therefore my delegation will vote against the Latin American draft.

A few moments ago the representative of Trinidad and Tobago said that our draft resolution does not go far enough. I hope that what I have just stated proves that ours is a much more practical and step-by-step approach. Our complaint is that the Latin American draft resolution ignores the history of the Middle East during the last twenty years. If the Arab States have refused to change their attitude for the last twenty years, is it fair to ask them to do so now when alien armies occupy vast chunks of their territory? Is it right for this Assembly to tell the Arab States that Israel need not withdraw its armed forces so long as the Arabs do not, side by side, recognize Israel, do not end the state of belligerency, do not agree to maritime passage-in fact, do not agree to a host of conditions?

The approach of the Latin American draft resolution, if approved by the General Assembly, will have far-reaching and deleterious consequences for most Member States, to whichever part of the world they might belong.

I now come to the two sets of amendments submitted by the delegations of Albania and Cuba respectively to draft resolution A/L.522/ Rev.3. My delegation stands solidly behind the non-aligned and Afro-Asian draft resolution which it has co-sponsored. This draft resolution has been hammered out after the most careful consideration, and it is consistent with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. In our view, it provides a chance towards a just and peaceful resolution of the very difficult and dangerous situation prevailing in West Asia. What we are anxious for is to move constructively towards finding a way for the reestablishment of peace on the basis of the principles and purposes of the Charter. We cannot, therefore, countenance any move which thwarts our draft resolution by bringing in all kinds of amendments. The amendments before the Assembly do not represent a constructive. approach which can find broad support. My

delegation therefore cannot support either of the two amendments.

112

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ISRAEL ALBANIA CUBA

**Date**: Jul 01, 1967

# August

# Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record

1967

Vol. XIII

AUGUST

No. 8

**CONTENTS** 

**PAGE** 

DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament

113

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Credit Agreement

115

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Message on Independence Day 115

JAPAN

Shri Morarji Desai's Speech at Luncheon by Foreign

Correspondents' Club 117

**PAKISTAN** 

India's Protest against Ill-treatment of Indian Officials by

Pakistani Police120

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Indo-Pakistan Border Incident 121

**SINGAPORE** 

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on People of Indian Origin

in Singapore

122

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

USA GERMANY JAPAN PAKISTAN INDIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement in Eighteen Nation Committee on Disarmament

Shri V. C. Trivedi, Indian Ambassador in Switzerland and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, made the following statement in the Committee in Geneva on August 10, 1967:

There was really no need for me to speak this morning, but I thought I should not let the day pass without some thoughts being discussed in our Committee, particularly following two of the most outstanding contributions we have heard from representatives for a long time. We have listened to an inspiring and thought-provoking address by the Foreign Minister of Italy, Mr. Fanfani (ENDC/PV. 318); and we have heard, after a certain lapse of time, a very illuminating and interesting statement by the representative of Romania (ENDC/PV. 320). I think that both those statements will remain outstanding contributions to our debate.

Of course, the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Italy will need to be studied very carefully by all countries-nuclear-weapon Powers and non-nuclear-weapon Powers-by members of this Committee and members of the world community outside this Committee. However, I thought I should point out that that particular statement by the Foreign Minister of Italy and the one made by the Foreign Minister two years ago (ENDC/PV. 219) were both based on the correct approach to the question of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, the approach being that non-proliferation is not Simply a matter of asking only the non-nuclear countries to do something. It will be recalled that in his memorable appeal two years ago he said that the nuclear Powers would have to under-take measures of disarmament and that, pending that, certain things should be done (ibid., pp. 18, 19). In my view, the present proposal also is posited on that philosophy.

A similar comment applies to the statement made by the representative of Romania. The principles outlined by him, particularly referring to the question of the obligations of the nuclear-weapon Powers, to the need for a non-discriminatory treaty and to the need for placing no impediments whatsoever in the way of the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes-which he said was one of the cardinal principles-are, I believe, the principles which we should all consider in our examination of a draft treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

While speaking this morning, I should like to mention that we have always maintained that the two considerations we must bear in mind if we wish to avoid dissemination of nuclear weapons to additional countries are first prestige and secondly, security. The Indian delegation has spoken about those matters at great length on various occasions.

Sometimes it is not realized that, without consciously making any efforts in that direction. some of us may be making propositions which invest the nuclear-weapon Powers with prestige, with a specialty privileged position. If it is argued, for example, that the Charter gives special privileges to the permanent members of the Security Council, the present members of the

nuclear-weapon club-that because they are permanent members of the Security Council they should have nuclear weapons-that is the most fallacious argument in the world, and I hope it will never be used, for it can never be accepted by the countries of the world. First of all, of course, the Charter does not say that the permanent members of the Security Council shall have nuclear weapons, nor does the Charter suggest that those permanent members alone should be allowed to acquire nuclear weapons, that--despite the Irish resolution (A/RES/ 1665(XVI) exceptions would be made in their case. Nor were the earlier proposals, such as the Baruch plan, the Gromyko plan and all the other plans, insincere or meant to apply only after the five members had acquired nuclear weapons. That is not the position. If it is

113

contended that because a permament member has nuclear weapons it should be allowed to have them and others should not, that is an argument which the peoples of the world will never accept. I know that is not intended; but we must not be led, even by implication--as I said, unconsciously-into that kind of thinking.

Another argument which has been used is the one about "neighbours": that if one country acquires nuclear weapons its neighbour will acquire nuclear weapons; that, for example, if the Soviet Union acquires nuclear weapons, Finland will acquire such weapons, or that if the United States acquires such weapons, Cuba must acquire such weapons. That kind of argument does not carry any conviction; in fact it justifies the fear of countries that their neighbours. may have acquired nuclear weapons. In fact that is an argument that should have been used earlier for preventing the third Power, the fourth Power and the fifth Power from acquiring nuclear weapons. You must not say, "For the five Powers it is all right; but if the sixth Power acquires nuclear weapons there may be a seventh, eighth and ninth." It just does not stand to reason.

In fact that argument supports the thesis that the only way to prevent the spreading of nuclear weapons to other countries--to neighbourscan be prevented only if the existing nuclear Powers do something about it. That is the thesis that has been used throughout in our discussions on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, the argument, for example, that because the United Kingdom has nuclear weapons Iceland should have nuclear weapons does not carry any conviction. Unfortunately, every country has disputes with its neighbours, but that does not mean that the possession of nuclear weapons by certain countries is justified or that the acquisition of such weapons by certain countries is justified.

In any event, the case for non-proliferation of nuclear weapons relies not on bogies but on real fundamental grounds, on grounds that make it necessary for us to attempt to eradicate the nuclear menace. The first step is to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons. That should be a constructive step, a genuine step, a step which really prevents proliferation of nuclear weapons by nuclear Powers or non-nuclear Powers.

Then there is the question of security. It is quite true that real security lies in disarmament. The Indian delegation has always maintained and continues to maintain that one cannot possibly have security under a regime of nuclear weapons. At the same time, it is unfortunate that the possessors of nuclear weapons have always linked such weapons with the question of security. For example, whenever propositions have been put forward for nuclear-free zones, they have said that they could not permit them, because that would affect their security. Whenever propositions have been put forward for reductions of the stockpiles of nuclear delivery vehicles---drastic and substantial reductions---they have said that they could not make such reductions, because that would affect their security.

When propositions have been put forward to give assurances that nuclear weapons would not be used against countries not possessing them or having them in their territories, the argument has been used that that would affect. the concepts of military planning and strategy for security.

The very fact that there are military pacts has been justified in arguments on the grounds of

security; otherwise the simple answer would be to dissolve the security pacts. It is not correct to say that there is no security problem. If there were no security problems, why should there be any security pacts-the NATO and Warsaw pacts and the little subsidiary pacts?

While talking about security I should also mention that when the question of the "cut-off" of fissile material has been put forward the question of security has again been brought in.

The question of security is important also because at least one country which has acquired nuclear weapons has publicly stated that nuclear weapons are meant as an instrument of its State policy, as an instrument for liberating people, as an instrument of war, as an instrument of some kind of revolution, cultural or otherwise. It is a question of security.

Therefore, when we are talking about a treaty which will require countries to take certain steps for the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons, the questions of security and security guarantees will be paramount. Whether or not one includes relevant paragraphs in the treaty, or how they are included, is a different matter, but those considerations will be paramount in the minds of people in considering any draft placed before us.

114

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA ITALY OMAN ROMANIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FINLAND CUBA ICELAND POLAND

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# Volume No 1995 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY Indo-German Credit Agreement

An Indo-German agreement was initialled in

Bonn on August 25, 1967 about financial assistance to India from the Federal Republic of Germany. The aid amount is Deutsche Mark two hundred and fifty millions and it is for the Indian Plan year 1967-68.

The agreement was initialled in the Federal Ministry of Economics by Shri S. K. Banerji, Indian Ambassador to Germany, on behalf of India and Mr. Erich Elson, on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Germany is among India's biggest donors of foregn economic assistance. The agreement was initialled "in a spirit of traditional friendly relaions existing between Germany and India, to further strengthen fruitful cooperation in the field of development aid.

GERMANY USA INDIA

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Message on Independence Day

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, broadcast to the nation the following message on the eve of the twentieth anniversary of the Independence Day (August 15):

I am very happy to have this opportunity of speaking to you on the eve of Independence Day. At midnight it will be exactly 20 years since that historic moment when India awoke to life and freedom. That moment saw the fulfilment of the dearest wish of every Indian heart for which numberless of our countrymen had worked and suffered for over a century until under the inspired leadership of Gandhiji their demand became irresistible.

"Freedom", Jawaharlal Nehru reminded us on that midnight occasion, "brings responsibilities and burdens and we have to face them in the spirit of a free and disciplined people". How have we met this challenge during the last two decades and how do we propose to meet it in the years to come are questions we, each one of us, should ask ourselves today. For the challenge addresses itself to each one of us, each one in his assigned field has to bring forth his best response, for each one of us has to contribute, even if it be by laying just one brick, well and truly, to the grand edifice which is the India of our dreams.

The rehabilitation, consequent on partition, of a vast multitude of some 10 million refugees, most of whom had left behind everything they possessed, was the first enormous task that con-

#### 115

fronted the newly independent State and it is to our credit that ill were resettled and integrated into the population. This could hardly have been possible had it not been for the fortitude and self-reliance shown by the migrants themselves. Not only did they succeed in rebuilding their lives, but they acted as a transfusion bringing a new vigour to the communities in which they settled.

Within two years of our Independence, by the end of 1949, the Constituent Assembly had completed its task of drawing up the political framework within which we could hope to achieve the aspirations of our people, and on the 26th January, 1950, India became a Republic with a constitution pledging it to secure for all its citizens Justice, Liberty, and Equality. By justice we meant not only political justice but also social and economic justice and equal opportunity for all. The Constitution itself abolished untouchability and discrimination of all kinds, but it was necessary to ensure that the socially and economically backward and the underprivileged should be able to compete on equal terms with their fellowmen. We have paid special attention to the needs of the so-called Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes mainly in the matter of education and employment opportunities.

In order to secure economic justice for the

vast majority of our people who five by agriculture, one of the first steps in land reform was the abolition of intermediaries and the vesting of land in the tiller. We have also given them an effective voice in matters that concern them most intimately by the institution of Panchayati Raj.

Equality of opportunity can come only as a result of mass education. Though we have not yet been able to provide free and compulsory education for all children up to the age of 14 as envisaged by the Constitution, by the end of 1966 it was' estimated that 78.5 per cent of the children between the age of 6 and 11 were attending schools, and by 1970 it is expected that this figure will have risen to 92 per cent. In the matter of secondary and higher education, we can claim to have made remarkable progress.

For the last 15 years we have been engaged in a series of intensive programmes for raising the standard of living of our people and the economic development of our country. Our first Five Year Plan for the period 1951-1956 involved an outlay of Rs. 19,600 millions in the public sector and Rs. 18,000 millions in the private sector. During this Plan, agricultural production increased by 22 per cent, industrial production by 39 per cent and the national income rose by 18.4 per cent. The second Plan was twice as big as the first and raised agricultural production by a further 20 per cent, industrial production by 41 per cent and the increase in the national income was 20 per cent. The third Plan was nearly double the second, but because of external aggression, in the second and fourth years of the Plan and a fall in agricultural output owing to adverse weather conditions in three of the five years, it failed to achieve the expected increase in the national income. Nevertheless, the rate of growth in key industries was more than 15 per cent per annum and very considerable achievements were registered in irrigation, power, transport and the social services.

Compared to 1950, we now produce four times as much steel, nearly five times, as much electricity and fifteen times as much aluminium. We produce Rs. 230 lakhs worth of machine tools against 34 lakhs before. The mileage of roads has been doubled and the areas under irrigation quadrupled. Bhakra, Tungabhadra,

Nagarjunasagar, to name only some of our new major irrigation works, along with their vast canal systems, are projects such as rival to those in any other part of the world. But still more significant is the fact that we have now established the base on which all our future development can proceed. We already have the capacity to build most of the heavy machinery and other equipment we may require.

Our development has undoubtedly been oriented towards industrialisation and inevitably the same spectacular results have not been achieved in agriculture, but it would be wrong to assume that this important sector of the economy has been neglected. The scheme of community development blocks now covers the whole country. The production of foodgrains increased from 54.4 million tons in 1950 to 72.3 million tons in 1966 which was admittedly one of our worst years. But even on the performance of our best years there is still a very great gap between our production and the needs of our growing population quite apart from the increasing demand as the level of the standard of living rises. The use of fertilisers and high yielding varieties of seeds and other modern techniques could produce enough for our needs even without any increase in acreage, and it is on this that we have to concentrate in the immediate future. Hitherto the problem has been to persuade our farmers to adopt new techniques but now a deer) psychological change has come about and it is they who are pressing for the provision of greater and more up-to-date facilities. We are, it seems to me, poised for a major breakthrough in the matter of agricultural production.

116

Because of the failure of the monsoon in the last two years we have had a severe drought in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar bringing acute distress to some 7 million people. With the coming of the rains this year, agricultural operations have commenced again and it is to be hoped that with a normal harvest the worst will be over. But we must see to it that the experience of this year is not forgotten. Even though it may not be possible to provide irrigation everywhere, a minimum supply of water for both humans and cattle must be assured in every village, independent of the vagaries of the climate.

I have spent much time in reviewing the past, but what of the future. The loans we have received from friendly countries to assist us in our development plans will have to be repaid and meanwhile the interest on them has to be met from our earnings of foreign exchange. We also require exchange for our minimum requirements from abroad for maintenance supplies and new projects. The only way we can meet this liability is by exports, even though this means doing without these communities ourselves. We must not falter now. The investments we have made in our economy are about to yield their full results and soon, in ten years or perhaps even in five, I am sure we shall see our country as the centre of a great economic change which will have its impact not only on our own 500 millions but on the whole of Asia and Africa.

Unlike the three previous occasions when a single political party was returned to office at the Centre and in almost all the States, the General Elections this year brought into power Governments of differing political complexions. This is no extraordinary development. Our Constitution envisaged and was designed for such a contingency. Indeed it may be said that our system is now being tested for the first time. Since every Government is concerned primarily with the good of the people of its State, there need be no conflict between the Centre and the States or between one State and another. Any differences of points of view can be adjusted where there is goodwill and a desire to serve the common weal and these, I think, one can venture to presuppose. But stability is vital now that we are at the turning point of our development programmes and we cannot afford to allow ourselves to be distracted from our purpose.

Now more than ever we need to exercise those qualities of self-control and discipline that won for us the independence that we shall be celebrating tomorrow. I am sure that that spirit is not lacking in my people and that they will meet the challenge of the future with faith and confidence and hard devoted work, each in his allotted field of service. May you all prosper in unity and bring credit and glory to our people is my humble prayer this day.

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

**JAPAN** 

Shri Morarji Desai's Speech at Luncheon by Foreign Correspondents' Club

Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister, paid a visit to Japan from August 14 to 22, 1967. On August 21, he was the guest of honour at a luncheon given in his honour by the Foreign Correspondents' club, Tokyo, on August 21, 1967.

Speaking on the occasion, Shri Desai said : Friends,

I am very grateful to the members of the Foreign Correspondents' Club of Japan for inviting me to this luncheon meeting and to you, Mr. Chairman, for the very kind words in which you have introduced me to this distinguished gathering. This is my last public appearance during the present visit to this great country, Japan; and I am very happy to have this opportunity to say a few words on my impressions of the present visit and to answer any questions that you may have on this occasion.

My first thoughts go naturally to my generous and indulgent hosts, the Government of Japan,

117

who have made my stay in this beautiful land both pleasant and fruitful. I did not come to Japan to conclude any deal or to negotiate any agreement, My purpose was to exchange views on matters of common concern, to renew old acquaintances and to make new ones, to familiarise myself-and through me, my Government --with the unique vitality and strength that Japan has demonstrated in the post-war years, and generally, to strengthen and cement the ties of

friendship and cooperation that have existed between India and Japan for many centuries now. I have met nothing but kindness and full confidence from everyone I have met here-from Prime Minister Mr. Sato, from my gracious and perspicacious host, Mr. Miki, and indeed from all the other members of the Japanese Government and from the representatives of a number of cultural and business' organizations. With your permission, I would like, to take this opportunity of publicly thanking the Government and the people of Japan and the various representatives of Japanese public life and opinion for the warmth and trust they have shown towards me and my country. I am immensely grateful to the Government and the people of Japan for giving me this opportunity to do my little bit to contribute towards understanding and co-operation between our two countries which is of vital interest and concern to all the peace-loving peoples of the world.

My visit to Japan has coincided with two significant events in the life of our two countries. On August 15, the day after I arrived here, India Celebrated her 20th anniversary of Independence from British rule. The same day marked the 22nd anniversary of the end of the war for Japan. These two last decades or so have seen truly revolutionary changes in the world. I personally believe that the world has taken a very rapid stride towards sanity and progress in the past twenty years; and it is this fact that there is something very real to salvage and safeguard, something very unique in human history to defend and carry forward that adds a special measure to the responsibility of the present generation, and particularly to the responsibility of all of us who are privileged to shape public opinion in whatever small measure around the world.

Even at the end of the second world war, during the darkest hour in Japan's history, we in India never believed that the spirit of the Japanese people was defeated. It was an Indian Judge, Justice Radha Binode Pal, who saw no merit in attaching any particular guilt to any particular nation for what was after all the product of a sordid age to the making of which many nations had contributed. We considered it repugnant both to ourselves and to our view of justice between nations to claim any repara-

tions from Japan.

What has happened in Japan over the past twenty years has far exceeded the expectations of most friendly observers. Today, Japan is a citadel of democracy in Asia. Its breathtaking and unique progress in the economic field is an example to the whole of Asia and indeed the symbol of the hope of the developing world at large. In the comity of nations, Japan has taken its rightful place, participating in her own quiet but efficient way in every initiative for co-operation among nations. Japan was a founder member of what has come to be known as the Aid-India Club organised under the leadership of the World Bank since 1958; and her assiatance in our development plans has been crucial. I would be failing in my duty if I did not take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude and the gratitude of my people to the Government and the people of Japan for the farsighted and constructive co-operation that they have extended in our efforts to regenerate the economy of India which had stagnated and indeed declined during the last several decades of foreign subjugation. It is only right and proper that after reestablishing so to speak her own rightful place in the comity of nations, Japan should take the initiative herself in strengthening co-operation in Asia. We welcome this initiative as we believe that Japan has a major role to play in furthering the cause of peace and progress in this long-suffering and much sinnedagainst continent of Asia which accounts for much the larger part of the human race.

For us in India also, these last twenty years have been exciting years, years of progress in every walk of life, years of struggle and striving, but years of hope and achievement all the same, I need not tell you what an exhilarating adventure it was on which free India embarked just twenty years ago--one-seventh of human society striking out to re-establish its self-respect, one of the poorest nations in the world seeking to achieve prosperity with justice, one of the most illiterate and diverse societies asserting its faith in democracy and the freedom of the individual. a multi-racial and multi-religious society proclaiming its faith in a secular state which eschews the hateful crutches of a nationalism based on exclusiveness and even antagonism to people of different faiths or ideologies. I will not take

your time to tell you all that has happened-and failed to happen-in India over the past two decades. But the fact is that despite all fore-bodings, India after twenty years of independence is the largest democracy in the world-and one of the freest of all societies at any time. Its record of religious tolerance within the country has only to be compared with that of others to appreciate what it must have entailed. Even at the risk of being misunderstood--and losing in the race for international aid--we have consistently refused to forsake our right to our own

#### 118

counsel in international affairs. Despite our extreme poverty, we have heeded every call for international co-operation-be it through the U.N. or the World Bank or the Asian Development Batik or such assistance as we can afford to several countries in different parts of Asia and Africa.

Economically, we have achieved over fifteen years or three plan periods substantial progressan increase in the production of foodgrains by 60%; in the production of cotton, of more than 100%; in the production of steel, of more than 300%; in the production of electricity, again, an increase of more than 300%; and a similar rapid transformation in the matter of production of machinery or the spread of education, health and the like. If you compare the progress of other nations in comparable periods, this is a very creditable performance indeed. And you will forgive me, if I remind you that this has been done with the help of foreign aid which in per capita terms is substantially lower than in the case of most other countries similarly situated.

I am well aware that much remains to be done in India. I am also aware that the, last two years have been particularly difficult in India and that these difficulties have created some misgivings even among friends. I am afraid, there is not sufficient understanding among friends abroad about the extra-ordinary nature of the difficulties that we have had to face in the past few years. Five out of the six past years-i.e. from 1961 to 1967-have been weather-wise poor for agriculture; and of these, the last two years have witnessed drought of a severity not experienced in the previous 100 years. In just

two years, the loss in terms of the output of foodgrains has been of the order of 30 million tonnes-not to speak of the loss in respect of other crops such as cotton or jute or sugar-cane or oil-seeds or the inevitable effect on industrial production. On top of this, we had to contend with a sharp increase in defence expenditure as a consequence of two aggressions, from China in 1962, and Pakistan in 1965-the latter being followed by a decline in foreign aid which even today in net terms is less than what we were receiving only a few years back. Is it surprising then that prices in India should rise, or that there should be some restlessness among our people or that our balance of payments would be in difficulty? The real miracle is that we have weathered all this with success, without any starvation deaths or damage to democracy-albeit with the help of friends abroad, but also by the courage and sacrifice of our own people.

Politically also, the recent elections and other events which have shown the emergence of a number of parties in greater strength than before and the corresponding reduction in the strength of the Congress Party are an evidence of the, fact that people are having greater faith in democracy and in the effectiveness of their own vote. The Congress Party could not hope to remain a monolith for ever; nor would it bode good for the future of democracy in India if it did. For a time, when the parties gaining strength are flexing their muscles and settling down to the responsibilities of power, there may be some transitional problems and even a little instability. But already, within less than six months of the new situation created by the last election, practically all the parties in India are showing signs of it new awareness--the awareness that those who wish to retain the confidence of the people cannot afford to agitate for ever and must settle down soon to the task of construction which is inevitably the task of co-operation and give and take in all genuinely democratic societies.

People often ask: Will India be self-reliant in the near future? I think this question needs to be understood and answered carefully as many misunderstandings spring from what is involved in this question. First of all, self-reliance or ability to dispense with aid has to be related to a certain positive objective-such as the rate at which an economy can grow without further aid. After all, India can be self-reliant even from tomorrow if it has to grow at, say, 3 per cent per annum. It is because not only we but the world at large considers such a rate of growth grossly inadequate in relation to our extreme poverty that the whole question of aid arises. It is my firm belief that in view of all the progress that we have already made, we can grow on an average at the satisfactory rate of 5 per cent per annum if we get on a net basis at least one billion dollars per annum over the next ten years or so. What I have said about net aid in the intervening period is important, because if the not inflow if capital from abroad goes on declining as it has done Li the recent past, our progress will be slower and our ability to terminate aid will be correspondingly reduced. I am not saying that aid must continue or that it must continue at a certain rate. That is for other people to decideand also for us in India to decide depending on the degree of good-will or ill-will associated with aid. If we cannot get aid on the scale necessary for a satisfactory rate of growth, we shall have to be satisfied with a slower rate of growth or accept even greater hardship for our people for some years to come. But I think it would not be proper to let aid-levels go down in net terms and yet expect self-reliance at a satisfactory rate of growth to be realised in a matter of a few years.

Our request for debt-rescheduling also has to be seen in this light. Let me make it quite clew that what we are making is just a request-not

119

a demand, and certainly not a threat. If we do not get the kind of accommodation we are seeking with the co-operation of the World Bank, we shall still honour our debts scrupulously, no matter what the consequences to our development or to the well-being of our people. But today, some 40 per cent of the aid we get has to be used for paying interest and amortisation charges on past debt which could not be contracted on concessional terms such as now are available from several countries and institutions. Debt charges use up nearly one-fourth of our export earnings. And in the case of more than one country, our debt payments are almost as large as the new loans we get so that on balance, we get hardly any net relief at all. It is under these circumstances that the World Bank has agreed to our

request to sponsor our case for debt-relief in the Consortium so that we can meet all the payments due from us without jeopardising altogether our economic development in the immediate future.

Sir, it has not been my purpose here to confine my attention to India alone. As I mentioned at the outset, the, world at large has taken rapid strides over the past twenty years. More than a hundred countries have become free and the colonial age is all but gone. Perhaps no other period in human history has seen so much progress in science and technology and so much determination to put them to the service of the economic uplift of all the peoples of the world. Internationally, quite apart from many examples of co-operation, there is of late much greater appreciation of the fact that despite all the differences in ideology or otherwise among nations, there has to be--and can be-peaceful coexistence and even constructive collaboration among the inhabitants of this planet. One has only to recall the suspicions and the rivalries of the early years of the cold war to visualise how much the international situation has changed for the better over the past few years. Only China remains wedded to the path of strife and distrust, proclaiming the inevitability and even desirability of conflict and eventual war between the so-called villages and cities of this world. Whether they truly believe in it or not, the present Chinese leadership considers it in the Chinese national interest to promote conflict rather than harmony, to propagate hatred and misunderstanding rather than fellow-feeling and friendship. Sooner or later China also must recognise that the path of sanity and co-operation is also the path of survival. But meanwhile, those who believe in peace and freedom and the equality of nations, big or small, will have to meet every situation by courage born of conviction, by alertness combined with incessant efforts to respond to the aspirations of their own people and, above all, by mutual solidarity and co-operation among like-minded people everywhere without closing one's mind to the possibility of establishing on this earth just one great family of man.

JAPAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA PAKISTAN

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **PAKISTAN**

India's Protest against Ill-treatment of Indian Officials by Pakistani Police

The following is the text of the statement issued by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi, on August 27, 1967 on the ill-treatment of Indian officials by Pakistani Police at Islamabad:

While on his way to shop at Rawalpindi on the evening of 22nd August prior to his trip on a holiday to Kabul on the following day, Shri Maharaj Sarup, First Secretary of the Indian High Commission, Islamabad, dropped in at the Ayub Park, a popular resort, for a little while. Two Assistants Shri R. P. Wadhwa and Shri S. K. Banerji took a lift in the car of Shri Sarup to visit Rawalpindi. As Shri Sarup and his companions were about to leave the Park to go to the bazar, some people set upon the Indian officials, beat them and took them away in two cars to the Cantonment Police Station where a

120

search made by the police authorities revealed nothing incriminating on the person of the officials. The presence at the Police Station of high Pakistani officials would confirm that it was part of a pre-meditated frame-up to involve the Indian officials. They were photographed at the Police Station with two unknown persons who had obviously been planted for the purpose.

The High Commission of India at Islamabad has already protested to the Pakistan Government over the arrest, illegal detention, manhandling of the Indian officials and the fact of their being prevented from contacting the High Commission for nearly three hours as well as the non-recognition by the authorities at the Police Station of

the identity cards issued by the Pakistan Foreign Office including the identity card of the Counsellor who wished to take them away from the Police Station.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **PAKISTAN**

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement on Indo-Pakistan Border Incident

The following is the text of the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs, Shri M. C. Chagla, in the Rajya Sabha on August, 14, 1967 on the unscheduled visit of the Deputy High Commissioner for Pakistan in India at Calcutta recently to the India-East Pakistan border near Petrapol (West Bengal) in mysterious circumstances:

On 18th July, 1967, the West Bengal Government reported to the Ministry of External Affairs that Mr. Hussain Imam, the Deputy High Commissioner for Pakistan in India at Calcutta, drove in his car, No. CD. 2136, on 4th July, 1967, followed by another car and stopped at some distance from the checkpost of the Customs Office at Jessore Road. Some three or four persons got down from the second car and after taking out something from the boot of the car which could not be distinguished from a distance crossed the undemarcated part of the border across the fields instead of passing through the checkpost.

The Ministry of External Affairs on 9th August asked the West Bengal Government to furnish immediately a full report on this incident and also to intimate the reasons how these three or four persons who crossed the border were allowed by the Customs and Police authorities to cross

the border in such an irregular manner. They were also requested to furnish information regarding the second car accompanying the Pakistan Deputy High Commissioner's car and as to whether it was a diplomatic or a private car and also whether the Deputy High Commissioner's car flew the Pakistan flag.

According to the latest report received from the West Bengal Government on the afternoon of 4th July, 1967, Mr. Hussain Imam, the Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan in Calcutta, proceeded to Haridaspur border checkpost in his car bearing No. CD--2136. He gave no prior intimation regarding this trip and his car did not fly the Mission's flag, Another car bearing WBE registration mark joined the Deputy High Commissioner's car near Gaighata and followed his car on the road to the border check-post. The second car had four passengers. About half a mile before the border check-post, both the cars slowed down and the passengers of the second car slipped out and ran away to the adjoining fields. The Deputy High Commissioner of Pakistan in Calcutta then proceeded to the checkpost with his car. His car was identified there and he was asked whether he would like to cross the border. He replied that he had come for a sight-seeing trip only and proceeded back to Calcutta. The check-post staff were caught by surprise and the passengers of the second car slipped away before they could be intercepted. Subsequent investigation reveals that the second car belongs to Hindustan Iron and Steel Co. Of the four passengers in the second car, one was an unidentified Indian tout and the remaining three came from Asian Hotel in Calcutta where they had been registered as three Muslim gentlemen from Bombay.

It was evident that the Pakistan Deputy High Commissioner did not visit the border for sightseeing purpose but that his visit was to escort the second car which carried the persons who crossed the border and to shield them against scrutiny by the Police, Customs or the public.

121

The visit was an unscheduled tour of the Deputy High Commissioner as he had not given the usual advance notice of it either orally or in writing to the West Bengal authorities. **Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **SINGAPORE**

Shri M. C. Chagla's Statement in Lok Sabha on People of Indian Origin in Singapore

Shri M. C. Chagla, Minister of External Affairs, made the following statement in the Lok Sabha on August 8, 1967 regarding the people of Indian origin in Singapore:

Following the British decision to withdraw their troops from the base in Singapore there has been apprehension that the ensuing retrenchment would adversely affect large numbers of Indians in Singapore. There have also been some press reports which in general conveyed the impression that Indians in Singapore have been singled out for discriminatory treatment.

I should like to keep the House informed of the position in this regard. There are approximately 29,000 currently employed in the base in Singapore of whom about 6,000 are Indian nationals. According to the Singapore authorities retrenchment during the next year will affect about 2,500 people, and by 1970 about 15,000 might be unemployed.

The Singapore Government's primary responsibility will be towards their own citizens including those of Indian origin. They have, however, stated that they would provide work permits to non-Singapore citizens also in case they find alternative employment. They have also said that the latter category will be free to stay on in Singapore, if they so desire. Singapore has no intention of forcibly deporting non-citizens, or for that matter Indians in particular.

Some press reports have appeared indicating that the Singapore Government might make things difficult for Singapore nationals of Indian origin by preventing their families from re-entering Singapore in cases when such families have been away from the country for a considerable time. In point of fact the Immigration (Prohibition of Entry) Order of 1966 enables the Singapore Government to prohibit the entry of the wife of Singapore citizen who has been living separately from her husband for a continuous period of five years. This Ordinance applies to families of Singapore citizens irrespective of their origin. The recent announcement on the subject does not therefore appear to be any new policy decision, nor can it be construed as discriminatory against the people of Indian origin in Singapore, as it applies to all citizens of Singapore.

There have also been press reports suggesting that inducements are being offered to Singapore citizens of Indian origin to renounce their citizenship and return to India. On July 23rd, one of the Singapore leaders in a speech advised Singapore citizens facing unemployment to take this opportunity to seek re-union with their families. He added that the Singapore Government would facilitate withdrawal of their gratuity and provident fund even though they might not have reached the age of 55, provided they were to "leave the country with no intention of coming back". It was, however, made quite clear that should any such persons wish to continue to stay in Singapore, the Government would look after them "without any discrimination". We have also been assured by the Singapore Government that there was nothing in these remarks to indicate that they were intended to apply to persons of Indian origin alone. In view of the concern that was felt regarding the future of Indians in Singapore, the matter was taken up with the Singapore Government and with the High Commissioner of Singapore in Delhi. The Government of Singapore has clarified that it is definitely not their intention to discriminate in any manner

122

against the people of Indian origin. The Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew has himself assured us on this point. We have accepted the assurance of the Government of Singapore and we feel that they will be implemented both in letter and spirit. On our part we shall continue to cooperate with them to ensure that Indians in Singapore remain fully conscious of their rights and responsibilities.

We have also made it clear that any Singapore citizen of Indian origin cannot automatically claim Indian nationality merely by renouncing their Singapore citizenship. They would become stateless Persons and would have to fulfil the conditions laid down for Indian citizenship before being entitled to it.

Singapore shares with us a common dedication to the principle of a multi-racial, multi-lingual and secular society, and we in India have watched With admiration the dynamism and imagination with which the Government of Singapore under its present leadership has been taking steps to build up the country on these lines. We are confident that they will continue to follow these policies which have helped greatly to consolidate the friendly relations between our two countries.

123

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA USA

**Date**: Aug 01, 1967

# September

# Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. XIII 1967 SEPTEMBER No. 9

CONTENTS

**PAGE** 

#### **CEYLON**

Prime Minister's Address to India-Ceylon Society

125

Prime Minister's Speech at Civic Reception

126

Indo-Ceylon Joint Communique

129

## DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Non-proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons 131

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Statement in the Committee of Twenty-four on Fiji 137

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND & WORLD BANK

Shri Morarji Desai's Speech at the Annual Meeting

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Shri Morarji Desai's Address to National Press Club

142

Indo-U. S. Food Agreement Signed

146

## MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

DIVISION

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA** 

INDIA FIJI USA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

## **CEYLON**

Prime Minister's Address to India-Ceylon Society

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to Ceylon from September 18 to 21, 1967. On the day of her arrival in Colombo on September 18, a reception was

held in her honour by the India-Ceylon Society.

Speaking on the occasion Shrimati Gandhi said :

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Thank you for your words of welcome and the kind sentiments you have expressed towards my country.

When one surveys the history of our human race, it is not easy to draw a balance-sheet in terms of contributions made and received. My father saw history not as a series of events in one country or another but as the universal story of man. In that perspective, the world is certainly indebted to Ceylon for preserving and propagating the Buddha's message through the ages. It is not mere coincidence that the founder of the Maha Bodhi Society of India and Ceylon was Anagarika Dharmpala--a son of Lanka. Ananda Coomaraswamy-another distinguished son-has made valuable contribution to our common heritage. He ranks with Shri Aurobindo and Rabindra Nath Tagore in his impact on Indian scholars and linkers in the early decades of this century, helping a whole generation to re-discover their culture.

Our two countries have been creators of culture. We are both inheritors and the creators of the modern idea that the salvation of our world lies in promoting tolerance of different religions, different social systems, different political philosophies--all mutually helpful and strengthening --in a spirit of peace. In his rock edict twelve, the Emperor Asoka proclaimed. "The faiths of others, all deserve to be honoured. By honouring them, one exalts one's own faith and at the same time performs a service to the faith of others".

In the past, our two countries have not merely influenced each other in religion, in art and literature, but have shared common beliefs, institutions, and social and political systems. While we work together, neither of us desires exclusiveness in our relationship. As this is my first speech during this visit, I should like to acknowledge publicly our gratitude to the Government and people of Ceylon for their generous gesture in diverting to our shores two ships carrying

eighteen thousand tons of rice. This was of help to us at a very difficult moment.

It is well known that our country has been passing through extremely difficult times during the last two years. However, it is not realised what tremendous effort, resources and organisation have gone in averting what might have been a tragedy of immense proportions. Our people rallied magnificently. Millions of people have been fed in drought affected areas. Thousands of people have worked together voluntarily to serve their afflicted brethren.

And in the midst of it all, we had our fourth general election. Your country, Mr. Chairman, is a mature parliamentary democracy. You can well appreciate the significance of the fact that in your neighbouring country which is inhabited by such a large segment of humanity, the democratic process should continue to be the sole instrument for bringing about social and political changes.

Even in the best circumstances, democratic processes are slow moving and fragile. And yet in India, during the last twenty years, a vast revolution has taken place in the fields of economic, social, cultural and educational development. I am confident that the difficulties which confront us at present will be surmounted and that we shall go ahead with the transformation of our society. I am equally confident that with its talented people, your country will succeed in enriching the life of the common man. These changes are not hidden. I notice the progress made by Ceylon during the last five years, as any visitor to India can see the changes there. You may, of course, be diverted by newspaper headlines of some crisis or other. Crises there a-re, difficulties there are. Confusion and disturbances there are. This is all a part of the process of growth in which many vested interests, many familiar customs and habits cannot but

125

be disturbed, as you cannot walk on the meadow without disturbing the grass. Our recent elections must be understood in this light. They marked an important stage in the political evolution of our people. In my view, it is truly remarkable how we have been able to weather these storms and to forge ahead in so many directions.

There is a vast field for co-operation in this exciting task of building our respective countries. We have much to learn from each other and we cannot but gain by cooperating with each other.

I know there are one or two problems in our relations which have at times caused us some anxiety. The presence in Ceylon of a large number of people of Indian origin has sometimes been an irritating factor in our relations. Fortunately, the 1964-agreement between the Prime Minister of the two countries has provided a framework within which the problem can be solved. On our part, we are taking all the necessary steps and shall continue to do so to fulfil our obligations under this agreement. I am glad that similar action is being pursued by the Government of Ceylon.

Our relations are too close for either of us to allow minor matters to interfere with our traditional friendship. I hope that any such problems which might arise in the future will be solved with goodwill. I sincerely hope that my visit and talks with your distinguished Prime Minister and other leaders will enlarge the area of understanding and cooperation between our two countries.

When our countries emerged from their long bondage, we shared many dreams. We had a vision of free Asia. The events of the last few years have tended to dim that vision. But we in India remain hopeful. I do believe that we can recreate that vision by determination and earnest endeavor to keep to our path and by basing our policies realistically on friendly co-operation, peaceful relations and non-interference in each other's affairs. Therein lies the key to the future growth of mutual trust and confidence and to the establishment of peace where today conflict reigns.

I would urge those of you who are of Indian origin and have already become citizens of Ceylon and those who are yet to acquire Ceylon citizenship. to identify yourselves with Ceylon and to give it your full loyalty. I am sure 'that the Government of Ceylon on its part is anxious to create an environment which will give you

confidence, justice and a sense of belonging and that opportunities will be provided for you to participate in Ceylon's development.

Those of you who are Indian nationals and are working here in various capacities should also think and act in the interest of Ceylon's development and welfare. Ceylon is a respected sister nation for which we have great affection, regard and friendship. Ceylon and India share a heritage in the evolution of which both countries have made significant contribution. Indians in Ceylon, be they citizens of Ceylon or India, should help to further this contribution.

## INDIA SRI LANKA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Sep 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **CEYLON**

Prime Minister's Speech at Civic Reception

Prime Minister Indira Gandhi made the following speech at the civic reception accorded to her by the Colombo Municipal Council on September 19, 1967:

Your Worship and citizens of Colombo:

How can I adequately express the feelings you have evoked in me by the warmth and friendliness of your reception? It reflects in many ways the intimacy of the relationship between our two peoples and our two countries. I have visited Colombo several times and each time your country has made a fresh impact on me. I am happy to have the opportunity of renewing my acquaintance with your lovely city and your friendly people and am glad to see how well Colombo has grown without losing its special charm.

The other day I was told by a journalist that the very size of India may be a cause for concern to her neighbours. But we look at our size in a different light. We are certainly a large country of five hundred million people. But, precisely, because of this as my father used to say, we have five hundred million problems. A democratic society must be based on concern for every individual. Those who accuse us of our size will also, I hope, sympathise with the magnitude of our problems.

If we want to build an extra primary school for each of our village we must have six lakh

126

more schools. If we need only two teachers in each school, we must have one million two hundred thousand more teachers. If we want one well in each village we have to think in terms of six lakh wells.

On the eve of our independence our people were emaciated and our production was the barest for subsistence. Nature had endowed our mother earth with vast and varied resources which lay dormant. Our agriculture was listless and we had hardly any industry. However, the people of India, the children of the Gandhian era, faced up to the challenge. And we gradually begun the great tasks of national reconstruction.

In Europe, democratic rights and liberties, the growth of social consciousness and population came at the end of a long period of economic gestation. Thus, when democratic rights were given and accepted the economy was already capable of responding to the needs. In our part of the world, the process was reversed. We began with the widest democratic franchise far men and women. They are the recipient of every right and liberty but we do not have the necessary wherewithal for the satisfaction of the elementary human needs for all our people. Much of the present tension and turbulence in Asia and Africa stems from this wide disparity and contradiction between the right of the individual and the utter paucity of resources to give meaning to those rights.

Last month we observed the twentieth anniver-

sary of Independence. These two decades have seen vast changes in India. In their anxiety to spotlight the spectacular, superficial observers recount only isolated happenings without attempting to find their roots in the past or their trends in the future. This gives somewhat disjointed and unreal picture and has caused much misunderstanding amongst our people and abroad.

There is no parallel in history for what we are trying to achieve in the India of today. In a country of such vast dimensions, of such diversity and different levels of development, the magnitude of our achievement should not be under-estimated. It is true that many problems remain, some of which are acute and complex. These are mainly of three kinds. There are the age-old problems of poverty and backwardness, the new problems of development and growth, and comparatively recent problems which are due to happenings beyond our control, such as aggression on our borders and unprecedented drought, now followed by tremendous floods which have created special difficulties in the last few years.

But even thaw difficulties and problems cannot obscure the fact that in the field of agriculture record Yields are being harvested with improved varieties of wheat and rice. Only a week ago I visited the Punjab Agriculture University and saw for myself the part of our revolution in agriculture. The District of Ludhiana where it is located, now leads the eight major wheat growing countries of the world in regard to the average yield of wheat. Further south in Tanjore another revolution is taking place in rice cultivation. Our new agricultural strategy hopes to add twenty-five million tonnes in five years, thus helping us to achieve self-sufficiency in foodgrains. This new approach to agriculture relics on intensive farming with the help of fertilizers, new varieties of seeds, extension of credit and the bringing together of the farmers, the scientists and the extension workers. Our farmers who have borne the heaviest burdens through the centuries are awakening to modern ideas.

In the field of industry-medium, light and small scale industries-have become considerably diversified and sophisticated. Our heavy industrial structure which was negligible is now a large and expanding one. The entire technological base has grown enormously. More exciting than these tangible results are the intangible-me change which has come about in the thinking and the abilities of our people. We are proud of our young scientists, our technicians and our managerial talent.

I do not wish to tire you with facts and figures but I think you will be interested in what we have been able to do. The growth in the output in steel, coal, machine tools, iron ore and petroleum products, cloth and bicycles, radios and diesel engines, has shown large increases. The number of children in schools has gone up from twenty-three to sixty-eight million. The number of voungmen and women in colleges is now one point six million. There is a large network of advanced institutions teaching technology at a higher level. We have thus accumulated a vast amount of experience born out of trial and error. We should like our relations with you to be many-sided. Like us, Ceylon is engaged in the great task of development and I have no doubt that our two countries can work together to our mutual advantage. We must explore these possibilities of cooperation. It is equally necessary to cooperate with all other nations who are similarly situated in pressing for a more liberal and forward-looking conception of the world trade in which the developing nations can enjoy a fair and growing share in international commerce with the richer and more advanced industrial nations. Only thus can the gap separating the rich and the poor be narrowed.

127

Only thus can the foundations of peace in the world be made less unstable.

As one surveys this wide world and, especially Asia, it is pleasant and satisfying to see the harmony of the relations between our two countries. hem and there difficulties do arise but we have met and talked and succeeded in overcoming them. And so one sees the entire picture of the relationship between Ceylon and India dating back now for some centuries as a relationship unmarred by conflict and enriched by mutual trust and confidence.

In more recent years, your city Colombo, be-

cane associated with ideas for creative cooperation through the Colombo Plan. On another occasion again certain proposals were formulated in your city. Their acceptance by both sides would nave provided a basis for the settlement of a conflict. Unfortunately that conflict continues and erupts every now and then in, ugly forms.

These twenty years we have constantly endeavoured to fashion our relations with our neighbours and with all countries on the basis of mutual respect, non-interference in one another's affairs and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of every State. Whatever little influence we possess we try to use on the side of peace and towards the, peaceful solution of problems. The young men of our armed forces have gone abroad as messengers of peace and often sacrificed their lives in defence of peace.

If in the world of today the great powers appear slightly relaxed in their relationship, it is due in a large measure to the influence exercised by countries such as our two countries and others of similar persuasion. One cannot help thinking a great deal about the causes of our contemporary turmoil. In an ago of tremendous scientific advance when man has the power to bend so many of nature's forces to Ins will, in an age of vast accumulation of wealth, we find that disparities between the rich and the poor nations are growing. Millions of people in Asia and Africa and other parts of the world live a life of penury and want. Their awakened consoiousness naturally makes them more poignantly aware of this conflict. The attempt to infuse ideological divisions of one kind or another, or to impose a particular way of life, further aggravates the situation. Peace and stability can come only with tolerance of political and social differences. We believe that every country should be free to develop in its own traditions and historical circumstance. At the same time the people of different nations should be conscious of what they have in common. Peace does not mean merely the absence of strife. It means goodwill for others and understanding of those who are different from ourselves. Even from the point of view of Limited self-interest it is necessary for countries to cooperate for the betterment of humanity. In the past this might have been regarded as idealistic but yesterday's morality

and idealism is today a matter of practical necessity.

There is great scope for purposeful cooperation between our two countries in many fields. This will benefit our two societies and help them not only to attain a fuller and more gracious life but will contribute to the stability and progress of our region and hence of the world. It is our earnest desire to join you in this cooperative endeavour, to profit from your experience and help, and to place at your disposal our own in any form you may wish to have. Indeed this will be nothing new. Some twelve hundred years ago technical experts from your great country went as far as Kashmir in the north of India to advise the local king on irrigation projects.

Economic development is an urgent necessity for us both but the tradition and heritage which we share enshrine a wider and nobler concept. The traditional patterns of our lives contain much that is of lasting value as well as of current validity-values of mind and spirit-which should be harmonized with the requirements of modern life in this scientific age. We who have the high privilege of shouldering responsibilities in our countries, have the opportunity of serving our respective peoples in a new and challenging endeavour, and endeavour to strengthen the basic foundations of our ancient traditions and by incorporating with them science and the application of technology. This process of synthesis between the vital elements of our traditions and the vibrant forces of current knowledge requires not only a climate of peace in the region but also a temper of peace in our peoples. However, I am confident that our peoples, who through the ages have acquired great experience in tempering power with the restraint of wisdom, will not be unequal to the present task of evolving harmony between science and spirituality.

In these tasks, the exchange of ideas and experience are of inestimable value and I am sure that I shall benefit greatly from my talks with your distinguished Prime Minister and other leaders of Ceylon. Ceylon and India have had long and unbroken friendship dating far back into history. May this relationship grow and prosper and become an example of good neighbourliness.

## SRI LANKA INDIA USA LATVIA PERU

**Date**: Sep 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **CEYLON**

Indo-Ceylon Joint Communique

Following is the text of the joint Communique issued at the end of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's visit to Ceylon:

At the invitation of Mr. Dudley Senanavake, Prime Minister of Ceylon, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, visited Ceylon from the 18th to the 21st September, 1967. The Prime Minister of Ceylon, on behalf of the Government and the people of Ceylon, warmly welcomed the Prime Minister of India on her first state visit to Ceylon as Prime Minister. He, recalled with great pleasure the affection with which the late Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi were received by the people of Ceylon on the previous occasions. During her stay in Ceylon, the Prime Minister called on His Excellency, the Governor General, Mr. William Gopallawa. She also visited Kandy and was afforded the privilege of a special exposition of the sacred tooth relic at the Dalada Maligawa. She called on the Venerable Mahanayake Thero of Malwatte and the Venerable Mahanayake Thero of the Asgiriya Chapter.

The Prime Minister of India was accorded a warm civic reception at Colombo and Kandy and attended a number of other receptions arranged by various public organisations in her honour. She was deeply touched by the warmth and friendship of the Government and the people of Ceylon towards India and conveyed to them cordial greetings and sincere good wishes on behalf of the Government and people of India.

The Prime Ministers of India and Ceylon welcomed the opportunity to renew their contacts and to exchange views concerning relations between the two countries and the world situation generally.

Among the subjects discussed were relations between the two countries with particular reference to trade and economic cooperation and the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement, the situation in the Asian region (and the Indian Ocean area), the policy of non-alignment, the continuing conflict in Vietnam and the tension in West Asia. The development of bilateral and regional cooperation in the economic, cultural, scientific and technical fields was also discussed.

The two Prime Ministers reaffirmed their determination to continue to work closely together and in co-operation with other countries to secure effective implementation of the recommendations of the United Nations agencies with a view to reducing the widening gap between the developed and developing nations. As both countries are producers of primary products, the Prime Ministers expressed their concern over the continuing fall in the prices of such products and the resulting adverse effect of this trend. The Prime Ministers noted the various steps taken by regional organisations and the developing countries to present a common approach at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, to be held in New Delhi in February 1968. They also emphasised the importance of securing concrete results and a positive programme of action at this conference and agreed that there should be a meeting at ministerial level between the two countries at an early date with a view to evolving a common approach at the conference.

The Prime Ministers viewed with concern the declining trend of world tea prices, and noted with satisfaction the discussions recently held in New Delhi between officials of the two governments with the object of evolving a joint action to reverse this trend. They agreed that an official delegation from India should visit Ceylon within the next few weeks to continue the discussions.

The Prime Ministers noted with satisfaction the progress made by the two countries in the development of techniques of agricultural production and agreed to exchange delegations at appropriate levels in order to benefit from each other's experience.

The two Governments expressed their resolve to promote greater cooperation in the economic, commercial and technical fields as well as in the field of education, ourism, science and culture. This would help str-- then the traditional ties of history and culture between the two peoples, while at the same time enabling them to derive the benefits of modern science and technology. The Prime Minister expressed satisfaction on the preparatory steps taken by both governments for the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon agreement of October 1964. They discussed the question of the remaining 150,000 persons mentioned in clause 4 of the Agreement and decided that this matter could more conveniently be taken up as soon as some progress has been made on both sides in the actual implementation of the Agreement. Both Prime Ministers reaffirmed their determination to take all further measures necessary to ensure the smooth and speedy implementation of this Agreement, in a spirit of mutual cooperation as hitherto, and agreed that any outstanding matters in this regard should be examined further at the appropriate levels and resolved.

The Prime Ministers discussed the grave situation in West Asia and recognised that peace in this region was vital not only for the peace of the world but also for the peace and economic well-being of the developing countries of Asia and Africa. They expressed the hope that a

## 129

peaceful settlement of this problem would be found in the near future on a just and honourable basis. The discussions revealed an identity of views on the essentials of this problem and the approach to a solution. The Prime Ministers agreed that any solution of this problem must ensure the return to peaceful conditions and the withdrawal of forces to the June 4, 1967 positions. They emphasised that occupation of territory by means of military action must be vacated without conditions. They further agreed that a satisfactory solution should seek to deal with this problem on a long range basis, take into account the legitimate aspirations of the people and respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of

all states in this area.

The Prime Ministers exchanged views on developments in Asia in general and in the South and South East Asian region in particular. They expressed their deep concern over the continuing conflict in Vietnam, which besides being a danger to world peace, was the cause of untold suffering to the Vietnamese people as a whole. They examined the initiatives taken by their respective Governments, the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organisation and other interested parties with a view to bringing about a peaceful settlement.

The Prime Ministers reaffirmed their conviction that a solution to the Vietnam problem could be found only through peaceful negotiations and that the provisions of the 1954 Geneva Agreements provide an acceptable basis for such a settlement. They agreed that the cessation of bombing of North Vietnam to be immediately followed by the cessation of all acts of hostility throughout Vietnam would greatly contribute to wards the creation of a proper climate for negotiations. They also agreed that the Vietnam problem must be settled by the Vietnamese people themselves, without foreign interference, and that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front are necessary parties to any negotiations directed towards a settlement.

The two Prime Ministers reaffirmed their faith in the policy of non-alignment as a positive force for the maintenance of world peace. Thep emphasised the importance of peaceful cooperation and co-existence among nations with different social, political and economic systems. Both sides reiterated their belief in the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and their determination to work together and in cooperation with other nations to remove racialism and remnants of colonialism in all their manifestations. They stressed the importance of complete and universal disarmament, both nuclear as well as conventional. They agreed that all international problems should be settled by the countries concerned through peaceful negotiations and not through resort to force. In this connection, they expressed the hope that the Colombo Proposals and the Tashkent Declaration would

be implemented in principle and practice. They expressed their firm conviction that for the maintenance of world peace and good neighbourly relations among states, it was essential for all states to respect scrupulously each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and refrain from interfering in each other's internal affairs. They stressed the importance of economic, cooperation. in strengthening the forces of peace and stability in the region, based on the principles of equality and mutual benefit.

The discussions between the two Prime Ministers took place in a frank and cordial atmosphere which reflected the traditionally close and growing ties between the two countries and the similarity of approach to major questions of common interests. The two Prime Ministers agreed that the ideas which emerged during the discussions should be further examined and implemented by the two Governments through appropriate channels. They also agreed that senior officials of the two Governments should meet once a year, alternately in Colombo and New Delhi, to review the progress of Indo-Ceylon relations in all fields and exchange views on other matters of common interest.

The two Prime Ministers reaffirmed their conviction that the Indian Ocean area should be an area of peace.

The Prime Ministers welcomed the approaching independence of Mauritius and looked forward to developing further their relations with this neighbouring country.

The Prime Minister of India expressed her sincere gratitude for the warm hospitality and friendly welcome extended to her and her party. She conveyed to His Excellency, the Governor-General, Mr. William Gopallawa and Mrs. Gopallawa, the cordial greetings of the President and the people of India. On behalf of the Government of India, the Prime Minister of India extended a cordial invitation to the Prime Minister of Ceylon to visit India. The Prime Minister of Ceylon gladly accepted the invitation.

130

# **Volume No**

1995

## DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

Shri V. C. Trivedi's Statement on Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Shri V. C. Trivedi, India's Ambassador to Switzerland and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, made the following statement at the 334th meeting of the Committee in Geneva on September 28, 1967:

The delegations of the United States and the USSR have presented their ideas on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the form of a revised text of a draft treaty in documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193. As both delegations have explained, the presentation of these documents should assist the members of the Committee in pursuing their task of negotiating an adequate and acceptable treaty with greater precision. In his statement of 24 August, the day the draft treaty was presented to us here, President Johnson also stressed that point and posed the problem very clearly. He said:

"The draft will be available for consideration by a governments, and for negotiation by the Conference." (ENDC/194, p. 1)

The President went on to say:

"The treaty must be responsive to the needs and problems of all the nations of the world-great and small, aligned and non-aligned, nuclear and non-nuclear.

"It must add to the security of all." (ibid.)
This then, is the present task of the Committee--to make, the draft responsive to the needs of all
nations and to ensure that it adds to the security
of all people.

The two super-Powers and their allies have been discussing and negotiating among themselves for about a year with a view to elaborating a draft recommendation which would essentially meet their requirements and the requirements of their alliances. It would be helpful to the Committee, therefore, if the non-aligned delegations were now to indicate in what way this draft document needs improvement and alteration. The mandate given to us by the United Nations demands that as a result of our negotiations the Committee should evolve a final draft which is acceptable to all concerned and satisfactory to the international community.

We are fortunate that in this field we are not working in a vacuum. We have the tragic history of past proliferation to warn us of spurious remedies, and we have the historic principles enshrined in United Nations resolution 2028(XX) (ENDC/161) to direct us to the right solutions. The United Nations has also given us as our terms of reference and as our basic guide the Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations (ENDC/5) formulated in September 1961. The success of our endeavours will depend upon the extent to which we give full and unequivocal consideration to those examples and those precepts.

Efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons have a long history, dating more or less from the time these weapons of terror and destruction became part of a nation's armoury. When the United States was the only nuclear-weapon Power and when it presented the Baruch Plan (AEC/PV.1, pp. 25-30 et seq.), the Soviet Union pointed out (AEC/PV. 2, pp. 65 et seq.) that two of the fundamental components of an international instrument in that regard were the prohibition of the production of nuclear weapons and the destruction within a period of three months of the bombs then in stock. Incidentally, it should also be remembered that one of the reasons why the Baruch Plan was found unacceptable was that, like the draft treaty before us, it sought to prohibit national research and development in atomic energy production.

The Indian delegation has had occasion in the past to quote the representatives of the United Kingdom and France on the question of preventing further proliferation. Those representatives

had stated categorically and logically in the discussions in the Disarmament Sub-Committee that the only way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries was for the existing nuclear-weapon Powers to stop further production of nuclear weapons themselves. The Government of India then repeatedly urged a cessation of nuclear weapon tests, and an "armament truce" among the big Powers. The United States had also been proposing that prohibition of the dissemination of nuclear weapons should depend upon and follow the cessation of production of fissile material for weapon purposes. In fact, until recently the United States advocated the cut-off as a first step in a series of measures of nuclear disarmament. Thus it has been the firm international thesis all along that the cessation of production of fissionable material for weapon purposes is the basis of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It has been argued in the Committee that the cessation of production of nuclear weapons by

131

all countries may have been the right solution for the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons, that it may have been recommended by all nations during the history of negotiations, but that it has. unfortunately, not so far resulted in an international treaty. in view of that, it is further argued, we should discard that solution and adopt some other way of obtaining a treaty.

That argument does not appeal to the Indian delegation. In the first instance, it does not stand to reason that the correct solution should be discarded in favour of an incorrect one because success has not been achieved so far or a particular treaty has not so far been signed. Perseverance is an essential requisite in all negotiations on arms control and disarmament. We have not yet been able to obtain any treaty on disarmament, partial or otherwise. That does not mean we should discard the concept of general and complete disarmament under effective international control-and that too in favour of a discriminatory concept of monopolistic armament-or that we should discard the concepts underlying various partial measures of disarmament in favour of concepts of graduated and responsive armament.

Secondly, although it is true that we have had no treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons so far, there is no reason to believe that we shall have a genuine and abiding treaty on the basis of any but the right concept. What is important is to have, not just any treaty, but a treaty which truly prevents the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom and French representatives in the Disarmament Sub-Committee warned the international community that additional countries would manufacture nuclear weapons, that there would be what is called further proliferation of nuclear weapons, unless the existing nuclear-weapon Powers stopped further production of those weapons themselves; and that is exactly what happened in 1952, in 1960 and in 1964.

It has been argued that, although the weight of history and the wisdom of principles require that a satisfactory and adequate treaty should be non-discriminatory and should prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons by all nations, nuclear as well as non-nuclear, big as well as small, powerful as well as weak, developed as well as underdeveloped, one has to be realistic. Surely realism should be a criterion to be applied to all States. If it is unrealistic to believe that the nuclear-weapon Powers will agree to a treaty which prevents the proliferation of their own weapons, it is equally unrealistic to assume that the non-nuclear nations, and Particularly the nonaligned nations which are facing the threat of nuclear weapons, will be enthusiastic about a discriminatory and ineffective treaty, a treaty which not only does not add to their security but in fact increases their insecurity. Jawaharlal Nehru said this in the Indian Parliament ten years ago:

"It is a strange way to ensure security by adding to every conceivable danger.

In the name of security atomic tests should go on; in the name of security hydrogen bombs should be flown," over the place; in the name of security all kinds of terrible weapons should be evolved; and in the name of security each party slangs the other and thereby creates an atmosphere where the danger becomes more acute. Of course, everyone must recognize the argument for security. No country and no government can risk its future, or can accept a position when another country can impose its will upon it. But if, in order to ensure security, measures are to be taken which really endanger it still further, then we fail in getting that security".

The Indian delegation has stressed repeatedly that further proliferation is only the consequence of past and present proliferation and that, unless we halt the actual and current proliferation of nuclear weapons, it will not be possible to deal effectively with the problematic danger of further proliferation among additional countries. In the language of United Nations resolution 2153A (XXI) (ENDC/185), an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons should achieve three objects: (1) prevention of an increase of nuclear arsenals, (2) prevention of a spread of nuclear weapons over the world and (3) prevention of an increase in the number of nuclear-weapon Powers.

As the resolution further points out, that can be done only by adhering strictly to the principles laid down in resolution 2028 (XX). The principles enunciated in resolution 2028 (XX) take into account the historical verities of the situation and stipulate how a treaty should be drafted so as to be acceptable and satisfactory to all concerned. They are not merely a set of principles set forth in a United Nations resolution; they are in fact the essential components of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Indian delegation has often analysed these principles and indicated how they should be given practical shape in an international instrument. The first principle has stipulated, inter alia. that the treaty should not permit nuclear or non-nuclear-weapon Powers to proliferate. The second principle has stated explicitly that the treaty should have within its body a balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of both the nuclear and the non-nuclear-weapon Powers. The third principle requires that the treaty should be a step towards disarmament and, more particularly nuclear disarmament. The fourth principle has asked us to ensure that the provisions in the treaty

132

based on these principles and incorporating this balance should be effective and not remain merely

an expression of intention or goodwill.

The non-aligned delegations have placed special emphasis on the principle of balance and on the principle that the treaty should be a step towards nuclear disarmament. There is no balance, however, between a platitude on the one hand and a prohibition on the other. Again, nuclear disarmament is not achieved by retrograde steps taken in the direction of the retaining of exclusive rights, privileges and options by certain armed and powerful countries, by acts of emission or commission and by the imposing of prohibitions on the rest--the threatened and the unarmed.

Earlier I referred to the basic terms of reference of our Committee-the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations formulated by the United States and the USSR in September 1961, They provide general as well as specific guidance in respect of all negotiations on matters of disarmament and arms control.

The eigth principle of the Statement stipulates:

"... efforts to ensure early agreement on and implementation of measures of disarmament should be undertaken without prejudicing progress on agreement on the total programme and in such a way that these measures would facilitate and form part of that programme". (ENDC/5, p. 3)

## The fifth principle states:

"All measures of general and complete disarmament should be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any State or group of States gain military advantage and that security is ensured equally for all." (ibid., p. 2)

Any measure which gives a tacit licence to a small group of States to develop, and augment its nuclear weaponry is in fundamental contradiction of those principles and purposes. When at the same time that particular measure imposes selective prohibitions only on the unarmed States, it certainly does not en-sure equal security for all.

As the Joint Statement has rightly emphasized, the supreme consideration is security. Some

nations may feel that their military pacts and alliances provide them with protection from nuclear threats or attacks. Others may feel that their geographical location or political affiliation gives them the requisite security. Even if they are right, our negotiations must ensure that security is safeguarded equally for all-for the aligned as well as the non-aligned, for those far away from hosthe nuclear arsenals as well as those in the neighbourhood of them; otherwise the disarmament or arms-control measure in question, ceases to be meaningful.

There has been some discussion, in this context, of security assurances to be given to nonnuclear nations. Theoretically speaking, such assurances or guarantees have been regarded as a means of ensuring security, the belief being expressed that it is possible or feasible to have unconditional, automatic, obligatory, credible and effective response from the super-Powers in case of nuclear threat or attack against the nonnuclear-weapon States. We should not, however, confuse the means with the end. Security assurances or guarantees are not the same thing as, security. The threat to the security of nonnuclear-weapon countries comes from the arsenals of the nuclear-weapon countries; and the correct way of dealing with that threat is to ensure in the first instance that no international treaty gives a licence to the possessors of these weapons to continue increasing the instruments of their threat: their nuclear weapons. The question of credible assurances against the use or threat of the weapons already in the armouries of the nuclear-weapon Powers is only the second and subsequent step.

All measures of disarmament and arms control have thus to be viewed in the context of security for all. The nations which believed that security was ensured by the possession of nuclear weapons have already acquired them; and they continue to act in terms of increasing the area of their security by embarking on wider, newer and more ominous systems of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery. 'Mat is not, however, the approach of a large number of nations, despite their technological and material endowments. India, in particular, believes that international security lies not in armament but in restraints on armament and in disarmament. That belief, in fact, is the basic philosophy underlying all discussions on disarmament, whether in our Committee or elsewhere.

It is in that context of history, as well as of fundamental principles, that we have to view the revised draft treaty before us: and it is in that context that we have to examine how it can be improved and made responsive to the needs and problems of all nations. History has taught us that proliferation cannot be ended unless nuclearweapon stocks are frozen at their present level and all further manufacture is prohibited. The principles worked out by the super-Powers, as well as by the United Nations, tell us that proliferation can be prevented if the appropriate treaty embodies a balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of nuclear and non-nuclearweapon Powers not to proliferate. That balance has also been defined. It should be such that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty

133

could any State or group of States gain military advantage, the supreme requirement being that security is ensured equally for all.

In their revised draft the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union have adopted the same framework as in their earlier draft treaties (ENDC/152 and Add.1; ENDC/164). The non-aligned delegations in the Committee commented on those drafts in their memorandum of August 1966 (ENDC/178) and said that the drafts did not pay full attention to the principles laid down in United Nations resolution 2028 (XX). If the draftsmen of the revised text had followed the correct approach and, in the language of United Nations resolution 2153A (XXI), adhered strictly to those principles, they would have been able to draft a more satisfactory document and our task would have been comparatively easier. At the same time, it would not be too difficult, given the will and the effort, to improve the present draft treaty so that it would conform, to the mandate given to us by the United Nations General Assembly.

As I said earlier, the United States-USSR draft is the result of exhaustive negotiations among the aligned nations for a period of nearly a year. The non-aligned members of the Committee have just seen the full and final text and will now need to

examine it carefully. To them the matter is extremely vital, for they are the non-possessors of nuclear weapons and wish to remain so. Their cities and populations, their industry and economy, are increasingly menaced by megadestruction even today, not to speak of the 1970s. At the same time, they are in no position to spend countless millions in perfecting either a defensive nuclear system or a deterrent offensive capability. Above all, they do not believe in nuclear weapons.

While this examination of the United States-USSR draft by delegations and governments is a continuing process, it will be helpful for the purposes of our negotiations and improvement of the draft if I make some preliminary comments on the documents before us. A negotiating committee is also a drafting committee, particularly when its negotiations relate to a draft. We are still at a drafting stage, and my comments are of the nature of those one makes in a drafting committee.

I do not propose at this stage to comment comprehensively on the preamble or on all the articles of the United States-USSR draft; I shah refer only to some of its basic provisions. The preamble could be altered, added to or subtracted from very easily to conform to the changes in the basic articles of the treaty. I shall therefore not refer to it in these preliminary comments. I shall not refer either, for the time being, to the unwelcome idea of a veto--a double veto--on amendments, the inadequacy of the review provisions, or the shortcomings of the withdrawal clause. I shall confine myself this morning to the basic articles of the treaty. Once they are improved, other improvements should present little difficulty.

The Indian delegation has stated in the past that there are two facets of the problem of proliferation of nuclear weapons: the first is that of dissemination, that is of transfer and receipt of weapons and weapon technology; and the second that of proliferation proper--that is, of manufacture of nuclear weapons. It is appropriate that the first two articles of a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should deal with those two aspects of the problem.

Articles, I and II of the draft before us purport to deal with those two facets of the prob-

lem. When commenting on the earlier drafts the Indian delegation pointed out that there was general agreement among nuclear--as well as non-nuclear-weapon Powers an the basic components of an article dealing with the question of dissemination of weapons. There was only some disagreement in that regard between the two super-Powers on the question of nuclear armament within alliances: and that has now been happily resolved.

No attempt appears to have been made, however, to deal with the question of the transfer of nuclear weapons to and their stationing in the territories of other countries, or with that of the training of the armed personnel of non-nuclear nations in the use of nuclear weapons. It should be remembered that India and other countries raised those points in recording their Reservations at the time of the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1665 (XVI) (the "Irish" resolution) in 1961. That matter represents one of the important features of the problem of dissemination.

Article I of the United States-USSR draft has another lacuna. That article says, inter alia, that nuclear-weapon States undertake not to assist, encourage or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or control over such weapons. Does it mean that one nuclear-weapon State can assist, encourage and induce another nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or acquire or control nuclear weapons? Surely that cannot be permitted. That may perhaps be only a drafting error or oversight which can be corrected easily. In any case it will need to be corrected.

There is, however, a third objection, which is much more serious. The old drafts submitted by the United States and the USSR, however, faulty in some respects, had one advantage. They dealt with nuclear weapons and their

134

partial proliferation but not with other matters. That, regrettably, has been changed in the draft, and art effort is now being made to deny development of peaceful technology to non-nuclear-weapon States in the field of nuclear ex-

plosions. Proposals are also being advanced for the establishment of a super-commercial monopoly of the nuclear-weapon Powers in this field. An appropriate draft on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons will have to deal only with the proliferation of nuclear weapons and not with explosive devices for peaceful purposes. Accordingly all references to such devices should be deleted from the treaty.

India is devoutly in favour of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but is equally in favour of proliferation of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. There have been debates over the years in various forums on the question of free-Gum of national research and development of atomic energy of the dangerous kind or the non-dangerous kind, as it was once called. Along with other nations, India has long maintained that there should be no fetters of any kind on the development of atomic energy for the purposes of economic and non-military development. At the same time, India is willing to agree to international regulation under a non-discriminatory and universal system of safeguards to ensure that no country manufactures or stockpiles nuclear weapons while undertaking research and development of peaceful nuclear explosives. As I said once before, however, India does not believe in throwing the baby away with the bathwater.

Those, then, are the three important draw-backs in article I as it is now drafted in documents ENDC/192 and ENDC/193.

Article II of the recommended draft is much more unsatisfactory. Unlike article I, which deals only with dissemination, this article mixes up the issues of dissemination and the manufacture of weapons. That is not because of any inadequacy in drafting but because the draft treaty in general, and this article in particular, does not adhere strictly to the principles of United Nations resolution 2028 (XX); nor does it take into account the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles of September 1961. It fails to heed the advice of Mr. Stassen, Mr. Jules Moch, Mr. Nutting and others and ignores the tragic lessons of the history of past proliferation. In effect, that article imposes discriminatory prohibition only on the non-nuclear-weapon, States, and gives a licence to the nuclear-weapon Powers to

continue their production and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

As I said earlier, article II does not deal only with the manufacture of nuclear weapons; it also incorporates a provision concerning dissemination--that is, receipt of nuclear weapons by non-nuclear-weapon Powers. All provisions concerning dissemination should appropriately be in article I. If necessary, that article can have two parts. Article It can then be confined to manufacture and will provide that each State party to the treaty undertakes henceforth not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons.

I should now like to refer to the two missing articles of the treaty, one relating to control and the other relating to obligations towards nuclear disarmament. The delegations of Sweden (ENDC/195) and Mexico (ENDC/196) have already taken welcome initiatives to fill in those gaps.

An article on control in a treaty on arms control and disarmament is a corollary to the basic articles of that treaty. An appropriate system of control in a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be related, therefore, to the twin facets of dissemination and manufacture of nu clear weapons--that is, to the provisions of articles I and II.

There is much talk these days of loop-holes, in a treaty on non-proliferation--and that, curiously enough, in the context of peaceful development of nuclear energy by non-nuclear-weapon nations. There will in fact be a real and dangerous loophole if there is no satisfactory control to ensure observance of the provisions in the present draft that the nuclear-weapon Powers should not transfer nuclear weapons or control over such weapons directly or indirectly, and that non-nuclearweapon Powers should not receive such weapons or assistance in their manufacture. The situation becomes particularly dangerous when it is universally known that one nuclear-weapon Power believes that it is desirable and even necessary for a large number of countries to possess, nuclear weapons, and describes those weapons as providing "encouragement to all the revolutionary peoples of the world who are now engaged in heroic struggles".

When there is so much talk of loop-holes and of stringent provisions of control of manufacture of weapons, and that also in a discriminatory manner, it is worth remembering that there is equal, if not greater, justification for effective provisions to ensure that there is no dissemination of weapons or weapon technology from a nuclearweapon Power to any other country. The concern of the Indian delegation is all the greater in that respect as the People's Republic of China has already expressed its complete opposition to signing any treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. While the other nuclear-weapon Powers are against the actual transfer of nuclear weapons to other nations as well as against the training of personnel belonging to non-nuclear-

135

weapon States in the use of these weapons as such, the same cannot be said of the People's Republic of China. To a country like India, that is vital.

Then there is the question of control over the production of nuclear weapons. The basic provision in an appropriate treaty will stipulate that all States undertake henceforth not to manufacture nuclear weapons. That will entail control over weapon-grade fissile material and the facilities which fabricate weapon-grade fissile material.

The Indian delegation believes, therefore, that the control provisions should deal with the transfer and receipt of fissile material, the transfer and receipt of weapons and weapon technology, and the lacilities for production of weapon-grade fissile material. This should be adequate and should provide a reasonable solution to the problem of control. It has been pointed out that uranium mines, plants for fabrication of fuel elements and the reactors are not in themselves a military danger. They do not promote any military purpose unless they are coupled with plants and facilities for the fabrication of the fissile material into weapons. It is the gaseous--diffusion plants, the chemical-separation plants and the centrifuge plants, if any nation is developing them, which have to be controlled.

The fundamental requirement that the Indian delegation puts forward in this context is that

control should be universal, objective and nondiscriminatory. The extent of the comprehensiveness or coverage of control provisions depends upon the mistrust and suspicion the negotiators have in regard to the parties to a treaty, Normally it is unreasonable and unprofitable to base an international instrument on the extreme threshold of unmitigated suspicion. There is, however, no cure for suspicion or mistrust. If it is generally proposed that control should be more comprehensive than what I have just outlined, India will have no objection, as long as it is universal and objective and applies in a nondiscriminatory manner to all nations, big and small, nuclear and non-nuclear. It would be entirely unjustified to direct the suspicions only towards the weak, the unarmed and the unpossessed. If there are to be any suspicions at all, it is the proclivities of the powerful, the armed and the possessors of weapons which should evoke greater suspicion. The control provisions should also cover all aspects of the problem and not only those which cause concern to the nuclear-weapon Powers and their allies.

On the basis of these criteria and considerations, the question of amending the text of article III, when it is presented to us, will not be difficult. All that will be necessary will be to omit the words "non-nuclear-weapon States", if the draft discriminates against that group of States. The extent and comprehensiveness of the control provisions will depend upon what the nuclear-weapon Powers are prepared to accept for themselves.

Finally, there is the missing article on obligations for disarmament. United Nations resolution 2028 (XX) stipulates that a satisfactory treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons has to be based on that principle. That requirement cannot be fulfilled by a mere mention of intentions and desires in the preamble to the treaty. Four years ago, more than a hundred nations subscribed to a Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in tire atmosphere, in outer space and under water (ENDC/100/ Rev. 1). That treaty also had preambular paragraphs, one proclaiming its principal aim to be the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament, and the other testifying to the search by

the United Kingdom, the United States and the Soviet Union for achievement of the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time, to their determination to continue negotiations to that end, and to their desire to put an end to the contamination of man's environment by radioactive substances. After four long years the international community is further away from the discontinuance of all test explosions than it was at that time.

The draft now before us is even more halting and hesitant than the Moscow test-ban treaty. Its preamble declares only the intention of achieving the cessation of the nuclear arms race. When it conics to specific measures, the preamble only expresses the desire to ease international tension which, when achieved, would have the result of facilitating the cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons, the liquidation of all existing stockpiles and so on--and that also as part of a comprehensive treaty on general and complete disarmament. That is hardly the fulfilment of a principle which, according to the United Nations, should form the basis on which a treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is to be constructed.

As the Indian delegation and others have pointed out, the threat to the security of nations is posed by the existence of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of nuclear-weapon Powers. Although the draft treaty on non-proliferation that the Indian delegation urges for acceptance by the international community will freeze that threat quantitatively at the existing level, the threat as such will still remain. The nuclear-weapon Powers of the world already have in their possession more than enough weapons to destroy all civilization as we know it. Our treaty would therefore have to deal in a much more specific

136

manner with the threat which the nuclear weapons pose to the security of nations.

The ideal solution would be to envisage a specific programme of disarmament in the treaty. The Indian delegation recognizes at the same time that the nuclear-weapon Powers are not at present prepared to consider this proposition. In view of that, the Indian delegation would suggest

the incorporation of a separate article in the treaty affirming the solemn re-solve of the nuclear-weapon Powers to undertake meaningful measures of disarmament, particularly of nuclear disarmament. Such a provision would also need to be related specifically to the article dealing with the review conference.

These are sonic of the preliminary comments and suggestions that the Indian delegation wished to make at this stage in the context of our negotiations. All of us have a common objective, and that objective is to eradicate the nuclear menace as soon as possible and to ensure security for all. We also believe that prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, which would halt the arms race even if it did not encompass a reduction of nuclear arms, is the first step that we must take in our quest for that objective.

INDIA SWITZERLAND USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA SWEDEN MEXICO CHINA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri C. R. Gharekhan's Statement in the Committee of Twentyfour on Fiji

Shri C. R. Gharckhan, Indian Representative at the U.N. Committee of Twentyfour (on colonialism), made the following statement at the 560th meeting of the Committee held in New York on September 14, 1967:

My delegation has studied the statement made by the representative of the administering Power concerning Fiji, as well as the working paper prepared by the Secretariat on this subject. The working paper, though containing useful information, is not as up-to-date as we would have liked it to be. This is perhaps inevitable since some of the developments in the territory took place only recently. The representative of the administering Power did attempt to bring the picture up-to-date, but with some significant omissions to which I shall refer later.

Taking into account all the facts of the situation, my delegation feels that the remarks made by it in the Fourth Committee last year are still valid. Very little, if any, effort has been made by the administering Power towards fulfilling the provisions of various resolutions adopted by the Special Committee, as well is by the General Assembly, on Fiji in particular Resolution 2185 (XXI). That resolution called upon the administering Power to take certain measures which, in the view of the General Assembly, are necessary to lead Fiji towards its independence as a unified and truly multiracial nation.

The administering Power was called upon in that resolution to abolish discriminatory measures, to transfer full powers to the Constituent Assembly to be elected on the basis of a straightforward one man, one vote principle, to fix an early date for independence and to receive a visiting mission in the territory. It will be obvious to members, from the working paper as well as from the statement of the administering Power, that none of these demands of the General Assembly has been fulfilled by the administering Power. My delegation cannot but regret this failure of the administering Power.

My delegation has, on several occasions in the past, explained how the present electoral system in Fiji discriminates against the indigenous Fijians and Fijians of Indian origin, the sole beneficiaries of the system being the tiny but power-

137

ful European minority. Out of the thirty-six elected members of the legislature. Europeans, who are less than 5 per cent of the population, have ten seats as against fourteen seats for indigenous Fijians, who constitute about 41 per cent of the population, and twelve seats for the people of Indian origin, who are a little over 50 per cent of the population. We would also like to remind the Committee, at the risk of repetition, that the electoral system is weighted heavily in favour of the European community. Thus, if one examined the system carefully, one would find that one European vote actually equals nine indigenous

Fijian votes and ten votes of Fijians of Indian origin.

The statement of the administering Power was significantly silent on the composition of the former Executive Council which has now been made into a Council of Ministers. It will be recalled that my delegation asked a question to the administering Power on this, but the representative of the administering Power said he was not in a position to furnish an answer at that time. We obtained this information from our own sources, and I am sure this will be of interest to the members of this Committee. The Executive Council started with ten members, to which one was, added subsequently. Of these eleven members of the old Executive Council, the European community, or rather the community which likes to call itself neither Fijian nor Indian. had six members. The indigenous Fijians had three and the so-called Indian community had two. This means that less than 5 per cent of the population had about 55 per cent of the scats in the Executive Council, whereas 91 per cent of the population had about 45 per cent of the seats. In the new Council of Ministers the Europeans have four seats, while the Fijians and the socalled Indians have three scats and one seat respectively, not counting the assistant ministers of which there are two. It does not require any profound analysis to show the disproportionately unjust share of power retained by the European community.

The representative of the administering Power devoted a considerable part of his statement to the need for developing racial harmony in Fiji. My delegation could not agree more with him on this subject. In fact this is the desire of all of us here. But we differ from him on the steps to be taken to bring about this objective. The representative of the administering Power himself admitted that there has been very little effective integration on the political or social level between the two main communities in Fiji. He, however, did not think that any useful purpose would be served by analysing the reasons for it or by apportioning blame on any one. My delegation, however, thinks differently.

History is formed Largely by the actions of men. The conditions prevalent in a colony are directly attributable to the Policies of the colonial Power concerned. If there has been, very little integration between different communities in Fiji, the administering Power can by no means escape responsibility for it. My delegation contends that it was the deliberate policy of the administering Power, as has been evidenced in many other British colonies also, to preserve and accentuate the differences between different communities so as to maintain its own dominant position.

The British Government could and should have seen to it that whatever differences there might have been between the various, communitics were minimized and, in the end, removed, instead of fomenting suspicion between them. My delegation believes that differences between the Fijian community and the community of Indian origin have been grossly exaggerated by the administering Power and that, given a chance and proper circumstances, the two principal communities in Fiji would be able and willing to live in peace and harmony. Thus in 1929, elections to the municipality in Suva had taken place on a common roll vote. We understand that the system was highly successful, which was perhaps one of the reasons why it was discontinued subsequently. The latest experiment in a cross voting system is a further proof of the fact that the two communities are perfectly capable of maintaining it harmonious relationship among themselves.

Why do the representatives of the administering Power insist on referring to the people of Indian origin as the Indian community? These people, who were forcibly taken several generations ago to Fiji to work as indentured labour on European-owned plantations, are as much Fijians as the indigenous Fijians themselves. If the Europeans want to retain their separate identity, they are welcome to do so. But my delegation submits that it is patently wrong to continue to classify the people of Indian origin as the Indian community. It is typical of the colonial policy that an Englishman going to Rhodesia becomes a Rhodesian, while an Indian going to Fiji continues to be labelled as an Indian. This practice of giving unnecessary labels to a part of the community would simply defeat the purpose which the administering Power says it is promoting, namely communal harmony.

As was stated by the representative of the administering Power himself, both the communities in Fiji accept that the long term aim should be--a single common roll, regardless of community or race. My delegation has no reason to doubt that a common roll system if

138

introduced in the community now would have very beneficial results for the people of Fiji as a whole.

My delegation is particularly convinced of this fact because we have been greatly impressed with the type of leadership which is now coming to the fore in the Wand. The Chief Minister, Mr. Ratu Mara, has already proved himself to be a very competent leader who is successfully tackling the task of building up his Country as a truly multiracial society.

My delegation does not consider it necessary to comment in any detail on the powers of the legislative and executive bodies in Fiji. We would merely point out that the powers of the executive, as well as of the legislature, are far from being "full" as demanded in General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI). The change-over to the new ministerial system, though welcome in itself, does not seem to imply any additional executive powers to the members of the Ministerial Council. The discretionary powers of the Governor to dissolve or prorogue the Executive Council and to act against the advice of the Executive Council seem to be very wide.

The administering Power's refusal to agree to a visit to the Territory by the Sub-Committee on Fiji came as a great disappointment to my delegation. My delegation was hoping that since the Government of the United Kingdom agreed to receive a visiting mission in one of its other colonial responsibilities, which was perhaps a far more complex and delicate situation, it would find it possible and perhaps to be in its own interest to have a visiting mission of this Committee in Fiji. The representative of the administering Power stated that his Government did not think any useful purpose would be served by such a visit to the Territory, especially in view of the unacceptable resolutions on Fiji adopted in recent years. But an overwhelming

majority of the General Assembly is of the view that such a visit would be eminently useful in ascertaining the facts at first hand.

A visit by the United Nations would also serve to allay the fears of some of the people in Fiji, which the administering Power says they have. about the possible repercussions of United Nations "interference".

My delegation would like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your decision to appoint the Sub-Committee in spite of the lack of co-operation by the administering Power. We hope that the Sub-Committee will meet at an early date.

Even at this stage, and I shall not call it a late stage, my delegation hopes that the administering Power will reconsider its decision regarding the visiting mission. Otherwise, the members of the Committee will be entitled to draw the obvious conclusions from the continued refusal of the administering Power to receive a visiting mission in Fiji.

INDIA FIJI USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date** : Sep 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND & WORLD BANK

Shri Morarji Desai's Speech at the Annual Meeting

Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister of India, made the following speech at the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) on September 26, 1967:

Mr. Chairman, may I first of all congratulate you, Sir, on the very discerning address with

which you summoned us to our task yesterday at this annual gathering. To our hosts, the Government of Brazil, all of us owe a heavy debt of gratitude for the excellent arrangements made for us and for the, gracious words of welcome with which our present session was inaugurated by the President of this great country. This is my first visit to Brazil and indeed to Latin America. India and Latin America are separated by thousands of miles, but we are drawn together by our common endeavours for the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of our people. I have no doubt that the present meeting will mark yet another stage in the coming together of Asia Africa and Latin America, a coming together which is directed solely against poverty, hunger and want among our people. I would also like to take this opportunity to welcome in our midst the new members of the Fund/Bank community. We are particularly happy that representatives of Indonesia are fortunately with us a-gain after a brief interruption.

This year, the Bank and Fund have completed 21 years of existence. Beset as we are with problems of one kind or another from year to year, we are naturally inclined to focus at these, gatherings on difficulties and disappointments of the day. But the year in which our two cherished institutions have come of age is perhaps also the appropriate time to look back at the entire balance sheet of our efforts and endeavours. As Mr. Woods reminded us yesterday, it is, during these two post-war decades that improvement of the well-being of human beings everywhere has been accepted, for the first time in history, as an international objective and responsibility. At no other time in the past has concern for one's fellow-men extended so nobly beyond national or racial or religious frontiers. What is more, what has happened in the social, economic and political fields during the past twenty years in both industrialised and developing countries has surpassed the expectations of even the most optimistic among us. In international league tables, which have become fashionable in some quarters, we, see from time to time different countries going up or down in respect of the record of economic progress or political stability or social consciousness and individual freedom. But the more remarkable fact is that behind these vagaries of fortune there ties. everywhere

an unprecedented struggle and striving for betterment of human conditions. We have not all followed the same path; nor have many of us followed the same path consistently. But whatever the course of action that we may have adopted from time to time in the light of our circumstances and in keeping with the tradition of our people, there are not many countries in the world and hardly any in the membership of our two institutions where the past 20 years have not witnessed a remarkable progress in the social economic or political fields.

Mr. Chairman, I consider it particularly appropriate to recall this at the present stage, when so many people hitherto committed to the cause of world economic development are beginning to be daunted and even disenchanted by the magnitude of the task that lies ahead. Throughout the developing world, there is at present a sense of disappointment about the progress made, whether in achieving satisfactory rates of growth or in mobilising adequate amounts of foreign aid on reasonable terms or in securing greater access to markets of affluent societies, or ensuring greater stability in regard to major primary exports. It is not uncommon to hear nowadays that the promise of the development decade has not been fulfilled, that the resolutions of the first UNCTAD conference have remained mainly on paper, that the Kennedy Round has not sufficiently taken into account the interests of the less developed countries-and to this. series of disappointments is added the fact that it has not been possible so. far for the richer countries to come to an agreement regarding the replenishment of IDA funds on a substantially larger scale than before. Among the richer countries also one senses some impatience with the fact that foreign aid continues to be needed on as large a scale as before that the poorer countries are not able to pay off their debts with interest in a reasonably short time, that the record of political stability has not been as enduring as one might have hoped for, and that many of the problems such as control of population or increases in exports or avoidance of inflation are proving more intractable than what all of us had hoped for. Undoubtedly, there is, substance in all these complaints. But if we allow the present mood of mutual disenchantment to settle, there is every danger of our dissipating the considerable gains of the past two decades. By all means, let us discuss our problems as freely and frankly as possible and team from the experience of each of us. But let us not lose our sense of proportion out of impatience. I was therefore particularly happy to note, Mr. Chairman, that you tried to put this question in proper perspective.

It is particularly heartening in this connection that this meeting should mark the culmination of one of the most outstanding achievements in history of our two institutions. The specific outline for a facility to meet the need for a supplement to existing reserve assets which has been drawn up by the Executive Directors for our approval is the result of patient negotiations over a period of years: and it represents a kind of compromise which is inevitable in any international undertaking. We ourselves would have preferred a more straightforward approach to

#### 140

this question of creation of international liquidity. But this is not the time to reopen the arguments and debates of the past. I would therefore say simply that we in India welcome the proposed seneme. We welcome it all the more because it ruily meets the fundamental requirement to which we attach importance---the requirement that any such scheme should be operated within the trusted framework of international monetary cooperation, namely the Fund and that it should apply uniformily to all members of the Fund. We have every hope that under the leadership of the Fund and its distinguished management, the scheme will be its distinguished management, outlook, fiexibility of approach and expert knowledge that we have come to expect from this institution. I should not fall on this occasion to express our appreciation and gratitude to all those who have worked so patiently for this culmination, to Mr. Schweitzer, to the Executive Directors of IMF, to the staff of the Fund, to the Group of Ten, to the secretariat of UNCTAD and to many individual experts and scholars who have contributed so much to the liquidity debate not only now but even when our two institutions were being conceived.

Looking ahead, it is our earnest hope that the liquidity exercise will not remain suspended in mid-air for any length of time---that the period between adoption of the contingency plan and

activation of the scheme would be as short as possible. The time for supplementation of existing reserves has already come. And there is no need to delay further action pending formulation of very precise criteria and guidelines to indicate the quantum of reserve creation. These are likely to evolve gradually in any even and experience of the first few years would itself influence further evolution of this scheme.

It is understandable that after 21 years, some need might be felt for possible reform in the normal functioning of the Fund. From time to time the less developed countries have made many suggestions to bring the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund more in line with the special and urgent requirements of a developing world. These and other suggestions will have to be examined carefully before any final decisions are taken on improvements in the present rules and practices of the Fund. However, it is our firm opinion that this question of reform of the present Fund should not be allowed to delay matters in regard to activation of the scheme for Special Drawing Rights.

Sir, one of the main reasons why we welcome the proposed scheme for Special Drawing Rights is because we see a definite link between the creation of international liquidity and the pursuit of more liberal trade and aid policies on the part of the richer countries. While the developing countries need a growing volume of reserves in their own right, they are equally interested in ensuring that the industrially advanced countries are not forced to follow restrictive trade and aid policies for want of sufficient room for manoeuvre in regard to their balance of payments. It is therefore legitimate for us to expect that the adoption of the Special Drawing rights scheme will facilitate a greater and more assured flow of multilateral foreign aid, that is of aid which we can count on with certainty over a number of years and without restrictions on its use.

It is therfore a matter of great regret for us that at his meeting we are not able to record any definitive progress towards replenishement of IDA funds, for which Mr. Woods and his associates have worked so hard and with such deep conviction and dedication for the past so many months. I am happy to note that Mr. Woods is

now encouraged to feel that the discussion concerning the amount, shares and conditions of the next replenishment of IDA's finances will now move forward to definite conclusions and that solutions may begin to take form at this very meeting. I earnestly hope that this question will be resolved soon and that at this meeting definite decisions will be taken, so that Mr. Woods is enabled to chalk out as specific time-table for new IDA credits, without which development programmes in many countries would be severely interrupted.

Our interest in IDA replenishment is clear. While we are naturally anxious to meet our own needs, we recognise that IDA operations should become more broad-based and should take into account the urgent needs of all its members among the developing countries. The best way of achieving this would be to replenish IDA funds on a substantially increased scale and indeed in a manner whereby availability of funds for IDA increases progressively from year to year. We are equally interested in IDA's operations being as unfettered as possible, while being not unmindful of the concern of countries in temporary balance of payment difficulties. I earnestly hope that the question of IDA replenishment would be well behind us by the time we all meet in New Delhi for the second UNCTAD conference.

Finally a word about the International Finance Corporation. IFC has served well its basic purpose of being a catalyst for private investment. The line of credit of \$100 million provided to IFC by the Bank should provide a basis for further useful expansion of IFC's operations. I am happy to say that IFC is playing a valuable role

141

in enabling us to secure financial and technical collaboration for the development of our industries, particularly the fertilizer industry.

Sir, I do not wish to take any more of your time by referring to many other aspects of international economic cooperation which are uppermost in our minds today as I have no doubt that some of my colleagues would undoubtedly do so. I would therefore conclude by expressing once again our deep sense of gratitude to the

Government and people of Brazil for receiving us so warmly in these beautiful surroundings.

## INDIA BRAZIL USA INDONESIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Sep 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Shri Morarji Desai's Address to National Press Club

Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister of India, paid a five-day visit to the United States of America from September 11, 1967. On September 12, the National Press Club in Washington gave a luncheon in his honour.

Speaking on the occasion, the Deputy Prime Minister said:

It is nearly five years since I came last to Washington and to the National Press Club. Many things have changed around the world In these five years. But one thing that has remained constant, and renews my spirit every time I come here, is the warmth and the hospitality of your people. Indeed, the purpose of my visit to the United States is, simply to reciprocate, once again, on behalf of the people and the Government of India, the goodwill and understanding that have distinguished the relationship between our two countries.

## COMMON VALUES

An Indian citizen visiting the United States finds the external landscape of your country quite different from that of his own. The technology and affluence of your cities bear little relation to what he experiences in his homeland. But very soon, almost in a matter of hours, when we look into your newspapers, or turn. on the radio,

or the television, or talk to a cab driver, the strangeness is lost and we from India sense that we are in a democracy as articulate and as individualistic as our own. And, I am told, Americans travelling in India have the same experience in reverse. The common values which we share of free discussion and of a free press make any citizen of one country feel perfectly at home in the other quite soon. This to me. gives the greatest assurance that in the future, as in the past, India and the, United States will continue to be close and good friends.

#### IMAGE OF INDIA

The press in India is free. If the domestic press is, free, the foreign press is even freer. What it says is not read within the country, and unlike the domestic press, it need make no allowance for the susceptibilities of the audience on which it reports. I am told that news about India in your national newspapers commands a great deal of interest; so, in fact, does the news about the United States in our newspapers. It will, therefore, be not inappropriate, and I hope not misunderstood, if, today, I were to address myself in this forum to correct the kind of image of India that has been projected in the American press in the past few months.

## 142

This image, if one were to describe it in broad terms, is that of a country which has suffered not only from bad luck, but also from bad management. The massive distress caused in India by two successive droughts has received much sympathy and understanding abroad and notably in your great country for which we are truly grateful. It has also, unfortunately, cast grave doubts about the correctness of India's policies for economic development and India's ability to feed herself in the future. Acts of God have not been adequately distinguished from acts of man and the overall impression of India that has been conveyed abroad is one of a country alternating from one crisis to another. These reports of gloom and doom are, I submit, quite mistaken. They are mistaken because they ignore the historical perspective of what has happened within India in the twenty years of her existence as an independent nation. They are unfortunate because they do not do justice to the value of

India's stability and growth to the international community.

#### NATIONAL INTEGRATION

Looking back at what has been achieved in India in the last twenty years, the first fact that comes to my mind, which is almost forgotten now, is the achievement of national integration without violence. When India became independent in 1947, what was one political entity was split into two nations and nearly 600 India, I would remind you, is in sharp contrast to the experience of many samller countries in Western Europe which achieved their national unity not without bloodshed or bitterness.

In the aftermath of independence, we also had a rehabilitation problem comprising some ten million refugees who had to be resettled and integrated in new surroundings. This problem was again solved with despatch and in a manner designed to wine out the vestiges of ill-feeling and bitterness which unfortunately marked the partition of India. In fact, even after the first few years of partition, refugees have continued to come from Pakistan to India whereas there has been hardly any movement in the other direction.

#### SECULAR DEMOCRACY

Along with national integration came the establishment of a secular democratic republic pledging to all its citizens equal justice under the law and equal opportunities for economic and social achievement. We have had twenty years in which this democratic structure based on a free vote for every adult man and woman, without any other voting restriction whatever, has been tested through stresses and strains and has come to stay. The India electorate, the largest by far among the world's democracies, has gone through the experience of four general elections and has each time made its choices in responsible ways. The most recent general elections in India, held early this year, have again demonstrated the complete freedom with which the Indian voter exercises his franchise. They have also demonstrated that a plurality in the party system is not inconsistent with the give and take, the compromise and accommodation, that are needed for the orderly functioning of a federal system. Today, most of the major parties represented in the Indian parliament are also the parties in power in the various states in India either singly or in combination with other local groups. This has led to the diffusion among the major parties of the training in the forming and running of governments that the Congress Party has had for several years. To the people, the last elections have shown that reasonable choices exist when they get dissatisfied with one party. The electorate also has an opportunity now to test and evaluate promises made at election time with performance after the elections. Another consequence of the elections is that in the conduct of the considerable political and economic relations that bind the Central Government in India with the Governments in the states, we can no longer proceed on the basis of decisions taken within one party in power in both the states and in the Centre: decisions will have to be and are being institutionalized within the framework of the Constitution and the Constitution has proved itself to be flexible enough for such a process. It is in these ways that we are witnessing a maturing of democracy, a testing and strengthening of its fibres in India today.

#### SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

What we are trying to do in India is to transform a multilingual, multi-religious and, to some extent, multi-racial society into a secular, literate, modern democracy, free from the inhibiting influence of superstition and religious intoleration. We believe that a man's religion is no less, but no more than his personal faith which has no relevance to the political life of the country and that all religions in their essence emphasize the brotherhood of man which is the highest value mankind has inherited so far. India is one of the very few countries where people with different religious faiths have lived and prospered side by side for hundreds of years---and this tradition

143

was interrupted only briefly during the closing yews of foreign domination. Any visitor to India is sure to notice this essential tradition of religious tolerance. I had some time ago referred to the image of India in the foreign press and speaking at this forum I may recollect the misgivings that were expressed in the foreign

press at the time when His Holiness the Pope visited India as to the kind of welcome which he was likely to receive. We in India had no doubt at all that His Holiness would be. accorded by the people of all religions the warmth and reverence that they would extend to their own religious leaders and indeed events proved us to be wholly justified. In the same way, we take pride that the President of India today belongs to a minority religious community. This is not merely symbolic for he war, elected to that high office not because he represented a particular community but because he emerged as the best choice on the basis of a national consensus, and the religious faith of a particular candidate was not a relevant factor in the emergence of that consensus.

#### **GREAT LEADERS**

The establishment and the continuation of this form of secular democracy which, unfortunately, has by no means been the uniform experience in many developing countries. has been possible in India basically because of two factors: firstly, the mat leader of our national revolution Mahatma Gandhi. vouchsafed to us the tradition of nonviolence and constitutional action through out the Tone process of winning freedom. Secondly. Jawaharlal Nehru, who led our country for seventeen years since independence recognized that the survival and sustenance of democracy can be assured only on the basis of steady economic growth towards a higher standard of life for the people. In recognition of this fact, he lost no time, after achieving independence, in launching, the country on a process of planned development.

#### ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER PLANNING

The first of the Indian Five Year Plans began in 1951; we have witnessed the completion of three Five Years Plans by the end of 1966 and it may be worthwhile to briefly review the development that has taken place. During the first two Plan periods, production of foodgrains increased from 54 to 82 million tons, that is by a little over 50 per cent whereas population increased by only 22 per cent. In fact, at the end of the Second Plan, we actually exceeded our target of food production. During the past six years we have had to contend with five bad

years: two of which witnessed droughts of a severity unprecedented in the previous hundred years. Even so, in 1964-65 when the weather was good, we produced 89 million tons of foodgrains, and this year, if all goes well, we hope to produce 95 million tons of foodgrains.

During this period, the area under irrigation has increased greatly and the consumption of chemical fertilizers has risen more than tenfold. There has been a consider-able investment in infrastructure, facilities. Electric power capacity has increased more than four-fold; there has been a striking progress in the electrification of towns and villages where the numbers have gone up from 3,600 to 62,000.

Railway freight capacity as well as the mileage of roads has been more than doubled, and India today not only manufactures rails, wagons and the locomotives required by our railways, but is also able to export them in competitive world markets. We have also started to manufacture most of the thermal and hydropower plants and transmission equipment we need and in a few months, we shall be commissioning our first nuclear power plant which has been set up with assistance from your country. In industry, the Iast fifteen years have seen an increase in output of nearly 150 per cent. Along with growth in output, there has been an increasing diversification and sophistication of the industrial structure arising from the fact that in India we have adopted a strategy of basic investments designed to exploit fully the natural resources of the country and to render our economy increasingly free from the need for foreign aid. India has one quarter of total world reserves of iron ore and has the potential to become one of the world's cheapest producers of steel. It is, therefore, rational, and not merely prestigious, for us to have undertaken large investments in steel production, which in this period has increased from 1.5 million tons to 6.2 million tons. The progress in other key industrial sectors necessary for self-reliant growth such as machine building, machine tools, chemicals and fertilizers, has been particularly striking at an average annual rate of growth of 15 per cent. There has been progress in the manufacture of consumer goods also, such as sugar, textiles, and light engineering goods which are also some of our important export commodities. The capacity for the manufacture

of chemical fertilizers has so far been created for 0.6 million tons and we have specific projects at various stages of implementation for increasing it to 2.8 million tons in the next five years.

In human terms, one of the most encouraging facts is that nearly 80 per cent of the children between the ages 6 and 11 attend school. The

144

number of primary and secondary schools has more than doubled and today, some 68 million children attend thew schools. There hag been a sharp increase in the number of technical institutions of all kinds, The number of hospital beds has doubled, and with the eradication of malaria and the control of many other diseases, there has been a fail in the death rate from 27 to 16 per thousand, and an increase in life expectancy from 32 to over 50.

#### SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES

This broad picture of achievements in the last fifteen years will give you an idea of the substantial changes that have taken place in the Indian economy. In aggregate terms, while the Indian economy for decades prior to the adoption of the First Plan was, virtually stagnant, real national income increased by nearly 70 per cent between 1951 and 1965. We can take some satisfaction from this, but to me as well as to my countrymen, we more crucial question is how much taster we can hope to develop in the future. The level of success we have had has itself generated a strong demand for a better We, a rise in expectations and a dissatisfaction with the rate of change among all sections of the people--business, labor, farmers students, the intelligentsia and that substantial minority-or is it a majority --which the National Press Club does not recognize, namely the women. And this is the most prominent single feature. of the Indian scene today. Our most recent general elections have demonstrated this dissatisfaction of the people which has taken the form in many parts of India of a desire for a change in the ruling party. Unfortunately, however, a change of party does not by itself strengthen the forces for, or increase the rate of, economic growth unless other elements that contribute to growth over some of which we have no control, are available. For the continuation of the democratic structure, this is the crucial test, namely whether it can be proved that the minimum aspirations of the people can be satisfied while preserving the social and human values that are the essence of a democratic system. In sharp contrast to what has happened in the only other comparable country, mainland China, we in India have struggled hard during these last twenty years to prove to ourselves and to the world that change is possible through persuasion rather than through force. But this is a struggle that has to be continued for many more years to come before the victory for democracy can be said to be decisive.

#### POLICY OF PEACE

One of the elements for stable and continued growth is the creation of conditions under which India can live in a state of peace and good neighbornness with the rest of the world and in particular with her immediate neighbours. We have, as a matter of policy, striven hard for this condition of good relations with the rest of the world and we derive satisfaction that our ties with all our neighbours, except unfortunately mainland China and Pakistan, have been the friendliest. With regard to Pakistan, which forms part of the same subcontinent, we desire nothing but the closest political and economic cooperation. We are ready and willing to discuss any and all mutual problems of interest with Pakistan and still await a response from her. The only thing that we, cannot and will not do is to give up any part of the integral territory of India.

## DEFENCE EXPENDITURE

Another requirement for development and stability is that unproductive expenditure of all kinds should be limited to the minimum, freeing the productive resources of the country for what directly results in an improvement in the standard of living. From this point of view also, we desire the creation of conditions under which India could reduce her expenditure on armaments. Before the Chinese invasion of India in 1962, our level of defence expenditure at about two per cent of the National Product was one of the lowest in the world. Its increase to a little more than four per cent since then was directly related to the Chinese aggression and unfortunately it has had to remain at that level because of the

policies pursued individually and jointly by China and Pakistan. We most earnestly desire to Emit this expenditure but can do so only if there is a reduction or an elimination of the threat to our borders. Considering her excellent relations with China, Pakistan does not have to arm herself against any objective threat and as another country striving for rapid economic growth, she should be in even a better position than we are for avoiding wasteful and unnecessary defence expenditures.

#### FOREIGN AID

I might in this gathering also say a few words on how we in India look upon the role of foreign aid. In India, we have always considered foreign aid as an extraordinary form of the transfer of resources which, however vital in the initial years, should be terminated in as short a time as possible. Our development strategy is designed to increase our export earnings and to save or substitute imports so that within a definite period, the need for a continued inflow of foreign aid is dispensed with. We have never conceived of aid as a substitute for domestic savings and have used foreign aid only to finance goods and ser-

## 145

vices that have necessarily to be imported. Despite the very thin margin that exists between income and consumption at the low per capita income levels in India, domestic savings as a proportion of the National Product has been pushed up from 5 to 11 per cent in 15 years. Tax revenues as a proportion of GNP have more than doubled in the same period, and I am sure you would agree that this would be a considerable achievement in any democracy, whether affluent or otherwise. It is facts, such as these and the others I recounted earlier which give us hope and confidence that given a satisfactory inflow of net foreign resources into India over the next en years, we shall be able to dispense with foreign aid thereafter without jeopardizing our prospects for future growth. So far, aid has accounted for no more than 3 per cent of National Income and only to a sixth of total investment. These are ratios that compare favourably with the experience of most other developing countries of the world. India, because of her size, is the largest recipient of foreign aid in

absolute figures, but in per capita terms, the aid that most developing countries have received is much larger than the share of India.

## TASKS AHEAD

I hope I will not be misunderstood if I have laid some emphasis on the sheer magnitude of the asks that have been accomplished in India and the tasks that remain. India is one-seventh of humanity and one-third of all the poorer countries other than China. The maintenance of political and economic stability in this large. segment of humanity is in itself a contribution of no small value to the world at large. That this has been done within the framework of democracy is an achievement of which, in the conditions of the world today, we can legitimately be proud) The task that remains-and the enormity of it cannot be exaggerated- is to achieve in India rapid and self-sustaining economic growth. In this task we have so far had the understanding and support of many friendly countries and notably your own. Neither we nor you can afford to get tired when more than half the journey is over and the goal is reasonably in sight.

## USA INDIA PAKISTAN OMAN LATVIA RUSSIA CHINA

**Date** : Sep 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Food Agreement Signed

India and the United States concluded an agreement in New Delhi on September 12, 1967 for the supply of one million tonnes of American wheat and milo as well as for 70,000 tonnes of vegetable oil and 30,000 bales of extra long staple cotton under the U.S. Food for Peace (Public Law 480) programme.

The agreement implements the authorization of additional food for India announced by President Johnson on September 1, and will assure an unbroken flow of foodgrains to meet the shortage caused by drought. It brings the amount of U.S. foodgrains supplied to India during 1967 to 6.1 million tonnes and the total since 1951 to over 52 million tonnes.

The United States Ambassador, Mr. Chester Bowles, and Shri P. Govindan Nair, Secretary, Union Ministry of Finance, signed the agreement on behalf of the respective governments.

The agreement, which is a supplement to the basic agreement of February 20, 1967, is for a total value of \$86.5 million (Rs. 65 crores). The terms are similar to those of the last P.L. 480 agreement concluded on June 24, 1967.

To avoid delay in obtaining and shipping the foodgrains required by India, authorization was given, shortly after President Johnson's announcement, for the purchase of 600,000 tonnes of wheat. The India Supply Mission in Washington has already made a number of purchases and some grain under this agreement should be on the high seas late this month and can be expected to arrive in India in November.

India will pay for four-fifths of the value of the commodities in rupees. Eighty-seven per cent of these rupees will be loaned by the United States to the Government of India to finance development projects. A further five per cent is reserved for loans to American firms operating in India or for Indian firms with American collaboration.

Payment for the remaining one-fifth of the commodities, and up to one-half of the ocean freight costs for shipping this portion will be covered by a long-term rupee loan. The loan, repayable over 40 years, will have a ten-year grace period during which no repayment of principal will be required and interest will be one per cent per annum. Interest during the subsequent 30 years of repayment will be 2.5 per cent. As in the June 24 agreement, when payments are made under the terms of the loan for one-fifth of the commodities, the rupees

received will be convertible to dollars at the option of the United States.

The agreement notes that the proceeds of this long-term credit will constitute an additional resource for financing India's annual and long-range development plans.

Today's agreement will help maintain the greatly increased rate of food supplies from the United States, which has been consistent since the failure of the monsoon in 1965. During the 30 months ending December, 1967 the United States will have supplied a total of 17.5 million tonnes of foodgrains to India.

With today's agreement, the total value of P.L. 480 commodities supplied to India rises to \$4,006 million. The supplies include 43 million tonnes of wheat, 4.7 million tonnes of maize and milo, 1.75 million tonnes of rice, 3.25 million bales of cotton, 297,000 tonnes of vegetable oils and considerable quantities of tallow, to-bacco, canned fruit and dairy products.

147

USA INDIA

**Date**: Sep 01, 1967

## **October**

	Volume	e No	
1995			
Content			

Foreign Affairs Record Vol. XIII

1967 OCTOBER No. 10

#### CONTENTS

**PAGE** 

## ALGIERS CONFERENCE OF "77"

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement at the Plenary Meeting 149

#### **CANADA**

Indo-Canadian Loan Agreements Signed

153

#### **CEYLON**

President's Speech at Banquet to the Governor-General of Ceylon

151

Reply by the Governor-General of Ceylon

154

Mr. Gopallawa's Speech at Banquet to President Zakir Husain

155

Reply by President Zakir Husain

156

## INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's Message on U. N. Day

157

Sardar Swaran Singh's Address to the General Assembly

158

Sardar Swaran Singh's Reply to Foreign Minister of Pakistan

162

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on West

Asia 163

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement on Nuclear-free Zone in Latin

America 165

## NEPAL

Joint Communique on Shri Morarji Desai's Visit

167

#### **POLAND**

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit

168

## UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Statement on Prime Minister's Visit

169

## YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet by President Tito

170

Joint Statement on Prime Minister's Visit

172

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION

## GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

#### ALGERIA CANADA USA INDIA PAKISTAN NEPAL POLAND YUGOSLAVIA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## ALGIERS CONFERENCE OF "77"

Shri Dinesh Singh's Statement at the Plenary Meeting

Shri Dinesh Singh, Minister of Commerce, made the following statement at the Conference of "77" in Algiers on October 13, 1967:

Mr. Chairman, first of all on behalf of my delegation and my own behalf, I should like to felicitate you most sincerely on your unanimous election as the Chairman of this meeting. We are indeed grateful to you for agreeing to guide our deliberations The glorious role you have played in the liberation of your country is well known to all of us. We expect that your guidance will enable the "77" to wage a successful struggle for the economic emancipation of the developing world.

Just about twenty years ago, we in India achieved our independence. It was a historic event for it also triggered the culmination of peoples' struggles for political emancipation all over the world. Over the last two decades, the entire complex of international relationships has undergone a revolutionary change. Over the greater part of the globe, political domination has been ended and sovereign nations have come into being.

A parallel change in economic relationships, has yet to take place. We in our country have, since the dawn of independence, been striving to develop and transform our economy to overcome dependence on foreign countries and to give our people a better life, Our people have cheerfully borne tremendous hardships. We have subjected ourselves to high taxation and to curbs on con-

sumption. In our endeavour to mobilize internal resources, we have denied ourselves many attractive items of consumption which would perhaps have made life more comfortable even if temporarily. Through all this effort we have been able to achieve a high rate of savings.

We have tried to develop our technical competence and sought to acquire greater knowledge of modern technology. We have made strenuous efforts; to augment our foreign incomes and to develop under conditions of unequal competition export markets for our goods. And yet we find we have still a long way to go before we can feel free in every sense of the word, before we can cooperate with the industrial nations of the world on an equal fooling, before we can be, satisfied that we have brought within the reach of all our citizens the possibility of large-scale application of modern technology to the resources with which nature has endowed us.

But we are not disheartened. We are determined to persevere in the path we have chosen even if the path is strewn with numerous obstacles which are the by-products of the colonial domination we have suffixed. We find also that there are other nations in similar situation and pursuing at the national level similar paths which have come up against similar obstacles.

We are, therefore, meeting together in Algiers to exchange our experience and to make a concerted effort to deal with these obstacles.

We meet under conditions of common adversity. The rate of economic advance in the developing world, instead of picking up, has declined. There has, been a setback in the income from the sale of primary products. The relative share of the developing world in the international trade in manufactures has shrunk. The net flow of capital resources from those who have to those who need them is threatening to take a downward dip. The chasm which divides the impoverished from the affluent nations is deeper and wider and has become more difficult to bridge than ever before. It is the tragic irony of our times that we should find ourselves in this situation in the seventh year of the development decade and in the fourth year after the adoption of the final act by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development,

It is our duty to examine why we have failed

to succeed and what we should do so that we may succeed in our future work. At the conclusion of the first United Nations Conference of Trade and Development, the "77" issued a momentous declaration of their resolve to work together for the creation of a new and just world order. We knew then that the first conference would not have met, the final act would not have been adopted and the continuing machinery would not have been brought into being if developing countries had not acted in concert, I repeat acted in concert in successive sessions of the Economic and Social

#### 149

Council in the General Assembly of the United Nations and elsewhere in evolving a common platform towards the end of the third fortnight of the Conference in Geneva and in conducting negotiations with the representatives of the developed countries during the last fortnight of that fateful Conference. We pledged ourselves in the declaration to maintain, foster and strengthen our unity in the future. Have we, may I ask, been faithful to this pledge? Have we, may I ask, been direction of our individual efforts to be deflected from our common goals? Can the failure to secure the implementation of the provisions of the final act be not attributed at least in part to our failure to maintain the momentum of our joint endeavours?

This meeting provides us with an opportunity to identify the deficiencies, in our efforts and to remedy them. I have carefully listened to my distinguished colleagues who have preceded me and I have been encouraged by the emphasis they have placed on the unity of "77" as an indispensable instrument for securing the adoption of new attitudes and new approaches in the international field. My delegation is ready to make its utmost contribution to the preservation and the strengthening of this unity.

The unity of "77" is based on the realisation that there, is no fundamental divergence in our economic interest and that all the countries represented here in this hall have a common stake in the restructuring of the world economic order.

There are many measures of international economic policy on which we have already reached agreement and which will bring benefit to all of us. These measures of course have had the unstinted support of us all. There are, however, other kinds of measures which are more relevant to the problems of only some of us and not so relevant to the problems of others. It is my submission that all such measures should be supported equally vigorously by all of us regardless of the extent to which one or the other measure benefits us more or less. It is the view of my delegation that the united support of the "77" as a whole is an essential pre-condition for the solution of even those problems which face only some of us.

I am convinced that we can greatly strengthen our unity if we are able to subordinate our national or regional interests to the common good of all. The fundamental basis of co-operation between nations is their ability to take into account the interest of others, and-to take an enlightened view of their own interests. It will' be the endeavour of my delegation to eschew narrow interests, to take interest in the difficulties which face other countries, to seek support for the solution of our difficulties which face other countries and to lend support to the solution of the difficulties of others.

We have also to be careful to see that the seeds of disunity being sown amongst us from time to time are not given opportunities to germinate. It is a cruet world we, live in. The poor not willing or able to earn a living by their own labours fall easy victims to charity and exploitations.

We have not, to the best of our knowledge, wavered in the past in our loyalty to the "77". We propose to listen attentively to the concerns to which expression will be given in the coming days so that we may harmonise, our national interests to the utmost extent practicable for the common good of all. We propose to stand shoulder to shoulder with our colleagues, from the developing world in our joint endeavour to ensure that before the second conference in New Delhi concludes its deliberations, the world community will have given itself a programme of international action to secure a rapid rate of advance for each one of us and for the economy of the world as a whole.

There is another aspect of the work of the "77" to which I should now like to turn. Each one of

us have toiled hard in the committees which have been set up by the first conference and also in the meetings of the Trade and Development Board. The secretariat has provided all the services expected of it and we have reason to be grateful to its distinguished Secretary General, Dr. Raul Prebisch for the sagacity he brought to bear on his manifold responsibilities and the vision which inspired his attempts to find solutions for our difficult problems.

And yet I have, the feeling that the results we have achieved have fallen far short of the expectations which had been aroused when we embarked on this adventure. It is possible that we have dissipated some of our energies in studies and in discussions and we have allowed ourselves to be engaged in wide ranging debates, some of them between ourselves, and not with the representatives of the developed countries. It is possible also that we did not concentrate our attention sufficiently on the means to secure the implementation of the modest gains of the negotiations in the concluding stages of the first conference. We certainly failed to mount a united and dynamic thrust to move the international community from the stage of deliberations. to the plane of concrete actions. The question is how can we remedy these deficiencies.

Fortunately for us the 5th Board succeeded with the help of our Secretary General in distinguishing issues on which negotiations can now be engaged with the more fortunate nations from those on which further work of study and consultation is necessary. We are also grateful to the Co-

## 150

ordinating Committee and its working groups for preparing the working documents which are now before us. The regional groups have held meetings to harmonies the points of view of their member-States and to give to us the basis for adopting a common position. The declaratory stage is now behind us: we should get down as speedily and as effectively as possible to We business of reaching agreement on the common platform for negotiations with the developed countries in New Delhi. We should, of course, be brief, we must also be realistic but at the same time we should be frank and precise in the statement of our position.

I do not wish at this stage of our Work to go into the concrete contents of our statement. I expect the committees we have set up will help us to formulate our conclusions. But I should like to dwell briefly on we modest objectives we should aim at. In the field of commodities we should, in the judgment of my delegation, seek to secure practical arrangements which will enable the exporting countries of the developing world to defend their economies against the adverse consequence of price fluctuations, to secure better returns for their labour and to achieve rising rates of exports and consumption. In the field of manufactures, our effort should be directed towards the institution of practical programmes to enable the members of the "77" to process their primary products, to diversify their economies, to bring about a more equitable division of labour, to overcome the handicaps inherent in the unequal conditions of competition and to secure substantial increases in the, off take by importing countries of their industrial products.

In the field of developmental financing, much remains to be done. The industrial nations now in the vanguard of economic progress have in a varying measure depended in the past on imported capital for their economic advance. The history of their development, largely based on colonial exploitation, about which for obvious reasons of good taste, I do not wish to speak in detail, imposes on them certain inescapable obligations. The international community has yet to give itself an adequate, mechanism to meet current economic necessities and to enable affluent nations to fulfil their historic obligations. It is up to us in this meeting to frame our views on this important subject and to request our friends to come to New Delhi prepared for a fruitful dialogue. There are many other matters we should include in our statement. In particular, we should deal as constructively as possible with the problem of adapting the, infrastructure of the world economy, including the monetary system, the arrangements relating to banking, insurance, shipping freights and opportunities and the practices in regard to the sharing of technological development to subserve the requirements of global expansions.

There is one more aspect to which I should like to invite the attention of this meeting. This is in regard to the inadequacies of the continuing

machinery which we accepted at the first conference as a result of prolonged negotiations. It has been our experience that by its terms of reference, the mechanism that we have at our disposal is condemned to engage itself only in endless discussion and debate. We have so far not succeeded in our efforts to build into this machinery those devices which have enabled industrial nations to act in concert and to use the processes of consultation and multi-nation pressures to contribute to one another's progress. We are aware of the revolution which has taken place in this regard in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation. The contracting parties to the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs have also utilized the techniques of negotiations, and consultation to achieve a remarkable. expansion in trade exchanges amongst industrial nations. Can we not endeavour to transplant some of these proved procedures into the working of UNCTAD?

Nothing will carry greater conviction with the nations whom we are urging to respond to our needs and aspirations, and nothing will hearten those elements in these nations, which are conscious of their national responsibilities and obligations more than the efforts and sacrifices which we the members of the "77" are able to make in the cause of our own economic and social development and the determination with which we succeed in pursuing programmes of mutual cooperation and assistance. All of us have a longway to go before each nation present in this chamber can claim that it has fully discharged its responsibility to its own peoples, to the group of "77" and to the world community as a whole. Nevertheless, the measures adopted over the past few years by the members of our group at national, sub-regional and inter-regional levels amply demonstrate their will and their determination to forge ahead. A striking example at the national level is the fulfilment by a large number of developing countries of the target of their domestic resources. Delegates must have been heartened by the "long march" recently undertaken by President Nyarere to encourage Tanzanians to rely on their own strength. In Nepal, the King has initiated a "Back to the village" movement. In my own country, our Prime Minister has laid the greatest emphasis on 'swadeshi', that is indigenous manufacture. We have also paid attention to agricultural productivity and the development of agro industries. We are determined to reduce

our dependence on external factors for securing further advances in the development of our economy. May I add a word of caution here. When we talk of self-reliance and import substitution. we do not mean what some, of the developed countries would like us to do, accept a secondary position of primary producers, country cousins,

151

second class citizens. What we say is that we should not constantly look up to the developed countries for their generosity or gifts. We need not copy them, need not and, in fact, should not, want to get overnight from them what they have acquired over a period of time albeit by exploiting us. Let us aim nigh not only to equal out surpass those now called developed. But then we must prepare for it, work for it and accept the necessary discipline, till we achieve it. May I say with all the frankness and the emphasis at my command, let us have the determination and the confidence to forge a future for ourselves by our methods and through our resources, both human, and material. This alone will force those, opposed to us to mend their ways, and submit to reason. This has been amply established in our struggle for political independence and I have no doubt it will lead us to success in our struggle for economic freedom

In this respect the efforts made by us to promow economic co-operation irrespective of political persuasions amongst different groups of developing countries, constitutes yet another example. At the regional level, India has had the opportunity and privilege of being partners in the endeavours. of the ECAFE developing countries to evolve the modalities of co-operation among them. India has also been taking part in the exploratory talks now going on under GATT among a group of developing countries for mutual exchange of preferences and we are about to succeed in evolving a framework of economic co-operation with developing countries from other regions. As many of my distinguished colleagues are aware, three countries met in New Delhi in December 1966 and resolved to prepare a modest scheme of inter-regional cooperation in trade and in industrial collaboration. The scheme evolved by the tripartite working groups is now engaging the attention of their respective Governments. It is our hope that

this essay in inter-regional co-operation will commend itself to the members of this group and many other countries will be prepared and willing in due course to contribute to its success and to participate in extending the scope and dimensions of its operation. These are but modest beginnings in the right direction. It is, in the view of my delegation, our joint responsibility in this meeting to formulate in concrete terms our plans for deepening and extending our mutual co-operation.

It has been urged in the past that we have parallel economies and consequently the scope for co-operating with one another is negligible. I wish to place for the consideration of my colleagues that this view stands in need of some modification. No country in this group produces on sufficient quantities all the raw materials that are needed for the development of its economy. Neither do also the developed countries and yet we have in our group all the raw materials, we need for the development of each one of us. Again we nave in our group, countries which have achieved substantial progress in the effort to diversity their economies. There are others which nave yet to embark on or succeed in this effort. The experience of one set of countries can be, of very great benefit to the efforts of the other set. Further, the desire of individual countries to concentrate on the most efficient utilisation of their limited resources in capital and technical know how and the need for profitable production to be based on multi-nation markets, will oblige each one of us to think in terms of specialisation of inter-change of experience of industrial collaboration and of the exchange of goods. In this connection, may I emphasise that we should not only think of economic co-operation in the field of trade but also industrial collaboration to manufacture together the goods we need. By doing so, we shall not only be sharing in capital management and profits but will automatically be building larger markets for the goods which can lead to greater production enabling modernisation and sophistication based on it.

Inevitably we shalt need to work hard to identify the sectors in which we can co-operate and collaborate to our mutual advantage and to the greater good of all of us, Perhaps the progress in the identification and exploitation of these

opportunities will be both gradual and difficult. It, however, we agree in this meeting to mount the necessary effort, if we make a firm resolution to surmount the difficulties in our path and it we decide on the machinery for the implementation of our resolution, we shall have succeeded in helping ourselves in strengthening the unity of "77", in building up regard for one another's requirements and possibilities and in assuring the international community that we are determined to do our duty and to meet out obligations.

I had occasion to refer earlier to those elements in the affluent nations which are engaged in persuading their fellow citizens, to rise to the occasion to meet the challenge of modern times and to give of their best for the evolution of a new order of economic relationships based on the economic freedom of sovereign nations and on voluntary co-operation amongst them. It should be our endeavour to take such steps as we may agree upon to give them all encouragement possible.

Mr. Chairman, on the soil of this, great country and in the suburbs of this great city, one of the epic struggles of national liberation has been fought. The only way we can honour those who have struggled for national freedom

152

in this country and in other lands is to address ourselves to the task left unfinished and to use the opportunity provided to us, by the kindness and generosity of the Government of Algeria to agree upon the strategy and the tactics to be followed by us in our common war on poverty, disease, ignorance, under-development and exploitation in all its forms. I have every confidence that our efforts shall be crowned with success.

ALGERIA USA INDIA RUSSIA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC TANZANIA NEPAL

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

## Indo-Canadian Loan Agreements Signed

India's High Commissioner in Canada, General J. N. Chaudhuri, and Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Paul Martin, signed in Ottawa on October 27, 1967 two loan agreements, providing for Canadian Dollars 29.50 million assistance to India.

The first loan agreement is for Canadian dollars 19.50 million for Idikki Power Project in Kerala. According to this loan agreement, Canada will supply equipment, including three generators and ancillary equipment required for power project. This project will supply electricity for industrial development of the area.

In the first stage, the power house will be capable of providing 400 megawatts of electric power and later on, this capacity will be raised to 800, megawatts. The completion of the first stage of this-project is expected to take five years.

This development loan is interest-free. The first repayment of the principal will be due on 30th September, 1977 and the whole amount will be repaid in 80 semi-annual instalments. There are no commitment fees or service charges.

The second loan is for Canadian dollars 10 million for the supply of industrial raw materials from Canada. The commodities included are sulphur, newsprint, copper, zinc, asbestos, aluminium, lead, synthetic rubber and wood pulp. The supply of these industrial materials from Canada will help India overcome its foreign exchange shortages.

CANADA INDIA USA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

## **CEYLON**

President's Speech at Banquet to the Governor-General of Ceylon

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, made the following speech at the Banquet given by him in honour of Their Excellencies Mr. W. Gopallawa, Governor-General of Ceylon, and Mrs. Gopallawa, in New Delhi on October 23, 1967.

Your Excellency the Governor-General, Madame Gopallawa, Hon'ble Ministers, Your Excellencies and Distinguished Guests:

As I rise to speak on this happy occasion may I say once again how glad we are to have Your Excellency, Madame Gopallawa and the members of your party in our midst. We regard Ceylon not only as a close and friendly neighbour but as a respected sister nation imbued with similar ideals and many shared cultural values. I hope you and the members of your party will enjoy your stay with us.

153

We have been looking forward to this visit. Many Heads of States and Governments have done us the honour of visiting us and our own former President Dr. Rajendra Prasad had visited your beautiful country. Heads of our Governments have also visited each other, the most recent being the visit last month of our Prime Minister to your country when she received a warm and affectionate welcome. This is the first time that we have had the privilege of welcoming to this historic land the Governer General of Ceylon and it is, therefore, an occasion of special significance to us.

The ties of friendship between our two countries are not new. They stretch back to ancient times, being based on shared historical experiences and common interests and ideals. A spirit of instinctive understanding and goodwill permeates our relations. While sharing a common historical heritage, we respect each other's individuality. We have much in common in our

cultural and social patterns. We have a broad similarity of outlook on the major questions of our time, and our Governments and peoples share a common dedication to peace, democracy and progress. We seek to enrich our respective political independence with a social and economic content as well as a spiritual outlook that flows from our ancient traditions.

We seem to live today in a dangerous and distracted world of tensions. A decade ago a spirit of optimism had permeated this region and the world, and held out promise of stability and development to countries like ours. Today the general scene looks less optimistic and many anxieties exist. It seems to me, therefore, most important that Governments like ours, dedicated to peace and peaceful development, should seek earnestly to promote further a climate of peace in the region and the world, and a rededication to development in conditions of peaceful co-operation.

One of the links we share with Ceylon is the message of the Buddha. It is a message of peace and compassion, of tolerance and goodwill. Centuries ago our illustrious ancestor, Dharma-Asoka had sent his own children, Mahendra and Sangamitta, to Ceylon with the message of peace and goodwill enshrined in Buddhism. Those sentiments of special kinship continue today and it is our hope that they will endure for all time to come. Ceylon has given this message of Buddhism a special place in its life

The recent discussions in Colombo between our Prime Ministers have revealed the great scope that exists for furthering cooperation between our countries. We are confident that such cooperation will not only benefit our two peoples but would also contribute to the stability and progress of the region.

Economic development and social adjustment to conditions of modern living are no doubt urgent necessities for both our countries. However, the traditions we share also enshrine a wider approach to life. The traditional patterns of our life contain many things of lasting value.

Our societies have had great experience in the art of life and Government in tempering power

with the restraint of wisdom. The great men and women of our lands, at all times, have held aloft the ideals of simple and gracious living at the highest levels of leadership. I have heard with great happiness and admiration that you epitomise this ideal in your life.

May I now ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to drink to the health of Her Majesty the Queen of Ceylon, to His Excellency Mr. William Gopallawa and Madame Gopallawa, to the happiness and prosperity of the people of Ceylon and to Indo-Ceylon friendship.

#### USA INDIA PERU SRI LANKA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **CEYLON**

Reply by the Governor-General of Ceylon

The following is the text of the speech made by the Governor-General of Ceylon in reply to President Zakir Husain:

Your Excellency Mr. President, Honourable Prime Minister, Honourable Ministers, Your Worship The Mayor, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Mr. President, the very warm words of welcome with which you greeted me at the airport this morning and the gracious and kind manner in which you have so quickly made me feel at home move me very deeply.

I have indeed looked forward to this visit for some time but for various reasons an earlier visit was not possible. However, I am happy that we are with you today. We have already seen, and hope to see more of, the precious monuments which exemplify the common cultural heritage of our two countries, the common elements of which point to the common motivations, sentiments and intellectual tradition that animated and moulded the life and thought of our peoples.

#### 154

Recorded history tells us that our ancestors came from India and thereafter there were continuous friendly relations between our two countries. We are indebted to India for many things. Of these, our most precious possession is the teaching of the Buddha. As mentioned by Your Excellency, it was the most illustrious Emperor Dharma Asoka who gave this precious gift to us. This was at the request of our own King Devanampiya Tissa, who maintained close and cordial relations with the Emperor. Indeed, he sent this message of peace and tolerance to the four corners of the then known world. In our country, we have carefully preserved and fostered this message.

More recently, the struggle for national independence initiated by the Indian national leaders heralded the process of liberation of the Afro-Asian World. The inspiring leadership of Mahatma Gandhi and many others gave the impetus to the national movements in other countries including Ceylon.

We are pleased with the recent visit of your Prime Minister to our country. We ate. glad that this gave us an opportunity to demonstrate our affection for her and our regard and respect for India. The outcome of the visit has reflected the traditionally close ties between our two countries and the similarity of approach to the major question of common interest. I have no hesitation in agreeing with you, Mr. President, that such co-operation will not only benefit our two peoples but also would contribute to the stability and progress of the region in general.

I am sincerely and deeply touched by your warm personal reference to me. May I say, Your Excellency, that your profound erudition, wide scholarship and deep humanism fittingly adorns the office of President of a great State. I wish you health, happiness and prosperity, and many more years in the service of your country.

May I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to join me in a toast to His Excellency the President of India, the happiness and prosperity of the, people of India, and the lasting friendship of our two countries.

### USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### **CEYLON**

Mr. Gopallawa's Speech at Banquet to President Zakir Husain

His Excellency the Governor-General of Ceylon Mr. W. Gopallawa, gave a dinner in honour of the President, Dr. Zakir Husain, in New Delhi on October 25, 1967.

Speaking on the occasion Mr. Gopallawa said:

Mr. President, my wife and I are deeply gratified that you have graced this occasion with your presence. Today, we complete the Delhi part of our programme, and I wish to tell you that I have found this visit useful and pleasant. I have also been impressed by the high resolution with which you are facing up to the problems of your country.

Yesterday, I visited the Nehru Memorial Museum, and one of the sayings of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru came vividly alive to me. Pandit Nehru tempered the elation he felt at the regaining of Independence with the thought that Independence was not the end of a struggle but only the beginning. He said: "The future is not one of ease or resting but of incessant striving so that we may fulfil the pledges we have so often taken and one we shall take today. The ambition of the greatest man of our generation has been to wipe every tear from every eye. That may be beyond us but, as long as there are

tears and suffering, so long our work will not be over...." How very apposite this statement is to our times! You referred a couple of days ago, Mr. President, to the optimism of a decade ago, which pervaded this area, being replaced now by a mood of disenchantment. The main reason for this mood has been the fact that economic growth has fallen short of our expectations and one of the reasons for this has been the poor receipts we have obtained for our major export commodities. If Ceylon and India, who, between them, produce nearly 80 per cent of the world supply of tea, get together, there is no reason why we should be the unhappy recipients of falling prices. The answer to this and similar problems will be found, I hope, in Delhi itself next February when the developing countries get together for their second major conference of this decade. It is only when we find the answers that we shall be able to wipe away some of the tears in the eyes of our peoples. We can do this in no other but a democratic way.

Ceylon and India are both countries unswervingly dedicated to a democratic way of life. Democracy, to be meaningful to our peoples, must be accompanied by economic freedom. The adaptation of traditional outlooks to the modern world, and the economic development of our countries, is the most urgent necessity of our times. We have to pursue this end relentlessly and with every resource available to us individually and corporately.

155

Mr. President: May I repeat, once again, that I have been most gratified at your hospitality and kindness. I hope that you will be able to visit us soon, when we might show you our own country and the problems that face us, for a sympathetic understanding is the surest path to mutual co-operation.

Ladies and Gentlemen: In the spirit of friendship that exists between our two countries, I raise my glass to drink to the health of the President of India and the continued happiness and prosperity of the, people of India.

USA INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **CEYLON**

Reply by President Zakir Husain

Replying to the toast, President Zakir Husain said :

Excellency, I am deeply touched by the very gracious words in which you have referred to the efforts we are making to face the manifold problems of this country. We are very happy that you have been able to see something of our capital city. I am glad this visit has been enjoyable to you, to Madame Gopallawa and the members of your party. I hope your visits to the other places of historical and spiritual interest as well as modern development in India will demonstrate to you the friendship and affection which the people of India have for the people of Ceylon.

You have reminded us of the inspiring sentiments which our two beloved leaders, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, bequeathed to us to meet the challenge of democratic development. Like you, we seek through such development to give an economic and spiritual content to our political independence. You have referred to our common dedication to democracy and pointed to certain specific fields where purposeful co-operation can be beneficial to both our countries. We agree with you in this and share your hope that the next United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to be held in New Delhi would lead to fruitful and satisfactory results.

There is need for our social institutions to become modern, vibrant and forward-looking. We must, if we are to fulfil our obligations to our peoples and our responsibilities to the international community, retain what is best in the past, not because of mere sentiments of veneration but because of its continued usefulness, and blend it with the new. India and Ceylon have been factors of significance in the growth of civilisation. Our continued and increasing cooperation in the present and future, in pursuit of our shared ideals, would not only help to nourish the creative impulses of our two societies, but be of benefit to the world at large. The task to which you and we have set our band is a stupendous one-it is not easy to change a static into a dynamic society, an empirical into a scientific way of thinking. We are bound to meet many a difficulty on the way, but we shall, I trust, with courage, perseverance and humility proceed surely and steadily towards our set goal.

I agree with you that a sympathetic understanding of each other is an assured path to mutual co-operation. I look forward, therefore, at an appropriate time, to visiting your beautiful country and to renewing our friendship.

Ladies and Gentlemen, may I now invite you to drink to the health of Her Majesty the Queen of Ceylon, to Their Excellencies Mr. William Gopallawa and Madame Gopallawa and to the progress and welfare of the people of Ceylon.

156

USA INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's Message on U. N. Day

In a broadcast to the nation on October 23, 1967 on the eve of the U. N. Day (Oct. 24), the President, Dr. Zakir Husain, said:

Tomorrow is the 22nd anniversary of the

coming into existence of the United Nations. The United Nations has come a long way since 1945 when a war-weary world sought to establish a new international order founded on the principles of peaceful co-existence, justice, equality of rights and respect for obligations that flow from treaties. The high purposes of the founders of the United Nations were to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to re-affirm faith in fundamental human rights, and to establish conditions in which the further evolution of the community of human beings can proceed in peace and freedom, and in the direction of social progress and better standards of life for all. The Charter of the United Nations begins with the words: "We the peoples of the United Nations" and ends with the words: "have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims". It is thus truly a peoples' Charter.

There is no doubt that the United Nations has saved the present generation from a world war. This is, perhaps, its most important achievement so far, because the threats to world peace have been many and very grave indeed. There have been several moments in the past when the world appeared to be on the brink of a war that might have enveloped the whole of mankind and imperilled civilisation itself. Fortunately, due to the wisdom of the leaders of nations almost all questions endangering world peace were brought to the forum of the United Nations, and in every cast the United Nations was able to stop the fighting sooner or later, although some of the problems that brought about the conflicts still remain unresolved.

Another measure of the success of the United Nations is the extent of the emancipation of man. When the United Nations was founded, only 51 nations comprised its membership, and many nations of Asia and Africa were not represented in it. Today there are 122 member nations but even so the United Nations is not yet fully representative of all the nations of the world. During the last 22 years in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations there has been a peaceful revolution, a process of rapid liberation of peoples from colonial domination. But there said remain especially in Africa strongholds of racial bigotry and pockets of colonialism which continue to defy the collective will of the United Nations. It is our endeavour together with others of goodwill to bring about speedily the total elimination of racial discrimination and the final liquidation of colonialism.

A look at the agenda of the General Assembly and the Security Council will give one an idea of the formidable range and complexity of the problems that confront man today. They represent the problems of the past, the present and the future. There is no doubt that if man and his civilisation are to survive on this planet, he must plan with care his future on it. In this exciting age when man is pioneering in outer space, it would be tragic indeed if he should be overwhelmed by problems of his own creation on earth, problems concerning the Proliferation of his species as well as his weapons and the rapid exhaustion of the world's natural resources. There can only be one common destiny for mankind as a whole--a future in which man will be able to conserve his resources, plan his population, narrow the gap between the rich and the poor both among the peoples and nations, and learn to live with his neighbour in peace and tolerance.

There is increasing awareness among all nations of the urgent need to work for the ful-filment of this common destiny. Much work in this field has already been done by the United Nations and its Specialised Agencies. But a great deal remains to be done before we can fulfil the promises that we have made to ourselves in the Charter of the United Nations. There is at present no international machinery other than the United Nations for accomplishing the common aims of mankind. It is of course not a perfect machinery and its inadequacies reflect the imperfections of its Member States. The

157

United Nations can safeguard the rights of its Members only if they fulfil their obligations to each other and to the United Nations. We must all therefore work together to strengthen the United Nations, which is now our only hope for peace and plenty on earth.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swaran Singh's Address to the General Assembly

Sardar Swaran Singh, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations and Minister of Defence, delivered the following address to the General Assembly on October 6, 1967:

Mr. President, may I begin by saying how pleased we are to see you as the President the General Assembly? In conveying our greetings and felicitations to you on your assuming this high office, my delegation salutes your great nation, which has been known as a bridgebuilder and a path-finder in Europe, both in the field of science and in culture. The first socialist representative to be the President of this Assembly, you are well-known to all of us here as an outstanding statesman. We have also great pleasure in paying tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Pazhwak, who represents our friendly neighbour, Afghanistan, and who has had the unique record of presiding over three sessions of the General Assembly in one year with great distinction.

All my colleagues who have spoken so far during this session have underlined what our Secretary-General, U Thant, has stated in his introduction to the annual report this year. He said:

"The picture...of what I regard as the most significant developments in the United Nations during the last twelve months is, on the whole, a discouraging one.... We now again see violence, threats, incitement, intimidation. and even hatred being used as weapons of policy in increasingly numerous areas of the world". (A/6701, pages 54 and 55)

The months that have elapsed between the closure of the twenty-first session and the commencement of the twenty-second session have seen two extraordinary sessions of the United Nations General Assembly---the fifth special session to deal with the problem of South-West Africa and the fifth emergency special session necessitated by the war in West Asia. We have, therefore, witnessed the unusual spectacle of a more or less continuous year-long General Assembly session. During this period, the Security Council also has been kept busy. And while all the discussions, deliberations and multilateral negotiations go on at the United Nations Headquarters, and as the involvement of the United Nations becomes increasingly deeper in problems connected with almost all fields of human activity throughout the world, we also hear doubts and hesitations about the capability of the United Nations to take meaningful action to cure and heal or to function effectively in situations of serious crisis.

At no time in its history has the United Nations faced such a critical situation for peace and such challenges to its cherished principles as it does today. A brief but savage war has taken place in West Asia causing suffering and misery to hundreds of thousands of persons. A long and vicious armed conflict is raging in South-West Asia which, if not checked, will certainly lead to a much wider conflagration. In southern Africa colonialism and racism are still rampant. The nuclear arms race shows no signs of slackening; thermonuclear stockpiles are growing at a frightening speed. As a founding Member of the United Nations India is deeply concerned at this growing trend towards violence in international life.

The gravity of the situation in West Asia has been of the utmost concern to the international community, Vast Arab territories lie under foreign occupation. Hundreds of thousands of persons have been displaced from their homes and hearths. Steps have been taken to annex Parts of these occupied lands and to continue the occupation indefinitely of the rest of the area. Tensions continue to grow along the cease-fire positions and there are frequent clashes in spite of the presence of United Nations observers. International commerce through this

region has been severely affected.

In the days preceding the outbreak of conflict last June, it was India's earnest and constant endeavour, both inside and outside the United Nations, to help preserve peace in West Asia by

158

urging restraint on all parties. We stood firmly behind the Secretary-General's efforts to gain breathing spell during which quiet diplomacy could be used to resolve the crisis. After Israel's attack on its Arab neighbours we and several other members of the Security Council advocated an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions held prior to the outbreak of hostilities. We did this because of our firm conviction that a cease-fire without a simultaneous call for a withdrawal of alien armed forces was not only contrary to the eminent practice of the- United Nations but also against its fundamental principle of non-use of force in international relations and the principle that territorial gains should not be made through military conquest. The deliberations of the fifth emergency special session, even though inconclusive, have shown a near unanimity among member nations on these fundamental principles. It is a matter of regret, therefore, that no progress has been made in securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied territories and in bringing peace and security to the area. India firmly urges that this impasse must be broken. We must all realize that failure to find a solution for the problems of West Asia would lead to even graver threats to peace. It is our belief that the foundation of lasting peace in West Asia should be built on certain basic and fundamental principles of the Charter, in particular those contained in Article 2. First, their must be a complete withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab lands under their occupation. Secondly, all States must respect the territorial integrity and political independence of one another in accordance with the Charter of this Organisation. Thirdly, all outstanding problems in the region should be settled exclusively through peaceful means. Finally, the just rights of the Arab refugees must be safeguarded. As the Secretary-General has reminded us:

"...people everywhere, and this certainly applies to the Palestinian refugees, have a natural right to be in their homeland and to have a future". (A/6701/Add.1,, para. 49).

It is also imperative to strengthen the presence of the United Nations in the area to ensure a smooth transition from the present state of crisis to a state of calm and peace. The role of the United Nations has been commendable in peace-keeping over the years in West Asia. I should like to pay a tribute to the officers and men of the United Nations Emergency Force who discharged their duties with such devotion and distinction and many of whom fell in the service of peace.

Another area where innocent people are suffering untold misery is Viet-Nam, Many representatives have expressed their deep concern and stressed the need to find a peaceful solution to this problem. My Government's views on the tragic war in Viet-Nam have been expressed on several occasions. As a neighbour belonging to the same continent and geographical region, India has a vital interest in peace in this area. As member and Chairman of the International Control Commission, we bear certain special responsibilities. We have also a wider and more important consideration in mind, that is the interests of world peace which can be threatened by an escalation of, the Viet-Nam conflict.

It is against this background that I should like to say a few words on this subject. My delegation welcomes the statement of the President of the United States wherein he said:

"I affirm without reservation the willingness of the United States to seek and find a political solution of the conflict in Viet-Nam."

India stands by its consistent policy that a solution to the problem of Viet-Nam must and can be found only at the conference table and not in the battlefield. We have always believed that a peaceful solution can be found within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954. In this context we are glad to note that Ambassador Goldberg has stated that these agreements should constitute the basis for a settlement. It is our conviction that the people of Viet-Nam alone can decide their destiny without any

foreign interference. The most immediate problem, however, is to create a proper atmosphere for a peaceful solution. The first essential step for this purpose, in our considered view, is the unconditional ending of the bombing of North Viet-Nam and we are confident that if this is done it will lead to cessation of all hostile activities throughout Viet-Nam and a Geneva-type meeting, to which all necessary parties, including the National Liberation Front should be invited. We are also confident that the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam would respond favourably to such a positive step which would be welcomed throughout the world.

The Government of India will continue, as they have done so far, to make every effort to shift the conflict from the battlefield to the conference table. In this respect we are encouraged by the positive response we have received from the various parties concerned, including the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. We would appeal to all parties concerned not to lay down any pre-conditions. There is always some military risk involved in de-escalating a conflict but the risks involved in escalation are greater. We hope, therefore, that the Government of the United States of America will, in the larger interests of peace, take a calculated risk by stopping the bombing of North Viet-Nam in the

159

belief that it will lead to a cessation of all hostilities throughout Viet-Nam and negotiations for a peaceful settlement.

We would also apeal to the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam to look at this question from the larger interest of peace in Asia and the world and we are confident that they will respond favourably if no preconditions are laid to the cessation of bombing of their territory. We should like to add the voice of India to that of others, including the Secretary-General's, who have expressed their belief and hope that an unconditional cessation of the bombing of North Viet-Nam would be followed by a cessation of all hostilities and lead to negotiations for a peaceful settlement. We do so not merely as an exercise in wishful thinking but with confidence and belief based on our talks with the various parties concerned in the con-

The problems of West Asia and Viet Nam do not exhaust the catalogue of situations which imperil peace and security because of interference from outside. Both in South West Africa and in Southern Rhodesia two racist minorities. militant and ruthless, to whom neither the fundamental rights of the people, who constitute the majorities in those areas, nor international opinion as expressed through numerous resolutions of the various organs of the United Nations. seem to matter, continue to hold power. I need not go into any details about my country's position either on apartheid or on colonialism. This is well known. I would merely say here that the sufferings of the people of Zimbabwe, the problems of the majority in South Africa, the problems, caused by Portuguese colonialism in Angola, Guinea and Mozambique, are all facets of one composite picture, It is a matter of regret that the trade and commerce which certain affluent countries are carrying on with those Territories should help to sustain the, oppressors in power. India joins with the Organization of African Unity in stating firmly and unambiguously that the stage is being set in that part of the world for a major explosion. It is the duty of the international community to persevere in its efforts to avert the tragedy.

In the current critical international situation, meaningful measures of genuine disarmament calculated to achieve the fundamental objectives of general and complete disarmament assume greater urgency than ever before. In this context one of the most serious problems facing the international community today is the need to halt, reduce, and eventually eliminate the growing nuclear menace. The nuclear weapon Powers are continuing to augment and develop their offensive and defensive weapon systems.

In the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and elsewhere, considerable attention has been devoted in the recent past to the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. There can be no doubt of the immense threat posed to world security and stability by the indiscriminate proliferation of nuclear weapons. India believes that non-proliferation, like all other disarmament measures, must be examined and resolved in the context of security for all.

It has long been an accepted and axiomatic principle that international security ties not in armament, but in restraints on armament, and in disarmament. The rational approach to the solution of that problem requires that any international instrument which seeks to limit the threat of nuclear weapons must ensure that the possessors of these weapons should be denied the licence to continue increasing the instruments of their threat. Nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved by the preservation of exclusive rights, privileges and options sought to be retained by certain armed and powerful countries while measures are to be, taken to limit the actions of the threatened and unarmed countries.

It is for that reason that India has consistently emphasized that any international instrument which seeks to deal with this problem, which would be acceptable and would endure, must ensure that both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon Powers accept obligations not to proliferate. It must be recognized that these mutual obligations are complementary and are but two facets of the same problem.

The General Assembly has already laid down, by its, resolution 2028 (XX), the principles which any non-proliferation arrangement should embody if it is to be truly balanced and non-discriminatory and a genuine step towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. It is only on the basis of these principles that a mutually acceptable non-proliferation agreement can be worked out.

Certain non-nuclear countries could have produced nuclear weapons several years ago, had they so desired, but have refrained from doing so. It can scarcely be argued that this policy of restraint and self-discipline should result in their being deprived of the benefits of the development of peaceful nuclear technology. While the Government of India continues to be in favour of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is equally strongly in favour of the proliferation of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes as an essential means by which the developing countries can benefit from the vast advantages of science and technology in this field. We are glad to note that our approach to this

160

of Governments. It is of the greatest importance that this consideration should be borne in mind in the formulation of a balanced and acceptable international non-proliferation instrument.

Ever since 1954 the Government of India has been making efforts to achieve a ban on all nuclear weapon testing. We are distressed that it has, not yet been possible to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The partial' Test Ban Treaty has remained doubly partial in that it has not been acceded to by all States, and in that it does not cover underground tests. There is a Serious danger that even that partial Treaty may cease to have any real meaning in view of the continuation and acceleration of nuclear weapon tests by non-signatory States. There have also been ominous, reports that with the development of more sophisticated weapons systems there might even be a resumption of atmospheric testing. The international community cannot but view that prospect with the deepest alarm and make intensive efforts to put an end to all nuclear weapon tests by all countries.

We are now nearing the end of a decade. which began with great hopes and expectations, for the poverty-stricken areas of the world, in which more than three-fourths of humanity resides. With the designation of the current decade as the United Nations Development Decade, we had hoped that a beginning had been made towards an all-out drive to reduce, if not bridge, the gap between the rich North and the poor South. The targets set for the Development Decade were by no means ambitious. And yet, nearly seven years after the solemn resolve of the entire international community to bend its en-Eries for the attainment of those modest targets, if we find ourselves farther away from them than we were we owe an explanation to ourselves and to the collective, conscience of mankind. So pressing and urgent are the problems of the developing countries that we can no longer afford to delay concerted international action to solve them.

There is no doubt that the effort for the im-

provement of living standards and for the attainment of higher rates of economic growth will have to be made by the developing countries themselves. And yet, year after year, this Assembly is reminded that the failure of the developing countries to attain the modest targets of economic growth set for the Development Decade has been mainly due to the insufficiency of external resources, and not due to any lack of effort on their part.

This year once again, concern has been expressed at the loss of momentum in international aid adversely affecting the efforts made to realize the goals of the, Development Decade. I join all those who have urged major industrialized countries to make every attempt to ensure the replenishment of the resources of the international Development Association. I would also urge them to reconsider their attitude to the Capital Development Fund and to make substantial contributions to it-the commencement of whose operations next year will mark an important step forward in international co-operation in this field.

Another matter for serious concern is that the terms and conditions of development loans continue to remain hard and inflexible and in some cases have become even harder. It has been estimated that if the present volume and the terms and conditions of aid to developing countries, were to be, maintained, a paradoxical situation will be reached by 1975 when there, will be a net transfer of resources from the developing to the developed countries. In order to overcome these difficulties, the developing countries must be enabled to increase their export earnings on which they must remain largely dependent if they are to stand on their own feet. That is the primary objective enshrined in the Final Act of the first drifted Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Although the permanent machinery of UNCTAD has completed three years of activity, as, the Secretary-General's introduction to his annual report highlights, the progress towards the fulfilment of the aims and objectives set forth in 1964 has been alarmingly slow.

The successful conclusion of the Kennedy Round negotiations a few months ago was no doubt an important event and will contribute significantly to further growth in world trade. However, it is a matter of serious concern that the main beneficiaries of this growth will be the developed countries, while the major problems of the developing countries in the field of trade have remained unresolved. My delegation would strongly urge the completion of the unfinished tasks of the Kennedy Round before the end of this year. In addition, new initiatives would be required for the expansion of the trade of the developing countries.

Mr. President, in a few months, time my country will have the honour to play host to the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. The "New Delhi Round", as U Thant has called it, will provide a unique opportunity not only for assessing the past achievements but also for the adoption of concrete measures for the future to provide practical and meaningful solutions to the urgent problems of the developing nations. In the next few days in Algiers the developing countries will be meeting to discuss their common problems and the solutions to those problems which they hope will emerge from New Delhi. Ulti-

#### 161

mately, the success of the "New Delhi Round" will be largely determined by the political will of its members to undertake the necessary measyres to provide these solutions. We have every hope that the "New Delhi Round" will usher in a new era of international co-operation in the field of trade and development of developing countries.

I have just enunciated the view of my Government on the issues of war and peace in West Asia and Viet-Nam; on colonialism and racialism; on international co-operation and multilateral efforts to remove poverty, All this I have said in the context of our basic approach towards peace and progress and our policy of co-existence and non-alignment. We believe that by remaining non-aligned we promote the cause of peaceful co-existence. It is further our belief that this approach and this policy express our profound faith in and loyalty to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter. Each one of the members of this world organization faces problems at home and in its own region. India is no exception to this. Our problems are gigantic, but these are matched by the determination of the Indian people to solve them through their own efforts within the framework of a democratic setup. We have this year had our Fourth General Elections, and our people have once again demonstrated their faith in the strength and vitality of democratic processes. Rapid strides have been made in industrialization and social services, taking us closer to our goal of a democratic socialist society. In spite of the burden we bear of meeting the challenge of an arrogant and unpredictable neighbour to our north-who unfortunately is not represented in this organization and thus not subject to its discipline-we shall continue to strive to realize our cherished objective, namely, a more prosperous and fuller life for all our people.

The international scene presents a sombre picture. There is surely at present an urgent need to rectify this state of affairs and direct the energy and resources of the international community towards the path of peace and reconciliation. Our Organization can and must give a lead in this direction through strict adherence to the cardinal principles of inadmissibility of the use of force by one nation against another; of respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty of States; of the right of all nations to live in freedom and enjoy the fruits of freedom; of the need to remove the canker of colonialism and racialism from the world; of settlement of international disputes exclusively through peaceful means; of international co-operation in political, economic and other fields for the benefit of mankind.

INDIA USA AFGHANISTAN ISRAEL SWITZERLAND ZIMBABWE SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ALGERIA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Sardar Swam Singh's Reply to Foreign Minister of Pakistan

Sardar Swaran Singh, Leader of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations and Minister of Defence, made the following statement in the General Assembly on October 10, 1967, in reply to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan:

Members of the Assembly will have noticed that in my statement I did not refer to the India-Pakistan question. My restraint was conditioned by the Tashkent declaration of which both India and Pakistan are signatories. It is therefore all the more regrettable that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has once again chosen to refer to certain matters which are the internal affairs of India. I have no desire to enter into a controversy with him. I shall simply say that those charges have no basis whatsoever. I repudiate them in their entirety.

I shall now confine myself to some indications of positive approach which I see in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I welcome his statement that Pakistan is prepared to adhere to the Tashkent declaration as a basis for settlement of all disputes between the two countries. India and Pakistan had agreed at Tashkent that relations between the two countries should be based on the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other. They also agreed not to have recourse to force and to settle their disputes through peaceful means. Further, they agreed that the two sides would continue meeting both at the highest and at other levels on matters of direct concern to both countries.

Another important provision of the declaration was the agreement of the two Governments to discourage propaganda directed against each other and, in fact, to encourage propaganda which promotes the development of friendly relations between them.

Ever since the signing of the declaration, India has made several attempts to start a constructive dialogue with Pakistan. Contrary to what the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has stated, the Prime Minister of India has also affirmed more than once our profound desire to have good

neighbourly relations with Pakistan. For example, on 5 April 1967 my Prime Minister said :

"We have always stated our point that it is necessary, in fact it is vital, for India and Pakistan to work in co-operation on as many issues and in as many spheres as possible because we are neighbours and because we share the same problems and difficulties, and we shall certainly continue to make every effort possible to have greater understanding and goodwill with Pakistan."

On our part, I should like to repeat with all sincerity that India is willing to discuss all disputes—I repeat, all disputes—with Pakistan without any preconditions. The Government of India stands by the Tashkent declaration and will patiently wait for a constructive response on the part of Pakistan.

INDIA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN USA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in the Security Council on West Asia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Security Council on October 24, 1967 on the West Asian situation:

At the outset, I wish to thank the representative of the United States for the very kind reference he made to me. The Security Council is meeting again tonight under the shadow of armed conflict in West Asia. We have before us the letters of the Permanent Representatives of the United Arab Republic and Israel (S/8207 and S/8208). We also have available to us

information provided by the Secretary-General (S/7930/Add. 44 and 45).

Even a cursory glance at the documents I have just cited makes clear the deliberateness of the attack mounted by Israel during the course of the day against the United Arab Republic. This fact is clear from the refusal of the Israeli authorities to accept the proposal of UNTSO to effect a cease-fire beginning at 1330 hours GMT. The United Arab Republic, the report of the UNTSO continues, accepted the proposal. The reply of the Israeli authorities was one of equivocation and procrastination.

The deliberateness of the attack is also brought out by the immense damage done to the industrial installations, particularly oil refineries in the Suez area. The Council is entitled to assume that the equivocation and procrastination was for the purpose of completing the plan of destruction of industrial installations and inflicting other damage to civilian life and property.

There is a related aspect of the matter to which I should like to draw the attention of the Council. The practice of reprisals has been specifically prohibited on several occasions, the last one being as recently as 25 November 1966 in Security Council resolution 228 (1966). Several successive Security Council resolutions have condemned Israeli military measures against its Arab neighbours. I need quote from only one of these resolutions, namely resolution 228 (1966) of 25 November 1966, which reminded Israel of the impermissibility of reprisals. Paragraph 3 of that resolution read:

"Emphasizes to Israel that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts."

All these past resolutions that I have referred to show that the Security Council has made it very clear that the policy of retaliation adopted by Israel is impermissible. What is more, the latest action of Israel infringes the terms of the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council in the month of June this year. I would remind the members of this Council that by its resolution

236 (1967) of 12 June 1967 the Council specifically condemned any and all violations of the cease-fire. In the context of the clear prohibitions of the resolution I have just cited, Israel cannot justify its attack of today under any pretext.

The Council has also heard statements in regard to the naval incident of 21 October, in which the Israeli destroyer Elath was sunk. My delegation, amongst others, was and is seriously concerned at that incident. The representative of the United Arab Republic has stated in his letter dated 23 October 1967 to the President of the Security Council that the destroyer was speeding in United Arab Republic territorial waters. The representative of Israel, on the other band, has stated that the vessel was outside the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic. The report of the Secretary-General on the naval incident---document S/7930,/Add. 43

163

dated 22 October 1967--provides no conclusive information on this aspect of the matter. Clearly there is need for further investigation, to determine whether or not the destroyer was actually in the territorial waters, of the United Arab Republic or on the high seas at the time it was sunk.

Determination of this fact has great importance in the context of Security Council resolution 236 (1967) of 12 June 1967, which specifically prohibited any forward Military movements subsequent to the cease-fire. My delegation, therefore, feels that an investigation of this incident, with all the circumstances attending it, should be ordered by the Secretary-General to enable the Council to come to a conclusion.

Having dealt with the specific items under discussion, I should like to emphasize the necessity for the Council to take further action to resolve the situation in West Asia. The continued occupation of vast Arab territories and the frequent clashes along the cease-fire positions are constant reminders of the grave situation prevailing in that region. The international community cannot ignore the existence of the threat to the peace resulting from this state of affairs. It is a matter of deep regret to us that

in spite of numerous meetings of the Security Council and an emergency special session of the General Assembly no progress has been registered in securing the withdrawal of the armed forces of Israel and in bringing peace and security to the area.

During the general debate in the current session of the General Assembly the leader of the Indian delegation stated:

"We must all realize that failure to find a solution for the problem; of West Asia would lead to even graver threats to peace." (A/PV. 1582, p. 36).

It is our firm conviction that the United Nations cannot even begin the process of finding Lasting solutions to the serious problems in the Middle East unless we take some concrete steps first to reduce tensions in the area. For that reason my delegation stated at the Council meeting of 9 June this year that, following its eminent practice, the Security Council should reinforce its call for a cease-fire and immediately order the withdrawal of all armed forces to the positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities. My delegation is more convinced than ever that unless the Security Council takes this first step of ordering the withdrawal of Israeli forces to the positions they held on 4 June 1967 the Council will meet again and again to consider grave violations of the cease-fire. There can be no beginning to reduction of tensions in the area unless Israeli forces first withdraw from the territories they have occupied.

During the course of this long and unhappy crisis in the Middle East, and more especially since the events of June 1967, it has become apparent to the world community that unless certain well-established and well-respected principles of international law and international practice come to be reiterated by this Council, with all the authority vested in it under the Charter, the journey from a state of war to a state. of peace and tranquillity may not be easy, or even possible. In this, time is of the essence, and the earlier the Council can act the better. It is the responsibility of the Members of the Security Council to intensify their efforts with a view to securing withdrawals and finding solutions of the grave problems of the area so that

the present precarious cease-fire leads to a just and lasting peace.

Earlier tonight we heard the statement of, among others, the representative of the, United Kingdom. I have great pleasure in agreeing with him that the Council should act urgently to deal with the serious problems of the area. What is more, I join my voice to his in saying that the resolution should be a fair and balanced one. In his turn, I hope he will agree with me that—a point which I have consistently urged for more than three months—the resolution should be based on certain fundamental guidelines to be given to the Special Representative who, we agree, should urgently proceed to the area.

164

INDIA USA ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement on Nuclear-Free Zone in Latin America

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the First (Political) Committee of the General Assembly on October 27, 1967 on the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America:

The item of the agenda under consideration has been brought forward in document A/6676 by the representatives of twenty-one Latin American States, signatories to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, in order to explain in the forum of the world Organisation the significance and scope of the provisions of the Treaty as recommended in resolution 22(IV) of the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America.

We have listened with deep interest to the statements made on this item by the representatives of the Latin American Republics, particularly the comprehensive and lucid statement made by Ambassador Garcia Robles in introducing the item to the Committee and the two statements of the delegation of Brazil.

There has always been widespread sympathy and support for the establishment of a nuclearfree zone in Latin America and for the efforts made by the Latin Americans towards that end. No wonder then that the achievement of an acceptable Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America has evoked appreciation and congratulations from the membership of this Committee. My delegation would like to join other delegations in congratulating the Latin American delegations on their outstanding success in concluding this Treaty. We would particularly like to offer our felicitations to Ambassador Garcia Robles for his dedicated and untiring efforts and skilful and tactful handling of the negotiations resulting in the culmination of the Treaty.

India has from the beginning welcomed the, efforts of the Latin American delegations in their endeavours to prepare a Treaty on this subject. India voted for resolution 1911 (XVIII) on the "Denuclearization of Latin America", as it voted, in the same spirit of understanding, for resolution 1652 (XVI) on "Consideration of Africa as a Denuclearized Zone" and resolution 2033 (XX) on the "Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa". India participated in the Preparatory Commission for the Denuclearization of Latin America by sending an observer.

The Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, in the words of our Secretary-General:

"....marks an important milestone in the long and difficult search for disarmament.... It provides...for the creation, for the first time in history, of a nuclear-free zone for an inhabited part of the earth". (Press Release SG/SM/661, p. 2).

The Indian delegation expresses its profound gratification at this achievement. The Treaty, in

our view, should help in the reduction of international tension. We hope that the conclusion of this Treaty will encourage the nuclear Powers to make serious efforts to work towards general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. As the representative of the United Republic of Tanzania stated at the 1507th meeting:

"... peace and security in our planet does not become any less threatened by unilateral measures, however positive, of the non-nuclear Powers." (1507th meeting, p. 51).

The Indian delegation welcomes the reference made in the preamble of the Treaty to the principle of an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations between the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers as contained in resolution 2028 (XX), because India attaches particular importance to the principles enunciated in that resolution.

We were happy to note the statement made by the representative of Mexico at the 1504th meeting in which he said:

"To sum up, therefore, the provisions of the Treaty of Tlatelolco on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, interpreted in the light of the provisions of articles 1 and 5, with which they are expressly linked in the text of article 18 itself, do not permit of any interpretation that could appear to justify either the concern that they would entail a possibility of evading the absolute prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America, or the concern that they might

165

become an obstacle to the use of such explosions." (1504th meeting, p. 66).

The Ambassador of Ghana, in his statement at we 1506th meeting, said:

"Another interesting feature of the Treaty which is of great importance to us is that, while it prohibits the use of nuclear energy for military purposes, it provides for the use of nuclear energy for economic development." (1506th meeting, p, 24-25).

We would particularly like to recall the statement of the representative of Brazil, made at the 1508th meeting, in which he brought to the attention of the Committee the contents of the Brazilian note delivered to the Mexican Government on 8 May last. It states:

"It is the understanding of the Brazilian Government that the aforementioned article 18 allows the signatory States to carry out with their own means, or in association with third parties, nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, including explosions which may involve devices similar to those used in nuclear weapons." (1508th meeting, p. 21).

We are most gratified at the explanation given by the Brazilian delegation, and congratulate them on their clear position on this aspect of the Treaty.

It is the view of my delegation that the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, including the development of peaceful nuclear explosive devices should not be Prohibited by any treaty. Nuclear energy plays a decisive role, in the mobilization of resources for economic and peaceful development. It must be utilized in every form, including the explosives that make possible not only great civil engineering projects, but also an ever-increasing variety of applications that may prove essential to speeding up the progress of our people. To India, this is a matter of vital importance. As a developing country India feels a pressing need for the continuing and steady development of nuclear science and technology for raising the economic standards of its millions of people. We do not deny that the technology involved in the production of a nuclear weapon is the same as the technology which produces a peaceful explosive device. But it should not mean that only the poor and developing nations should be denied all technology for fear that they may use it for military purposes. There could be international regulation udder a nondiscriminatory and universal system of safeguards to ensure that no country manufactures or stockpiles nuclear weapons while undertaking research and development of peaceful nuclear explosives.

Many Latin American delegations have spoken on the question of guarantees to be given by the

nuclear Powers. The representative of Chile stated at the 1506th meeting:

"In order to ensure the full implementation of the Latin American Treaty, it is essential that other countries which are obligated morally and politically by this initiative should not stand aside from this document. The idea that one day there will be a general agreement on disarmament is not a valid explanation for delay in guaranteeing and co-operating with all already existing regional document which is complete and effective." (1506th meeting, p. 17).

The obligations of the nuclear Powers in this respect are of paramount importance to the success of the Treaty, and we welcome the statement of the representative of the United Kingdom, made at the 1508th meeting, in which he announced his Government's decision to accede to the Protocols.

Before concluding, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to article 30 of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which envisages that the Treaty shall be of a permanent nature and shall remain in force indefinitely, but that any party may denounce it by notifying the General Secretary of the Agency if, in the opinion of the denouncing State, there have arisen or may arise circumstances, connected with the, content of the Treaty or of the Additional Protocols I and II attached thereto, which affect its supreme interests and the peace and security of one or more contracting parties. My delegation considers that this withdrawal clause in the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America is a great improvement on other documents on arms control and disarmament.

166

INDIA BRAZIL USA TANZANIA MEXICO GHANA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA CHILE

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

Joint Communique on Shri Morarji Desai's Visit

Shri Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister of India, paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from October 22 to October 24, 1967. At the end of his visit the following joint communique was issued:

At the invitation of His Excellency, Mr. Kirti Nidhi Bista, His Excellency, Mr. Morarji Desai, Deputy Prime Minister of India, paid a 3-day goodwill visit to the kingdom of Nepal from October 22nd to October 24th, 1967.

His Excellency, Mr. Morarji Desai, was accorded a warm and affectionate welcome by the people of Nepal. During his stay in Kathmandu, Mr. Morarji Desai, paid a visit to some of the places of historic and cultural importance and addressed several important social and cultural bodies, including the Nepal Council of World Affairs.

Mr. Morarji Desai was received in audience by His Majesty the King at the Royal Palace. Mr. Desai also called on the Prime Minister, Mr. Surya Bahadur Thapa.

The talks between the Deputy Prime Minister of India and the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister of Nepal were marked by a spirit of cordiality, mutual trust and sympathetic understanding of each other's problem. Their talks were mainly centred on the questions of bilateral interest. They restated their belief in the vital interest of each other's prosperity and well-being.

In the Indian side, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Desai, was assisted by Mr. T. P. Singh, Secretary, Revenue and Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, Mr. T. C. Seth, Member, Central Board of Excise and Customs, ex-officio, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Department of Revenue and Insurance and Mr. Ashok B. Bhadkamkar, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs. In the Nepalese side, the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Kirti Nidhi Bista, was assist-

ed by the Secretaries of the Ministries of the Foreign Affairs, Economic Affairs, Finance, Power and Irrigation, Mr. Y. N. Khanal, Dr. Y. P. Pant, Dr. B. B. Thapa and Mr. B. B. Pradha.

The two Deputy Prime Ministers appreciated the value of exchange of visits and close personal contacts among the leaders of the two countries, for promoting full understanding on which alone genuine friendship could thrive. They also expressed the hope that in times to come, the bonds of friendship between Nepal and India would go from strength to strength.

Mr. Kirti Nidhi Bista hoped that the visit of Mr. Morarji Desai would be an important milestone in the development of friendly relations between Nepal and India.

The Deputy Prime Minister of India was highly impressed with the efficiency and orderliness of the administration and the economic progress made in the recent years in Nepal, under the stewardship of His Majesty the King. Mr. Morarji Desai expressed satisfaction over the progressive and fruitful development of relations between Nepal and India and assured the Deputy Prime Minister of Nepal of the Government of India's increasing assistance, both material and technical, in the economic development of Nepal. He also agreed to arrange an early technical appraisal of the Karnali hydroelectric project from the point of view of determining India's interest in it. The Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Kirti Nidhi Bista, thanked the Government of India for all their generous help and assistance.

The two Deputy Prime Ministers reiterated their firm support and unflinching dedication to the principles of peaceful co-existence, non-alignment, international co-operation and peace. being fully convinced that elimination of the threat of war and the preservation of world peace remain the noble aim to which mankind aspires. The two Deputy Prime Ministers expressed their belief in the settlement of conflicts by peaceful means, without resorting to force in the relaxation of inter-national tension, based on the principles of mutual respect for independence. sovereignty, justice, equality and peaceful co-existence.

The two Deputy Prime Ministers of Nepal and

India attached special attention to the problems

167

of economic imbalance caused by the widening gap in the standard of living of the peoples between the economically advanced and developing countries. They emphasised the need for the favourable trade terms or the preferential treatments to the developing countries from the developed. In this respect, they expressed their willingness to work together with other developing nations, to achieve this objective through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development at its forthcoming meeting at New Delhi.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, expressed his thanks to the people and His Majesty's Government of Nepal, for the welcome and hospitality accorded to him and the members of his Party during the visit. The Deputy Prime Minister of India also extended an invitation to the Deputy Prime Minister of Nepal, to pay an early visit to India which he accepted with pleasure.

NEPAL INDIA USA LATVIA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

**POLAND** 

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid a visit to Poland from October 8 to October 11, 1967. At the end of her visit and her talk with the Polish Prime Minister, the following Joint Communique was issued:

At the invitation of Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, paid an official visit to Warsaw from October 8 to 11, 1967 where she was accorded a warm and cordial welcome. During her visit, Shrimati Gandhi was received in audience by Mr. Edward Ochab, Chairman of the Council of State and called on Mr. Wladyslaw Gomulka, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party with whom she conducted a prolonged conversation.

The two Prime Ministers used this opportunity to review the current international situation and the relations between the two countries. In the talks, the Indian Prime Minister was assisted by Shri Rajeshwar Daval, Foreign Secretary, Shri P. N. Haksar, Secretary to the Prime Minister, Shri V. M. M. Nair, Ambassador of India in Poland, Shri S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce and Shri J. S. Mehta, Joint Secretary. Ministry of External Affairs. The Polish Prime Minister was assisted by Mr. Adam Rapacki, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Witold Trampczynski, Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. Lucjan Motyka, Minister of Culture, Mr. Jozef Winiewicz, Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. P. Ogrodzinski, Director General in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Mr. R. Spasowski, Ambassador of Poland to India and Mr. S. Wilski, Director of Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The talks took place in an atmosphere of friendship and cordiality.

The two Prime Ministers discussed a wide rang. of international problems including the situation in Viet Nam and in the Middle-East (West Asia), the problems of security in Europe and in Asia, disarmament and other matters pertaining to this question.

The two Prime Ministers stated that a similarity of views on these questions as already expressed in previous declarations made by both the countries continued to exist. On that basis they positively appraised the development of cooperation between both the countries in the sphere of international politics and the further possibilities of such cooperation in the future.

They agreed that the policy of peaceful co-

existence and international cooperation to which both the countries are dedicated has proved its validity in the past and provides the best possible means for the resolution of international problems in the future. Both the countries agreed that the principles of--respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity and noninterference in the internal affairs of States must characterise the pattern of international relations.

Particular attention was devoted to the situation in Viet Nam. While expressing their deep

168

apprehension in its development, the two Prime Ministers stressed once mom that the solution of the Vietnamese conflict should be based on the Geneva Agreement of 1954 and the right of the Vietnamese people to decide upon their own destiny. The unconditional cessation of bombing of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam is necessary preliminary step towards that end.

The Prime Minister of Poland outlined the progress achieved by Poland in her economic development since the last visit of the Prime Minister of India to Warsaw. The Prime Minister of India while noting with appreciation the remarkable progress that Poland had made, reviewed India's economic situation. Despite unexpected setbacks and serious food shortages caused by the failure of two successive monsoons the Indian economy has maintained its resilience and after a period of consolidation is in a position to resume an appreciable rate of growth.

The two Prime Ministers expressed concern at the growing gulf between the developing and the developed countries of the world which must be bridged in the interest of all nations. In this context, the two Prime Ministers welcomed the prospect of the second meeting of UNCTAD scheduled to take Place at New Delhi in the spring of 1968 and hoped that concrete proposals for international cooperation would emerge therefrom.

Reviewing the mutual relations between the two countries, both the Prime Ministers expressed their gratification at their progress in various fields and emphasized their common intention to develop them in the future.

The Prime Ministers expressed satisfaction about the steady growth of mutually beneficial trade. They agreed that there is considerable scope for increased industrial and economic cooperation which would lead to greater extension and diversification of mutual trade. They desided that joint studies on certain industrial sectors like railway wagon construction, manufacture of machine tools and fishing industry should be completed early and concrete steps taken to implement the recommendation of the experts.

The Prime Minister of India took the opportunity to extend an invitation to the Prime Minister of Poland, Mr. Jozef Cyrankiewicz to visit India at a convenient time. The invitation has been accepted with appreciation.

POLAND INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

### UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC

Joint Statement on Prime Ministers Visit

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid a visit to the United Arab Republic from October 19 to October 21, 1967.

The following is the text of the joint statement issued at the conclusion of her visit:

At the invitation of the President of the United Arab Republic, His Excellency Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Prime Minister of India Shrimati Indira Gandhi paid a visit to the United Arab Republic from 19 to 21st October 1967. The Prime Minister of India received warm and enthusiastic welcome

from the Government and the people of the United Arab Republic which reflected bonds of friendship between the two countries.

During her visit the Prime Minister of India held talks with the President of the United Arab Republic which took place in an atmosphere of frankness and cordiality. Two leaders reviewed international situation particularly some of major problems which disturb world peace and threaten prospects of relaxation of international tensions. They reaffirmed their conviction regarding the vital importance in relations between States of adhering to the basic principles of international behaviour and those embodied in the character of the United Nations. They reiterated their faith in the principles of non-alignment and sovereign right of all nations to maintain and develop their political and economic independence without outside pressure or intervention. They emphasised the principle that no advantage should

169

be allowed to be derived through use of force for the purpose of furthering territorial or political objectives.

Two leaders expressed their particular concern at the serious situation still prevailing in the Middle East (West Asia). They underlined the urgency of finding a just solution to the problem and especially to withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories occupied by them since June 5, 1967. The Prime Minister of India reiterated the solidarity of the Government and the people of India with the Arab peoples and their support for just rights of the Palestinian people. The President and the Prime Minister also reviewed the bilateral relations between the two countries. While expressing satisfaction at the development of these relations in political, economic and cultural fields, they agreed that extensive possibilities of expanding and intensifying their cooperation must be further explored. They also noted with gratification the considerable progress which had been achieved in implementing the decisions taken in October and December 1966 to increase the tripartite economic cooperation between India, the United Arab Republic and Yugoslavia, and decided that in consultation with Yugoslavia their mutually beneficial cooperation be further developed.

The President and the Prime Minister acknowledged the value of mutual exchanges of visits and reiterated their intention to continue such periodical high level contacts.

USA INDIA ISRAEL YUGOSLAVIA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### YUGOSLAVIA

Prime Minister's Speech at Banquet by President Tito

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to Yugoslavia from October 11 to October 13, 1967 at the invitation of the President of Yugoslavia, His Excellency Josip Broz Tito. On October 11, President Tito gave a Banquet in honour of the Prime Minister.

Replying to the toast by President Tito, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said:

Your words have touched me deeply. To come to Yugoslavia and to meet you and Madame Broz; is certainly a privilege but even more it is to find understanding hearts and warm and strong hand-clasp of true friendship.

You were kind enough to talk of the closest cooperation and mutual understanding which have characterised the relations between our two countries for a number of years. This is reflected by the continuous exchange of visits between our countries at all levels. I myself was lost in your country on the beautiful island of Brioni in July 1966 and had very cordial and fruitful talks with you and your colleagues. Some months later, we were privileged to come you and Madame Broz in India and we also had the opportunity of holding a tripartite meeting with our mutual and esteemed friend', President Nasser. Recently we had the privilege

of receiving your Foreign Minister Mr. Nikezic and our Foreign Minister also paid a visit to you. I mention these not as a bare recital of visits but as evidence of our will to work together in political and economic fields in order to extend the boundaries of mutual cooperation and to concert our action in defence of peace.

Today world peace hangs by a slender thread. While there is some movement towards non-proliferation treaty, nuclear arms race continues to loom large on our horizon. This is bad enough. What is worse is that racialism and colonialism continue to divide and oppress people in new forms. In such a situation it is the duty of all men and nations of goodwill to unite and throw their weight behind the forms of peace by unceasing exploration of all avenues of cooperation and in the interest of a just and honourable settlement of disputes through peaceful means.

#### 170

You have referred to the continuance of deep tension and unresolved crisis in West Asia. This continued stalemate is a threat to peace. Aggression must be vacated. Only on this basis can the problem of security of nations in this region begin to be tackled. Other problems, economic as well as human, can be considered separately. We have followed with keen interest the great efforts which you have made in personally visiting a number of Arab capitals and in sending special envoys to other capitals of Europe and Latin America. Our good wishes and hopes accompanied you on your journey. As a result of these sincere probings, there emerged a series of constructive ideas which have provided the modus vivendi and which contain the basis for lasting settlement. We have welcomed and supported your initiative as also your ideas and shall continue to do so. Through this period it has been useful to have the closest contact with you and your representatives and to share the information. Many difficulties are yet to be overcome but we can discern wider recognition of the need for finding a political solution of the West Asian crisis. We must continue to pursue our efforts to make this possible.

We are glad that in this hour of great

national crisis, our friend and colleague, President Nasser, wealthered the storm with great wisdom and courage. We send him our message of solidarity. I am firmly convinced that the great historical movement of the Arab people will go forward in strength and unity towards the achievement of his progressive aims. The tide of Arab nationalism cannot be reversed. Statesmanship consists in recognising the validity as well as the vitality of this great movement of the Arab people towards national self-expression.

Mr. President, you have also referred to the long, bitter, cruel and unnecessary war which continues to play havoc with lives of the Vietnamese people. But there can be no end to the conflict except by political means on the basis of acceptance of the right of the Vietnamese people to decide their own destiny. Stoppage of bombing of North Viet Nam could bring the war nearer an end. We can derive some satisfaction that there is now a growing and wider recognition of the need for this step. When we make suggestions for ending the Viet Nam conflict, we should like it to be clearly understood that our purpose is not partisan unless passionate devotion to peace is regarded as partisanship. We have all fought, suffered and sacrificed for freedom for our countries and in our different ways. What can be of greater concern to us than to preserve and strengthen that freedom and to resist all that threatens and endangers it?

Mr. President, since you visited India a year ago, we have held our fourth General Elections. The results have fortified our belief in the inherent strength and viability of our political institutions. The Government of India remains firmly committed to principles' of socialism and democracy at home and non-alignment and peaceful co-existence abroad. The past year has been a difficult one for us because of drought and floods but we expect to gather a good harvest which will greatly help in invigorating our economy and accelerating its rate of growth. In this situation, India, like other developing countries, seeks a legitimate share in the expanding of world trade. This is a question which assumes increasing importance and is one on which we wish to work with otherin securing a positive outcome to world trade

conference to be held in New Delhi early next year.

Tripartite discussions between our two countries and UAR have established the ground work on which, I hope, we shall be able to build a worthy edifice of economic and technical cooperation. Our interest in this interregional economic partnership is not incompatible with our interest in fostering intra-regional cooperation with our Asian neighbours.

Mr. President, under your wise and inspiring leadership, Yugoslavia has been a pioneer in many directions and is now taking great strides in national and international endeavours. We wish you and the Yugoslav people continued success. Our two countries are firmly linked by the bonds of sincere friendship which is based on shared ideals and purposes. We deeply cherish our relations with Yugoslavia and are confident that they are contributing to peace, to understanding and progress in the world.

I invite Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to join me in a toast to the health of President Tito and Madame Broz, to comradeship between our countries and to world peace.

171

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## YUGOSLAVIA

Joint Statement on Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of the joint statement issued on October 13, 1967 on the visit of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to Yugoslavia:

At the invitation of the President of the

Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, His Excellency Josip Broz Tito, and the President of the Federal Executive Council, His Excellency Mika Spiljak, the Prime Minister of India, Madame Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to Yugoslavia from October 11 to 13, 1967.

During her visit to Yugoslavia, the Prime Minister of India had talks with the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the President of the Federal Executive Council on which occasion there was a useful exchange of views on the current international problems with particular emphasis on the situation in the Middle-East and in Viet Nam, the Tripartite economic cooperation as well as further promotion of cooperation in A fields of interest to India and Yugoslavia. The talks were held in an atmosphere of frankness and mutual understanding, characterized by cordiality and friendship existing between the Governments, and the peoples of the two countries. A concordance of views was noted on all major international issues as well as readiness of the two parties to continue their cooperation with a view to making joint contribution to the cause of peace and equitable relations in the world.

172

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### **BULGARIA**

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on October 16, 1967 at the end of the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's visit to Bulgaria:

At the invitation of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, paid an official visit to Bulgaria from 13th to 16th October 1967. This was the first visit by an Indian Prime Minister to Bulgaria. The people of Bulgaria accorded her a heart-warming and spontaneous welcome which fully reflected the friendly feelings between the two peoples.

During her stay, the Prime Minister of India was received at Varna by the Chairman of the Presidium of the National Assembly of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Georgi Traykov. The Prime Minister of India and her party made a tour of Sofia, Varna and the resorts near it, and the Cooperative Farm at the village Staro Zhele bare in Plovdiv district. What they saw typified the progress which Bulgaria has made in the last two decades.

The Prime Minister of India and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria had discussions on a wide range of international problems and also on the relations between the two countries.

On the Indian side, those also participating in the talks were Shri Rajeshwar Dayal, Foreign Secretary, Shri P. N. Haksar, Secretary to the Prime Minister, Shri A. S. Mehta, Ambassador of India in Bulgaria, Shri S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, Shri J. S. Mehta, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Shri S. Bikram, Shah, Chief of Protocol, Shri Natwar Singh, Director in the Prime Minister's Secretariat. On the Bulgarian side, those also participating in the talks were: Mr. T. Tzolov, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. I. Bashev, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. I. Boudinov, Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. I. Popov, Deputy Foreign Minister, Mrs. B. Avramova, Deputy Minister of Education, Mr. Kh. Dimitrov, Bulgarian Ambassador in India, Mr. V. Todorov, Chairman of the Bulgarian Foreign Trade Bank, Mr. B. Ahiel, Adviser

to the Chairman of the Council of Minister's office.

The talks revealed a close similarity between the viewpoints of the two countries.

1

The two sides outlined the progress achieved as well as the problems they encountered in their national efforts to build a modern and efficient economy. The Prime Minister of India explained how the three Five-Year Plans had stimulated the modernisation of India's agriculture and laid the foundations for rapid scientific and industrial advance. Because of the imposed necessity of diverting expenditure for defence in the last five years and the failure of successive monsoon in the last two years, the Indian economy suffered a temporary setback but is now poised to resume its earlier rate of development.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria explained the achievements in the socialist construction of the country. The swift progress recorded in the field of industry, agriculture, education and culture was due to the dedicated efforts of the Bulgarian people. The aid of the Soviet Union and the cooperation with the other socialist countries was of great importance in the economic development of the country. He added that the development of the country turned her into a partner for economic cooperation.

In the course of the talks the two delegations discussed the possibilities of further strengthening the relations between the two countries. They noted with satisfaction that the links between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and the Republic of India have been expanding particularly in the field of economic cooperation. They expressed the conviction that the agreements between the two countries-the long-term Trade Agreement, the Payments' Agreement, the Agreement on Cultural Cooperation, the Agreement for Economic and Technical Cooperation and the Agree-

ment on Scientific and Technical Cooperation (the last two signed by them in May, 1967) - provide a good basis for the further development of cooperation between them. Both sides decided to do all within their power to further expand and develop the relations between their respective countries and to work for the consolidation of their bonds of friendship. It was also agreed to explore the possibility of establishing an inter-governmental body for promoting further avenues of Indo-Bulgarian economic cooperation.

Reviewing the international situation, both Heads of Government expressed their opinion that respect for territorial integrity, the right of nations to choose their own foreign and domestic policies, the dedication to peace and peaceful co-existence, and the necessity to resolve all problems, including border problems, without the use of force, are principles which provide the only basis for correct and normal international relationship. On the basis of these principles the representatives of the two countries are cooperating with each other in the United Nations and other international forums.

The two sides exchanged views on the problems of the security in Asia and Europe.

They discussed the dangerous situation created in Vietnam and agreed that it was in the interest of all peace-loving countries that the conflict be terminated immediately. As a first step to this end, the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam should be stopped unconditionally. The Vietnam problem could be solved peacefully only on the basis of the Geneva Agreements of 1954, thus giving the Vietnamese people the opportunity to decide their own future without foreign intervention.

On the West Asian situation, they expressed their solidarity with the just, cause of the Arab people and declared that the status quo ante the war should be restored as soon as possible with a view to the establishment of peace and security in the

region.

The Prime Minister of India and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria reaffirmed their desire to strengthen to the utmost Indo - Bulgarian relations. The Prime Minister of India indicated the Government of India's wish to open a resident mission in Sofia as early as possible. She also extended an invitation to the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria and his wife, Dr. M. Zhivkova, to visit India at their convenience, which was accepted with pleasure.

2

### BULGARIA INDIA USA VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### **RUMANIA**

Joint Communique on Prime Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a joint communique issued on October 19, 1967 at the end of the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhis visit to Rumania:

Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, paid an official visit to the Socialist Republic of Rumania from October 16-19, 1967, as guest of Ion Gheorghe Maurer, Chair-man of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Rumania.

During her stay in Rumania, the distinguished guest from India and the persons accompanying her, visited Bucharest and Ploiesti, some industrial enterprises, a horticultural unit and cultural and artistic institutions, thus acquainting themselves with achievements in the field of economic and cultural development in Rumania.

The Indian guests were welcomed with warmth and hospitality by the Rumanian Government and people.

The Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was received by Nicolae Ceausescu, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party; on this occasion an exchange of views took place on Rumanian-Indian relations and on some contemporary international problems. The Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi extended to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party and Madame Nicolae Ceausescu to visit India, which they accepted with pleasure.

The Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was also received by Chivu Stoica, President of the State Council, who gave a luncheon in her honour.

During the visit, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Ion Gheorghe Maurer, and the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, held talks on the evolution of Rumanian-Indian relations and on some current international questions of interest to the two governments.

The talks were attended on the Rumanian side by: Gheorghe Macovescu, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Marin Mihai, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Alexandru Constantin Albescu, Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, Aurel Aredleanu, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Socialist Republic of Rumania in New Delhi, Nicu Serban, Acting Director of Protocol in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Gheorghe Iason, Acting Director in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The talks were attended on the Indian side by: Rajeshwar Dayal, Foreign Secretary, P. N. Haksar, Secretary to the Prime Minister, Amrik Singh Mehta, Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of India in Bucharest, S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce, J. S. Mehta, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of External Affairs, S. Bikram Shah, Chief of Protocol and K. Natwar Singh, Director in the Prime Minister's Secretariat.

During the talks, which took place in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cordiality, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Rumania and the Prime Minister of the Republic of India, noted with satisfaction that, in the past few years, the relations between the two countries, based as they are, on the principles of national sovereignty and independence, equal rights, non-interference in domestic affairs and mutual advantage, have marked a steady development.

Pointing out that the progress made by the two countries in their economic and cultural development creates increasing possibilities for extending and diversifying their bilateral relations in all fields, the two Prime Ministers agreed that there exist favourable conditions for widening, on a mutually advantageous basis, the economic, cultural, technical and scientific cooperation between Rumania and India.

3

The exchange of views on the international situation brought to the fore the common concern of the Governments of the two countries to ensure the preservation of peace and the achievement of international security. Underlining the dangers to peace stemming from the existence of hotbeds of tension in different parts of the world, the two-sides believe that every state is duty bound to make unceasing efforts with a view to achieving a climate of international detente and understanding and to offer its contribution to solving outstanding issues. They affirmed their respect for the principle that no attempt to change established borders by force can be countenanced. The two Prime Ministers emphasised the significance of

establishing and promoting, among all states of the world, whatever their political and social systems, relations based on the observance of national sovereignty and independence, equal rights, mutual advantage and non-interference in the domestic affairs of others. These principles meet with ever wider recognition in the international community.

The two Prime Ministers expressed their deep concern at the danger from the continuation and intensification of the conflict in Vietnam. They agreed that the unconditional cessation of bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam is a prerequisite for a lasting settlement of the Vietnam problem. The two sides agreed that the solution of the Vietnamese question must be based on respect for the inalienable right of the Vietnamese people to choose their own destiny without external interference, in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

On the situation in the Near East, the two sides agreed that an urgent settlement of the problem is imperative. They expressed their opposition to the use of force for gaining political or territorial advantage and reaffirmed their stand that the territories occupied by force must be vacated. The two sides agreed that the establishment of lasting peace in the region can be achieved peacefully only with due respect to the legitimate aspirations of the peoples and territorial integrity and sovereignty of all states in this area.

The two Prime Ministers expressed their conviction that the attainment of general disarmament under effective international control would serve as a real guarantee for lasting peace in the world. They stated that a treaty on the non-dissemination of nuclear weapons should be conceived as part of a system of measures aimed at the elimination of these weapons. To make it really effective, it is necessary that such a treaty should be based on a mutually acceptable balance of obligations. It should offer real guarantees for the security of all

states, nuclear or non-nuclear, and should secure for all nations, on the basis of equality and without any discrimination, unrestricted rights to use and develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It should also provide for an equitable system of control applicable to all countries based on the principle of the sovereign equality of states.

The two sides emphasized the role and significance of the contribution which the United Nations Organisation can make to the maintenance of peace and to the promotion of international cooperation. They were in favour of increasing the effectiveness of this organisation by consistent implementation of the principles of the Charter and the assurance of universality of its membership.

The Prime Minister of India, while expressing pleasure and satisfaction at the value of the visit as a contribution to better mutual understanding and strengthening the friendly relations between the two countries, extended to the Chairman of the Council of Minister of the Socialist Republic of Rumania and Madame Maurer an invitation to visit India at their convenience in order to continue these contacts. The invitation was accepted with pleasure.

4

INDIA ROMANIA USA PERU VIETNAM SWITZERLAND

**Date**: Oct 01, 1967

## November

# **Volume No**

1995

Foreign Affairs Record

1967

Vol. XIII

NOVEMBER No. 11

#### **CONTENTS**

**PAGE** 

#### **BULGARIA**

Indo-Bulgarian Cultural Exchange Programme

173

### **CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

Indo-Czechoslovak Trade Agreement Signed

173

### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Prime Minister's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming Chancellor

Kiesinger 174

Chancellor Kiesinger's Reply

175

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner to Dr. Kiesinger

175

Reply by Dr. Kiesinger

177

Dr. Kiesinger's speech at Dinner to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

178

Reply by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

179

Joint Communique

180

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in Security Council on west

Asia 181

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in Security Council on Congo

184

Shri Baksh Singh's Statement in Special Political Committee on

Apartheid 186

### INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on her Visit Abroad 188

### SOUTH YEMEN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament

190

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY

**DIVISION** 

### GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

#### BULGARIA NORWAY SLOVAKIA GERMANY INDIA CONGO YEMEN

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## **BULGARIA**

Indo-Bulgaria Cultural Exchange Programme

The Cultural Exchange Programme between India and Bulgaria for the two years 1967-69, under the Indo-Bulgarian Cultural Agreement, was signed in New Delhi on November 6, 1967. Prof. Stefan Stanchev, First Deputy Chairman of the State Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, signed the programme agreement on behalf of Bulgaria and Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, Minister of State in the Ministry of Education, for India.

The other members of the Bulgarian delegation were Mr. Dimitar Shopov, Head of the Asia Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Mr. Petar Valkanov, Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of Bulgarian People's Republic in New Delhi. They were assisted by Dr. Boris Jibrov, Cultural Secretary in the Bulgarian Embassy. The talks began on November 3.

The agreed programme which was negotiated in an atmosphere of co-operation and cordiality has 35 items as compared to 22 items in the last one. It envisages exchange and cooperation in the fields of education, science and technology, art and culture, health and sports, press, radio and television through exchange of educationists, scientists, experts, artists, scholars re-search students, art exhibitions, grant of scholarships, mutual recognition of degrees and diplomas, exchange of publications, radio programmes, scientific publications and specimens.

In terms of persons, 15 Bulgarians will come to India while 16 Indians will go to Bulgaria. This includes the visit on either side of 5 scientists, 2 writers and one archaeologist, exchange of two exhibitions and the possible exchange of artistic ensembles, circus and circus workers. In addition, three scholarship holders will be exchanged for long-term visits for doctoral/post doctoral study and specialization.

BULGARIA INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### **CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

Indo-Czechoslovak Trade Agreement Signed

A trade agreement between India and Czechoslovakia was signed in New Delhi on November 28, 1967. The agreement envisages exchange of goods of the order of Rs. 800 million between the two countries in 1968.

On behalf of India the trade agreement was signed by Shri S. Ramachandran, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce, while Mr. L. Pesl signed the agreement on behalf of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The new trade agreement provides for the import by Czechoslovakia of a large variety of engineering goods such as M.S. pipes, pipe fittings, cutting tools, diamond tools, hand and small tools, auto ancillaries, locks and padlocks, railway wagons ancillaries, wire ropes, industrial plants and machinery, switch gears, refrigerators, flash lights, etc.

173

Some of the new items which Czechoslovakia will be taking from India are linoleum, paints,

varnishes, lacquers, sports goods, cigarettes, ilmanite and ferro-manganese. These new products would account for nearly Rs. 90 million in the anticipated exports during 1968.

During the discussions the leader of the Czechoslovak delegation said that the Exploratory Purchase Delegation has also identified many other manufactured goods, which have a good scope for export to their country. They would like the common consumer in Czechoslovakia to see these products. It was suggested that all these products should be displayed in a wholly Indian exhibition which may be arranged in Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1968. This suggestion has been accepted and steps are being taken for an exhibition during May-June 1968.

On the side of India's imports from Czechoslovakia, a prominent feature is the provision for capita goods, spares and components for maintaining the production programme of the various projects set up in India with Czechoslovak assistance, such as, Bharat Heavy Electrical Projects at Ranchi and Hyderabad. In addition, Czechoslovakia will supply to India in increasing quantities essential raw materials for maintaining economic activity, such as, Alloy and Tool Steel, Newsprint, Chemicals, etc.

The remarkable growth of trade and economic relations between India and Czechoslovakia can be seen from the fact that volume of trade over the last 12 years has increased manifold. The exchange of goods which was of the order of Rs. 30 million in 1955 increased to Rs. 500 million in 1966, Rs. 360 million in the first six months of 1967 and was expected to rise to Rs. 800 million in 1968.

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech at Palam airpart welcoming His Excellency Dr. Kurt Georg Kiesinger, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, who arrived in New Delhi on November 20, 1967 on a 3-day official visit to India:

Excellency, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you and Frau Kiesinger on behalf of the Government and the people of India. This is the first visit from a Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany to India.

Excellency, you are renowned for your statesmanship and we are honoured by your presence in our midst. We have admired your liberal outlook and your progressive views and are comforted by your unwavering interest and friendship for India. I am looking forward to our discussions later in the day. But your visit would not have been complete without Frau Kiesinger, to whom I am specially grateful for undertaking such a long journey for so brief a stay. The family has a great appeal to us in India and, I am sure, that the gracious presence of Frau Kiesinger will add great charm to the next two eventful days.

For decades, there has been a mutual attraction between India and Germany. Your visit, Excellency, therefore, is a continuation of an old association. But let it not be mistaken for a sentimental journey for we shall avail of this opportunity to forge new links and strengthen old ones and place Indo-German relationships on a dynamic footing.

Though you will not be able to see much of this vast land of ours, you will, I am sure, feel the warmth and the richness of our friendship. We are beset with gigantic problems today--some man-made and some arising out of the inclemencies of Nature. We are trying to tackle them as best as we can and to some extent, we have succeeded in the task. We have been assisted by good friends like yourselves which has been of great comfort to us and for which we are naturally grateful. We hope, Excellency, that

your visit will be another important landmark in

174

the friendship between our two peoples and will augment and intensify Indo-German collaboration in all spheres.

I should like to extend to you, Excellency, and Frau Kiesinger once again a very hearty welcome.

### GERMANY INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Chancellor Kiesinger's Reply

The following is the text of the Chancellor's reply:

Mrs. Prime Minister, Excellencies, Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you very sincerely for the friendly words with which you have welcomed my wife and myself to New Delhi. It is a great pleasure for me to be in India again as your guest in a country that has always held special attraction for me.

This is my third visit here, but it is the first time that a German Chancellor pays an official visit to India. Your father's visit to Germany is still vivid in the minds of all those who had the privilege of meeting with him, This great statesman not only determined India's course, he also established respect all over the world for the moral strength of his country and its convictions.

My visit is also an expression of the friendly relations that have bound Germany and India to-

gether even before the birth of the Union, and have always proved of benefit to both peoples throughout their eventful history. On the firm ground of Indo-German cultural relations, close cooperation has developed in the economic sphere, the possibilities of which are far from exhausted. Our political relationship is trustful and forward-looking, as it befits peoples committed to the same political ideals of democracy and peace and justice.

The fact that it took me only a few hours to come to you from Germany shows how the world has shrunk. But the dwindling distances are attended by growing dangers which make it incumbent on the responsible people in this world to join forces in the great task of promoting world peace.

I come to hear what moves you here in India, to learn from your experience and problems in solving urgent tasks, and to get to know your aims. I also come to acquaint you with the problems confronting us in our still divided country.

I am looking forward with great expectation to the exchange of views in the next few days, for, I am sure, that these talks will be fruitful and beneficial to both sides.

I am happy that my stay in India affords me an opportunity to underline the importance we in Germany attach to this great democratic country and to the message of international understanding and peace which India has given to the world and this visit is to prove how deeply we desire closer cooperation with your country.

GERMANY INDIA USA

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner to Dr. Kiesinger

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech at a dinner given by her in honour of His Excellency Kurt Georg Kiesinger, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Mrs. Kiesinger in New Delhi on November 20, 1967:

Mr. Chancellor, Frau Kiesinger, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a privilege and pleasure to have with us this evening our distinguished guests from the Federal Republic of Germany, Chancellor Kiesinger and Frau Kiesinger. I welcome you on behalf of Government and people of India. We appreciate your coming to visit our country from half a world away.

We welcome you not merely as a Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany but as a

175

person who has always evinced interest in our country. We have followed your career with interest from the day you arrived in Bonn after giving up your distinguished career in the legal profession in Tuebingen. We are sure that the Federal Republic will make continued progress under your leadership and that this visit will further strengthen the relations between our two countries.

The Germany of Goethe and Schiller, of Immanuel Kant and of Beethoven has inspired our intellectuals, as it has, millions of people in all parts of the world. Baden Wurttemberg from where you come, Sir, has a special association for us. It was at Stuttgart, the capital of Baden Wurttemberg, that the Indian Tricolour was first unfurled in 1912. For me personally that part of Germany has cherished poignant memories, as it was not far from there in Badenweiler that my mother spent her last months in 1935.

## POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC TIES

Though it is only after we achieved independence that we developed political and economic ties, for decades before that we had profound

cultural inter-action. It would not be an exaggeration to say that no European nation made a greater attempt to discover and understand the ancient wisdom of India than Germany did. The reason is obvious. Philosophical inquiry is the fundamental basis of the genius of your people which those famous last words of Goethe, "Light, more light" sum up so completely. Goethe's sensitive spirit responded instinctively to Sanskrit literature. It was the work of German scholars, notably Max Muller, that enabled us in our turn to rediscover ourselves.

During the last 20 years, our relations have been diversified. There is a great deal of mobility not merely in trade and commerce but also in men and ideas.

Like the rest of the world, India is, changing and undergoing a series of transformations as it moves from one stage to another in her journey from traditionalism to modernity. There is a fascinating and sometimes frustrating, interplay between the changing and the unchanging, the dynamic and the static. But the pace of this change is not fast enough. The work that remains is immeasurably greater than anything we have yet achieved. Development is more complex than the subtlest economist had imagined even a generation ago. I take this opportunity of acknowledging the great sympathy and assistance we have received from the people of Germany in our efforts to create a new India.

A wide gulf of poverty separates us from the richer and industrially-advanced nations. Poverty is both an absolute and a relative concept. Either way it is painful and disturbing and the world will not be free, of trouble until this gulf is narrowed. Over the last decade, disparities have actually widened and continue to do so, This is perhaps the most difficult of the problems which statesmen must recognise and solve. I sincerely hope that the forthcoming United Nations, Conference on Trade and Development will find practical solutions to the problem.

We recognise that material prosperity cannot be an end in itself for it solves only one half of man's problems. Power has to be tempered by restraint as mere affluence will corrode unless it is allied with culture. I have no doubt that in this quest also the people of India and Germany can and will co-operate.

#### DEMOCRATIC FRAMEWORK

In India we remain totally committed not merely to the democratic framework within which we are trying to work out our destiny but to giving the highest priority in the allocation of resources to (the development of our economy and in particular of agriculture. Without being unduly optimistic, I think I would be right in saying that we, have got some measure of out problems and the manner in which these can be solved.

Concerned as we are with the problem of providing liberty, national dignity and bread to our people, we cannot but sense, a growing disquiet at the present international situation. Our own commitment to peace and peaceful coexistence remains firm.

Mr. Chancellor, this afternoon we met and had useful discussions on many matters of mutual interest and current concern. I have spoken here of less tangible, matters because these are the warp and woof of existence from which we might weave the patterns we desire. They are the fundamentals which matter.

We are glad to have Your Excellency in our midst and I am delighted that your gracious lady is also here and will have some little time to see something of Delhi and Agra.

May I also welcome all the other distinguished members of your party and may I invite you all Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to join me in a toast to the good health and welfare of our distinguished guests, the Chancellor and Frau Kiesinger, and other members of the party, to Indo-German friendship and to the peace and welfare of the peoples of the world.

176

GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Reply by Dr. Kiesinger

Replying to the toast by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Kiesinger said:

Madame Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like again on behalf of my wife and the members of my party to thank you very sincerely for your kind invitation to visit your country, to thank you for the fruitful talks which we had today already and to thank you for the gift of this festive occasion and evening which provides us with an opportunity of meeting again a large number of distinguished guests whom we have known already and of meeting new friends whom we meet during these days.

India has always been close to the hearts of us. Germans. I think this must be due to some very deep affinity existing between our two peoples. I myself have felt very early the attraction of India and this is my third visit which I am paying to your country. The first, I paid in 1956 and at a time when I was staying in Calcutta. I had to go right back to my country because of the Suez crisis and the Hungarian revolt that had broken out at that time. I came back again in 1965 and then I was able to convince myself of the great progress that had been achieved in the meantime in this huge country. And now I have the honour as the Head of Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to pay the first official visit of a German Chancellor to Your Excellency and to this country.

In all these years I have followed with interest the development of this country and I have seen how you were able to go your way facing such numerous difficulties. Let me tell you that we have admired the way in which you have been going forward on that path.

### **INDIAN LEADERS**

Of the great leaders of this country, unfortunately I was not able to have the personal acquaintance of Mahatma Gandhi, but already as a young man I had admired and venerated him as millions of people around this globe have admired and venerated him. And it was a pleasure and honour for me to take the Chair in our National Committee which was formed to celebrate the centenary of Mahatma Gandhi's birthday. I had the honour and privilege several times to meet your father, Jawaharlal Nehru, the great architect of Indian democracy. We had the bonour of having Dr. Radhakrishnan as our guest in Stuttgart, and during my visit here, of meeting your President, who was then Vice-President of India.

Very recently we had the great pleasure, of meeting Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Desai, in Bonn. And now Madame this great burden of responsibility of this huge country with its 500 million people has devolved on your shoulders, and the fate is lying in your hands. It sometimes seems as though the problems which we have to deal with at home compared with the worries and burden with which you are confronted here are somehow more manageable. Our two countries have different problems and worries. We have followed with admiration the way in which you as Prime Minister have overcome and are overcoming day by day these problems, worries, facing difficulties as you go along and we wish you sincerely success in this heavy task.

I said that our two countries have their problems and we are grateful that you have always shown understanding for our big national problem --the division of our country--and for that we thank you sincerely.

### PEACE IN JUSTICE

We have our problems, each of us, but together we have at heart the cause of peace because we know that we must succeed in preserving peace on this earth and we must succeed in preventing a major war from springing up at any given point of this globe because if such a

war came it would not only be terrible for our two peoples but it would be disastrous for mankind as a whole. Peace can only be real peace when it is peace in justice. And justice implies many things.

It implies not only that one day the very idea of war will be abhored by all people, by each and every man. It implies that one day no man can suffer anywhere on this, globe, no single person may suffer from starvation. And though there are differences in the kinds of problems with which we are confronted, though we are acting in different spheres and on different con-

177

tinents, we know that the fate of this shrunken world has become. so closer, interdependent, that none of your problems can leave us indifferent, that we have to share them because we are partners of the dangers which confront us and we are partners in the fate of the peoples of this world, we are partners in making our contributions each of us and jointly to a happly future for mankind.

I hope that this first visit of a German Chancellor will soon find its echo and reflection in your visit to Germany, Madame Prime Minister, at your earliest convenient date and you can be sure of a sincere and heartly welcome of the whole German people. I hope that this visit of the German Chancellor. will open an era of still closer cooperation and partnership between our two nations.

GERMANY USA INDIA

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Dr. Kiesinger's Speech at Dinner to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

The following is the text of Chancellor Kiesinger's speech at a dinner given by him in honour of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi; on November 21, 1967 at the German Embassy, New Delhi:

Madame Prime Minister, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen,

Our short and all too brief visit here in Delhi is drawing to its end. It was brief but it was rich in substance. I think we can say it was rich in results. We had the opportunity of meeting our Indian friends and I had the privilege with you, Madame Prime Minister, to discuss many important questions, questions of particular concern to our two peoples, questions inherent in the, great problems of this world. And I want to take this opportunity tonight while you are gathered around this table at the German Embassy, our guests, on behalf of my wife and on behalf of the gentlemen accompanying me to extend to you our heartfelt thanks and to express to you our deep friendship and to thank you for the cordiality with which you have received us as your guests.

When, very unmerited I must confess, I recieved the Honorary Doctor of Laws from the University of Delhi, I said that Mahatma Gandhi was a great legal teacher for me. Not only a teacher of politics which he certainly was but teacher of law. And I recalled important sections in his, autobiography where he says that in a very complex and difficult case be was unable to make, progress in applying the law and that, therefore, he went to an old friend of his, a famous barrister and said that he was completely desperate because he was unable to make any headway in the solution of the case he was handling at the time. And that very wise colleague tells us in his book, "Gandhi, remember one thing, take care of the facts and if you do then the. law will take care of itself". He heeded that voice and he continues to say that taking care of the facts he was able to solve the case and win the case for his client.

#### IMPORTANCE OF FACTS

As a student I drew great advantage from that

teaching of his and I continued to draw advantage from applying that lesson I learnt. He tells it is not only in law that it is, important to see the facts, it is just the same way with the medical profession where the doctor when he gives the right diagnosis is only stating the right facts and it is on that basis that he can heal. But it also applies to politics. And that is why the legal profession of which I am a part feels particularly predestined to go into Political life because it is important in politics to see the facts, what prejudice, what errors get in the heads of men simply because either they have not endeavoured or they have been unable to recognise the facts.

So, we, came to India in this friendly spirit in order better to know the facts of India of today and thus be in a better position to meet them. We have learnt during the past two days and this certainly is the beginning of growing knowledge. We also had opportunity of telling our Indian friends something about the facts of the Germany of today, to explain to you and to better understanding with you for those facts. We have agreed to this very good procedure to somehow institutionalise these meetings, and to have each year of Foreign Ministers' meeting and have consultations. And these consultations, what end do they serve if not to get to know more facts and realities of our two countries but also of the world and to exchange our views about them.

178

### DEEPER FRIENDSHIP

As I have said during these two days, India has always been close to the hearts of us, Germans. May I say that now India has even come closer to our hearts than it was already. And when we return back home we do so firmly determined to remain friends of India and to feel still deeper friendship for you than we did already hitherto.

I planted at Rajghat a tree and I tell you Ambassador and at the same time through you to all the future Ambassadors of Germany here in India that you should have someone here at the Embassy to look after the tree, a caretaker of the tree so to say, who will see to it, that tree grows fast. I hope it will. A day will come when the son or daughter of mine or a

grandson or a grand daughter of mine will come here and see that tree, a powerful large shadow casting tree and will then say, 'That is true; my father planted out of veneration for the great Mahatma Gandhi and out of friendship for the Indian people and as a token of friendship between the German and the Indian peoples and in the hope that that friendship will grow ever more between our two nations and that son or grandson of mine will then be able to say, 'he was right' and the hope that the friendship between the two peoples may grow and that it will help contribute to bring about peace in this world, that hope of his also has been fulfilled". May that wish conic true.

May I ask you to raise your glass and join me in a drink to the health of the Prime Minister of India, Madame Indira Gandhi, to our friends and to a happy future for the Indian nation.

## GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

#### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Reply by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi

Replying to the toast by Chancellor Kiesinger, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said:

Your Excellency Kiesinger and our German and Indian friends,

I have been deeply moved by your voice, by the warmth of the friendship which you have shown towards us and towards the Indian people. I want to assure you that that friendship and warmth is reciprocated by all of us.

India is a A arm country. Its climate is warm

but its people are also very warm-hearted and that is why, I think, there is a greater response to ideas and to feelings than there is to material things. Not that we are less materialistic than other people but perhaps merely because we do not possess so many material things. And perhaps because of that we are trying to cover up by talking about other things. And yet, when one looks at the facts one sees that originally people started coming to India because of the wealth of India.

It was the wealth and riches of this country which attracted all these invasions and ultimately were responsible for our enslavement. So that we were conscious of the material things also. And yet in spite of them, we have had people from time immemorial who have looked beyond those things. And now either because we want or because of circumstances, we like to keep our sights on those things with meaning to the material aspect of life.

#### NEW DIMENSION TO FRIENDSHIP

You are very right, Mr. Chancellor, in saying that your visit has added a new dimension to the friendship between our two countries and has taken it beyond the friendship between two governments to the level of friendship between two peoples., and I think this is a very important development. We have had some knowledge of your country but there is no doubt that meeting together like this, having such a frank and fruitful discussion does add to one's knowledge and ones understanding.

One of the strangest things in the world of today is that in spite of fast communication, the ability in time and space to move and to meet more people to see more things this has not really helped in a greater understanding, either of people or of things. Whereas in olden times one saw less but perhaps one saw it better. Today one sees more and, somehow, skims on the surface of things. And, therefore, meeting together as we have here helps us, to break through the surface to a deeper level and this again helps in building-up friendship and understanding without which there can be no peace.

179

So, we attach very great importance to your visit and we are grateful to you for coming, for bringing your great lady with you and we certainly hope that we shall have the opportunity of meeting your son and daughter. So something has been begun as you have aptly compared it to The tree which you have planted, a seed of friendship has been sown and I sincerely hope it will also grow into a tree which is shady and fruitful and which gives comfort and solace to men.

May I ask you, all Ladies and Gentlemen, to raise your glass to the good health of the Chancellor and Mrs. Kiesinger, to our other German guests and to the great German people.

GERMANY INDIA USA PERU

**Date:** Nov 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

#### FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Joint Communique

The following is the text of a Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on November 21, 1967 at the conclusion of talks between the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Kurt Georg Kiesinger:

At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Dr. Kurt Georg Kiesinger, paid an official visit to India from November 20-22, 1967. He was accompained by Mrs. Kiesinger, State Secretary von Guttenberg, State Secretary Jahn and senior officials. The Federal Chancellor and his party received a warm and friendly welcome from the Government and the people of India.

The Chancellor was received by Dr. Zakir Husain, President of India. He had talks also with the Deputy Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, and met other members of the Indian Government.

This first official visit by a Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany is a sign of the bonds of trust and friendship which have long existed between the two countries.

The two Heads of Government, assisted by their respective officials, held discussions, on the international situation, including East-West relations, disarmament and security, and Indo-German relations. The discussions, which took place in an atmosphere of frankness and cordiality, have indicated a broad similarity of views on a variety of international problems and have led to a more profound mutual understanding.

In order to enable a continuing exchange of views, the two Heads of Government agreed that the Foreign Ministers of India and of the Federal Republic of Germany, or their representatives, should meet once a year, alternately in Bonn and in New Delhi, to discuss questions of mutual interest and concern. They expect such periodical consultations to enhance mutual relations still further and are convinced that both Governments, by coordinating their views on important questions, could also contribute towards international understanding and cooperation.

The Prime Minister of India reviewed the problems of development in the Indian context and the progress made in building a self-reliant economy. She expressed her appreciation of the economic and technical cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany. The Federal Chancellor was impressed with the progress achieved by India in all directions and affirmed his Government's desire to, continue and strengthen the economic, scientific and technological cooperation existing between the two countries.

The two Heads of Government recalled that both India and the Federal Republic of Germany are dedicated to parliamentary democracy, the rule of law, freedom of expression and of opinion. In their international relations they are firmly committed to the easing of tensions, the promotion of international cooperation and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. In this context they deprecated any resort to force to settle disputes.

The Federal Chancellor stated that it was, the firm policy of his Government to improve relations with the countries of Eastern Europe. He drew attention to the division of Germany and to the resolve to seek reunification by peaceful and democratic means. The Prime Minister of India expressed the hope that this problem would be settled peacefully.

The Prime Minister of India explained to the Federal Chancellor the situation in regard to Indo-Pakistani relations and the desire of the Indian people to live in peace and cooperation with their neighbour in the spirit of the Tashkent

180

Declaration. The Federal Chancellor took note of the Indian position and expressed the hope that Indo-Pakistan problems would be settled by peaceful means.

Recounting the recent developments on the Sino-Indian border, the Prime Minister explained the political economic and defence problems which they posed and emphasised India's determination to safeguard her territorial integrity and to preserve her democratic system and way of life. She emphasised the desire of the Government of India to live in peace with all her neighbours. The Federal Chancellor expressed the sincere hope that these problems would be resolved peacefully and would not hamper the progress of India.

Reviewing the recent developments in respect of the Non-Proliferation Treaty and Disarmament, the two Heads of Government stressed the importance of taking early steps towards general disarmament. They agreed that any treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to be effective and universally acceptable should be non-discriminatory and should not inhibit the development of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

The two Heads of Government reviewed the pattern of Indo-German trade and economic relations. The Indian Prime Minister referred in

particular to, the persistent imbalance in the commercial exchanges between the two countries, In keeping with the desire in both countries to increase mutually beneficial commerce they agreed that such problems should be discussed between experts of the two countries. In this context they recognised the importance of the Second Meeting of the UNCTAD to be held in Now Delhi early next year, and expressed the hope that this Conference would lead to a liberalisation and diversification of trade between developed and developing countries.

Taking note of the traditionally close relations existing between the two countries in the field of scholarship, culture, science and technology, and with a view to their further intensification the two Heads of Government declared their intention to enter into a Cultural Agreement between the two countries in the near future. They welcomed the proposed establishment of an Institute of German Studies at the Nehru University.

The Federal Chancellor, while thanking the Prime Minister of India and the Indian Government for the warmth and hospitality with which he and his party were received, extended an invitation to the Prime Minister to visit the Federal Republic of Germany, on a date to be agreed upon. The Prime Minister of India accepted the invitation with pleasure.

GERMANY INDIA USA PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in Security Council on West Asia

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the

following statement in the Security Council on November 9, 1967 on the Weir Asian situation:

Mr. President, I should first of, all like to extend my delegation's sincere felicitations to you on your assumption-of the office of President of the Security Council for this month. We feel assured that you will preside over our Council with the same probity, wisdom and impartiality which have marked Your guidance of the informal consultations among all members of the Council during the past few days. It is our earnest hope that under your leadership the Council will break the unfortunate stalemate on West Asia and move forward towards a peaceful settlement.

It is now over five months since the Security Council first took up consideration of the dangerous situation in West Asia. As we all remember, in the months of June and July, the

181

Council adopted several unanimous resolutions demanding a cease-fire and the cessation of all military activities in the area. It was also the unanimous agreement of the. members of the Council that a cease-fire was to be only the first step in the direction of creating conditions for permanent peace and stability in West Asia.

Some of us earnestly urged that, having taken the first step in ordering a cease-fire, the Security Council should take the further steps of securing the withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied territories and in bringing about peace and security to the area. These two steps were, in our view, necessary to prevent the emergence of graver threats to peace and security in the future.

### **GRAVE SITUATION**

During the last few months, the General Assembly also has expressed its views on this grave situation first, in the fifth emergency special session, and then during the general debate at the twenty-second regular session. Although these deliberations of the General Assembly have been inconclusive on the vital questions concerning the maintenance of peace and security, nevertheless they have underlined the deep concern of

Member States at the crisis, and have revealed certain fundamental areas, of agreement which could pave the way towards finding definitive solutions.

First, withdrawal of Israeli forces to the positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities, that is, to the positions held on 4 June 1967.

Second, withdrawal should not result once again in the situation of part peace and part war. Therefore, there should be an end to the state of belligerency as it existed before the outbreak of hostilities on 5 June 1967. Further, it should be possible for all States in the area-indeed it is the right of all States-to live in peace and complete security free from threats or acts of war.

Third, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, all States in the area must respect the political independence and territorial integrity of one another.

Fourth, there must be a just settlement of the long-deferred problem of the Palestine refugees.

Fifth, there should be not only freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area. but there should be a guarantee of such freedom.

By its resolution 2256 (ESV), the General Assembly, bearing in mind the resolutions adopted and the proposals considered during the fifth emergency session, requested the Secretary-General to forward the records of that session to the Security Council to facilitate the resumption by the Council of its consideration of the tense situation in West Asia. The Secretary-General complied with this request of the General Assembly through a letter dated 21 July 1967, addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/8088).

Among the important proposals considered by the General Assembly was document A/L.523/ Rev. 1, which contained the text of a draft resolution sponsored by twenty Latin American delegations. I should like to request that the Latin American draft resolution, to which I have just referred, be circulated as a Security Council

document.

During the last three to four weeks, the Afro-Asian and Latin American delegations members of this Council have been engaged in intensive and extensive consultations in regard to the most appropriate course to be followed by the Security Council. Individually or collectively, we examined all the proposals, formal and informal, which were put forward during the months of June and July when the General Assembly was meeting in emergency session. We had before us the non-aligned draft, the Latin American drafts and the papers which were produced as a result of discussions between the Soviet Union and the United States. We also had the benefit of the valuable passages from the Secretary-General's Introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly this year. We took all these proposals into account and tried to produce a fair and balanced paper for the consideration of the Security Council. Needless to say, we also had in mind the views of the other members of the Council and of the parties concerned.

#### DRAFT RESOLUTION

I am sure my Latin American and Afro-Asian colleagues will bear me out when I say that in finalizing the three-Power draft we had the Latin-American draft as the basic document of reference. The draft resolution which has now been distributed to the members of the Council in document S/8227, and which I have the honour to introduce here today on behalf of Mali, Nigeria and India, closely parallels the Latin American draft co-sponsored by twenty delegations in the General Assembly. The draft resolution reads:

"The Security Council,

182

"Expressing its continuing concern with the grave situation in the Middle East.

"Recalling its resolution 233 (1967) of 6 June 1967, on the outbreak of fighting which called for, as a first step, an immediate cease-fire and for a cessation of all mililary activities in the area, "Recalling further General Assembly resolution 2256(ES-V).

"Emphasizing the urgency of reducing tension, restoring peace and bringing about normalcy in the area,

- "1. Affirms that a just and lasting peace in the Middle East must be achieved within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations and more particularly of the following principles:
- "(i) Occupation or acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible under the Charter of the United Nations and consequently Israel's armed forces should withdraw from all the territories occupied as a result of the recent conflict;
- "(ii) Likewise, every State has the right to live in peace and complete security free from threats or acts of war and consequently all States in the area should terminate the state or claim of belligerency and settle their international disputes by peaceful means.
- "(iii) Likewise, every State of the, area has the right to be secure within its borders and it is obligatory on all Member States of the area to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of one another;

#### "2. Affirms further:

- "(i) There should be a just settlement of the question of Palestine refugees;
- "(ii) There should be guarantee of freedom of navigation in accordance with international law through international waterways in the area;
- "3. Requests the Secretary-General to dispatch a special representative to the area who would contact the. States concerned in order to co-ordinate efforts to achieve the purposes of this resolution and to submit a report to the Council within thirty days."

#### **EOUALITY OF OBLIGATIONS**

There is no need for me to explain the preambular paragraphs of the draft resolution. So far as the operative paragraphs are concerned, they are also clear and unambiguous. Our endeavour has been not only to state each principle in clear terms but also to link it to the others so as to give equal validity to each and to ensure equality of obligations. But there are a few points which need to be explained. The first operative paragraph begins by affirming what is obvious to all of us and it is that peace and stability can be brought to West Asia only within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations. We do, not attempt to pinpoint any particular provision of the Charter because, in our view, the entire Charter should be the framework.

In sub-paragraph (i), the basic point of operative paragraph 2 (A the Latin American Draft is brought in, namely, the inadmissibility of occupation or acquisition of territory by military conquest. The second half of the same subparagraph in regard to withdrawals uses language identical, word for word, to the operative paragraph 1 (a) of the Latin American draft, Subparagraph (ii) of our draft goes farther than the operative paragraph 1 (b) of the, Latin draft. It is somewhat more comprehensive because it not only calls for the termination of the sate of belligerency but also of any claim of belligerency. Sub-paragraph (iii) of our draft takes up the question of territorial inviolability and political independence which was referred to in operative paragraph 3 (c) of the Latin draft.

Here again, our draft resolution is somewhat more comprehensive because it clearly states, borrowing the language of our distinguished Secretary-General, that every State of the area has the right to be secure within its borders-I emphasize, "within its borders". There are two other points mentioned in operative paragraph 3 (c) of the Latin draft. They are: the problem of refugees and the establishment of demilitarized zones. As far as the question of refugees is concerned, this is provided for in our operative paragraph 2(i). However, I must make it quite clear that in our view the question of refugees comprehends only the Palestinian refugees and not those who have acquired

that status as a result of the conflict in June this year. In our view, as soon as Israel withdraws front all the territories she has occupied as a result of that conflict, the problem of the so-called new refugees would automatically cease to exist. In so far as the establishment of demilitarized zones is concerned, sub-paragraph (ii) of our operative paragraph I refers to the right of every State to live in peace and complete security free from threats or acts of war. If the establishment of demilitarized zones is found to he necessary in the light of the Special Representative's report, that could be taken care of in conformity with sub-paragraph (ii). Of

183

course, it is clear to all of us that demilitarized zones, must be established only with the consent of the States concerned.

#### FREEDOM OF NAVIGATION

Now we come to the question of freedom of navigation which is mentioned in operative paragraph 3(b) of the Latin American draft, and finds a place in our draft in subparagraph (ii) of operative paragraph 2. Our draft talks of guarantee of freedom of navigation in accordance with International Law. Most international waterways have their own particular regimes. In the case of the Suez Canal the Constantinople Convention of 1888 is applicable. If, however, no particular regime exists, then the waterway, such as the Gulf of Agaba, is regulated by customary International Law. We have been told in informal consultations, that the reference to International Law merely serves to confuse the issues, to promote prolonged litigation. etc. My delegation is not convinced that this is so. However, we are prepared to examine very carefully any arguments that might be advanced in the Council in respect of the word "in accordance with International Law".

Operative paragraph 3 of our draft needs to be explained only in one detail. We request the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Council within thirty days of the adoption of this resolution. It is not, of course, our contention that the work of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General would be over in thirty days. Nevertheless, it is important to re-

ceive a report in the very near future because of the urgency of the problem. If the period of thirty days is considered too short, the cosponsors of the draft resolution would be quite willing to consider other suggestions in this regard.

The Co-sponsors of the; draft resolution which I have just introduced have tried very hard and sincerely to present a fair and balanced formulation of all the principles and the problems germane to the situation in West Asia. We know that some of the provisions of our draft are not in accordance with the wishes of the parties concerned. We are keenly aware that there are differences within the Council and between the parties on what should be the basic approach at this stage. It has been our endeavour and will continue to be our effort to narrow down these differences. I should like to emphasize once again, that the core of our guide-lines for action lies within the four corners of the Charter of the United Nations and particularly of its most fundamental principles.

It is our view that the Council should lay down in clear and unambiguous language the principles it considers to be appropriate to the Solutions of the problems of the area. The three-Power draft initiates the process of peaceful settlement of the West Asian crisis. Members of the Council will note that the draft resolution provides for the adoption of all peaceful means to settle the disputes. As we see it, the mission of the Special Representative and his contacts with the parties may open up various possibilities of the means of peaceful settlement within the framework of this resolution.

#### UNHAPPY CHAPTER

Our deliberations, consultations and consideration of the West Asian crisis have reached a crucial stage; the time is now ripe for the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility for maintenance of peace and security. This Council cannot allow itself to be bogged down any further in endless controversy. All of us around this table share the common objective of restoration of peace and security to all the nations and peoples of West Asia.

We must, therefore, look forward to the day

when all States of the area through the genuine implementation of the provisions of our resolution will be able to close an unhappy chapter of the past and start a new era of good neighbourly relations. It is in this spirit and with this objective that we have presented this resolution and we would request our colleagues to give it their earnest consideration.

INDIA USA ISRAEL MALI CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in Security Council on Congo

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, mode the following statement in the Security Council on November 14, 1967 on a complaint to the Council from the Congo regarding the activities of a group of mercenaries on its territory:

The Security Council, within four months of its consideration of a complaint from the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

184

regarding the activities of a group of mercenaries on its territory, is called upon, once again, to examine a similar complaint from the same Government. Members will recall that in July this year and before that in October 1966 also the Council had met to deal with exactly the same situation.

This frequency of interference by external forces in the domestic affairs of a Member State of the United Nations is a matter of great concern to my delegation, a concern which, I have no doubt, is shared by the other members of the

Council. My delegation attaches the highest importance to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of Member States and, consequently, deplores any such interference or attempted interference from any quarter.

#### FORCES OF COLONIALISM

We all know the history of the friendly country of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and how it has been subjected to foreign forces of colonialism, in one form or another, since its emergence to independent statehood over seven years ago. Soon after it became independent the country was engulfed in a bitter civil war which, as we all know, was engineered and controlled from outside. The United Nations, whose assistance was asked for and provided on a massive scale, succeeded, after four years of ceaseless efforts, in restoring the territorial integrity and sovereignty of the country.

The Government of India is proud of this achievement of the world Organization and of its own contribution to it. Everybody hoped that the Congo would be able, thereafter, to live in peace and to consolidate its internal position so as to devote its energies to the cause which is so dear to all the newly independent countries, namely, the betterment of the standards of living of our peoples. But, alas, this was not to be the case for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which continued to be the victim of foreign interference and which has, as a result, been obliged to spend a good deal of effort and resources on combating the reactionary elements from outside.

My delegation listened with great care and sympathy to the statement made by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the 1372nd meeting of the Council on 8 November. I wish to assure the Deputy Minister that my delegation, far from getting weary, in fact appreciates the trouble and efforts made by his delegation to apprise the Council with the unhappy situation existing on the borders of the Congo.

The principal source for the recurrent troubles faced by the Democratic Republic of the Congo from outside seems to be the Portuguese colony of Angola. The representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo gave a detailed expose of

the latest incidents involving the activities of mercenary bands which came into the Katanga province of the Congo from Angola with a view to carrying out their usual destructive plans. The representative of Portugal, as was to be expected, denied that Angola was being used or was allowed to be used as a base of operations for interfering in the domestic affairs of the Congo. But as was rightly pointed out by the representative of the United Kingdom:

"....it is hard--it is very hard--to believe that the latest band of mercenaries, who apparently came into the Katanga province of Me Congo from Angola, could have been assembled and armed in Angola without the knowledge of the Portuguese authorities". 1372nd meeting, p. 46).

#### UNCONVINCING DISCLAIMER

That mercenaries had entered the Congo cannot be doubted by any one, And the only place they could have come from is Angola. The disclaimer of the representative of Portugal, therefore, did not and could not sound convincing. As the representative of the United States stated:

"It is very difficult for my delegation to understand how foreign mercenaries could be present in Angola, make preparations for such a misadventure and then leave Angola for the Congo without the knowledge or at least acquiescence of the Portuguese authorities. The implications of Portuguese responsibility, even if only tacit, would therefore appear to be serious" (Aid., P. 57).

My delegation would like to express its most serious concern at the reported and repeated attempts of the Portuguese authorities to use and permit the use of their African colonies for the purpose of interfering in the domestic affairs of the neighbouring independent African States. I have advisedly used the noun "State" in plural because my delegation recalls that the Governments of Zambia, Senegal and Guinea also have complained of the active interference in their internal affairs by the Portuguese authorities in Angola and so-called Portuguese Guinea, in documents S/7664, S/8186 and S/8194. In fact, the Security Council had deemed it necessary to include a paragraph in its resolution 226 (1966)

185

"Urges the Government of Portugal, in view of its own statement, not to allow foreign mercenaries to use Angola as a base of operation for interfering in the domestic affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;".

#### **CURSE OF MERCENARIES**

My colleagues from Ethiopia, Liberia, Burundi, Zambia and Nigeria gave a very accurate analysis of the situation obtaining in southern Africa today. They explained how the problem of mercenary activities was only a ramification of more fundamental problems in southern Africa with which the United Nations has failed, up to now, to deal effectively. My delegation agrees with the views of our African colleagues. It is obvious that the difficulties of the Congo and some other African countries will not be completely eliminated until the people in Angola, Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea achieve their freedom and independence.

The Deputy Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has appealed to the Council for help. He told us in very moving terms that his country wanted only one thing. I quote from his statement:

"We have suffered a lot. Many countries here who have helped us know about our misfortunes. All we want is to live in peace in our country. We want the foreigners and the Congolese living in our country to continue to go about their business in peace without having to defend themselves against bandits, outlaws and mercenaries." (1372nd meeting, pp. 26 and 27).

Surely the Security Council cannot fail to heed this appeal from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I want to assure the representative of the Congo that my delegation will give full support to any measures which would help his country to rid itself of the curse of the mercenaries. We hope that the Security Council will deal effectively with the complaint of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in the discharge of its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

INDIA CONGO USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ANGOLA PORTUGAL GUINEA SENEGAL ZAMBIA BURUNDI ETHIOPIA LIBERIA NIGER NIGERIA MOZAMBIQUE

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Baksh Singh's Statement in Special Political Committee on Apartheid

Shri Baksh Singh, Member of the Indian Delegation to the United nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on November 8, 1967 on the policies of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa:

A whole generation has passed since our Organization first took up the question of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa. Year after year the United Nations has debated and condemned these oppressive policies which enable a small minority to perpetuate its domination over a much larger majority in flagrant disregard of the principles of the Charter of the United Nat-ions and in clear contravention of all canons of civilised human behaviour.

Never in modern history have so few oppressed so many for so long. Today there is hardly any aspect of South Africa's political, social and economic life which has not been legislated upon to reinforce the malignant philosophy of racial segregation. It is not difficult to imagine the grave dangers to peace of Africa and indeed of the whole world posed by the developments that are now taking place in South Africa as well as in the neighbouring Territories of Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies. We are deeply concerned at this situation and raise our voice of protest and indignation along with the vast majority of the membership of our Organization as well as the world at large in condemning these discriminatory policies.

We in India are justly proud of having been the first to oppose the policies of apartheid. Nearly sixty years ago Mahatma Gandhi, the father of our nation and great fighter for freedom, justice and equality among nations and peoples, first raised the banner of struggle in South Africa. Even before India became independent, my country took political and economic measures against apartheid. In addition to severing all diplomatic, commercial and economic contacts with South Africa, we have persistently opposed the extension of any loans and assistance by the World Bank to the South African Government and South African companies.

#### ATTITUDE OF CONTEMPT

This year again, as in the past nineteen years, our world Organization is faced with the same problem, albeit in a more acute, form. The

186

numerous United Nations resolutions calling upon the South African Government to retreat from its discriminatory policies remain unimplemented. United Nations resolutions calling upon States to take measures of a political and economic nature against the Pretoria regime have been only partially carried out. No wonder therefore that the South African regime not only has persisted in its oppression of the majority, but has become even more defiant and has adopted an attitude of contempt towards the United Nations. It is also worth noting that South Africa is extending its racist policies towards the neighbouring territory of Southern Rhodesia, whose illegal regime it actively supports, thus making any sanctions against the one ineffective unless they are applied to the other also.

Representatives will recall the historic resolution 2145 (XXI), adopted by the General Assembly on 27 October 1966, which decided to terminate the Mandate of South West Africa and make that territory a direct responsibility of the United Nations. Yet the South African Government not only defied the United Nations but even threatened violent resistance to the implementation of that decision. In South Africa itself measures of racial separation and discrimination are being applied with increasing rigour.

New legislation has been brought into force to widen even further the scope of apartheid. Repressive measures against the opponents of apartheid have been intensified and severe penalties are meted out to anyone who raises his voice in protest. Opponents of apartheid are subjected to very harsh measures, including arrest, banishment and ill-treatment. Along with this, a massive build-up of military and police forces in South Africa is continuing, virtually turning that country into an armed camp.

#### ECONOMIC SANCTIONS

All these developments point to a danger of violent racial conflict. My delegation believes that it is the responsibility of our Organization to help the people of South Africa in gaining justice and freedom, and that the only peaceful way of doing this is through the application of universal and mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa. We therefore attach paramount importance to the responsibility of South Africa's many trading partners, which have not so far seen fit to implement the United Nations resolutions calling for economic sanctions and an embargo on the sale of military equipment and stores to South Africa. We do not conceal our disappointment at their refusal to join the rest of the membership in implementing various resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

South Africa's trading partners must realize that by their refusal to give effect to thew policies they are in effect giving direct encouragement and support to the South African Government to persist in its oppressive policies of racial discrimination and intolerance. Clearly, these nations are bartering away the future of millions of human beings for their own narrow economic gains and financial benefits. My delegation would once again urge them to reconsider their decision in the interest of justice and in the interest of our Organization. We agree with those who maintain that the Security Council should be asked to apply mandatory economic sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter.

My delegation commends the Special Committee on Apartheid for its report in documents A/6864 and S/8196. The Committee has

rightly emphasized the extreme gravity of the present situation in South Africa and the imperative need for action by the international community. We are, in general agreement with the report.

#### FIGHT AGAINST APARTHEID

We record our appreciation of the assistance rendered by the United Nations Trust Fund to the victims of apartheid and commend the efforts of many governmental and private organizations in mobilizing world opinion against apartheid. My delegation also wishes to pay special tribute to the Government of Zambia, which was host to the International Seminar on Apartheid, Racial Discrimination and Colonialism, held at Kitwe from 25 July to 4 August of this year. The large participation by several States, including India, specialized agencies of the United Nations and private nongovernmental organizations is proof of the continuing concern of the international community for this most important problem.

My delegation shares the concern of African nations at South Africa's efforts to undermine their unity and their resolve to fight against apartheid. In this connexion, we note the suggestion made by the representative of Cyprus to establish national committees on apartheid in Member States. This suggestion deserves careful and sympathetic consideration.

My delegation has noted with particular satisfaction the important decisions taken by the Commission on Human Rights to promote more

187

rigorous efforts to publicize the constant and gross violation of human rights in South Africa and to encourage world public opinion to exert its influence to stop such violations. While there is an urgent need for an international campaign against apartheid and for more energetic efforts in that direction by various United Nations organs, it is also essential to co-ordinate efforts against apartheid in order to avoid duplication.

#### UNIVERSAL ABHORRENCE

Once again the debate in the Special Political Committee has shown universal abhorrence of

the discriminatory and segregationist policies of the South African Government. We share the concern expressed in the Secretary-General's introduction to his annual report at the "increasing loss of faith in the possibility of peaceful transformation in accordance with the objectives defined clearly by the General Assembly and the Security Council". (A/6701/Add. 1, para. 104) My delegation believes that the time has come for the entire United Nations and the world at large to act in a determined and concerted manner in order to remove the canker of apartheid from the soil of Southern Africa in the interest of all peoples and nations.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA MALI USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA CYPRUS

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### 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 November 16, 1967 an her recent fours abroad:

As the House is aware, I paid official visits to a number of friendly countries during the last two months. I was in Ceylon from September 18 to 21. I visited the Peoples Republics of Poland, Bulgaria and Rumania in response to long-outstanding invitations. I also spent a few hours in Moscow and on my way back, I spent two days each in Belgrade and Cairo. These visits lasted from October 8 to 21. More recently, I was in Moscow from November 6 to 8 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary celebrations of the October Revolution.

Hon'ble Members must have seen the joint communiques and the statements issued after the conclusion of my visit to these countries.

#### **CEYLON**

The warmth and cordiality with which the Government and people of Ceylon received me was most moving. I met various sections of people in Colombo and Kandy and had the privilege of special 'Darshan' of the historic Tooth Relic at the famous Buddhist shrine in Kandy. I also called on the Mahanayaka Theros of Malwatte and Asgiriya Chapters.

My talks with the Prime Minister of Ceylon and his colleagues were frank, friendly and fruitful. We discussed, in particular, the possibilities of increased cooperation in the economic. cultural, scientific and technical fields and the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964. We reviewed the discussions which had taken place between the officials of the two countries regarding further cooperation in the promotion of tea, a commodity which is vital to Cevlon's economy and an important factor in India's trade. Our discussions also covered the general international situation and in particular the situation in the Asian region. It revealed a similarity of approach to many questions. We agreed to promote greater bilateral cooperation and re-affirmed our determination to work closely together, and in cooperation with other countries, to secure effective implementation of the measures necessary for reducing the widening gap between the developing and developed countries.

We agreed that the concrete ideas which emerged during our discussions should be pursued and implemented by the two Governments

188

through appropriate channels. It was further decided that officials of the two Governments would meet once a year alternately in Colombo and New Delhi.

As the Prime Minister of Ceylon remarkedand I fully agree-the goodwill prevailing between our two countries today is greater than at any time in the last two decades. I am confident that Hon'ble Members fully share the desire of the Government to further develop cooperation with Ceylon to our mutual benefit. Mr. Speaker, may I now refer to my visits to the countries in Eastern Europe. The House As aware that these countries have made remarkable progress not only in the development of their economies but also in the development of their national personalities. We have very friendly relations with them and our economic cooperation with each of them is constantly increasing.

#### **POLAND**

It was as long ago as 1955 that Prime Minister Nehru visited Poland. No Indian Prime Minister had so far been to either Bulgaria or Rumania. Apart from our close diplomatic relations with these countries, the leaders of these nations have visited India-in some cases on more than one occasion-and in a variety of ways have given evidence of their friendship towards us.

For sonic years, Poland and Rumania have been helping in our development plans and have extended substantial credits to us. In May this year, Bulgaria also extended commercial credits to us. Our trade with these countries, which is based on a balancing non-convertible rupee arrangement, has grown rapidly. The trend to diversify the character of our exports from the purely traditional items to include the products of our engineering industries is significant. We have, therefore, attached great significance to these commercial relations.

I was glad to re-visit Warsaw after twelve years and could not but be impressed to see this city which has suffered such terrible destruction, rebuilt as a monument to the undying courage of the Polish people. During my discussions with Prime Minister Cyrankiewicz and other leaders, we surveyed the problems of Europe as well as of Asia and the question of disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We talked of our special responsibilities as members of the International Control Commissions in Indo-China. We agreed on the urgent need for a peaceful settlement in Vietnam. We decided also to bold joint expert studies with a view to further the economic collaboration between the two countries.

I was touched by the warmth and spontaneity of the welcome which I received from the Government as well as the people of Bulgaria. In my talks with Mr. Zhivkov, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, we discussed the experiences, achievements as well as the problems of the economic development of our countries.

#### BULGARIA

Bulgaria has developed from a relatively backward agricultural economy with limited resources to a more balanced economy in which national wealth is continuing to rise. Apart from Sofia, I visited Varna on the Black Sea which has become an important tourist centre attracting visitors front all parts of Europe.

We also discussed international affairs. I indicated our intention to open shortly a resident Mission in Sofia to further strengthen our relations. We have also agreed to explore the possibility of establishing an inter-governmental body for promoting Indo-Bulgarian economic cooperation.

#### **RUMANIA**

It was interesting to see the new attitudes which Rumania is evolving in its foreign relations. In the frank and friendly exchange of views which I had with Mr. Maurer, the Prime Minister, and other leaders, I found friendship towards our country. We discussed the problems facing the countries of Asia and Europe. I also took the opportunity to explain our difficulties with Pakistan as well as China. Rumania fully recognises peaceful co-existence as a principle which must determine relations between States and fully endorses the validity of non-alignment. We also discovered that there was a close proximity in our views on the need for disarmament as well as on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Apart from Bucharest, I visited Ploestli, the centre of Rumania's giant petro-chemical industry from which we in India have received valuable assistance in the development of our own oil exploitation and refining capacities.

USSR

Even though my stop-over in Moscow on 8th October was only for about three hours, it was useful for me to get a first-hand indication of Soviet views on international problems. The Soviet Union is interested as ever in the implementation of the Tashkent Declaration, in the formulation of which Premier Kosygin played such an important part. I was assured that Indo-Soviet friendship remains firm and durable and continues to be based on a mutuality of inte-

189

rests as well as respect for each other's sovereignty and independence. I found no evidence to any change in Soviet policies towards us.

#### YUGOSLAVIA

In Belgrade I received from President Tito, the Yugoslav Government and the people of Yugoslavia a very warm reception which fully reflected the special bonds of friendship which we have forged with Yugoslavia. President Tito described the positive gains from the initiative he took to help resolve the West Asian impasse. Our two Governments have been in close touch with each other and have continued to work together at the United Nations.

#### UAR

The visit to UAR was also useful. The enthusiastic welcome accorded me by President Nasser, the Government of UAR and the people of Cairo was a recognition of India's consistent understanding of and support for the just rights of the Arab people and the special relations which exist between UAR and India. President Nasser and I discussed the West Asian question and agreed that a just and peaceful solution must be found to the serious situation still prevailing in that part of the world. It was recognised that any solution must bring about the vacation of territories occupied forcibly.

Both in UAR and Yugoslavia the leaders of the two Governments expressed their satisfaction at the steps which are being evolved to forge tripartite economic collaboration between the three countries.

The visit to all these countries was made, in acknowledgment of the friendly and beneficial

co-operation which has developed with them over the past years. The opportunity was used to explore future possibilities of intensifying the economic links already existing between them.

#### VALUABLE DISCUSSIONS

But more important than the obvious gains, the goodwill and understanding which has been fostered by the visit to these countries and the opportunity of having personal discussions with their leaders have been valuable. With your permission, Sir, I should like to take this opportunity to acknowledge on my own behalf and that of the Government our sincere thanks for the hospitality accorded to me and to my colleagues which, I know, was an earnest of the friendly feelings and the abiding interest which these countries have in the welfare and progress of our country as we have in theirs.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall conclude by referring to my visit to Moscow. The formal invitation to attend the 50th anniversary celebrations of the Great October Revolution was accompanied by a personal message from Premier Kosygin and I thought it appropriate and in keeping with the friendly relations between our two neighbouring countries to respond to the invitation. I therefore, visited Moscow from the 6th to the 8th November. I took this opportunity to convey to the Government and the people of Soviet Union the warm greetings and felicitations of the Government and the people of India on this historic occasion.

USA BULGARIA POLAND RUSSIA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA SRI LANKA INDIA CHINA VIETNAM PAKISTAN ROMANIA UZBEKISTAN

**Date**: Nov 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### SOUTH YEMEN

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in he Parliament on November 30, 1967 greeting the emergence of South Arabia as a free and independent nation -- The People's Republic of South Yemen:

After more than one century and a quarter of colonial domination, South Arabia today emerges as a free and independent nation-The People's Republic of South Yemen. On this auspicious occasion we extend our greetings and offer our good wishes to the Government and the people of the new State. We also pay our tribute to the valiant freedom fighters who have laid down

190

their lives during the struggle for their independence. We wish the new State a happy and a bright future.

There have been close and intimate relations for centuries between India and South Arabia. It shall be the earnest endeavour of the, Government of India to further strengthen our relations with the independent state and also to extend such economic and technical assistance as we can and which they may need.

As the House is aware, India has consistently supported the right to independence and sovereignty for the people of South Arabia and for many years now we have made earnest efforts for the achievement of this aim through the United Nations and otherwise. Therefore, it is a matter of great satisfaction and pleasure to us that South Arabia is now an independent nation.

The independence of South Arabia is yet another step towards decolonisation in the world. We earnestly hope that the day is not far off when the remaining colonised peoples and countries will also become independent.

The Government of India has extended recognition to the People's Republic of South Yemen and it is our intention to convert our Commission in Aden into an Embassy with a resident Ambassador. The necessary steps in this regard have already be initiated.

I am sure that all Members of this House as also the people of India join me in extending a warm welcome to the new State of the People's Republic of South Yemen, in the, comity of nations and in wishing it a bright future.

191

YEMEN USA INDIA **Date**: Nov 01, 1967

### **December**

# **Volume No** 1995 Content Foreign Affairs Record 1967 Vol. XIII DECEMBER No. 12 **CONTENTS PAGE** ASIAN-AFRICAN LEGAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE Prime Minister's Inaugural Address ....... 193 INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in General Assembly on Southern Yemen 194 Shri D. P. Dhar's Statement in Special Political Committee on Palestine Refugees ..... 195

Sant Bux Singh's Statement in Special Political Committee on
Peace-keeping
Operations
196
Sant Bux Singh's Statement in General Assembly on Problem of
Defining
Aggression
198
Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement in General Assembly on Colonialism 202
Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement in General Assembly on South West Africa 203
Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement in Fourth Committee on Fiji 205
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs 208
LAOS
President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming the King of Laos 211
Reply by His Mejesty the King of Laos
President's Speech at Banquet in honour of King Savang Vatthana 212
King Savang Vatthana's Speech at Banquet in honour of President
Zakir
Husain
Reply by President Zakir Husain
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement Signed
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Indo-U.S. Foodgrains Agreement Signed
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA YEMEN FIJI LAOS USA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### ASIAN-AFRICAN LEGAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Prime Minister's Inaugural Address

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, inaugurating the ninth session of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee in New Delhi on December 18, 1967 said:

Mr. President, distinguished delegates and other guests:

It gives me very great pleasure to welcome you all here. I do not know if I am the right person to inaugurate such a gathering. Although I do come from a family of lawyers and should really have had the utmost respect for the law, I grew up in an atmosphere when it seemed that all laws were generally against the people who lived in the country and more particularly against my family. Therefore, at a very small age, my own view of the law was highly coloured by Oscar Wilde in "Ballad of Reading Jail" in which be said: "I know not whether laws be right or whether laws be wrong. All that we know who are in jail is that the wall is strong and that each day is like a year, whose days are long".

But having grown in that atmosphere, nevertheless as one grew and watched the happenings in one's own country and abroad, one could not help coming back to the more orthodox view that there can be no civilised society without the rule of law. And it is essential where there are people of different viewpoints and different interests that there should be some way for them to settle their disputes without breaking heads or taking the law in their own bands. As Bertrand Russell has said, society cannot exist without law and order and cannot advance except through vigorous innovations. So, I think that is why you have gathered here today. You do believe in the rule of law and yet you also believe in innovation where it is essential.

This Committee, as has been pointed out by Mr. President, was established in- 1956 as a forum for Asian and African States to discuss questions relating to international law, My father, who inaugurated the first session the next year, that is, 1957, expressed the hope that the emergence of African and Asian countries as independent nations would make an impact on the scope and content of international law and would make it a law of universal application, a law which would protect the legitimate interests of all members of the international community. He also invited the committee and other international lawyers to address themselves to contemporary issues, such as the question of legality of nuclear tests and concepts of war and neutrality so as to help us to clarify our ideals on these and related subjects.

During this period of ten years, a number of remarkable developments have taken place both in the field of politics as well as in international law. The old colonialism is virtually eliminated except for Portuguese territories of Africa. Many new States have emerged. The United Nations now has 123 member-States and so there is naturally better representation of Africa and Asia in international organisations including a number of organs of the United Nations, that is, the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission and other institutions relating to international law. The new States are contributing to the development of international law as of common law for mankind.

#### RESPECT FOR RULE OF LAW

There has been in the world a tremendous growth in the field of science and technology, exploration of outer space, and along with that growth, an acute awareness of the need for rapid economic development and social progress. Therefore, it is inevitable that international law should address itself to a variety of problems arising from these developments.

Much work has been done with regard to its codification and development. I see from the present agenda before this Committee that the Committee will consider problems relating to the law of treaty and legal questions arising from the World Court's judgment on the South West

African cases. To a lay person it seems, obvious that the basic principles of the law of treaties should be such as will promote respect for the rule of law and treaty obligations. The tragedy of South West Africa is well known and the

193

Republic of South Africa also continues to defy the United Nations with impunity. What are the steps which can be taken to bring South Africa within the discipline of the United Nations Charter and give legitimate independence to South West Africa?

These and other questions will be discussed by you. I should like only to point out the need for unity amongst ourselves. We, between the countries of Asia and Africa, have tremendous potential strength but we can only use that strength for our own good and for the benefit of mankind as a whole if we can stand united on is many subjects as possible. There are bound to be differences of opinion on a number of issues but we must always try to find the largest area of agreement and work from that as the base. That is the only way in which we can give weightage to our views and can persuade the world to pay heed to them.

I would like to wish success to your deliberations and to wish all those who have Come from other countries a pleasant, interesting and enjoyable stay in India and I hope that all of you will have some chance of seeing what we are doing in India and, here, may I thank you for the kind words which you said about me and about my country, Mr. President?

I hope that the delegates will have opportunity of seeing not only the tremendous difficulties which India faces and which we share with other developing nations: they will no doubt also see the problems which are not new problems problems which we have faced for hundreds of years—the problems of poverty and backwardness. I hope that they will go with an impression not just that India is a country which is making tremendous progress in spite of tremerdous odds, but also that India is a country where there is great friendship for the other countries of Africa and Asia, sympathy with their problems and. desire to help them in a spirit

#### CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA SOUTH AFRICA INDIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri G. Parthasarathi's Statement in General Assembly on Southern Yemen

Shri G. Parthasarathi, India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on December 14, 1967 on the admission of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen to the United Nations:

Mr. President, today is a very happy day for freedom-loving people everywhere. After more than a quarter of a century of colonial rule the people of South Arabia have achieved their cherished objective of HI freedom and independence. They had to struggle long and hard and to make many sacrifices, including the supreme sacrifice of the lives of many valiant freedom fighters. Their struggle has at long last been crowned with success. My delegation congratulates them and pays a sincere tribute to the dynamic leaders and the people of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen. The United Nations must derive immense satisfaction from the fact that yet another colonial Territory to whose intricate problems it has devoted considerable time and effort has at last joined the comity of nations as a free and sovereign nation.

My delegation took an active part in the deliberations on the question of Aden and strongly supported the efforts of the world Organization to help the people of Aden in achieving their inalienable right to freedom and independence. We did that because of our firm commitment to the principle of the rights of the

colonial peoples everywhere to independence and because of our long-standing friendship with the people of South Arabia. My delegation, therefore, is particularly happy to welcome the People's Republic of Southern Yemen to our midst in the family of the United Nations.

My Government, which had been following the developments in regard to the South Arabian question with the greatest care and interest, was among the first to extend its recognition to the new Republic on the day of its independence.

194

in announcing the recognition of the new State in the Indian Parliament, my Prime Minister extended to the Government and people of the new nation the warm greetings and good wishes of the people of India. She also expressed our willingness to extend such economic assistance as we could and which the new Republic might need.

We warmly congratulate the Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen and his colleagues on the admission of their country to the United Nations, and we look forward to working with them closely.

My delegation feels assured that the People's Republic of Southern Yemen will be a dedicated and loyal Member of our Organization and that it will make an effective contribution to all our activities here.

INDIA YEMEN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri D. P. Dhar's Statement in Special Political Committee on Palestine Refugees

Shri D. P. Dhar, Minister of Education and Planning, Government of Jammu and Kashmir, and a Member of the Indian Delegation to Me United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on December 15, 1967 on Palestine refugees:

#### Mr. Chairman,

The recent armed conflict in West Asia has added new poignancy to the problems of inhabitants of Palestine who became homeless nearly two decades ago. The plight of nearly 1-1/3 million human beings has touched the conscience of many nations and people and has been the subject of discussion in the General Assembly from its earliest years. And yet the community of nations has been unable to tackle the basic issues which gave rise to this problem and which may well again threaten the peace and security of the region.

The question of Palestine refugees needs to be examined in several aspects which cannot be divorced from the political background and history of the region. It is pertinent to recall that the partition of Palestine was brought about by a resolution of the General Assembly which simultaneously recommended certain measures to ensure the civil and political rights of its Arab inhabitants. The United Nations thus recognised its responsibility for the future of Arab people of Palestine.

A year later the Assembly reaffirmed this decision vide its resolution 194 (III) of 1948. The resolution stated in paragraph 11; "that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live in peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for the loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or the authorities responsible." The same resolution instructed the Palestine Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation to them. The right of choice between repatriation and compensation was thus clearly recognised and emphasized in several subsequent resolutions.

Many long years have passed since then, but the refugees have received neither compensation nor an opportunity to return to their homes. The Conciliation Commission, which was charged with this task, has also been unable to make any headway in the implementation of resolution 194(III) in spite of annual exhortations from the Assembly. We cannot but regret this lack of progress and would once again remind the Assembly of its moral obligation to implement this resolution and thus assure justice for the people of Palestine.

#### A NEW DIMENSION

A new dimension has been added to the great tragedy of Palestine. Hundreds of thousands of Arabs have lost their homes and hearths for the second time in a generation. Many scores of thousands had to flee from the Gaza strip and the Sinai peninsula, from the West Bank of the Jordan and the Golan heights of Syria. As the Commissioner-General of UNRWA has stated. over 350,000 persons, including 120,000 UNRWA registered refugees, were rendered homeless as a result of the recent conflict. The debate on this question in the Fifth Emergency Special Session reflected a universal concern. at the suffering of these displaced persons and resulted in the adoption of resolution 2252 (ES-V). The representatives of an overwhelmingly large number of Member nations also called for the return of these so-called new refugees to the areas from which they fled in June this year.

195

The Security Council in its resolution 237 (1967) and the General Assembly in its resolution 2252 (ES-V) called upon the Government of Israel "to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have tied the areas since the outbreak of hostilities." And yet according to figures contained in the Commissioner-General's report, only 14,000 persons had been given permission to cross over to the West Bank of the Jordan out of over 200,000 who had crossed over to the Last Bank on June 5. This fact has also been clearly indicated in the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA who has stated on page 13 and I quote: "It is clear from the figures given above that the hopes which were

generated at the beginning of July that at least the bulk of the displaced persons would be able to return to the West Bank in pursuance of the terms of the Security Council's resolution 237 (1967) have not been realized."

Surely, our Organisation could not remain indifferent to this state of affairs. My delegation is convinced that unless this question of refugees and displaced persons is resolved in accordance with the relevant United Nations resolutions the international community will continue to face grave problems and dangers to peace and security of the region. We would therefore urge the implementation of these decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

It cannot be over-emphasized that the conflict of June 1967 and the consequent occupation of vast Arab territories has greatly complicated the situation in West Asia. It is our firm belief that lasting solutions of the many problems existing at present can be worked out only when the key issue of the refugees is dealt with and steps are taken to ensure the just rights of the Arab people of Palestine on the basis of paragraph 11 of resolution 194(III). It will be appreciated that the refugee question is not only a humanitarian question of great importance but central to the political stability of the entire area.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation commends the work done by the Commissioner-General and his colleagues in UNRWA in rendering assistance to the refugees and in trying to secure their economic and social betterment in spite of numerous difficulties. We should also like to express our appreciation of the assistance provided by UNRWA and private agencies to alleviate the sufferings of the victims of the recent hostilities. The Commissioner-General's report (document A/6713), however, leads to the conclusion that the UNRWA's efforts at economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees have suffered a severe reverse in recent months. The financial crisis faced by the Agency has been vividly described by Dr. Michelmore in the concluding parts, of his report.

#### HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

My delegation shares this concern and hopes

that adequate financial resources will be forth-coining to enable UNRWA to discharge its tasks. Without increased financial contribution, particularly from the more prosperous countries, UNRWA could hardly be expected to maintain, much less expand, its humanitarian assistance to the refugees in the field of relief, health, education, etc. For our part, my delegation has already pledged in spite of our urgent requirements, to maintain its previous level of contributions, apart from direct bilateral assistance to the states concerned for the benefit of refugees.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation had co-sponsored resolution 2252 (ES-V) last July and is again one of the co-sponsors of draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/L-156. There is surely urgent need to provide humanitarian assistance and relief to persons displaced in the recent conflict. We would also like once again to stress the need for concerted action to cope with the immediate and intensely human problems faced by the Arab population rendered homeless in the earlier conflict.

INDIA USA JORDAN SYRIA ISRAEL

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

### **Volume No**

1995

#### INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sant Bux Singh's Statement in Special Political Committee on Pence-keeping Operations

Sant Bux Singh, M.P., Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the Special Political Committee on December 5, 1967 and the U.N. Peace-keeping Operations:

Once again our debate in the plenary session of the General Assembly as well as in this Committee has underlined the importance of peace for the well-being of nations and peoples and for the proper fulfilment of the purposes and principles of our Organization. Having actively participated in several peace-keeping operations in many different parts of the world, India is deeply conscious of the significance of the question of peace-keeping Operations in all their as-

196

pects for the future of the United Nations. During the discussion of this issue in the regular and special sessions of the Assembly as well as in Special Committees and Working Groups, my delegation has had the opportunity to state its point of view on different aspects of peace-keeping operations. I shall not therefore go into its history or repeat all what we have said in the past, but would only set forth briefly the salient points of my delegation's position.

The constitutional, political and the financial aspects of peace-keeping operations are closely intertwined and there are different viewpoints on the respective roles of the, Security Council and the General Assembly on the initiation, authorization, supervision and the financing of operations involving the deployment of armed forces in situations falling outside Chapter VII. The discussions and deliberations, consultations and negotiations in various committees of the United Nations over the past few years have done much to clarify the issues and concentrate attention on certain basic aspects of the problem.

It is universally recognized that the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security and therefore, for the establishment of peace-keeping operations. Differences of opinion appear when we come to the exact definition of the respective powers of the Council and the Assembly. Some States insist on the Security Council's exclusive responsibility for the maintenance of peace, while the others would have the Assembly take over this function in the event of the Council's failure to act in a given situation due to lack of unanimity. There is a third point of view which my country has, according to which certain types of operations excluding those under Chapter VII but involving the stationing of armed personnel for the purposes of observation and investigation could be undertaken either by the General Assembly or the Security Council at the invitation of the States concerned or with their express con-

My delegation is of the view that the roles of the Security Council and the General Assembly, while they are complementary to each other, should be kept clearly separate and distinct as provided in the Charter. At the same time all Member States should make strenuous efforts to reach common agreement on a practical approach to this very complex question. The United Nations as a whole has little to gain and much to lose by a unilateral imposition of certain views by narrow majorities or debating victories. It is a matter of satisfaction to my delegation that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, realizing the dangers of such an approach, has wisely concentrated on efforts to broaden the areas of agreement and narrow the field of disagreement among Member States.

#### **EQUITABLE FORMULA**

I now turn to the question of financing future peace-keeping operations. Since there is a great deal of general agreement on the authority of the Security Council to authorize certain peacekeeping operations, it stands to reason that the Council find the means to support the operations which it authorizes. There are several possibilities. The Council could, for instance, decide that the expenses should be met by the parties to the dispute which necessitated the operation; by voluntary contribution of Member States of the United Nations; by some or all members of the Security Council; by the aggressor or the party responsible for the situation requiring the mounting of such peacekeeping operations; and finally by a combination of any of these methods. If all those methods fail, the Security Council should request the General Assembly to find ways and means of financing the peace-keeping operations.

My delegation is aware of the differences of opinion on this point but in our considered judgment the authority to tax the entire membership of the United Nations rests solely with the General Assembly. Once this is recognized it is far easier to work out an equitable system of assessment in apportioning the expenses of peace-keeping operations in situations where the Security Council is unable to agree on a particular method of financing. For instance, it is now

widely acknowledged that whereas the great Powers have a special responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security and also the greatest capacity to pay, the economically developed countries have far greater capacity to pay than the developing countries whose financial resources are very limited. Any equitable formula for sharing peace-keeping costs must take this factor into account without, however, in any way undermining the collective interest of all Member States in the decision-making process of reducing the authority of the General Assembly by the establishment of a finance committee.

I should also hasten to add that my delegation fully recognizes the importance of effective cooperation among the great Powers which is so essential for the maintenance of peace and security. We therefore express our sincere hope that the great Powers will come to an agreement not only on future peace-keeping operations but also in liquidating the liabilities incurred during the past peace-keeping operations. My delegation feels that a thorough study of methods of financing future peacekeeping operations along the lines I have indicated above will go a long way

197

in overcoming the financial crisis faced by the United Nations during recent years.

There is another aspect of peace-keeping which deserves some consideration. For the last two years attempts have been made to work out formulae giving one or more permanent members of the Security Council the right to opt out from the obligations to finance peace-keeping operations. My delegation had occasion to make clear in the past, and would do so again, that this kind of approach is inappropriate for the General Assembly and militates against the principle of collective financial responsibility. We should like to reiterate that funds for peacekeeping should be obtained either through voluntary contributions or through an assessment of a compulsory nature binding on all States Members of the Organization. My delegation cannot, therefore, support the draft resolution contained in document A/SPC/L-148 and will vote against it.

My delegation has carefully listened to many

statements made in the course of our debate and would like to make some comments on what is, commonly referred to as the peace-making role of the United Nations as distinct from its peacekeeping role. Some delegations have despaired of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations unless they are accompanied by settlement of disputes. My delegation does not share this gloomy view of our Organization. The maintenance of peace and security is of course the fundamental purpose of the Charter of the United Nations which confers on the Security Council primary responsibility in this regard. This objective has two important aspects, viz., the preventive aspect and the curative aspect, which are in essence two sides of the same picture.

#### FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES

In Article 2, the Charter lays down certain fundamental principles and requires the Organization and its Members to act in accordance with those principles, the most important of which are respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of States and the obligation of Members to refrain from the use or threat of force. Only the strictest adherence to these basic principles can ensure peace in our troubled world.

We are all aware how a disregard of these principles has in the past given rise to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. The international community will continue to face the threat of violence and war if it does not resolutely set itself against all tendencies which seek recourse to arms as a means of settling problems.

The importance of these principles has been realized by our Organization and has been reiterated on several occasions; for instance, during its twentieth session the General Assembly passed resolution 2131 (XX) on the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. Resolution 2225 (XXI) of the General 'Assembly condemned a forms of intervention in the domestic or external affairs of States and called upon all States to carry out faithfully their obligations under the Charter. Similarly, Resolution 2103 (XX) of the General Assembly on the principles of international law concerning friendly relations and co-operation

among States reiterated certain fundamental principles, the faithful execution of which would greatly contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of friendly relations among States.

In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General has drawn our attention to an increasing resort to violent solutions and to widespread exhortation to violence in the name of one cause or the other. He states:

"When unbridled use of force is accepted and intimidation and threats go unchallenged, the hopes of a world order such as the one outlined in the Charter become dim and hollow. When prejudice and hatred dominate the relations of nations or groups of nations, the whole world takes a step backward towards the dark ages."

## The Secretary-General goes on:

"There is but one true answer to violence, duress and intimidation among States; the answer must be found in a resolute rejection of violence and a determined resistance to it by that vast majority of men and women throughout the world who long to live in peace, without fear." (A/6701/Add.1, paras, 151 and 153).

I have cited the General Assembly resolutions and the Secretary-General's report to show that in the consideration of peacekeeping operations we must not lose sight of the fact that faithful adherence to fundamental Charter principles is absolutely essential to avoid the creation of situations likely to endanger international peace.

The second aspect of maintenance of peace and security is the pacific settlement of disputes which are likely to endanger peace. Article 33 of the Charter provides several means of peaceful settlement, such as negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or

198

other peaceful means of their own choice. What is important is not so much a particular means of

settlement but the determination of the parties to negotiate peaceful solution of disputes.

There is no substitute for this desire to solve disputes through peaceful means. Where such a desire exists, as it did in the case of India and Pakistan when they signed the Tashkent Agreement, it is possible to reduce dangerous international tensions and pave the way to restoration of peace. The Charter does not lend itself to any interpretation that would absolve the parties from their responsibility to seek solutions through peaceful means of their own choice.

For several years now the General Assembly as well as the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping has been considering various proposals on this or that aspect of peace-keeping, but sharp differences of opinion have prevented a meaningful conclusion of our consideration of this question. Now the only criteria for judging the merit of various proposals which have been put forward is whether they will contribute to the elimination of differences and bridging the gulf between contending viewpoints.

If our objective is to find a broad-based consensus representing the generality of membership of the United Nations-as I believe it is-then nothing can be gained by injecting elements of fresh controversy which can only complicate an already complex issue and take us farther away from our goal, which is to find a common agreement.

INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN PAKISTAN

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Sant Bux Singh's Statement in General Assembly on the Problem of defining Aggression

The following is the text of the statement made by Sant Bux Singh, M.P., Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, in the General Assembly on December 4, 1967 on the problem of defining aggression:

Mr. President, my delegation wishes to offer its condolences to the Government and people of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic on the great loss that they have suffered in the passing away of the President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of their country. We also grieve for and offer our condolences to the people and Government of Gabon over the demise of their President.

Ten years have elapsed since the General Assembly last considered the problem of defining aggression. During that time the world has witnessed international conflicts many of which involved the use of armed force, and some even brought the whole world to the brink of another major war. Every now and again we witness situations in which the maintenance of international peace and security is threatened. But all this time we have made no serious attempt to continue our efforts to find a generally acceptable definition of aggression, though all of us know that in any form of collective security system--and this certainly applies to the one we have accepted in the United Nations Charterprevention of aggression is the central problem which that system has to tackle.

The Indian delegation, therefore, welcomes the initiative taken by the delegation of the Soviet Union with regard to the item under consideration. We have given careful consideration to the necessity of expediting a definition of aggression and we believe that it is. time now to take up this problem once again, rather than to bury it for all time or at least indefinitely. We must see if we can make some progress towards its solution and towards the evolution of a United Nations definition of the concept of aggression, which can materially help this Organisation in achieving its primary purposes, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security and the development of friendly relations among nations.

**COLLECTIVE SECURITY** 

It is unnecessary for us to point out that the United Nations Charter enjoins all Member States to refrain 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 United Nations". It requires the Security Council to "determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression" and states that the very first purpose of the United Nations is "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace". It is obvious, therefore, that if we could find a generally acceptable definition of aggression it would help this Organization to discharge its responsibilities better, for a suitable

#### 199

definition of aggression seems to be central to the entire work of the United Nations.

Because of the difficulty of formulating such a definition, it would appear that many States come to believe that collective security through the United Nations is impracticable and that States must depend for security on their capacity to defend themselves by their own arms, or on collective self-defence commitments in regional or other alliances. But we believe that in the present international situation there is in fact no alternative to collective security, especially for the smaller nations, and it is essential for us to do everything to strengthen the collective security system of the Charter, particularly 'in the interest of the progress of the developing countries in the economic, social, cultural and humanitarian fields.

It is true that real progress towards the prevention of armed conflicts will depend ultimately on the improvement of the atmosphere of world opinion against the use of force in international relations and in favour of the settlement of disputes through peaceful means, but meanwhile we must do whatever we can to improve the peace-keeping and peace-enforcement procedures of the United Nations, and an attempt to find an acceptable definition of aggression which could be used by the United Nations organs in the discharge of their functions would be a worthwhile attempt in that direction.

We are aware, of course, of the long history of this problem. Indeed, the problem of defining aggression is not new. The League of Nations tried it before the Second World War. We are well aware of the famous Litvinov definition put forward at the Disarmament Conference. The problem was also discussed in 1945 at the San Francisco Conference and from 1950 to 1957 it was considered in the United Nations, first in the International Law Commission and from 1952 in the Sixth Committee and the Special Committees of the General Assembly. It is not necessary for us to recount the detailed history of that consideration here. It is true that no agreement on a definition of aggression could be reached at that time, but it is equally true that the majority of representatives who took part in those discussions considered that it was possible to achieve a definition of aggression, despite the many difficulties.

We may recall that the main reason for the postponement of our efforts at defining aggression in 1957, when we adopted General Assembly resolution 1181 (XII) upon the recommendation of the Sixth Committee, was to give, the States which had then recently been admitted to the United Nations the opportunity to consider the work done by the 1956 Special Committee on the question of defining aggression and to offer their views on the matter.

It is true that by that resolution the Assembly referred the question to a Committee composed of the Member States whose representatives had served on the General Committee at the most recent regular session of the General Assembly, to report and recommend to the Secretary-General when it considered the time appropriate for further consideration of the question by the General Assembly.

The Indian delegation abstained on that resolution in 1957. This Committee has not recommended the time as being appropriate for further consideration of the question of defining aggression by the General Assembly so far, though ten years have elapsed since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 1181 (XII). That does not mean however that we should not consider this question in this Assembly today, when Member States consider it important enough to be taken

up without further delay.

## CONCEPT OF AGGRESSION

It is not my intention to go into a legal discussion here of the concept of aggression. Such a discussion would, I realize, be more appropriate in the Sixth Committee, which is to consider this item next week. But I should like to say that, whether we like it or not, the concept of aggression is one which has not only contributed to the vocabulary of international law but also substantially reinforced the content of that law. Broadly speaking, it denotes the use of force in a manner which is not compatible with the present-day rule of international law, i.e., the use of force other than by way of self-defence, or pursuant to United Nations decisions.

The word "aggression" itself was originally used as a technical term to indicate the first transgression of a frontier, but as Mr. Pompe has pointed out:

"Since the 'outlawry' of war has loaded the concept of aggression with the notions of illegality and criminality, assistance and recourse to armed force on the side of the attacked State can no longer be qualified as aggression".

The report of the United Nations Secretary-General (A/2211) of October, 1952 has pointed out:

"The concept of aggression which is closely bound up with the system of collective security was introduced into positive law by the League of Nations."

200

Again, an eminent jurist, Professor Quincy Wright, has stated:

"The words 'aggressor' and 'aggression' appear very little in treaties until after the world war, but in editions published since 1925 they are often to be found in the indexes and since that date the subject has been dealt with in books on international organizations and in numerous pamphlets and articles by both statesmen and jurists as well as official texts."

Therefore, the basic question now is whether it would not be fruitful to attempt any further elaboration of the concept of aggression in legal or juridical terms. Does a concept of aggression have any special significance, or can the problem simply be by-passed? The answer to those questions has to be found in the concept of collective security incorporated in both the League of Nations Covenant and the United Nations Charter.

Since the concept of aggression is closely bound up with, and is in fact central to, the whole concept of collective security, it is obvious that the question of the further elaboration of that concept in legal or juridical terms cannot simply be brushed aside. It emphasize-, the illegality, and even the criminality, of resort to force except by way of self-defence or in pursuit of United Nations decisions. It emhasizes the collective interest of all Members of the United Nations-indeed of the world community-in preventing resort to force.

I may recall here that in the past when this question was considered in the General Assembly. my delegation had stressed that a definition of aggression would have to be related to contemporary concepts and should not constitute an ossification of outmoded conceptions. The central problem would, of course, be to keep the definition alive, as it were. We realize that the definition should not be of such a character which would in the words of a former British statesman, Sir Austin Chamberlain, "be a trap for the innocent and a signpost for the guilty". Different delegations might have different views on the content of the concept of aggression. In fact, the records of the 1952 and 1956 Special Committees on the subject as well as the valuable report of the Secretary-General, contained in document A/2211 demonstrate the problems in this regard.

My delegation is fully aware, that the definition of aggression has a bearing on the problem of disarmament. Speaking at the eleventh session of the General Assembly in 1957 the representative of India had pointed out that the definition of aggression was linked with the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Since 1957 we have witnessed the adoption of resolution 1653 (XVI) which contains the declaration on the prohibition of the

use of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. We are also encouraged by the fact that the Assembly presently has under consideration a draft convention on the subject of the prohibition of such weapons. The trend of international opinion, as result of the emergence into independence of a large number of States in Africa and Asia over the last ten years, is also now increasingly against the use of such weapons in any circumstances. From this point of view, my delegation considers that the time may now be propitious for re-embarking on the quest for the definition of aggression.

In addition, my delegation is also conscious of the progress made by the General Assembly in related fields. Thus by resolution 2160 (XXI) the, General Assembly adopted a declaration setting forth inter alia its understanding of the principle that States shall refrain from the use of force or any threat thereof. That question has also been under consideration by the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. I might point out that the various formulations put forward in the Special Committee on that principle stipulate, inter alia that "wars or aggression constitute international crimes against peace". This is in line with General Assembly resolution 95 (1) of 11 December, 1946, by which the Assembly unanimously affirmed the Nurenberg principles.

The Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States has not completed its task. Nevertheless, the discussion at various sessions of the Special Committee as well, as in the General Assembly on the principle of the nonuse of force throws valuable light on the subject. The Special Committee's mandate is very wide. and, in addition, in dealing with the principle of the non-use of force, the Committee will have to approach its task from a broader perspective than that of defining aggression. However, as has been rightly pointed out in the Memorandum of the Soviet Foreign Minister of 22 September 1967 (A/6833), there is an urgent need for a generally accepted concept of aggression which would prevent States from resorting to force on various pretexts. It would, therefore, be appropriate, having regard to all these considerations, if the General Assembly were to focus attention

on this concept and try to expedite the elaboration of the concept of aggression.

My delegation, therefore, believes that we must

201

in all sincerity make a serious effort once again to arrive at a generally acceptable definition of aggression which can help the United Nations organs in improving their peace enforcement procedures and strengthen the collective security system of the United Nations Charter, which is so vital to all Member States, especially to the smaller countries and the developing countries. We would, therefore, support the Soviet Union's proposal to establish a Special Committee whose task should be to endeavour to define "aggression" with this view in mind.

INDIA RUSSIA USA GABON CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement In General Assembly on Colonialism

Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, M.P., Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on December 15, 1967 on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples:

Mr. President, one of the primary objectives of the United Nations is to facilitate the emergence of dependent nations from their colonial status to sovereign independence. Various organs of the United Nations have been giving their undivided attention to the problems of colonialism for the past twenty years. It is indicative of the progress made in this field, or rather the lack of

progress, that the same items have been appearing on the agenda of the General Assembly through these years. What distresses my delegation is the fact that almost all the Members of the Organization, with the usual exceptions of Portugal and South Africa,, have declared their adherence to the principle of freedom and independence for the dependent peoples in the world, and yet, progress in the implementation of this principle is woefully slow.

It is true that quite a few countries achieved independence during the past few years, particularly in the late fifties and early sixties when strong winds of change were blowing across the African continent. It was the hope of my delegation that these winds of change would swiftly sweep across not only Africa but other parts of the world as well, so that one of the most important purposes of the establishment of the United Nations would be accomplished. Our hopes, alas, were not fulfilled because of the unwillingness of the administering Powers, many of whom profess respect for the principle of the right of self-determination, to discharge their obligations under the Charter.

## "SOLID WALL OF DEFIANCE"

The most challenging problems in the field of decolonization are those existing in southern Africa. The situation there, which is very familiar to all of us, was described most apply by the Secretary-General, who, in his address at the recent meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity in Kinshasa, said:

"It is a matter of utmost regret to me, as I am sure it is to you, however, that the closing chapter of the story of colonialism is yet to be written: that especially in the southern part of your great continent the collective determination of the United Nations to bring the story to an end seems to have met a solid wall of defiance. I am sure that the international community will not accept this state of affairs as a fait accompli--it must redouble its efforts to remove the last traces of colonialism from the globe, with the least possible delay. The United Nations will undoubtedly continue to be a focal point of this noble international endeavour."

My delegation associates itself fully with the sentiments expressed by the Secretary-General. It is our belief that that "solid wall of defiance" can be broken down if all Member nations, and especially the more influential ones, lend their support unreservedly to the implementation of the relevant resolutions of the United Nations. It is not the ability to take effective action that is lacking: what is lacking is the willingness of certain Member States to discharge their obligations fully.

One of the bodies of the United Nations most intimately involved in the common endeavour to liquidate colonialism is the Special Committee of Twenty-Four. The Special Committee, of which my delegation is privileged to be a member, was designed to act as a watchdog for the General Assembly, to examine and recommend measures for accelerating progress in the implementation of the historic Declaration on the Granting, of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The adoption of that Declaration and the establishment of the Special Committee have given an undoubted fillip to the process of decolonization.

#### 202

The report of the Special Committee covering its work for the year 1967 is an important document. The Committee carried out its work both in New York and in Africa. The Committee's sessions in Africa were very valuable for they enabled the members, and particularly the representatives of the administering Powers, to see in person some of the constructive projects being carried on by the national liberation movements of various colonies. The Committee also heard petitioners representing a great number of liberation movements and political parties from colonial territories in Africa.

My delegation would like to take this opportunity to thank the Governments of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia and the United Republic of Tanzania for their invitation and general hospitality, which made it possible for the Committee to meet in Africa.

My delegation pays a sincere tribute to the Chairman of the Special Committee, Ambassador

Malecela of Tanzania, whose total dedication to the cause of decolonization won our high admiration.

I should like also to take this opportunity of expressing the admiration of my delegation for the heroic struggle which the colonial peoples in Africa and elsewhere have been waging for their liberation. Very often the struggle has been bloody, as in the case of South Arabia, but we all know that in dealing with colonial authorities one is compelled to use all possible means.

I wish also to appeal to the administering Powers to co-operate with the United Nations in its noble task of establishing a society based on justice and freedom and to realize that it would be in their own interest to bow to the inevitable and to arrange for a smooth transfer of power to the people under their rule.

## **DECOLONIZATION**

At its current session the General Assembly has dealt with two new items in the fields of decolonization. Agenda item 24--activities of foreign economic and other interests which are impeding the implementation of resolution 1514 (XV)--was discussed for the first time as a separate item. Its inscription as a separate item enabled the Fourth, Committee to devote more time and attention to that important question than would have been possible otherwise. Agenda item 97 relating to the implementation of the Declaration by the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations was also inscribed on our agenda for the first time, on the initiative of the People's Republic of Bulgaria. That item was discussed extensively in the Fourth Committee. We hope, that the adoption of the resolution on that item will lead to close and more active co-operation between the United Nations and the specialized agencies in that field.

Although the year under review did not see many substantial changes in the colonial situation, one highly significant event was the accession to independence of the former colonial Territory of South Arabia. The birth of the People's Republic of Southern Yemen has been greeted by my delegation as well as by freedom-loving people everywhere as a milestone in the com-

mon struggle against colonialism. Also scheduled to become independent next year are Mauritius and Swaziland.

This limited success will no doubt encourage the Special Committee to redouble its efforts and to examine every possible means of accelerating the liquidation of the remaining vestiges of colonialism. The Special Committee will continue to have a very heavy schedule of work ahead of it for there are still about fifty-one dependent territories with nearly 29 million people to which the Declaration applies.

My delegation looks forward to another year of hard and challenging work in seeking to fulfil our collective determination that peoples all over the world should enjoy their inherent right to shape their future according to their own wishes and aspirations.

INDIA USA PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA ZAIRE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CONGO ZAMBIA TANZANIA MALDIVES BULGARIA YEMEN MAURITIUS SWAZILAND

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement in General Assembly on South West Africa

Shri R. N. Mirdha, M.P. Member of the Indian Delegation to the United Nations, made the following statement in the General Assembly on December 14, 1967 on the question of South West Africa:

A little over a year ago the General Assembly of the United Nations took a historic decision when it adopted resolution 2145 (XXI). In that resolution the General Assembly declared that South Africa had failed to fulfil its obligations in

respect of the administration of the Mandated Territory of South West Africa and to ensure the moral and material well-being and security of the indigenous inhabitants and had, in fact, disavowed the Mandate. The General Assembly therefore decided that the Mandate conferred up, on His Britannic Majesty to be exercised on his behalf by the Government of the Union of South Africa was terminated, that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory and that henceforth South West Africa came under the direct responsibility of the United Nations.

Further, by the same resolution, the General Assembly resolved that the United Nations must discharge those responsibilities with respect to South West Africa.

The fact that resolution 2145 (XXI) was adopted with near unanimity among all the Members of the Assembly, with the usual two exceptions of South Africa and Portugal, had led us to hope that the day would not be far when the people of South West Africa would be able to enjoy their inalienable right to freedom and independence, the objective towards which the efforts of so many Member nations, including my own, have been directed for many years past.

Our hopes, alas, have not been fulfilled due principally to two factors: the continued lack of co-operation by the authorities in South Africa and the attitude of some of the powerful Western friends and allies of South Africa, I shall deal with these two factors briefly.

Paragraph 7 of resolution 2145 (XXI) called upon the Government of South Africa:

"forthwith to refrain and desist from any action, constitutional, administrative, political or otherwise, which will in any manner whatsoever alter or tend to alter the present international status of South West Africa."

## ODENDAAL COMMISSION

The response of South Africa has been exactly the opposite. Instead of complying with the terms of resolution 2145 (XXI), South Africa has, with its characteristic contempt for the verdicts of this Organization, actually

strengthened its hold over the Territory. Thus, preparations have been made for implementing the recommendations of the notorious Odendaal Commission, with the aim of partitioning the Territory.

Members will recall that the report of the Odendaal Commission has been specifically rejected by the United Nations as being an attempt to dismember the, Territory in violation of several General Assembly resolutions. South Africa always wanted to incorporate South West Africa within its territorial frontiers. It wits my delegation which, in 1946, realizing this danger, took the initiative of introducing a draft resolution recommending that South West Africa should be placed under the International Trusteeship System. South Africa, however, never gave up its sinister designs and made repeated, though so far unsuccessful, attempts to obtain some sort of legal recognition of its illegal possession of the Territory. The Odendaal Commission report is one of the most subtle of those attempts.

Equally unacceptable is the manoeuvre of South African authorities in regard to Ovamboland. Nobody was deceived by the oiler of so-called independence to Ovamboland. Ovamboland is an integral part of the Territory of South West Africa, and any move to detach it from the rest of the Territory must be regarded as an aggressive act. The Special Committee of Twenty-Four rightly condemned this manoeuvre of South Africa in its resolution adopted on 19 June 1967, of which my delegation was a sponsor.

Yet another example of the defiance of South Africa for the opinion of the international community is provided by its illegal arrest and trial of thirty-seven South West Africans in Pretoria. The action of the authorities in South Africa in arresting people in a Territory over which it has no legal jurisdiction and in transporting them 2,000 miles away from their homeland for the purpose of prosecuting them under an Act which is grossly inhuman, cannot and must not fail to arouse the conscience of civilized people everywhere.

The contents of the so-called Terrorism Act are by now quite familiar to members. Its application to South West Africa is patently illegal

Even the defence counsel, a South African, raised doubts about the applicability of the Act to South West Africa.

Both the Committee of Twenty-Four as well as the United Nations Council for South West Africa have condemned the arrest and trial. One of the detainees has already succumbed to the torture methods practised by South African authorities. My delegation implores the Members of this august body to do everything within their power to persuade South Africa to discontinue the trial and to release the prisoners.

The response of South Africa, though deplorable, is not altogether surprising. We were led to believe by certain Members that one more attempt to intimate a dialogue with South Africa would be well worth undertaking, Accordingly, and in conformity with resolution 2248 (S-V),

#### 204

the Council for South West Africa addressed a toner to South Africa on 28 August 1967. South Africa, of course, did not reply to the Council's letter. Instead, it wrote a letter to the Secretary-General, in which inter alia, it made a passing reference to the, Council's letter and dismissed the United Nations resolutions as being illegal.

The exercise of contacting South African authorities nevertheless was useful, though not for the same reasons adduced by its advocates. The negative reply of South Africa, we hope, will have convinced the doubtful among us of the utter futility of expecting any change of heart in the Oppressive racist regime in Pretoria.

## DIPLOMATIC DIALOGUE

This brings me to the other factor which I mentioned at the beginning of my statement, namely, the attitude of the powerful friends and allies of South Africa in the West. I do not have much to say on this matter except that those Western Powers bear a heavy responsibility with respect to the fate of the African population of South West Africa. They have, so far, not shown any active concern to discharge their responsibilities. My delegation believes that if they exerted sufficient and credible pressure on South Africa, the situation would certainly change.

The African and Asian Members of the Organization were counselled patience by many Memger nations of the West. We were advised to seek a peaceful solution through diplomatic dialogue with South Africa. Although sceptical of the outcome of such a dialogue, the United Nations Council for South West Africa did take the initiative and contacted the South African Governmerit. South Africa's response should satisfy those who counselled patience, that it is not just a question of exercising patience or restraint; the question is much more fundamental, namely, that the United Nations, having resolved to discharge its responsibilities with respect to South West Africa, must take appropriate steps to discharge those responsibilities.

In its reply, which was addressed to the Secretary-General, the Government of South Africa made many misleading and totally erroneous statements regarding South West Africa. My delegation does not consider it necessary to deal with the substance of the letter at length. Indeed, from our past experience we find it futile to engage in any logical or rational argument with South Africa.

Suffice it to recall that resolution 2145 (XXI), by which the General Assembly terminated South Africa's mandate and assumed direct responsibility for the administration of the Territory, had a sound basis, the Assembly's competence in the matter as a successor to the League of Nations having been recognized by the International Court of Justice. My delegation is not surprised at the response of South Africa, for it is only natural that confronted by the unanimous will of the world body it should seek to take refuge behind meaningless legalities. The attempts made by South Africa to cover up its illegal occupation of the Territory will only serve to further expose its aggressive designs to the world.

I have not commented on the report of the Council for South West Africa for the simple reason that my delegation is a member of the Council, and as such, supports it fully.

Before I conclude, I should like to express the hope of my delegation that all the Members of the United Nations would leave aside whatever narrow parochial interests they might have in this matter and would join in a common endeavour to deal with the unfortunate situation created by the defiant, negative attitude of the South African authorities. All those delegations which voted in favour of resolution 2145 (XXI) are morally obliged to work for the effective implementation of the important decisions embodied in that resolution. Failure to take speedy and concerted action would not merely result in a loss of prestige for our world body, it may well prove disastrous for the peace of southern Africa and perhaps, the whole world.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PORTUGAL

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## INDIA IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri R. N. Mirdha's Statement in Fourth Committee on Fiji

The following is the text of the statement made by Shri R. N. Mirdha, M.P., Member of the Indian Delegation to the 22nd session of the U.N. General Assembly, in the Fourth (Trusteeship) Committee on December 6, 1967 on the question of Fiji:

Mr. Chairman,

While dealing with any colonial territory it is useful to start with an examination of the provisions of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the extent of their implementation

205

by the colonial power concerned. In the case of Fiji, the latest resolution adopted by the General Assembly is Resolution 2185 (XXI). Resolution 2185 called upon the Administering Power to take certain measures which in the view of the General Assembly, were necessary to lead Fiji towards its independence as a unified and

truly multi-racial nation. The Administering Power was called upon, inter alia, to abolish discriminatory measures, to transfer full powers to the Constituent Assembly to be elected on the basis of one man one vote, to fix an early date for independence and to receive a visiting mission in the territory.

It will be obvious to members, from the report of the Special Committee of Twenty-four as well as from the statement of the Administering Power, that none of these demands of the General Assembly has been fulfilled by the Administering Power. My delegation cannot but regret this failure of the Government of the United Kingdom.

#### ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. Chairman, my delegation has explained on several occasions in the past, how the pre-sent electoral system in Fiji discriminates against the indigenous Fijians and Fijians of Indian origin, the sole beneficiaries of the system being the small European minority. The electoral system is based primarily on communal voting, a phenomenon with which most of the former British colonies are painfully familiar.

Let me explain some features of the electoral system in Fiji. Out of 36 elected members of the Legislative Council, Europeans who are less than 9% of the population have 10 seats as against 14 seats for indigenous Fijians who constitute about 41% of the population and 12 seats for the people of Indian origin who are a little over 50% of the population. The electoral system thus is weighted heavily in favour of the Europeans. If one examines the system carefully one would find that one European vote actually equals 9 indigenous Fijian votes and 10 votes of Fijians of Indian origin. This is a flagrant violation of the principle of one man one vote which is universally recognised as the very essence of a democratic system. This is the principle whose application the General Assembly has repeatedly called for, not only in Fiji, but in all other colonial territories such as Southern Rhodesia, Colonies under Portuguese domination, the former territory of Aden, etc.

As a further example of the privileged position occupied by the members of the European

community I would like to invite the attention of the distinguished members to the composition of the former Executive Council and the present Council of Ministers. Of the 11 members of the Executive Council the European community, which is officially called community which is neither Fijian nor Indian, had 6 members. The indigenous Fijians had 3 and the so-called Indian community 2. This means that less than 5% of the population had about 55% of the seats while 91% of the population had about 45% of the seats in the former Executive Council. In the new Council of Ministers of 8 members the Europeans have 4 seats while the Fijians and the so-called Indians have 3 seats and one seat respectively, not counting the assistant ministers. It does not require any profound analysis to show the disproportionate and unjust share of power retained by the European community.

The distinguished representative of the Administering Power dwelt at length in his statement yesterday on the differences existing between various ethnic groups in the territory. Mr. Chairman, no delegation can dispute the fact of the existence of people of different ethnic origins in Fiji. Indeed, this phenomenon is not peculiar to Fiji. There are various other countries and territories in the world with mixed populations. The ethnic differences, however, should not be allowed to come in the way of developing a strong and unified nation.

It should be the policy and endeavour of the Administering authorities to do everything within their power to minimise these differences and to promote effective integration among the communities at all levels. The representative of the Administering Power devoted considerable part of his statement on the need for developing racial harmony in Fiji. My delegation could not agree more on this subject. In fact, this is the desire of all of us. But we differ from him on the steps to be taken to bring about this objective.

## HARMONIOUS RELATIONSHIP

The Administering Power has admitted that there has been very little effective integration on the political or social level between the two main communities in Fiji. Although we agree with the Administering Power that an attempt to seek the causes for this lack of integration and to apportion blame on any one would not serve any useful purpose at this stage, we find it necessary to state that the Administering Power cannot by any means escape responsibility for it. We find it necessary to say this only because the representatives of the Administering Power have exaggerated, much to our regret, the differences between the two main groups in Fiji, using them to justify the various inequities in the present political set-up in the territory.

#### 206

Mr. Chairman, we are glad to know that the Administering Power shares, even at this late stage, my delegation's firm belief that, given a chance and proper circumstances. the two principal communities in Fiji would be able and willing to live in peace and harmony. This was in fact proved as far back as 1929 when elections to the Municipality in Suva had taken place on a common roll vote. We understand that the system was highly successful. We cannot help wondering why the experiment, instead of being extended to other parts of the country, was discontinued even in Suva. The latest innovation of the cross voting system is a further proof that the two communities are perfectly capable of maintaining harmonious relationship among themselves.

It has been stated by representatives of Administering Power that both the communities in Fiji accept that the long-term aim should be a single common roll regardless of community or race. My delegation has no reason to doubt that a common roll system if introduced in the territory now would have anything but beneficial results for the people of Fiji as a whole.

As my delegation stated earlier in the committee of Twenty-four, we are particularly convinced of the healthy effect of a common roll system in view of the very impressive leadership that is now coming to the fore in the island. The Chief Minister, Mr. Ratu Mara, has already proved himself to he an extremely competent leader who is successfully tackling the task of building-up his country as a truly multi-racial society. My delegation pays a sincere tribute to Mr. Ratu Mara and his colleagues. Mr. Ratu Mara and his colleagues have only strengthened the belief of my delegation that, left to them-

selves, the two communities in Fiji will work hand in hand for their common betterment.

#### COMMUNAL INTEGRATION

In this connection my delegation believes that the Administering Power can make a beginning in the process of communal integration in Fiji by discontinuing the practice of referring to the people of Fiji by their ethnic and racial origins. This practice of giving unnecessary labels to the people of Fiji defeats the purpose which the Administering Power says it wishes to promote, namely communal harmony. Thus, the people of Indian origin who were taken several generations ago to Fiji to work as indentured labour on European-owned plantations are as much Fijians as the indigenous Fijians themselves.

I should also like to comment briefly on the inadequacy of the powers of the legislative and executive bodies in Fiji. General Assembly resolution 2185 (XXI) called for, I quote "the transfer of full powers", to the elected representatives of the people. Both the legislative Council as well as the Council of Ministers cannot, by any standards, be said to enjoy full powers.

The recent change-over to the new ministerial system, though welcome in itself, does not seem to imply any additional powers to the ministerial council. The Governor, who is appointed by the Crown, retains control, among other things. for defence, external affairs, internal security and public service. The discretionary powers of the Governor to dissolve or prorogue Executive Council and to act against its advice when he considers it necessary in the interests of public order, public faith or good government might hamper the development of the executive organ into a truly effective body. The powers of the Legislative Council to initiate bills is severely restricted by the provision that no bill can be introduced without the consent of the Governor if its effect would be to impose taxes or to increase expenditure.

I need not remind members that most bills of any consequence would inevitably have financial implications. Further, the Governor is empowered to refuse assent, to reserve legislation and to ensure that bills are passed by certification. Mr. Chairman, this Committee would do well to all upon the Administering Power once again to take appropriate measures to enable the people of Fiji to exercise effective political power.

The General Assembly, in its resolution 2185 (XXI) endorsed the decision of the Special Committee to appoint a sub-committee to visit Fiji and requested the Chairman of the Special Committee to appoint the sub-committee as early as Practicable in consultation with the Administering Power. The Administering Power told the Fourth Committee last year that since it had Placed all the facts before the Fourth Committee there was no justification for a visiting mission. The General Assembly however decided, and quite rightly, that it would be useful to send a sub-committee of the Committee of Twenty-four to Fiji for the purpose of studying at first hand the situation in the territory. The same view was expressed frequently during the recent consideration of this item by the Special Committee.

Despite appeals addressed to it by several resolutions and a great number of delegations the attitude of the Administering Power has remained negative on this question. This has been a great disappointment to my delegation. The

#### 207

Resolution adopted by the Special Committee on 15th September, 1967 makes an urgent appeal to the Administering Power to cooperate with the Special Committee and to consider its decision concerning the visit of the Sub-Committee on Fiji.

My delegation hopes that the Administering Power will not fail to respond positively to such repeated appeals coming from different organs of the United Nations. As far as my delegation is concerned, I should like to give the assurance that we will abide by the findings of the visiting mission, whatever that might be.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that the only constructive action left to this Committee is to reiterate the main provisions contained in its resolutions adopted last year and to Urge the Administering Power once again to take necessary and timely measures to enable the people of Fiji to achieve their independence in accordance with their freely ex-

pressed wishes.

#### INDIA FIJI USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

## INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha Debate on Foreign Affairs

The following is the text of a statement made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in the Lok Sabha on December 22, 1967, initiating a debate on the international situation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move:

'That the present international situation and the policy of the Government of India in relation thereto be taken into consideration.'

Sir, I welcome this debate and I share the concern. of the Hon. Members that it is to be such a short one. But the world situation is somewhat like the situation in our own country; it is a blend of both hope and despair. On the one hand, there is an urge towards peace and economic progress through international cooperation and, on the other hand, there do exist centres of tension which cause conflicts and divisions within the world community. On the positive side there is an ever-increasing awareness of the need for the inter-dependence of nations.

Although each country would like to be as self-sufficient and as self-reliant as possible, nevertheless, the world cannot exist without a certain amount of inter-dependence between different countries. One of the factors which causes great concern to India and to all developing countries is the widening gap between the

rich. and the poor nations. And, in spite of much effort that is being made in many directions, we have not been able to solve this problem, and the gap is a growing one. I feel that this is what sows the seeds of conflict and is an everpresent feature that disturbs peace.

## BURMA, CEYLON AND NEPAL

We greatly welcome the good relationship which we have had with our neighbouring countries, with Burma, with Ceylon and with Nepal. With Burma, as Hon. Members know, we have recently concluded a border agreement. With Ceylon, I have already mentioned to the Hon. Members on a previous occasion of my own visit there, which was followed by the visit of the Governor-General of Ceylon, which gave us opportunities to exchange views. With Nepal also we have had several exchanges. Our Deputy Prime Minister has been to Nepal and, very recently, the King of Nepal passed through Delhi. We were both able to have talks with him and to take up various matters of mutual concern.

We have been trying to maintain good relations and develop our relations with other countries of South-East Asia and also with Japan, with Australia and with New Zealand. We have a modest programme of technical assistance and bilateral economic cooperation between India and other developing countries. But the urge of Asia towards economic progress and even cooperation cannot further itself while there is any area of conflict, and that is why from the very begin-

#### 208

ning it has been our effort to be interested in problems of peace and to try the, ways of achieving peaceful settlement wherever there is conflict.

## **VIETNAM**

We have been vitally interested in the conflict in Vietnam, for instance, and I should like to repeat our hope that bombing should be stopped there, thus giving an opportunity to open up ways in which the conflict can come to the conference table from the battle field. We are deeply interested in peace in the neighbouring countries and, therefore, we have supported all peace initiatives which have been inspired by the same objective, and specially that made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U thant.

We continue to shoulder our responsibility of the chairmanship of the International Control Commission in the hope that this Commission may ultimately provide an instrument for international peace. I am sure the House would wish to join me in paying tribute to the personnel of the International Control Commission and our Consulate General in Hanoi, who are conducting themselves with calm, courage and dignity in very difficult circumstances. I know that the Commission is not able to be very active but, nevertheless, all parties are desirous of its continuance, as I said earlier, in the hope that in the future it could play a more useful role.

#### CAMBODIA AND LAOS

I should like also to speak of our relationship with Cambodia and Laos. Both these countries are facing extremely difficult situations and in spite of the pressures and difficulties they are trying to maintain a neutral position, and we do support them in this. Recently, we welcomed the King of Laos and we had the opportunity of reaffirming the similarity of our aspirations and ideals.

The other visit we have had was of the Chief Minister of Fiji, Mr. Ratu K. K. T. Mara. We have assured him of our interest in cooperation and in the peaceful and harmonious development of Fiji. Then, more recent still, we had the Prime Minister of Mauritius, Sir Shewsagar Ramgoolam. His visit also provided us with an opportunity for renewing our old cultural and traditional ties with the people of Mauritius and for forging new links.

## AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

While dwelling on Asia, I should like to mention once again the growing understanding between our country and Australia and New Zealand. We belong to the same geographical region and our interests are interlinked in many ways. We are glad that there has been a realisation of this--and we of course have always

believed in this-in Australia and New Zealand also. Today our thoughts go out specially to the people of Australia, for this is the day when they are mourning the tragic death of their able and distinguished Prime Minister, Sir Harold Holt.

#### UNITED KINGDOM

While I am speaking of the Commonwealth, may I here mention our relations with the other countries of the Commonwealth and, in particular, with the United Kingdom? Recently, we had the visit to Delhi of Mr. Prentice, the Minister for Overseas Development and I mentioned to him, as I would like to say here, our appreciation of the terms under which the United Kingdom has given us aid, without interest and with long period of repayment and with extreme flexibility in its utilisation as between project and non-project.

#### **CANADA**

With Canada also we have growing ties. We have been working together for many years in the International Control Commission and on many international problems. We have co-operated and we have tried and are trying to seek peaceful solution of world problems.

## WEST ASIA

Hon. Members are also aware of our efforts in the Security Council to work towards a resolution which could provide the basis for the U. N. Mediator to restore normality in the West Asian region. We welcome the resolution and we offer our good wishes to the Mediator in the very delicate task which he has undertaken. We believe that normal and stable conditions should be restored in that region, as soon as possible in the interest of the country concerned and, even, if I may say so, in our own national interest. The territories occupied by force should be vacated and the just rights of the people should be recognised.

#### SOUTH YEMEN

We welcome the establishment of the independent Republic of South Yemen, which is another country with which we have had close ties and

traditional links. We are glad that at the present moment this relationship has been very greatly strengthened and there is the friendliest of feelings between the people of South Yemen and ourselves.

#### AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA

With the countries of Africa and Latin America also our relations remain friendly. We share the same world-view and the same desire to safeguard our respective sovereignties and to promote international co-operation. By and

209

large, in this area also the trend has been to remain away from ideological, military and political groupings and rivalries so that they could concentrate their attention on more positive and mutually beneficial links.

One cannot look at Africa without also seeing a few black spots which remain there.....

We have on many occasions expressed our indignation at the efforts of small minorities to subjugate The vast majority of inhabitants in disregard to the expressed sentiment of the United Nations and of the world community.

## **EUROPE**

As far as Europe is concerned, we have no bilateral disputes either with Western European countries or with countries of Eastern Europe. In different ways both these regions have been contributing to our economic progress. We recognise the economic strength and progress which these countries have made in recent years and we welcome this process of closer economic, technological and cultural connections which are now being, built up with India.

But we do feet, as I mentioned earlier, that Europe and specially the more advanced countries of Europe, can do a great deal more to enable us to trade with them, which alone can place our economic relations on a secure basis. We are fully aware of their own difficulties—the problems of European security and so on—and we hope that they will be resolved peacefully.

The visit of the German Chancellor has greatly added to the understanding of our respective problems and, I feel, has laid the foundations of closer economic, cultural and scientific collaboration with the Federal Republic of Germany.

#### USA AND USSR

Our co-operation with the USA and the USSR continues to develop over a wide field of economic, scientific and cultural activities. We appreciate greatly the friendly assistance which they have both given and the faith they have shown in our own efforts to fulfil our national objectives. The generous food and economic assistance from the U.S.A. is a proof of their understanding and interest in our problems and our objectives. At the same time, the extensive programme of economic co-operation with the U.S.S.R. provides an equal proof of our common interest in safeguarding and promoting international co-operation.

#### **CHINA**

In this picture which is one of harmoniously developing relationship it is unfortunate that I ave. to mention that the situation still remains unsatisfactory with regard to two of our neighbours. China continues to maintain attitude of hostility towards us and, as hon. Members know, spares no opportunity to malign us and to carry on anti-Indian propaganda not only against the Indian Government but the whole way of our democratic functioning and even our national integrity.

But I would like to say that we do not harbour any evil intentions towards the Chinese people and we do hope that a day will come when they will also realise that it is to the interest of all the countries of South-East Asia that we should be friends and that each country should be able to devote its strength to solving the very major problems of combating poverty, backwardness and all their attending evils.

#### **PAKISTAN**

With Pakistan we have had and still have the many common bonds of history, tradition and culture and, therefore, it is all the more regrettable that our relationship has followed such an uneven course. We, on our part, would certainly like to see the people of Pakistan prosper and progress and to have friendly neighbourly relations with them because, here again, we believe that friendly relations between India and Pakistan would contribute to the strength of both the nations and would help them both to achieve a better life for their people without our attention being diverted to other purposes.

It is for this reason that we welcomed the signing of the Tashkent Declaration and even now, in spite of all the obstacles which we face, we continue to do our utmost on our side to see that it is implemented. But the House is well aware how difficult this is. The immediate need, we feel, is to heal the wounds caused by the conflict of 1965 and to normalise our relations. This is what we have been trying to pursue with the Government of Pakistan.

The development of mutually beneficial economic and other relationship should not follow the consideration of more tangled political questions but should precede them and should aim a, creating a friendly atmosphere. On our part, I should like to say that we shall not miss any opportunity of having a fruitful dialogue in order that such a feeling of trust and understanding is gradually restored and avenues are opened out for better collaboration on various issues.

## DISARMAMENT

We have not laged behind in our efforts to promote disarmament because, again, for the simple reason, we believe that the resources of the world should be turned to constructive and productive uses. Therefore, while we have reservations on partial or discriminatory arrangemerits for the non-proliferation of nuclear wea-

210

pons, we sham the belief that such an unprecedented reservoir of energy should be used for peaceful and not for destructive purposes.

#### SECOND UNCTAD CONFERENCE

In this connection, I mention the Second

UNCTAD Conference which will be meeting in New Delhi very soon, in early next month. All our Members are already aware of the growing disparity between the developed and the developing nations. While the per capita income of the people in the developed countries. in recent years, has been rising, on an average, I am told, by 60 dollars per year, that of the people of the developing countries by only 2 dollars per year. Similarly, the goods manufactured by developed countries are becoming more expensive while the prices of the goods which we manufacture or which come from other developing countries are falling, thereby reducing our purchasing-power.

Some time ago, it was felt that effort should be made to find ways to transfer in an orderly and peaceful manner resources which are essential for rapid economic growth of the developing countries and that is why the Secretary-General of the U.N. had suggested the Development Decade. Unfortunately, these efforts have also been in vain and have, not succeeded at all. Instead of the gap being bridged we see that it has been considerably widened.

Now, another effort will be made at the Second UNCTAD Conference to hold this trend and help to enable developing countries to acquire greater resources for their own accelerated economic progress. The developing countries are not asking for aid; they are not asking for charity or for any grant. But they are asking only for the opportunity to trade and to acquire greater possibilities of the transfer of resources from these countries which can afford them and which, in the long run, is to their own interest.

It is recognised today, as we recognise in our own internal position, that prosperity cannot belong to only a few. Just as in our country, we see it cannot belong to a limited number of persons or certain classes, in the same way, in the whole world community also, unless opportunities are shared, we cannot have a world peace. Therefore, we must continue with our efforts to enable all the less developed countries to build a better life.

## LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE

While shaping foreign policy, national interest

must, naturally, always be kept in view, both from the political point of view and from the economic point of view. At the same time, we must keep our sights on long-term perspective. Conditions, locally or in any given area, may change and sometimes, because of these changes, we may have to take up a new programme. But this should not make us divert in any way from our basic values.

There will always be ups and downs for any country. In fact, there are ups and downs for all countries, even those which are advanced and which have the possibilities of solving their problems with the resources at their disposal. Even they see ups and downs, even they see that their policies are not always succeeding, are not always bringing the results for which they worked and which they hope for.

But our aim, while we can make adjustments for any new position that arises, should be not to divert from the basic principles and to do nothing which would bring discredit to the country. We should have faith in ourselves and always so mould our thinking and our actions as to serve the long-term interests of the country. It is sometimes when you get diverted by what seems to be in your interest today, that you see that you have moved away from what is really in the long-term interest of the country and of the people.

INDIA USA BURMA NEPAL JAPAN AUSTRALIA NEW ZEALAND VIETNAM CAMBODIA LAOS FIJI MAURITIUS CANADA MALI YEMEN GERMANY CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN UZBEKISTAN RUSSIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

LAOS

President's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming the King of Laos

The President, Dr. Zakir Husain, welcoming His Majesty the King of Laos, Sri Savang Vatthana, on his arrival in New Delhi on December 3, 1967 on a State visit, said:

I am very happy to welcome Your Majesty. Your Royal Highness and other distinguished visitors from Laos to India. Your Majesty is well known in our country as an enlightened

211

sovereign and a friend of this country. Both Your Majesty and Her Majesty the Queen had done us the honour of visiting us before. We regret that on this occasion Her Majesty the Queen has not been able to come.

The friendly and fraternal ties between our two countries are a matter of great satisfaction to us. We share a rich cultural heritage and many common aspirations for peace and development. We are aware that the friendly and peaceful people of Laos who seek to preserve their independence, and territorial integrity in conditions of neutrality are facing some problems. India, in its role in the International Commission and elsewhere, has tried to assist in this cause. We hope that despite the present difficulties, peace and unity will soon be restored in your country.

May I express the hope that Your Majesty and your party will find your stay in this friendly country of ours pleasant and fruitful and that you will be able, not only to feel the spirit of the ancient traditions that link us, but also to see something of the process of development in various fields in which India is at present engaged.

I emend to Your Majesty and the distinguished members of Your Majesty's party a warm and hearty welcome.

LAOS USA INDIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

## LAOS

Reply by His Majesty the King of Laos

Replying to the President's welcome speech, His Majesty, Sri Savang Vatthana, King of Laos, said:

Excellency, Madam Prime Minister,

It gives me great joy to be in India today. This visit reaffirms the ever-lasting friendship of the Kingdom of Laos for the Republic of India. As far as I am concerned this is a token of our constant friendship. This is also a special occasion for a pilgrimage to the. sources of the Lao faith and to the origin of the Lao culture.

Thanks to the thoughtful kindness of your government, I have enjoyed a most comfortable journey. It has been for us all the most interesting because we knew that it is taking us towards fast and sincere friends.

Excellency, my first and for me a pleasant duty is to thank you for your kindness to us and also to convey to you greetings and good wishes that my people formulate for your health as well as for the happiness and prosperity of India.

LAOS INDIA USA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

LAOS

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of King Savang Vatthana

The following is the text of President Zakir Husain's speech at a Banquet given by him in honour of His Majesty the King of Laos at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi, on December 3, 1967:

Your Majesty, Your Royal Highness distinguished friends from Laos,

Earlier today we had the honour of welcoming you to India. For Your Majesty this is not a first visit to this country. Your Majesty knows well the friendly sentiments that bind our two countries and the rich cultural heritage we share.

We, in India, have followed with interest and admiration the efforts of the Laotian people under Your Majesty's able and inspiring leadership to improve their economic lot. Help has been forthcoming from international organisations and from friendly countries. The multilateral assistance now being given to Laos in the construction of the Nam Ngum multipurpose project, which on completion is expected to provide 120,000 kw of electricity and irrigate 32,000 hectares of land, and the projected bridge over the Mekong river, is, being supplemented by technical and other aid from individual countries. Laos is essentially an agricultural country, and we are happy to learn that present programmes are addressed towards exploiting the potentialities of Laos becoming a surplus state in its principal crop, rice. We are also glad that United Nations and other experts are being commissioned to explore the mineral resources of the land. One of our own mining experts is associated with this project.

As in the industrial, so also in the educational and cultural fields, India would be glad to enlarge its association with Laos to the maximum

212

extent possible. India is at present helping to meet part of the Laotian requirement for steel, trucks and consumer goods. Requests for teacher training and scholarships for study of Buddhism, Pali, Sanskrit and other subjects have been largely complied with. Requests for training facilities in administrative institutions are being given all consideration.

In another area also. Laos-Indian relations have been further advanced. I refer to India's compliance with the Royal Government's request in 1964 for assistance, especially in the medical field. One of the last decisions of our late Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, made only two days before his death, was to send a team of 43 doctors and auxiliary personnel in response to the appeal. Since their arrival in Laos, the Indian medical teams (the present one being the third) have attended to nearly 400,000 cases. We are happy to know that the hard work and dedicated service of our medical teams has been appreciated by the Laotian Government and people. India has also assisted in the construction of the Physics and Anatomy laboratories of the Vientiane School of Medicine.

With the crying need for economic reconstruction which faces all developing nations, it is most unfortunate that the people of Laos should have had To face a difficult situation in which they cannot devote a valuable part of their energies at home, to work for national economic advancement and the preservation of Laotian political neutrality.

The steady deterioration of the political situation in Vietnam has not been without its attendant adverse effects on neighbouring Laos. In these circumstances the effective functioning of the ICSC in Laos has been rendered the more difficult. However, it is our earnest hope that in Laos, as in her neighbouring sister state of Vietnam, peace will return before long permitting file people to use their great talents for economic betterment and political and social dignity.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would request you to join me in drinking a toast to the health and long life of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Laos and To the welfare and happiness of the people of Laos.

LAOS USA INDIA LATVIA VIETNAM

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

#### **LAOS**

King Savang Vatthana's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Zakir Husain

The following is the text of the speech of His Majesty King Savang Vatthana of Laos at a banquet given by him in honour of the President, Dr. Zakir Husain, in New Delhi on December 5, 1967:

Mr. President, Madam Prime Minister, Ladies. and Gentlemen,

You have very kindly agreed to be our guests this evening in this place which bears the most illustrious name of Ancient India.

Mr. President, you are at home here. My sta---in Delhi is almost over. During it, the joy of receiving the warm welcome of a friend was tinged with sadness at the memory of the great men of New India who have passed away. Their name, their stature project on the Indian scene the greatness of their deed and the grandeur of their souls.

I am not leaving India yet. The Government of India has very kindly made it possible for me to revisit the sacred Buddhist places. At the mention of this word, another word comes to haunt my mind--peace--and when one speaks of peace, one thinks of war. There is war still in East Asia. It has lasted a long time and serves to divide peoples more and more from one another; it sows hatred among them. I have said to myself that victory after so prolonged a conflict would be a pyrrhic one; that a defeat accompanied by ruin would leave cruel wounds on the bodies of men and bitterness in their hearts. I have said to myself that men at war can still find reasons to come to an understanding, reasons for mitigating their misunderstandings, reasons, for calling a halt to war, reasons to hold one another in esteem.

I am sure India understands me when I say this. Blest be India's soil, cradle of Buddhism,

where the Master taught us to know ourselves to forge our will to extirpate the spirit of evil from our beings, to stretch our hands out to all humanity in goodness, charity, to see a friend in every enemy.

The Government of India is also making it possible by means of an elaborate programme of visits to see its achievements in the social, agricultural, industrial and scientific fields. It has given me an idea of its national development programme. May I take this opportunity to express the wish that India may achieve full suc-

213

cess as a reward for her faith in her future as a great country, for her labours, for her hardships.

As for me, after this wonderful visit, I will have the joy of taking back to Laos, to the Laotian people the affection and friendship of India as I have brought with me the affection and the friendship of the Laotian people.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I request you to join me in a toast to the prosperity of India, the happiness of her people and the health of her President.

LAOS USA INDIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# **Volume No**

1995

LAOS

Reply by President Zakir Husain

The following is the text of the President, Dr. Zakir Husain's reply to King Savang Vatthana:

I have, referred on earlier occasions to the great pleasure that Your Majesty's visit has given

us. Tomorrow, you and the distinguished members of your party will be leaving Delhi to see something more of the ancient and spiritual heritage. of this country, as also some of the areas of modern development in which we are engaged at present. Your Majesty's visit to the various parts of this country would, I hope, give you a glimpse into our hearts and minds and of our deep and abiding affection for Your Majesty and your people.

Your Majesty had referred in generous terms to the constant friendship of Laos for India and the close feelings of kinship and culture that link us with you. We deeply appreciate and reciprocate these sentiments in full measure. One of the strongest bonds between our two countries is the message of the Buddha. This message of peace and tolerance of compassion, understanding and goodwill, is very relevant to our times and to our continent. I am glad that Your Majesty is going to visit some of the places of pilgrimage associated with the life and enlightenment of the Buddha.

With the common heritage of peace and tolerance, it is, only natural that the people of-both India and Laos desire friendship and cooperation not only between themselves but among all peoples of the world. Peace for both our countries and for our continent and the world is also essential for development and construction. The Father of our nation, Mahatma Gandhi, and the architect of the new India, Jawaharlal Nehru considered it their greatest ambition to wipe every tear from every eye. We are glad to note that Your Majesty's Government has through the efforts of its own people implemented important development programmes. We are sure that despite the present difficulties your country is passing through, peace and unity would be restored leading to the fuller realisation of the ultimate objectives embodied in the Geneva Agreements. We want to assure you of the continued goodwill and support of the Governmerit and people of India in the consistent efforts of Your Majesty's Government to maintain the unity and neutrality of Laos. This unity is bound to blossom into an abiding harmony which would bring out the true genius of the Laotian people. We also hope that in the larger interest of peace and good neighbourly relations, all the countries of our region, as also those interested

in the peaceful development of this continent, which is the home of over two-thirds of humanity, would strictly abide by the Bandung principles to which Your Majesty had referred earlier. As a friendly neighbour of Laos, India has a vital interest in the peace and prosperity of Laos and this region.

For all of us, developing countries, the achievement of economic self-reliance and social harmony are essential requisites to give our people the means of a modern and fuller life. On behalf of the Government and people of India, I want to assure Your Majesty, once again, of our desire to develop to the fullest possible extent our cooperation with Laos.

May I now ask Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to join me in a toast for the good health and long life of Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Laos, and for the progress and prosperity of the friendly and peace-loving people of Laos.

214

LAOS USA INDIA SWITZERLAND INDONESIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

## **Volume No**

1995

## UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo Soviet Trade Agreement Signed

The following is the text of a Press Note issued in New Delhi on December 26, 1967 on the signing of an Indo-Soviet trade agreement:

An agreement on the broad pattern of commodity exchange between India and the Soviet Union for the year 1968 was signed at New Delhi on December 26, 1967 by Shri K. B. Lall, Secretary, Ministry of Commerce, on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. M. Kuzmin, the

First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, USSR, on behalf of the Government of the Soviet Union.

During the past decade there has been a remarkable growth of trade between India and USSR and the total volume which was Rs. 0.8 crores in 1953 and Rs. 88 crores in 1958 has risen to Rs. 198 crores for 1966. For the year 1967 it is expected that the trade both ways will be near about Rs. 280 crores.

The agreement signed today aims at increasing the trade level to about Rs. 300 crores.

So far as India's imports are concerned the agreement provides for the import of capital goods, components and spare parts for maintaining the production programme of the, various projects set up in India with Soviet assistance, such as the Steel Plant at Bhilai, the Heavy Machine Building Plant at Ranchi, the Heavy Electricals at Hardwar, the, Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Project at Ranipur and many others. In all about 40 major projects set-up with Soviet cooperation will receive their components, parts and equipments, from Soviet Union. There are many other developmental projects which need phase supply of machinery, spares and raw materials from the Soviet Union. These needs have been taken into consideration and provided for with a view to assure the growth of the Soviet assisted projects as planned.

Apart from machinery, equipments and spares, the present agreement assures the supply of essential raw materials for maintaining the level of Indian economic activities. These materials include large quantities of fertilisers like ammonium sulphate, muriate of potash and urea sulphur; of zinc and tin plates; of chemicals for the manufacture of medicinal products, of dyestuffs and laboratory chemicals and of other materials, like raw asbestos, wood pulp and newsprint. Oil products including kerosene form an important part of the import programme.

So far as India's exports are concerned, the trade in traditional items like tea, coffee, spices, mica, oil cakes extraction etc. will be maintained at the previous year's level. Non-traditional items have also featured largely in India's export plans for 1968. Manufactured goods like leather shoes, textiles, ready-made garments, bed linen, hand-

kerchiefs etc. woollen knitwear, spectacle frames, enamel for wire, rolled steel products, accumulators, automobile tyres and tubes will go to Soviet Union in increasing quantities. On the whole, it is presumed, there will be a larger proportion of export of our non-traditional manufactures and semi-manufactures. In addition, discussions are underway for increasing the off take by the Soviet purchasing organisation from the production of Bhilai Steel Plant.

The leaders of the two Delegations exchanged ideas on the possibilities of securing further expansion in trade exchanges between the two countries and of intensifying economic cooperation-in related fields. It was considered that having regard to the changing patterns of production and consumption in the two economies a much higher degree of commercial cooperation is called for and a conscious effort is needed to adapt the production of one country to the requirements of the other.

In this connection, possibilities of revitalising and reinforcing existing production arrangements or setting up new ones in India for meeting the requirements, of the Soviet market have been explored. it has been agreed that more detailed discussions will take place at expert level in the coming months. It is hoped that as a result of these discussions, it would be possible to initiate some long-term measures with a view to widening the range and increasing the volume of product exchanges between the two economies.

The discussions between the two Delegations were marked by usual cordiality and by their

215

common determination to consolidate the ground which has been gained and to seek out new avenues for further work in this field.

The Leader of the Soviet Delegation and some of his colleagues visited industrial centres in India and came to the conclusion that much more can be done for increased importation of a variety of Indian industrial products into the Union. The Leader of the Indian Delegation on his part expressed the hope that with the revival of economic advance in the country, it would be possible to increase importation from

the Soviet Union.

## INDIA USA RUSSIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967

# Volume No

1995

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Foodgrains Agreement Signed

The following is the text of a Press note issued in New Delhi on December 30, 1967 on a foodgrains agreement signed between India and the United States of America:

Under an agreement signed here today, India will purchase 3.5 million tons of foodgrains from the United States under the Public Law 480 (Food for Peace) programme. The foodgrains rare valued at \$ 210.7 million (Rs. 158.03 crores).

Shri S. Jagannathan, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, signed the agreement for India, while Mr. Joseph N. greene, Jr. Minister, American Embassy, signed for the United States.

The foodgrains to be shipped to India under the agreement will consist of 3 million ions of wheat and 500,000 tons, of grains sorghum (milo). To speed tip the movement of the foodgrains, authorization has already been given for the purchase by the India Supply Mission in Washington of 700,000 tons. Some grain under this agreement will be shipped from the United States early in January, and the entire quantity is to be shipped during the first half of 1968.

The new agreement is the third supplement to the basic agreement of February 20, 1967, and will bring the total amount of U.S. foodgrains supplied to India since 1951 to over 55.5 million Ions. The agreement notes the fact that the Government of India as part of its overall development objectives, is giving priority to a wide variety of programmes to improve production, storage and distribution of foodgrains. In this connection, the Government of India has announced that it will assure an adequate return to food producers by put-chasing all foodgrains offered at no less, than its procurement price levels, even if procurement targets are exceeded. To help stabilize prices and build reserve for emergencies, the Government of India intends to create adequate buffer stocks as, quickly as possible.

The Government of India has also set targets for fertilizer availability, irrigation, and the use of high-yielding, varieties which are designed to continue the trend towards greater agricultural productivity.

India will pay in rupees for four-fifths of the value of the U.S. grain included in the new agreement. Eighty-seven per cent of these rupees will be loaned by the United States to the Government of India to finance development projects. including projects to increase agricultural production. A further five per cent is reserved for loans to American firms operating in India or for Indian firms with American collaboration. The remaining eight per cent (the rupee equivalent of \$13,488,000) is reserved for use by the United States. Of this, \$ 10,535,000 or five per cent of the total value of commodities in the agreement, is convertible to dollars at the request of the United States.

Payment for the remaining one-fifth of the commodities, and up to one-half of the ocean freight costs for shipping this portion, will be covered by a long-term rupee loan. This loan, repayble over 40 years, will have a ten-year grace period during which no repayment of principal will be required and interest will be two per cent per annum. Interest during the subsequent 30 years of repayment will be 2.5 per cent. The rupees received as repayment of principal and interest on the loan will be convertible into dollars at the option of the United States Government.

216

## USA INDIA LATVIA

**Date**: Dec 01, 1967