1971

January

Volume No 1995 Content Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII **JANUARY** No.1 **CONTENTS PAGE CANADA** Prime Minister's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming Prime Minister Trudeau Mr. Trudeau's Reply Prime Minister's Speech at Lunch in Honour of Mr. Trudeau Mr. Trudeau's Reply COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT MEETING 5 Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement FIJI Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in Honour of. Prime Minister of Fiji 9 Reply by Sir Kamisese, Mara **FRANCE** Indo-French Protocol Signed 10 **GUYANA** Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in Honour of Mr. Burnham Reply by Mr. Burnham 11

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE
HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS
President's Message on Republic Day
13

TANZANIA
President Giri's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Nyerere
15

Reply by President Nyerere 17
President Nyerere's Farewell Speech

President Giri's Reply

19

UNITTED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech Welcoming Mr. Heath

20

Mr. Heath's Reply

20

Prime Minister's Speech at Lunch in Honour of British

Prime Minister

21

Reply by Mr. Heath

22

(ii)

CANADA FIJI FRANCE GUYANA INDIA TANZANIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Prime Minister's Speech at Palam Airport Welcoming Prime Minister Trudeau

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech welcoming the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, on his arrival at Palam airport on January 11, 1971:

It is, indeed, a pleasure to greet you in New Delhi. You have seen India, perhaps, as no other outsider has, travelling third class and doing many things which others normally don't. But in these last two days, perhaps you have sensed something of the change and excitement through which the country is passing today.

The tasks which confront us are of incomparable magnitude because of our numbers and also because we are at a time when the conflict between the generations, the conflict between tradition and modernity, the conflict generated by the disparities and inequalities - are at their peak.

We welcome you as a leader of a nation with whom we have a warm and growing friendship and as a statesman whose vision, dynamism and perceptive involvement in the future have a relevance beyond the borders of Canada. Your visit brings Canada closer to our people. We have been looking forward to your coming and we wish you and your party an interesting and enjoyable stay with us.

CANADA INDIA USA **Date**: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No 1995 CANADA

Mr. Trudeau's Reply

In his reply Mr. Trudeau said:

May I first thank you for your very warm words of welcome, Madam Prime Minister, and also for calling to, mind the very happy visit I had to India on previous occasion. I only wish that at this time I had more opportunity to see the cities, villages, temples that I saw with much pleasure in previous trips and also to meet the people who were so kind to me, who were wise and friendly and made my passage in your country a warm one.

This, you know, is the third visit of a Canadian Prime Minister to India - Mr. Louis St. Laurent was hem in 1954 and Mr. Diefenbaker in 1958, nad I know you will take this as an indication of the lasting interest that Canada has in India and the lasting friendship which we know unites our people.

You mentioned, Madam Prime Minister, the problems we have in common. we also have in common a great deal of other values We are committed to the preservation of democracy. We believe in freedom under law and we know, that our two very large countries will be united in their desire to meet the problems. That is one reason why I am very happy to be with you and to have the opportunity over the next days to have long talks with you and your Ministers.

So, thank you very much for your hospitality. In the name of our Canadian party, I want to tell you how happy we are to be here.

1

CANADA INDIA USA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CANADA

Following is the text of the speech made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at a luncheon given in honour of the Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, at Rashtrapati Bhavan on January 12, 1971:

It is a pleasure to have you, Prime Minister, with us this afternoon. A vast distance separates our two countries. In history and tradition, we do not have much in common. But the political objectives of our people are similar. We stand unflin-

chingly for the causes for which we in India have been striving. Like you, we seek to build a multi-lingual, multi-religious society based on participatory democracy. But the people can be persuaded to keep alive their faith in democracy only if it gives a promise of results; otherwise they will feel compelled to look elsewhere. Time does not wait, nor do vast numbers who are emerging from the apathy of ages.

You have been quoted as saying that you dream all the time, dream of. a society --and I quote - "where each per-son should be able to fulfil himself to the extent of his capabilities as a human being, a society where inhibitions to equality would be eradicated". We can understand you for we share this dream. Much that has happened in India is proof that dreams do come true and that dreams are the stuff of what is most worthwhile in life. But dreams have to be made real.

We are here faced today with unprecedented social change. The question is not merely of fully utilising our resources, or augmenting our production, but of ensuring that the benefit from these has the widest possible distribution, so that social and economic justice reaches down to the weaker sections of our society. It is our endeavour to narrow the disparities in our society, against which you also have expressed a feeling of repugnance, and the discrimi-

nation which have caused so much hardship to vast numbers of our people and which have prevented us from sharing in man's progress towards a better world.

You know India from before. But even brief visit is sufficient to recognise that it is not an easy task for the whole people to step out of old habits and customs which have hardened over the centuries. Every where, the static and the dynamic are in conflict and those who see the shape of things to come, who are willing to adjust so as to make the transition smoother, are usually in a minority. The experience of the past can at best be a preparation for new challenges. We need the capacity to ask questions; we need vision to grasp the problems of the future; we need courage to act. Answers come from those who care enough to seek for them, and often from rebels. But rebellion has to be distinguished from violence or from recalcitrance, for you know from experience that violence creates more problems than it seems to solve. Throughout history when one age is ending and another coming into being, there has been great upheaval. Violence is a part of life. But men of goodwill have always attempted to control it. If this was desirable before, today with the world for our neighbour, it has become imperative. Change can and must be brought about by peaceful and democratic means.

Many years ago, our poet Rabindra
Nath Tagore sang of a world which was not
divided into fragments by narrow domestic
walls. We feel that every international body
for cooperation is an instrument for the
lowering of such barriers. That is why
after we attained Independence, my father
devised a formula to preserve the Commonwealth with added dignity and purpose, as
an association of free and equal nations to
advance the welfare of all its members.

Canada and India work together to ensure the total condemnation of apartheid. I am sure that we shall oppose all measures which would imply support for any form of racialism. Prime Minister, may I take this opportunity of expressing India's warm, appreciation of Canada's enlightened approach to aid? We are touched by the care and thought which you have given to our problems and difficulties. This is the attitude of

2

peace that each nation should recognise that its own interest is closely bound with that of the world around it. I know how deeply aware. you are of the compulsions of an interdependent world which is in the painful throes of upheaval. You have shown sensitivity, courage and vision. You have overcome the, constraints of convention and given a new dynamism to your country and to its role in the world community.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I request you to drink a toast to the health and happiness of Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, and to friendship between India and Canada?

CANADA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No 1995 CANADA Mr. Trudeau's Reply

The Canadian Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, said in reply:

I have never before had the extreme pleasure of attending a State lunch in such beautiful surroundings. I want to thank you particularly, Prime Minister, for the warmth of your hospitality and for the very very pleasant way in which you have

received your Canadian guests. This is something which we cannot reciprocate when you come, as I hope you will, to visit us in Canada. We won't be able to provide this kind of lunch in January at any rate and to the compliment of the words. But I do want to say that in spite of that very obvious difference, there are many many similarities between our countries and I was delighted to hear you - not only point out many of the developments which we have in common, but to realise that even in the themes of your very warm welcoming speech to me, you dwelt on some of the subjects that I would want to touch upon briefly today.

I have not yet been in India three full days on this visit yet the ambience of this country is so insistent, the sensations so pervasive, that in this short time I have been impressed again with the wisdom, the perception and the devotion which are the heritage of this ageless land. Three days are so many grains of sand in the hourglass of a lifetime, but they have renewed for me many of my memories of India - and given me a glimpse of much that I had not seen before. Three days have left me, as on my previous visits, with an intense desire to return, to see and to learn what this society and those that have preceded it offer to the world beyond your shores

One need not journey to Arunachala to celebrate the triumph of light over darkness; that triumph is evident in many parts of India, and it is recorded in a variety of ways. The day before yesterday at Agra, Brindaban and Mathura and again at Sarnath I saw testimony of man's devotion to ideals so pure in concept that their appeal is eternal. And yesterday in Varanasi - and I expect this afternoon when I go to Nehru University - there is evidence of a different sort, evidence of a determination to employ technology and science for the betterment of the peoples of this great country.

If it is possible-to marry the ageless understanding of the East with the application of modern technology from the West, as I believe it is, then it may well be in India that the espousal will occur. Even if we in the West possessed no other activation or no other motivation for our economic assistance programmes, to which you referred in kind words, Madame Prime Minister, the repayment of the immerge legacy of wisdom, of art, of philosophy, of knowledge - those elements that distinguish civilised man from the savage-would by itself be more than sufficient reason to do what we can to share with you those skills with which we have been favoured by geography and circumstance. The immensity of the challenge - raising the economic base of the second most populous nation in the world - should no more deter us in our task than did the immensity of the task which faced, your philosophers and teachers and no more should it deter them in the pursuit of their goals. The material poverty of India in the 20th century is nothing as compared with the spiritual

3

and artistic poverty of much of the world in centuries past.

Our common task cannot be accomplished without cooperation, from both of us. In saying this, I do not underestimate the problem that faces you, Madame Prime Minister, of encouraging your peoples to improve their own lot, any more than you, I am sure, underestimate the problems that faces some Western leader in encouraging their electorates to support assistance programmes. The people of both our countries could benefit from an honest acceptance of the reality of the world as it is today and not as it was in yesteryear.

Amrita Pritam has written of the past; two of her lovely lines read:

"Thy eyes are heavy with dreams, Dreams of days gone by

Amrita would not ignore the past, any more than we would. But neither would she avoid the future. Nor should we. Both India and Canada must seek and benefit from the windows on the world which are

available to us. One of those windows is the Commonwealth. That unique association, possessing no structure and little of an institutional nature, permits us to meet to visit one another, and to exchange views on an entirely informal and frank basis. The Commonwealth is a product of man's desire to live in peace with his fellow inhabitants of this planet, and of his genius for pragmatic arrangement. I regard it as valuable and worth preserving.

In our partnership for development with India, Canada has learned, and is learning, much about the development process. To assist us in this respect we have recently created in Canada the International Development Research Centre which is designed to find answers to many developmental problems. It is an exciting project; the chairman is a man well known to India. He is my predecessor in office, the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson. His knowledge and understanding of the vital development process is supplemented in the Centre by the skills and experience of a number of experts from many parts of the world. Among them, I am happy to note, is a distinguished Indian, Mr. A. L. Diaz. Our common task is the transfer of resources, skills and technology, our goal is the acceleration of the developmental process and the avoidance of the costly errors and problems encountered by the industrialized nations in their laissez-faire experience. We have learned, as one important example of the heavy penalty for progress that many of us have paid in the form of environmental pollution; we have learned too, that this penalty is one that need not be paid.

Pollution is not a necessary by-product of industrialisation. Pollution is a matter of concern for all countries. On this planet this planet which we all share - there is an absolute limit to the available quantity of fresh water, pure air and the necessary elements for the recycling of oxygen. Should those quantities be overtaxed, either by the greed of thoughtless developed nations or by the ignorance of ambitious developing nations, the human race will be the loser. Without an understanding of this problem

and the assignment to its solution of the highest priority - all our development programmes will be for naught. We shall find that in our common quest for a better life we shall have poisoned the very biosphere upon which we depend for life.

Development, the new Commonwealth, pollution - these are all variations of a fundamental reality which faces all governments in all countries. That reality is as evident in New Delhi as it is in Ottawa. And you yourself, Madame Prime Minister, touched upon this this morning in our talks and here again today. I referred to "reality" called change. Whatever our political ideology, whatever our economic or social system, whatever our geographic location, the phenomenon which is common to all of us is change. I have not the slightest doubt that the decade which has just begun will be witness to more changes in most spheres of human activity than has any other decade in history. Changes of this order bring with them problems, and in most instances they are problems for governments.

Democracies offer every facility for change. Political and judicial processes are, or should be, geared for change. Yet in this turbulent age in which we live, nation

4

after nation is learning that these Processes are too slow, that the rate of expected change outpaces by far the rate of actual change. In that event, as in an electrical system designed in an older, less demanding time, the pressure of the new load becomes so intense that fuses blow and the apparatus breaks down. All too often the flash point is accompanied by violence. Violence is no stranger to this decade, either in my country as are have learned to our sorrow in recent weeks, or in yours from which has come the important lesson that ahimsa, nonviolence, is not weakness. In dealing with violence, governments must be firm, but never should they fall into the trap of the extremists and - through the employment of violence or counter-violence - inflame still further the activities of the dissidents.

The lesson given us by India is the lesson of attempting to understanding, of probing beyond the symptoms, of seeking out the root causes of dissatisfaction, and of administering to the basic illness.

It may well be that the violence which is so wide-spread in our time is a product of the mind; of the sub-conscious clash between the forces of desire and the forces of reaction. Should this be the case, then the solution will be found through a combination of factors; the comprehension of the East plus the technology of the West. Did not the Maitreya Upanishad point out more than 2000 years ago that the source of man's bondage and of his liberation are both in the mind?

Perhaps this will be the most important result of the cooperation of the East and the West that I mentioned a few moments ago. As partners in development we share the responsibilities for the success of our endeavours as we shall benefit from the dividends which success will bring. Measured in those term, our enterprise is as breathtaking in its scope as it is exciting in its concept. Our contributions are to a world order within which all nations, and all men, can live in freedom, dignity and decency.

To that end, Madame Prime Minister, I am confident that our most worthwhile talks this morning contributed. Thank you for your most generous hospitality, thank you for your gracious toast. May I respond by proposing a toast to you, kind lady, and to the people of India?

CANADA USA INDIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

Following are the relevant extracts from the statement of Sardar Swaran Singh. Minister of External Affairs and Leader of the Indian Delegation to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting at Singapore on January 15, 1971:

We in India have something at stake in saving the concept of the Commonwealth. It was a conscious decision by Jawaharlal Nehru to remain in the Commonwealth even after India became a Republic. His was a vision of a multi-racial group of nations belonging to every creed, every colour and every continent. It would pain us greatly if the fruitful results of this vision were to be shattered.

It is in this spirit of preserving the basic principles and the unity of the Commonwealth that we wholeheartedly support the Draft Declaration presented by the distinguished President of Zambia. We believe that this Draft Declaration will strengthen the ideals and basic concepts which are fundamental to the very existence

5

and the continuance of the Commonwealth It would, therefore, be fit and proper if such a Declaration and may I suggest we call it the Singapore Declaration - were to issue unanimously from this forum of free association of 31 sovereign independent countries that are happy to belong to the Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. Chairman, we are against the use of force or violence, but as Mahatma Gandhi said violence is bad, slavery is worse. It is because of the feeble character and ineffective nature of the sanctions applied against Rhodesia, South Africa and Portugal that they have the audacity to flout the will of the vast majority of people in Southern Africa. We cannot, therefore,

blame the people of this area if they are forced to resort to arms in order to gain freedom and to liberate themselves from racial oppression and colonial domination.

We would respectfully suggest that it is only by denying support to such racist regimes that we can turn the struggle for liberation of Southern Africa into a peaceful one: otherwise the danger of bloody wars will increase.

We are glad, Mr. Chairman, that the Commonwealth has given lead in the process of de-colonialisation. We are, however, perturbed by the emergence of a new type of colonialism through which the big and more powerful countries are seeking to dominate the smaller and weaker countries through economic and military influence. Some call it neocolonialism. By whatever name we may call it, the fact remains that od theories of spheres of influence and balance of power are being revived in new shapes and forms. The powerful make their presence felt in many ways and thus attempt to enlarge their sphere of influence. The extension of their military commitment to new areas inevitably attracts counteraction by other powers. The limited wars which we have witnessed in the last 25 years are the consequence of such policies.

It is a matter of regret and concern that there are as yet, no signs of a resolution of the war in Indo-China. It is indeed unfortunate that the people of Cambodia, who were maintaining a delicate balance between the protagonists in Vietnam, have willy-nilly been drawn into this terrible conflict. There can be no military solution of the problems of Indo-China. There has to be, sooner or later, a peaceful negotiated political settlement and no military treaties by either side are going to resolve this conflict.

Instead of Vietnamizing the war, would it not be much better to Vietnamize the peace? It is our considered assessment based on our contacts with all the parties concerned, that there can be a political settlement in South Vietnam beginning with the formation of a broad-based coalition government comprising all elements and followed by free elections supervised by an international commission. There can be no free elections as long as foreign troops are there. It is, therefore, imperative that all foreign forces must be withdrawn from Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam, beginning with those of the U.S.A. who have the largest contingent of foreign forces there. There must be a deadline for the withdrawal of all foreign forces and phased withdrawal can be arranged under the supervision of an international commission.

A solution of the Vietnam problem is essential to solve the problem of Laos and Cambodia as well. The three are interlinked. We believe that a solution can be found within the broad framework of the Geneva Accords leaving the peoples of Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam free to determine their destinies and to choose the form of government they want without any outside interference. We must begin to turn our thoughts from war to peace and think of the challenges we will have to face in the post-war period in Indo-China.

Some three years ago our Prime
Minister had suggested that the states of
Indo-China should have their neutrality,
independence, sovereignty and territorial
Integrity ensured by an agreement or convention subscribed to by the Great Powers,
including China as well as by other countries
in the region. We are happy that this concept is gaining greater support amongst
various countries in the region. We hope
that the successful neutralization of IndoChina and the elimination of great power
rivalry in South-East Asia will enable us to

6 undertake the great task of building up this war-ravaged region.

While sovereign, independent countries are free to enter into any arrangements they wish to safeguard their security, what we are anxious to avoid in our region is any rivalry or military competition between the great powers. Military alliances con-

cluded in the context of the great power conflict only create a false sense of security and increase tension by giving rise to counter military alliances. It is for this reason that we would wish to see great power co-operation with the countries of the region in the building up of this area rather than great power rivalry and military competition.

We cannot but view with regret and concern that the power game has arrived in the Indian Ocean, until now a peaceful region of the world. Step by step, the Indian Ocean might now be transformed into an arena of great power rivalry and tension, much to the detriment of the interest of the littoral states, who are far more concerned over the growth of South African military power than of any hypothetical Soviet threat.

At Lusaka, the Non-Aligned States of the world including in their ranks a majority of the littoral states, issued an appeal urging the great powers to remove their bases and presence from the area, leaving it an area of peace. We hope that that appeal will not go unheeded.

We are unable to agree with Britain's reported decision to set up military bases and presences at strategic points in the Indian Ocean area, including her most recent decisions to instal jointly with the U.S.A. certain facilities at Diego Garcia. As it will effect not only our own security but that of the littoral states in the Indian Ocean, the philosophy behind the decision is to our mind, obsolescent.

To deploy power to watch over British interests spread out over a wide area is not the best way to guarantee them. The old correlation between power and stability has been largely disestablished as power by itself no longer commands obedience or guarantees security. On the contrary, as we know, power moves of one side provoke power moves by the other, and there is a rapid escalation of rivalry and tension in the power-invested region. The days of domination or leadership by any power or

group of powers, however great or powerful, are over. Not even the smallest independent country in the world today is prepared to mortgage its sovereignty and independence to the greatest power. We believe that the concept of leadership should give place to the concept of equality and partnership.

The people of India are wedded to the concept of peace and democracy. Democracy may appear to be a slower process in the short run. It is a surer and more lasting process in the long run. We have brought about a silent and peaceful revolution in a democratic way. However, we are still facing tremendous problems because of the size of our population and the hopes and aspirations that democracy and freedom have aroused in their minds. Our people are in a hurry. They want the fulfilment of the promises that democracy and freedom held for them. We believe that our own struggle for independence was but a part of the larger struggle for freedom and independence of the whole colonial world.

We hope that the Commonwealth will give a lead to the rest of the world in building bridges, narrowing gaps and bringing about equality and freedom to all peoples of the world, irrespective of their creed or colour.

7

INDIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA ZAMBIA SOUTH AFRICA CHINA CAMBODIA VIETNAM LAOS SWITZERLAND

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FIJI

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in Honour of Prime Minister of Fiji

Following is the text of the speech made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at a dinner in honour of the Prime Minister of Fiji, Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, and Adi Lady Lala Mara at Rashtrapati Bhavan on January 29, 1971:

It gives me very great pleasure to welcome the Prime Minister of Fiji, his charming wife and the rest of his party to Delhi. The Prime Minister is not a stranger to us. I believe this is his fourth visit to our country but even in the short time since his last visit much has happened in his country and ours. When I was at the United Nations a few months ago I had the privilege and the pleasure of welcoming Fiji as the youngest member of the United Nations.

Independence is a tremendous thing to achieve. But there is no doubt that it is a first step, that it opens the doors of opportunity, but it also attracts new challenges. Each one of us who has passed through this door knows that them is tremendous satisfaction but the road is a very long and difficult one. You have, if I may say so, started off exceedingly well by knitting together all the different people and different races who live on your islands so that you have a solid foundation of stability, peace and cooperation. This is what we are trying to achieve here. I think, by and large, we have achieved it even though quite often we have quarrels amongst us and what are known as fissiparous tendencies make themselves evident. But as you have probably noticed underneath it is a strong base of Indian unity and a feeling of Indianness regardless of what religion one may belong to or what part of the country one may come from or what language one may speak.

You and we share this great problem of bringing a better life to our people. Much has to be done to catch up with lost time, much has to be done because the other countries are racing very fast indeed and as one of the characters in Alice in Wonderland said sometimes you have to run fast merely to stay in the same place. This is how we find ourselves because if we stop

for an instant we find that everything else has moved on ahead.

We wish you well in your attempts for the progress and development of your islands. We are not a rich country. As you know we take help from others and yet we do give help to others also because we believe that in this world, which we hope will one day be one-world, it is necessary for people to help one another and especially for countries who are developing to be strong internally and to have good relations with other countries because only then can they face up to their difficulties and make their contribution to world peace. We have always believed that freedom, progress, peace - all these are indivisible. That is, if there is tension in one place, it has a reaction in other places. That is our main interest in working for peace amongst all nations. We know also that where there are great differences, there is tension within the country or internationally and that is why our attempt has been to support those policies and those steps which would reduce these very big differences. We did not always succeed but nevertheless we feel that we must do what is right and sometimes. of course, it succeeds also.

So I would like to say how happy we are to have you amongst us. We are glad that you could see at least the end of our Republic Week Celebrations and share our happiness at this great event which happened just 21 years ago. We wish you well in your endeavours and we shall be glad to help you in any way we can to bring greater happiness and greater prosperity to all sections of the people in Fiji. So, I welcome you here on my own behalf and on behalf of the Government of India and on behalf of the people of this country.

Ladies and Gentlemen, may I request you to drink a toast to the health and happiness of the Prime Minister of Fiji, Lady Mara and to friendship between the two countries? **Date**: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FIJI

Reply by Sir Kamisese Mara

Following is the text of the speech made by Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara in reply to the toast proposed by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi:

May I first of all thank you very much indeed for your kind words of welcome? I would like to thank you also for the hospitality which has been extended.

As you have stated, Madam Prime Minister, I have already been here before and this is actually my fourth visit, three of which have been official visits. I have learnt since to take your hospitality in small doses. There are many reasons why I am so pleased to have this opportunity of thanking you and the Government and people of India for the kindness that has been extended to Fiji.

First of all, I would like to thank you for the guidance and help that you and your Ministers have extended to us during our move towards Independence. We have had several visits from your officials and your Ministers. You will recall, Madam, it was during one of my unofficial visits to India, when I passed through as a transit passenger, that I had the privilege and honour of meeting you in Kaula Lumpur. You gave me the privilege of seeing you the next day after the dinner that was given in your honour, and you asked me what you could do to help, and if you remember, Madam, I said: "I Was so impressed by your

speech last night and your advice to the Indian population of Malaysia that I only wish that message could be given to our people." And it was through that that Mr. jaisukh Lai Hathi came over and saw our people. And if our passage towards Independence has been smooth and a happy one, no less credit should be given to you and your people and your Ministers who have come to help us. We would also like to take this opportunity of thanking you for providing facilities for the education of our citizens. Many have been here before, many are here and I am sure many Will be here. It is for this reason that I would also like to thank you, not only for the Indian community who have made Fiji their home and they have enriched our culture by bringing in their own culture and they have of course helped a great deal in helping the economic development of our country - that we are looking forward in the dawn of our Independence towards a prosperous future. We know that already in the very short months that we have experienced the burdens of Independence.

In the visit to the United Nations which you referred to, Madam, I remember stating that the experience of Independence to us - and that was only a few days since we had our Independence - was not unlike getting out of the compartment of a jet airliner. Firstly you have the heady experience of a fresh air, secondly the cautious step down to earth; thirdly the helping hands of friends who would like to help and fourthly perhaps a place in the rat race.

However, as you said, Madam it is a joyful experience, also a stabilising experience. It is the responsibility that makes one feel cautious and think twice in every step that one has to take. And this is the experience we have already learnt. My ear catches the laughter of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. S. M. Koya, whom I have brought with me and he may be wondering like many here, why I have brought him here. It is not because I fear any coup while I am away. But it is an acknowledgement, Madam, for the role that he had played, the constructive role he had played in helping our country to move smoothly into Inde-

pendence. Our Constitution reflects that. Many parts of it require the cooperation of both the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. And I felt that when I was invited to come to your country, the first thing that came to my mind was to accept it in gratitude for all that you have done, and combined with it I felt that I should also bring the Leader of the Opposition who and his party had helped me and my party to make our move towards Independence a smooth and happy one. We, I believe I may be speaking for the Leader of the Opposition but politics is politics and I have

9

my own reservations, have the same objective in our country and that is to try and make people of all races and culture to live together in harmony, quarrel perhaps even, without violence, and work together for the good of all people so that we can find peace in the quiet and peaceful country that are in the middle of Pacific.

May 1, in conclusion, ask our members to raise their glasses and drink a toast to the Prime Minister and the Government and people of India?

FIJI INDIA USA MALAYSIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Indo-French Protocol Signed

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on the protocol on French credits to India for 1970 - 1971, signed in Paris on January 21, 1971:

A protocol on French credits to India for 1970-71 was signed in Paris on Thursday, January 21, 1971. The credits amount to 157.7 million Francs (Rs. 21.29 crores) and include 27.7 million Francs (Rs. 3.74 crores) for debt relief. The credits also include a loan of 75 million Francs to finance projects; 55 million Francs have been earmarked for the purchase of light equipment, semi-finished products, steel, chemicals, etc. Half the loan will be in the form of low interest Government credits while the other half will be guaranteed bank credits.

The protocol was signed on behalf of India by Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and on behalf of France by a representative of the French Finance Ministry.

FRANCE INDIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GUYANA

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner in Honour of Mr. Burnham

Speaking at a dinner given in honour of Mr. Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, Prime Minister of the Republic of Guyana, and Mrs. Viola Burnham, in New Delhi on January 28, 1971, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi said:

It gives me very great pleasure to welcome the Prime Minister and his party. We are happy to have them amongst us and we remember when Mr. Prime Minister was here with us last, many years ago in 1953. Much has happened in your country since then and a great deal has happened in our country. Before Independence, your

country was known as the Eldorado of European region and long long ago our country was attracting philosophers, explorers, merchants, seamen and all kinds of people from all over the world. But then we both came under colonialism and shared various experiences. We shared the experience of fighting for our independence and that was when you had first been here, and we shared your anxiety and we wished you well even then. Now you are trying to take your country forward. You are bringing together the different races, which have found their way in Guyana from different parts of the world. And we know

10

that whether the country is big or small, it always has great problems. And our own experience tells us that the more you solve the problems, the more new problems there are to solve. And I do not think one ever comes to the end of problems or even difficulties. We can only hope that as we go along, we gain more experience and strength to face them and to solve them.

You have come to India at rather an exciting time because I am one of those who believe that the very fact of development and growth in a country like India is an exciting adventure. But like all adventures, it has its difficulties, and in India the growth, the development and the changes which are taking place have aroused tremendous hopes in our people and along with them great impatience, because they say that things can be done, they wonder why they are not done faster and why they do not reach out to more people. This is what we are attempting to do to make freedom more real to all of our people. Freedom can have meaning only if it brings more welfare, more education, more opportunity and also does something for the inner man-not only for his basic material needs.

The world is changing fast and we are having difficulty keeping up with all these changes. But there are certain basic things which remain the same and I hope that

India will always remain wedded to the concept of tolerance, of brotherhood, of friendship and cooperation. This has been the foundation of our policy at home and abroad and I believe we share these ideals with you.

I am looking forward to our talks with you tomorrow. We have met recently - not very recently but some months ago - in Lusaka where we had useful discussions, and before that I have the most pleasant memories of the very warm and delightful reception you gave to me and my party when we were in Guyana. We hope that you will glimpse something of the changes which are coming about in India and how they are affecting the people as a whole.

We have a great deal in common and many differences also between our two countries. But I hope that the friendship between us will be strong and will deepen with every new contact and with every visit. We specially hope that Mrs. Burnham, your charming and very accomplished wife who is with you on this trip, will have some time to see other things that are happening in India, not merely what Heads of State like to see. Both of you and other members of your party are very welcome. We want to tell you that India has looked forward to your visit. We are glad you are with us. We hope you will have a pleasant and enjoyable stay and get a feeling of the friendship which we have for your people and that you will take back with you pleasant memories of your very brief stay in India.

May I ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen, to drink to the Prime Minister of Guyana and Mrs. Burnham and to lasting friendship between our two countries?

GUYANA INDIA USA ZAMBIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

Reply by Mr. Burnham

Replying to the toast proposed by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Mr. Burnham said:

It seems to me that there was some fortuitous connection between India and the part of the world from which I come. I have read in good old history books that Columbus discovered our part of the world in an attempt to find a new route to India and that is why we call it the West Indies. But apart from the fortuitous connection there is closer ties between our countries and the great land of India in that a large part of our population consists of descendents people who were originally from India and who have been playing a most important role in our historical, our economic and our political development over the years.

Well, then India has another, and to my mind, a deeper significance to us in Guyana. India as I had learnt in school, as every school boy knows, led the struggle of

11

her freedom during the late nineteenth - earlier perhaps - up to the middle of the 20th century. In Guyana when I was still at school I was familiar with names like Mahatma Gandhi, Nehru - the distinguished father of a distinguished daughter-Rabindranath Tagore and a number of others. I do not want to show off in my familiarity with your great people. We were at a much lower stage of political development in Guyana, or British Guinea as it used to be called at that time. But your heroes were our heroes, your cause was our cause and I still think one of the greatest experience I have had was that I was present in some part of Europe in 1947 attending the international meeting of students and had the privilege of seconding the resolution sending congratulations to the people of India upon having achieved independence.

But India has not merely been a source of inspiration in that respect to myself and my erstwhile colleague, Dr. Jagan. India was the source of solace, comfort and encouragement. Well, I recall vividly when we together visited this country approximately 18 years ago, it was the only country where having been deposed - we still think wrongly and unjustly especially when we consider what they are failing to do in Rhodesia today - it was the only country where the unfortunates found any real friendship and it was a source of great comfort and happiness to find that we were welcomed and we were given advice by the late Jawaharlal Nehru and a number of other persons.

We have also watched what India has been doing in the field of international relations. The adumbration of the concept of nonalignment and neutralism as distinct from neutrality, we have admired the role that this country has been playing in the world and naturally it has been a source of great pleasure to us because we felt as if we ourselves were doing, what India, the leader of our section of the world was doing. Naturally India has problems and I am sure that the Prime Minister would not be Prime Minister if she did not have problems. I think we Prime Ministers have a knack of attracting problems and hope to enjoy the satisfaction of thinking that we have solved them, before we die. But in spite of the problems which India has there can be no doubt that it is blessed with a government, with a Prime Minister, who would tackle the problems with verve, with vigour and definitely leaving a name to point many a moral and to adorn many a tale.

I have noted the great strides in physical terms which India has made since I last visited her as a young boy. Now I am an old man. My grey hair has become a little more obvious, at least that is what my wife told me this morning - these wives make sometime flattering observations - but, I suppose, that is their democratic right. And

I want to congratulate the Government and the people of India. I always liked to be kind to the ladies and after I heard that there was going to be an election in India very shortly I asked my Minister of State to get in contact with the Government of India through the Indian High Commission in George Town and to offer to postpone my acceptance of the very kind invitation to be here. I understand the very gallant lady would have nothing to do with the postponement and insisted that we should come along and see India again. I am most grateful not only for the invitation, not only for the warmth of the welcome and the hospitality, but I am most appreciative of the gallantry shown by the Prime Minister and the fact that she has been prepared to take time off from a busy schedule to play host to representatives of so small a country as Guyana. She did remark on her visit to Guyana and perhaps it is poetic justice that I should be returning her visit a few weeks before her election because that is what she did to me in November of 1968 but I can assure her that it was purely fortutious and not a matter of design.

We in Guyana recall the impressions which she left on all the peoples of Guyana. We recall the stories that were told by the people who just had a glimpse of the Prime Minister, by people who were merely able to touch her or to grab some of the flowers she threw to the children, to her admirers. Hers is a name which is remembered most fondly in Guyana. That is as it should be, for she has many reasons to justify it. One is the charm which she showed when she was there, the interest which she showed and that struck me particularly because she

12

came to us after a long and tiring trip in Latin America, the interest which she showed in people, her willingness to stop over and to speak to the crowds when they were pressing. That is one reason why it should be automatic that she should be remembered but if she would forgive me she is also remembered very fondly as a daughter of one of Guyana's greatest

heroes - the late Pandit Nehru. In Guyana he is not only a household word, his name is not only a household word but we feel that he is one of us and that is why this afternoon when I visited the Nehru Memorial Museum I was bound to remark that he belonged not merely to India but to the world. In my conceit and chauvinism I was tempted to say that he belonged peculiarly to Guyana.

There is yet another reason why the Prime Minister is remembered in. Guyana. The fact that she is Prime Minister of India with which we have so many ties not merely of blood but ties of goals, concepts, objectives. India is a country to which I say unblushingly we look to for leadership amongst the developing nations who are seeking to fashion for themselves a new way of life and a better life for their people, who are seeking to remove themselves from the tallons so to speak of those birds of prey which we sometimes describe as the 'big powers' seeking to draw into their respective orbits, seeking to make us satellites of theirs.

In those circumstances, may I say what an honour I, my dear wife and the rest of my delegation consider it to have been able to pay what for us is all too short a visit? But you know there are problems of Heads of Governments being away too long. We are very glad and happy that we have been able to pay this visit. We are thrilled by the old friendship which we have been able to identify again. We look forward to even closer relationship between our two countries. We are small, it is true, but we still think that there can be relations between India and Guyana to the mutual benefit and advantage of both nations.

Would you ask me or would you agree with me, therefore, those of you who do not have the good fortune to be permanent residents in India, those of you who suffer from the disadvantage of coming from the small nation of Guyana to rise and drink a toast to the gallant, the charming and the dynamic leader of the people of India, the Prime Minister of India?

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Message on Republic Day

The President, Shri V. V. Giri, broadcast on January 25, 1971 the following message to the Notion on the eve of the Republic Day:

Tomorrow will commence the twenty-second year of our Republic, and as the Nation prepares to celebrate the Day, I offer my warm greetings and good wishes to my comrades, my fellow citizens, throughout India and abroad. Our democracy is on the eve of yet another milestone in its progress. In the next two days, notifications will issue calling upon our people to choose their representatives for the Lok Sabha, that supreme body to which the Government of the day is made responsible under our Constitution.

The most important sanction for the existence, and survival, of a parliamentary democracy is free and fair elections. A parliamentary democracy derives its strength, and authority, from the will of the people in whom resides the sovereign power to choose the Government. India has rightly been described as the largest democracy in the world. Our electorate, it is estimated, is now around 275 million. It

13

has been a matter of pride to us that our electoral machinery has earned a reputation for the observance of the highest standards of impartiality and integrity. This is, equally, a tribute to every single voter, man or woman, who constitutes our vast electorate. Other countries have complimented us for the orderly and peaceful manner of our elections.

Adult suffrage has come to stay in India, and the citizen's, vote today is considered a most cherished right. I would appeal to all the voters, and to the political parties who play such a vital role in the elections, to totally eschew bitterness or violence, or abuse of the human person in their election campaigns. There is virtue in preserving good conduct. Let it not be said even of a single individual that he subordinated himself to base instincts which may prove destructive of a harmonious society.,

In the days of our struggle for freedom Gandhiji gave us the direction: "I shall work for an India in which the poorest shall feel that it is their country in whose making they have an effective voice; an India in which there shall be no high class and low class of people; an India in which all communities shall live in perfect harmony." This direction has as much relevance today as when Gandhiji gave it long years ago. Our Constitution has committed the State to promote the welfare of the people by securing, and protecting effectively, a social order in which justice, social, economic and political shall inform all the institutions of the national life. In a vast country like ours, steps for bringing about, and preserving a better social order have to be a continuous and continuing process. Its problems and its challenges, particularly with persisting poverty and growing unemployment, constantly remind us that we all have a job to do and to do it well. Economic distress cannot be solved by political adjustments. What is needed is an earnest desire and a dedicated will to do good; and do it in such a way that those who are in greater need, those sections of the community who are less favourably placed, receive the highest attention.

The material resources are not the

exclusive property of any class or group of people. They have to be at the disposal of the wider family of man which constitutes the Nation. Wide social and economic cleavages among a people and the accompanying inequalities of welfare and opportunity will hinder the progress of any nation. Real progress towards greater equality should concern the masses of the poor people.

We achieved independence by establishing a tradition of disciplined political cooperation and collective responsibility. We gave the parliamentary system a meaning and a purpose which have helped us to preserve it. Since Independence, a new generation of young men and women has grown up in our country. Their horizons and perspectives are naturally different from those, of the older generations. They are impatient because they find that the response to their urges and needs is not quick enough. This is a point of view which cannot be overlooked. It is they who will be the leaders, administrators and statesmen of tomorrow

In the building of a better and more prosperous India, we have insisted on peaceful and orderly methods. We are respected in the comity of Nations because we are recognised as a peace-loving people. While we seek friendly cooperation from all countries and value their association, we do not tie ourselves to the ideology of the one or the other. We believe in universal human freedom, not based on the supremacy of any particular class, but on the freedom of the common man everywhere and the fullest opportunities for him to develop.

On the solemn and joyous occasion of the celebration of the Republic Day, I invite every citizen of our great country to rededicate himself to the cause of national consolidation, not as a goal or as a me-re aim, but as the visible expression of achievement and fulfilment. Jai Hind. **Date**: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

President Girl's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Nyerere

Following is the text of the Speech made by the President, Shri V. V. Giri, at a banquet given by him in honour of President Nyerere of Tanzania at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi on January 23, 1971:

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

it is my great privilege to welcome you, Mr. President, and your eminent colleagues on behalf of the Government and people of India in these formal surroundings. You have been with us only a short while, but you have captivated ours hearts, and we feel that we have amongst us friends of long standing. Your presence with us tonight cannot but recall in the minds of many of us the fact that the story of our freedom traces its prophetic beginnings to Africa. It was in South Africa that the Father of our Nation, Mahatma Gandhi, first raised the banner of protest against the indignity of racial discrimination; and it was there that he forged the weapon Of 'Satyagraha' - non-violent cooperation which eventually shook a great Empire, and led to India's independence. This was but the beginning of the end of modern colonialism, and the emancipation of Asia and of much of Africa followed.

Mr. president, we remember with high

esteem the great role that you Yourself

played in the freedom struggle of your country. We applaud the example you have set in seeking to forge in harmony a society comprising different racial groups and religious communities, all enjoying equality under the rule of law.

Like the men revered by our people, in times ancient, as well as, nearer now, you represent in your person the ideals of simple living and principled action. We therefore understand well, Mr. President, now it is that your people acclaim you a Mwalimu, respected teacher. We salute you as the hero of your country's independence as the courageous embodiment of resurgent Africa, and as a great son of our century.

Mr. President, I spoke of the story of emancipation of peoples. There is no need for us to be reminded that the last chapters in this story have yet to be written, and that this will not have been accomplished until all pockets of colonialism and neocolonialism have been erased from the face of the earth. Freedom is indeed indivisible, and racial inequality and colonial domination are an affront to the spirit of man. Nowhere today are these basic truths so contemptuously disregarded as in white-ruled Southern Africa. There, the pernicious doctrine of apartheid and the corrupting practice of racial discrimination flourish unchecked, and there a small minority imposes with brutal force, and let it be noted, in the name of civilisation, its cruel will on the majority population.

In your continent, the story of freedom will not be complete until the people of South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea, Bissau become free to shape their destinies. Mr. President, I believe that there is such full accord between our Governments on these issues of human dignity and equality that there is no need to elaborate. You are aware that independent India it was that pioneered in the United Nations and other forums the international voice of protest against apartheid; and of the sustained fervour with which since then she has joined her efforts

to those of civilised humanity against the evils of racial intolerance and colonial domination. You are aware that the Government of India considers it important that in every field her relations, or shall I say, non-relations, with South Africa and the illegal regime of Rhodesia, should conform in letter and in spirit to the requirements of the decisions of the United Nations. Today, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights may

15

well be said to be a list of rights which nonwhites are being denied in Southern Africa-None in our wide world with any claim to sensibility or civilization can attempt an extenuation of the inequity that is the order of the day in South Africa. The fact, however presses on us today, Mr. President, that important and powerful interests are continuing to afford succour and sustenance to those entrenched in power in South Africa. We are not impressed with the torrent of pleas that emanates in justification from those interests. The Scripture-, warn that by their fruits it is that ye shall know them. The people of Africa and many others well know the fruits of these policies.

Mr. President, many are the endeavours and the objectives in which our Governments and peoples find themselves in close concord. We are agreed on the fundamental principles of international life, namely, non-alignment in the politics of military power blocks, non-intervention in internal affairs, respect for sovereignty, equality and territorial integrity. These our views are rooted not in an exclusive regard for narrow national interests, but in our conviction that they alone represent the surest basis for lasting international peace, goodwill and understanding.

We welcome recent developments in the world scene which would indicate that the champions of ideological war are retreating from their extreme postures. We take good note of the avenues opened to mankind because agreed limitation of some of the deadliest weapons ever conceived is close to coming within the range of possibility, even

as a sequel to fear of overkill capacity. Nevertheless, the gaping chasm that we discern in man's achievement is that having reached the stars, he has yet to learn that wisdom lies in fellowship, and in the eradication of man's own inhumanity to fellow man. When affluence and poverty together stride the world, peace and stability cannot but be insecure. Powerful nations by choosing to limit expenditure on arms can assist crucially in levelling the gap between the rich and the poor of the world.

Mr. President, your country and mine need to work against time to catch up the leeway of decades of stagnation, to make up for the wasted years of alien rule., our deep concern in these aspects of the world situation stems from our great need and none need regard our stance as lacking in appreciation of the valuable assistance received from friendly States abroad, or as arising from ecstatic expectations without self-exertion and effort.

Our Governments are committed to raising the lot of the common man, and of ensuring conditions in our societies under which opportunity and reward for all will flow from the equality of men. We in India have travelled on this road for some years

Mr. President, we stand ready to extend to your Government in the fullest measure that our experience, our resources and our technology permit, our cooperation, in ways that may be found to be of value for the planned development of your country. You need no persuasion that our cooperation will be based on our deep respect for your country and our ardent desire for its prosperity.

Mr. President, independent India has unreservedly commended to persons of Indian origin living abroad that they must needs share-the travails no less than enjoy the glories of their lands of adoption. None need question their desire to preserve their religio-cultural traditions, but the lands of their adoption must hold primary place in their hearts. Those who have followed this path in your country, Mr. President, are now your people, and we have no doubt that they

will find full opportunity to contribute to the progress and prosperity of Tanzania.

Mr. President, it is not open to us to rewrite history. But our Governments are determined to reshape the pattern of our societies. On behalf of the Government and people of India, I wish you success and good fortune in the tasks that, you have set in your country. On behalf of the Government and people of India, and on my own behalf, I send our warmest greetings to the people of Tanzania.

May I request you, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, to join me now in raising your glasses to the good health and happiness of President Julius Nyerere, and of his distinguished colleagues, and to the evergrowing friendship and fraternity between Tanzania and India?

16

TANZANIA INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA NAMIBIA ZIMBABWE ANGOLA GUINEA GUINEA-BISSAU

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

Reply by President Nyerere

Replying to the toast proposed by the President, Shri V. V. Giri, President Nyerere said:

Mr. President, Madam Prime Minister, Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of my colleagues and myself, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and your countrymen, for the warm welcome we have received in India, and for the kindness - and relevance - of your remarks this evening. The kindness, Mr. President, refers to the things you said about myself; when I speak of relevance and truth I am referring to the rest of your remarks!

This is the first visit to India for many of us, but we have, of course, had a great deal of contact with India's representatives elsewhere. Indeed, we come straight from. the Commonwealth Conference at Singapore, where India's distinguished Foreign Minister, and his colleagues, have been upholding the policies - and the honour - of this Republic in a manner which has won great admiration. But this is only the latest of much Indian-Tanzanian cooperation, and contacts of many different kinds. In particular, Mr. President, we remember the visit to Dar-es-Salaam of the lady who is now the Prime Minister of India. I am not a prophet, and did not at that time anticipate the office she would later hold. I must say, however, that we were nontheless impressed by her - both as a person, and as a superb representative of a sister Republic.

But the links between India and Tanzania are of very much longer standing than that. Before the independence of either nation, they existed; indeed our history suggests that there was contact between Indians and the peoples of East Africa before either of our areas was colonised. Yet it was during East Africa's colonial period that contacts between our two countries became institutionalised. Both of us were 'used' for the benefit of the colonial power; joint activity and cooperation was imposed on our peoples.

But although peoples from this sub-continent were brought to East Africa for the purposes of Europe, I think it is fair to say - and now possible to say! - that both of us received some incidental advantage. Certainly we in Tanzania did so. For although the main Tanzanian railway lines were built while my country was occupied by the Germans, Indian people still found themselves involved in its construction. And peoples from what is now this Republic were

active in commerce and trade while mainland Tanzania was still being subdued by its first coloniser.

Since the independence, first of India, and later of Tanzania, the ties between us have been changing in form. As you, Mr. President, have just indicated, they are now developing according to our deliberate choice, and for our actual benefit. On the personnel level, Tanzania's economic development has been assisted both by Tanzanians of Indian descent, and by Indian citizens. The comparative advantage in education and job training opportunities which our brown citizens had enjoyed during colonial days has, in very many cases, now been put to public service; and in addition we have received valuable help from Indian citizens who have been working in our country for a long time. Indeed, as I have said many times before, the 1967 nationalisation of our banks succeeded in large part because of the work - and the loyalty of these people.

We have also had technical aid - and valuable aid - from India. Not only in the fields I have mentioned, but also in the expansion of our cottage and small scale industry activities, and in the running of our nationalised Insurance Corporation. I would like to express our appreciation for this assistance. It is a practical example of the value of cooperation between developing countries - and a refutation of the notion that we must always look to Europe or America for ideas and practical assistance.

Further possibilities of cooperation, over a wide range of activities, became clear

in our very good and useful official talks this morning. I was extremely pleased to find that these confirmed my long standing belief that Tanzania could use India's experience, to its own great benefit, and that India is very willing to help us to do so.

On trade too, we must look more into the possibilities of working together. Many

of the things which Tanzania is accustomed to buying in Europe may be obtainable from those developing countries - like India - which are some steps ahead of us in economic development.

What our desire for increased cooperation means in practical terms must be worked out by our respective experts - and no doubt both sides will do a lot of hard bargaining about prices, terms, qualities, and so on. Yet I believe we must undertake this work, and that it will bring mutual benefit if we adhere to the precept - commerce with morality'. And we must succeed.

For it is no use the underdeveloped nations just complaining about the domination of the rich countries in the world economy. We have to work among ourselves to see how the Third World can he made a little more self-reliant: This does not imply any desire that we-should isolate ourselves from the rest of the world, any more than Tanzania's domestic policies of socialism and self-reliance mean an isolation from all other countries. It simply means recognising that the poor are the ones who are concerned with their poverty, and who have the responsibility of advancing themselves.

I believe this is particularly relevant to economic relations between Tanzania and India. For trade between us has no canal - open or closed - to pass through, and it does not have to pass near any hostile power or naval base. We must treat the Indian Ocean as the link it can be, not the barrier others would like it to be.

It is true, of course, that the need for unity of action by the poor nations is becoming increasingly recognised. In the UNCTAD Conferences, the group of nations which has become known as the 77 have worked together. Our success was limited, but it was sufficient to indicate the strength we could have if we really acted as a united group. But that is not enough; our cooperation there was achieved - and to some extent maintained - in terms of confron-

tation with the rich. The Non-Aligned Conference at Lusaka provided evidence of an increasing awareness that we must do more than that. The Indian Prime Minister's speech was an important contributory factor to this awareness, and I hope that we shall succeed in following up the various points which she, and others, made there.

Mr. President, a long speech from me would be no proper return for the kindness I have been shown since my arrival in your country. And in any case, many of the things which it might have been appropriate for me to say about our common international policies on non-alignment, human equality and anti-colonialism, have been said very effectively by you this evening. Let me just add, therefore, that we in Tanzania do appreciate the great lead which has been given by India in all these matters; this nation's international record shows that the Indian Government is determined to avoid the first of the sins listed by Mahatma Gandhi - that of polities without principle. I could wish that his teaching in this matter - as in others - was more widely adopted by the nations of the world. As it is, we can only try to spread the application of this truth by the force of our example. I believe it is because both of our nations endeavour to do this, that there is a great deal of cooperation between India and Tanzania in international activities for the support of human rights in Africa and elsewhere.

Finally, Mr. President, I must say that the people of Tanzania much appreciate the fact that we have been able to continue with our planned visit, despite our expectation of some inevitable preoccupation by India's leaders with more domestic affairs. On this, I will only say that we are all politicians, and we would be very loathe to get in the way of an election. Which is not the same thing, Mr. President, as saying that we are uninterested in this event, or in the choice which the Indian people will shortly be making.

Yet we believe that India, above all, knows that the future lies with those people who are able to unite for common purposes, and who are able to keep tribal, language, and religious links to their proper spheres, without allowing them to be used to separate man from man. And in that belief we put our trust. For India's unity, her stability and her democracy, are of vital importance to the progress of humanity - and particularly so to the peoples of Africa avid Latin America who are searching for unity across national boundaries.

Mr. President, I thank you, and hope you will allow me also to propose a toast:

To the President of India, and to the unity and progress of all this nation's people.

TANZANIA INDIA USA ZAMBIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

President Nyerere's Farewell Speech

Following is the text Of the farewell speech made by President Nyerere On January 27, 1971 at the conclusion of his six-day State visit to India:

Although our stay has been very short, my colleagues and I have gained a great deal from this visit to India. The talks with India's leaders were very useful indeed, and will, I believe, lead to even greater cooperation between our two countries in the coming years. Further, we had an opportunity to glimpse both the problems of this country, and the progress which is being made in overcoming them. I can only say

that we were most impressed and believe that we can learn a great deal from India's experience and achievements.

We were fortunate also that our stay coincided with the magnificent celebrations of Republic Day. This enabled us to see something of the great diversity and the great potential of India. It also meant that we could, on behalf of Tanzania, join with the people of this country in their rejoicing and in their prayers for peace, progress and unity in the coming years.

I am extremely sorry, however, that it has become necessary for me to return to Tanzania earlier than had originally been planned and thus to miss the interesting visits to Bangalore, Poona and Bombay, which had been prepared for us. I hope that the leaders and people of those areas will accept our sincere apologies for the inconvenience which they have been caused.

Mr. President, thanks are embarrassing between friends. Let me, however, express the warm appreciation of my colleagues and myself for the kindness, friendliness and efficiency with which we have been received and looked after in India. We have been treated as brothers.

TANZANIA USA INDIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TANZANIA

President Girl's Reply

Replying, President Giri said:

I thank you for your generous words.

For all of us it has been a great experience to have had you with us. We feel enriched by your visit, brief though it has been. we have profited by your sagacious assessment on the many matters on which our governments have exchanged views. I have no doubt that your visit is the beginning of new vistas of friendship and cooperation between our two countries.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Government and people of India, and on my own behalf, I wish you godspeed, and would request you to convey to the people of Tanzania our best wishes for their progress and prosperity.

19

TANZANIA USA INDIA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech Welcoming Mr. Heath

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following speech welcoming the British Prime Minister, Mr. Edward Heath on his arrival in New Delhi on January 9, 1971 on a four-day visit to India:

May I welcome you, Mr. Prime Minister, and your distinguished colleagues to New Delhi. This city was called 'New' in relation to the several old capitals which had flourished here much earlier and to whose existence many handsome monuments and ruins bear testimony. But even that New Delhi - the aloof official capital - is now a part of history. The distance between Old Delhi and New has closed in mileage

and in thought. Today, Delhi is the people's capital. Our countries have known each other for many centuries and India is not unfamiliar to you. Your visit gives us an opportunity to renew the friendship which has come into being since we achieved Independence and which we value.

Visits and discussions will lead to greater international understanding. Your stay here is brief, but it will enable you to get better acquainted with the magnitude of our problems and the tremendous efforts we are making to solve them and to deepen the sympathy and understanding on which alone friendship can endure.

Recently we met in the great hall of the United Nations. The occasion and the setting was a reminder to us all, who have been called upon to serve our countries, that we owe an equal responsibility to the world and to its people. I sincerely hope that Indo-British relations will strengthen the cause of international understanding. I welcome you and your party once again and wish you a very pleasant stay amongst us.

INDIA USA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Heath's Reply

Following is the text of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Heath's reply:

Madame Prime Minister, I am glad to be back here again. I should like to thank you for the warm welcome which you have just given to my colleagues and myself on this visit. I was last here in January 1966, i.e., five years ago. I have no doubt I can see many developments since my last visit. The British Prime Minister was last here in 1958, i.e., twelve years ago. I am very glad that so early in my career as Prime Minister, I should be able to come here to meet you again and to visit you.

We last had the opportunity of talking at the United Nations which you have just mentioned. I found that of very great value. I am sure the talks which we are going to have before the Commonwealth Conference can also be of great use to us.

Of course, as you have said, there have been close connections between our two countries for a very long time and there have been changes in both our countries. But the ties between us are still very close indeed. And like you, we value them. We value them greatly. But these are not ties which are based on nostalgia for the past. They are ties which are a frank realisation of the present.

I would like to say to your people and perhaps particularly to the younger

20

people - that we do not ask for privileges based on sentiment. What we ask is to be judged on our merits. And to Britons at home I always say this that today in India, what we have to do is to prove that on our merits we are acceptable. This, I believe, is the attitude which is right for us to adopt and on which we can base our friendship today. We have the same objective, Together we want to see the gap which exists between the developed world and the developing world diminished. Both our countries have worked solidly towards this end, and particularly the work which members of the Indian Government did with me and my colleagues in the first UNCTAD Conference in Geneva in April 1964 has been the basis of all the work of UNCTAD ever since.

We also have the same objective of

giving equal opportunities to our people for their own development regardless of their political beliefs or their faith, their creed or their colour. And we also have one supreme objective which is that of increasing prosperity in the world and ensuring a peaceful world in which our two peoples can together flourish.

So, once again I would like to thank you for the very warm welcome which you have given to me, to say how much we value the ties between our two countries and to hope that in future they will grow stronger and stronger.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA SWITZERLAND

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech at Lunch in Honour of British Prime Minister

Following is the text of the, speech by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at a lunch given in honour of the British Prime Minister, Mr. Heath, in New Delhi on January 10, 1971:

We are here today to welcome a distinguished statesman and through him to honour the great traditions of his country. A quarter century ago the world witnessed a great event of history here - the transfer of power from Britain to India. It was a moment when the noblest instincts and the aspirations of our two nations coincided.

Prime Minister, this is perhaps a good time for you to be here. You will see how your country has influenced many aspects of our national life. You are here on the eve of our fifth General Elections when, apart from other hectic activities, there is the usual forecasting of results in the press, an exercise in which I believe you have little confidence.

The vast ocean of Indian civilization assimilates and changes the currents which flow into it. We have adopted your political institutions to a continental nation, a pluralistic society and a developing economy. We have made our own Britain's traditions of personal liberty, the rule of law and the equality of all people irrespective of religion or colour. Someone has remarked that the last Englishman survives only in India. But when you peel off the layers of accent, dress or even ideas underneath you will always find something basically Indian. Our English, as you have no doubt noticed, has a character specially of its own. Our relations with your country are extensive and involved and have been able to survive because they have constantly evolved and adjusted to changed circumstances. As you yourself said yesterday, our relations can be meaningful only so long as they are relevant to the contemporary situation and pass the test of public evaluation. Each nation, like each individual, must face the reality of the situation and find fulfilment in its own way. The precedents of other countries may be useful, but cannot be infallible and may even be misleading. It is not possible to have universal answers to specific problems.

Prime Minister, you were in India five years ago. In this period much has changed. The expansion of education, the growth of

21

industry - the visible progress has aroused expectations and hopes amongst our people. We know that the better life is possible and are impatient to achieve it. This desire for equality and for social justice is the central fact of our political life. Our concern now is to attune our institutions and our lives to the needs of our people, to reduce glaring diparities and to change archaic and unjust social and economic conditions. For this journey we must strive for our own. path. I can only say that it will always be a peaceful

and a democratic one. The experiences of our people, the sufferings they have endured because of discrimination of caste or religion or economic backwardness cannot but profoundly influence our approach to international issues such as racial discrimination and the obligations of the affluent towards the poorer countries. As a people we are sensitive to certain ideas and attitudes not because of what others think or do, but essentially because of our own background and our traditions and values. We believe that positive relationships between nations must be based on equality and operation.

Since our Independence, Indo-British cooperation has expanded significantly. In some sectors of our economy our pi-ogress has been considerably helped by Britain's enlightened and understanding assistance. I hope that our association will be even more fruitful in the years to come and will help us to progress towards our goal of technological and industrial self-reliance. This and the common institutions to which I have referred give a distinctive equality to Indo-British relations. We should like them to prosper and expand for the mutual benefit of our people and also for the larger cause of international amity and cooperation. There is so much on which we can build.

Prime Minister, I have great pleasure in welcoming you to our country. We are glad that you and your party were able to spend some time with us. May your visit lead to greater harmony between our two nations.

INDIA USA

Date: Jan 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Following is the text of Mr. Heath's reply:

Prime Minister, I would like to thank you and your government for the welcome which you have given to me here and to my colleagues who are with me, the Lord Chancellor and the Attorney General, and the members of my party who are going on to the Commonwealth Conference in Singapore.

I am delighted to be here again. And what more Pleasant welcome could one have than a Sunday lunch in these beautiful surroundings - such vivid colour, such a splendid spectacle. I think too I would like to thank you for inviting so many friends here, friends of long standing whom I met on many occasions both in Delhi and in London, in New York and Geneva in the conferences of the world. So being here today at a Sunday lunch is really, I think I can honestly say, like being home. This I could honestly say if we were ever able to have lunch in the open at home. You could not have decided to do anything more pleasant than to entertain us in this way.

I come for the first time here as Prime Minister and I feel myself specially privileged to be the guest of the Indian Government. It seems to me perhaps rather strange that twelve years should have passed since the last visit of the British Prime Minister to this great country. But at least I can make the resolution that such a long period should not elapse again before the visit of the British Prime Minister, but let me say once, Prime Minister, I am not in any way trying to pre-judge the result of elections in my own country, let alone of elections in yours. And I won't comment on your remarks except to say that if you do want to

a number going very cheaply at home at the moment.

You have spoken in your wise words of Indo-British relations. It is indeed a long History of circumstances which has brought our two countries together. But twenty-three years ago with that historic change of which you spoke we began a wholly new relationship and it is to the future that both countries and the peoples of both countries now look.

India, one of the world's oldest civilizations, is also today the world's largest democracy. We appreciate the enormous problems which you are facing and we also know of the skill and the energy with which you are transforming this country. And you are perfectly right, I can see today how great the changes are since I was last here five years ago.

But Britain also is changing. British society has experienced a more complete and thorough transformation since the Second World War than ever before in a comparable period of time. We are creating a society of opportunity and justice at home, where people have the confidence to look outward to the many tasks in the modem world to which we feel Britain is able to help by setting her hand.

If 1947 marked a watershed in Indian history, so also it was the beginning of a new era for Britain. A vast colonial empire was transformed with a minimum of violence into an association of free and independent sovereign countries. We began then the task of adjusting our aims and objectives to the new post-war world. As British society began to transform itself at home, so we examined and redefined our role in the world.

Since I have been Prime Minister, I have made it clear on many occasions, including our meeting at the Special General Assembly session of United Nations at New York, that British policies will be determined, in the same way as other countries determine their policies, by our national

interests. But I am equally determined, as are my fellow countrymen, that these interests win never be construed in a narrow or a selfish way. We seek to strengthen our country so that she can play a more effective part in the world of the 1970's and beyond in a way which is appropriate to the new world which is developing around us. We shall continue to contribute to the maintenance of those values which we cherish and which I know you also cherish as well.

Those countries in which democracy and the rule of law flourish do have a special responsibility in this troubled world. The unique grouping of nations, which form the Commonwealth, also has a responsibility and its own special contribution to make. it was through Pandit Nehru's historic decision in 1949 that India as a Republic should continue as a member of the Commonwealth that our organisation was transformed into a multiracial association of free and independent nations, and the modern history of the Commonwealth has followed from that.

Today there are 32 member countries with a total population of some 900 million people. In a few days' time, Singapore will, be the setting for a conference which bringtogether these vastly differing nations. Whatever differences there may be between us, I think we all share in common a belief in the value and the importance of our Commonwealth association, and in the concepts in which it is rooted.

I spoke at the United Nations in October of the task of promoting economic and social development. I also urged the importance of the continued expansion of international trade on which prosperity must ultimately be founded.

It is of particular satisfaction to me that Britain has been able to play a part in the advance of the Indian economy. We have a sustained and continuous aid commitment to India, which is larger than that to any other country. We have also continued to contribute to India's industrial development by direct investment, by industrial collaboration, by trade and by technological know-

ledge and experience. We are delighted to do this. But our relationship goes far beyond these matarial ties. It ranges over a much wider field of human endeayour. The

23

many professional and personal links which exist between our two countries are equally important to us both, and enrich both our nations.

Last November, I had the honour of being invited to the dinner to honour the memory of Pandit Nehru in London. I said to those who were present - and I would like to repeat it to you today - that we in Britain feel enriched by the Indian community which lives among us. We have welcomed to Britain people from all parts of the Commonwealth. It is our determination to provide them fully and equally and without discrimination on any ground, with the benefits of our society. It is in this most practical way that we demonstrate our total rejection of any system that discriminates between its people on the basis of race, or colour or creed.

Britain and India still share so much in common. We share the same ideals. We have the same concern for justice and human rights. While we are guided by our national interests, we both see these interests broadly in the promotion of peace and progress and prosperity, not only for ourselves but for the world as a whole. I believe that there is much that our two countries can achieve together. In concert with our partners in the Commonwealth, we can achieve much to break down the prejudices, the inequalities and the divisions that confront mankind.

We in Britain look forward to working most closely with India on the many tasks and problems which face the world today, tasks and problems which demand united efforts of all of us to try to solve them, and I believe that the talks which we are going to have later on this afternoon, a continuation of those we had in New York and later in Paris, will contribute to the efforts we

can both make to the creation of a just and prosperous and peaceful world.

And so, once again, I would like to thank you, Prime Minister, for the very warm welcome that you have given to us, to say what immense pleasure it is to be here in your country, how much we wish the visit could be much much longer, what intense feeling we have of the value of coming together on occasions like this.

I would like to ask the assembly that you have brought together to honour us to-day to rise and drink to the health of the Prime Minister of India.

24

UNITED KINGDOM SWITZERLAND USA INDIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE FRANCE

Date: Jan 01, 1971

February

	Volume No	
1995		
Content		

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII FEBRUARY

No. 2

CONTENTS

PAGE

FIJI

India-Fiji Joint Communique 25

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Indo-G.D.R. Protocol on Scientific and Technical Cooperation

Shri	L.	N.	Mishra's	Speech
------	----	----	----------	--------

27

GUYANA

India-Guyana Joint Communique

28

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

India Welcomes Bhutan's Membership of the U.N. 29 Shri S. Sen's Statement in the Committee on Natural Resources 30

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Hijacking of Indian Airlines Plane 34 India's Note to Pakistan on Central Labour Laws Bill 35

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on British Decision to Supply Arms to South Africa 35

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Talks

36

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

FIJI INDIA GUYANA BHUTAN PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FIJI

India Fiji Joint Communique

Following is the text of the Joint Communique issued at the conclusion of the visit to India of the Prime Minister of Fiji, the Hon'ble Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, on February 5, 1971:

At the invitation of the Prime Minister

of India Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of Fiji, the Hon'ble Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara, KBE, and Adi Lady Lala Mara, paid a State visit to India from January 29 to February 5, 1971. The Leader of the Opposition in the Fiji Parliament, Mr. S. M. Koya and Mrs. Koya were also members of the party. They were accompanied by Mr. Charles Walker, Secretary for Public Service and Rural Development, Mr. S. B. Butadroka, Cooperatives Officer, and Major M. V. Buadromo, Private Secretary to the Prime Minister.

The two Prime Ministers discussed a wide range of subjects concerning the international scene and bilateral relations. The talks were held in an atmosphere of great friendliness and reflected the close and traditional ties between the two countries, and the similarity of their outlook on many matters of importance. The Prime Ministers emphasised the need for peace and stability for the progress of the Asian and Pacific regions, so that the governments and peoples of the area could concentrate their resources on the economic development and social betterment of their peoples. They expressed the hope that it would be possible for every State to be left free to determine its own future in accordance with its own wishes.

The two Prime Ministers referred to the recent Commonwealth Conference in Singapore. They recalled with pleasure that there had been wide agreement between their two delegations on a number of subjects discussed. They recognised that the value of the Commonwealth lies in its being a multi-racial society of nations which believes in peace and international cooperation, and in eradication of social injustice, economic inequality and racial discrimination. They, therefore, welcomed the Singapore Declaration which had been issued at that conference.

The Prime Ministers exchanged views on the efforts being made by their Governments for the social and economic developments of their peoples, keeping in mind the various problems of diversity that they have faced. The Fiji delegation explained the

developments leading to the independence of Fiji. They stressed the atmosphere of tolerance, understanding and goodwill among the various communities which had contributed so much to the building of a multiracial society, in which persons of Indian origin had played their role. The Prime Minister of India noted this with satisfaction.

The Prime Ministers agreed that the friendly and cooperative relations so Happily existing between the two countries should be further strengthened and developed. They emphasised, in particular, the importance of expanding trade and of greater collaboration in economic, technical, cultural and scientific fields. The Prime Minister of India expressed her readiness and that of the Government of India to extend all possible help for the development programmes of Fiji. Aid to Fiji in the field of training and the provision of professional and technical experts would continue. The Community Development Programme in India would be explored and relevant experience and expertise, as required, would be made available to help Fiji develop its own newly launched Rural Development Programme.

25

The Prime Minister of Fiji expressed his appreciation of the offer.

It was agreed by the Prime Ministers that steps be taken to establish an Indian cultural centre in Fiji.

The Prime Minister of Fiji expressed deep appreciation of the cordial reception and hospitality accorded to him, Adi Lady Lala Mara and the delegation. Both Prime Ministers recognised that the visit had helped to strengthen the mutual understanding and co-operation between the two countries and peoples.

The Prime Minister of Fiji extended an invitation to the Prime Minister of India to pay an official visit to Fiji. The Prime Minister of India accepted the invitation with thanks.

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Indo-G.D.R. Protocol on Scientific and Technical Cooperation

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on February 2, 1971 on the signing of the Protocol on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between India and the German Democratic Republic;:

A Protocol on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between India and the German Democratic Republic, valid for a period of 5 years, was signed in New Delhi on February 2, 1971 by HE. Mr. H. Soelle, G.D.R. Minister of External Economic Relations and Shri L. N. Mishra, Union Minister of Foreign Trade.

Simultaneously, letters were also exchanged between the G.D.R. Deputy Minister of External Economic Relations, Mr. E. Kattner, and Chowdhary Ram Sewak, Union Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade, finalising the Trade Plan for 1971.

Trade relations between India and G.D.R. have steadily grown from Rs. 18 lakhs in 1953 to Rs. 45 crores in 1970. G.D.R. has emerged as the fourth largest trading partner of India in the Socialist World.

The Trade Plan finalised for 1971 envisages further growth of trade between the two countries around 10 per cent in the current year. This growth is envisaged over the level achieved at the end of 1970,

which has been the highest ever level achieved in mutual trade between India and G.D.R.

Principal items of import from G.D.R. into India would be rolled steel products, alloy tool and special steels, printing machinery, harvesting combines, ships, medical X-ray films and cinematograph films, various organic and inorganic chemicals, muriate of potash fertiliser, raw diamonds and other items of machinery and equipment.

Principal items of export from India to G.D.R., apart from traditional goods, would be engineering goods, such as, hand knitting machines, cutting tools, wire ropes, locks and padlocks, fittings, automobile accessories, etc.

Increased purchases of jute manufactures, coir yarn and products, tanned and semi-tanned hides and skins and chappals are envisaged. G.D.R. is also emerging as a potential market for fruit juices, marine, products, paints for ships, linoleum, glazed tiles, sports shoes, etc.

The Protocol on Scientific and Technical Cooperation between the two countries

26

signed for the first time today envisages exchange of experts and trainees as well as relevant information in different fields of science and technology. Among others, it envisages closer cooperation in the field of foreign trade through joint cooperation in product development, adaptation and market research for developing bilateral trade as well as for joint cooperation in third countries.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Shri L. N. Mishra's Speech

Speaking immediately after signing the Scientific and Technical Cooperation Protocol between India and German Democratic Republic in New Delhi on February 2, 1971, Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra said:

We have just signed a Protocol for Scientific and Technical Cooperation between our two countries and have also finalised the Trade Plan for 1971. Both these are important documents as they show the way towards further development of our trade relations in a diversified manner. It has been a matter of satisfaction for us to see the trade between our two countries steadily growing. No wonder that today G.D.R. is our fourth largest trading partner in the socialist world and by the end of 1970 we have reached the highest ever level of trade exchanges with the G.D.R. amounting to Rs. 45 crores. We are confident that on the basis of discussions held now, growth of trade should continue to be with the same tempo as it has been last year. If we develop an integrated approach to the problem of growth of two-way trade exchanges, I am sure, we should be able to sustain the tempo of growth around 10 per cent per annum. I have noted with particular satisfaction that a number of new items have been included in the list of commodities to be exported from India to the G.D.R. particularly in the field of manufactured and engineering goods. I do hope that at the implementation stage both sides will seriously take these into account in order to realise them into practice. India is today emerging as a major exporter of a number of sophisticated industrial products and we would like to see more and more of these items being exported to the G.D.R. in the coming years.

It is a matter of great pleasure for us that we have also signed a Protocol today on Scientific and Technical Cooperation. This is the first ever Protocol on the subject being concluded between the two Governments. There is considerable scope for forging scientific and technical cooperation both in commercial and non-commercial fields. While the Protocol provides a very broad framework of the Agreement, details will have to be worked out by competent organisations on both sides in order to identify the spheres in which useful exchanges of experts, trainees and information and knowledge could take place on a mutually beneficial basis.

His Excellencies Mr. Soelle and Mr. Kattner have come on their first official visit to India. We would have liked them to visit our country for a longer period so that we would have been able to show them what India has achieved since her Independence in various fields of national activity. While the present stay is rather short, we do hope that next time when they visit us they will give us more time.

27

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GUYANA

India-Guyana Joint Communique

Following is the text of the Joint Communique issued at the end of the 5-day visit to India Of the Prime Minister of Guyana, the Hon'ble Mr. Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, on February 1, 1971: At the invitation of the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, His Excellency the Hon'ble Mr. Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, Prime Minister of the Republic of Guyana, paid an official visit to-India from January 27 to February 1, 1971. Prime Minister Burnham and Mrs. Burnham and their party were warmly welcomed by the Government and people of India. During his stay in India, the Prime Minister of Guyana witnessed the "Beating Retreat" Ceremony and visited the Indian Agricultural Research Institute in New Delhi. They also visited Agra.

The Prime Minister of Guyana called on the President of India, Shri V. V. Giri, and had discussions with the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. The Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, called on the Prime Minister of Guyana.

The Prime Minister of Guyana was assisted at the discussion by H.E. Mr. Saso Narain, Speaker of the National Assembly, H.E. The Hon'ble Mr. S. S. Ramphal, Attorney General and Minister of State, H.E. Mr. J. Carter, High Commissioner designate of Guyana to India, Miss L. A. Mansell, Chief of Protocol, Ministry of External Affairs of Guyana and other officials. The Prime Minister of India was assisted by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, Shri T. N. Kaul, Foreign Secretary, Shri S. Krishnamurti, Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Shri T. P. Singh, Secretary, Ministry of Education and Youth Services, Shri D. Hejmadi, High Commissioner of India to. Guyana. Shrimati K. Rukmini Menon, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Shri Natwar Singh Joint Secretary, Prime Minister's Secretariat, Shri K. S. Ramaehandran, Joint Secretary, Department of Mines and Metals and other officials.

The two Prime Ministers discussed the international situation and Indo-Guyana bilateral relations.

India and Guyana have long-standing

friendship and a common outlook on many important matters. The Prime Minister of India recalled her visit to Guyana in October, 1968, and her discussions with the leaders of Guyana.

The two Prime Ministers share the conviction that the Commonwealth can have value only if it functions as a multi-racial society of nations who believe in peace and international cooperation and in the eradication of racial discrimination. They reviewed the discussions at the Singapore Conference on the proposed sale of arms by Britain to South Africa and further discussed the subject. There was a close identify of views between them about the need for further consultations.

The two Prime Ministers agreed that there was need and scope for increasing cultural and technical cooperation between the two countries. The two Heads of Government also agreed that efforts should be made to expand trade and economic relations between India and Guyana. At the request of the Prime Minister of Guyana, it was agreed to make available to the Government of Guyana the assistance of Indian experts and facilities for obtaining the services of consultancy organisations, for planning and implementing projects in various fields such as agriculture, industry, mining, irrigation and power, and to provide facilities for the training of Guyanese nationals in India in agriculture, medicine, dentistry and other fields. The two Prime

28

Ministers agreed that studies would be undertaken to identify other areas of technical and economic cooperation between the two countries. A team of Indian experts would visit Guyana in the near future for this purpose. It was agreed to conclude agreements for cultural and technical cooperation between the two countries.

The Government of Guyana welcomed the suggestion to open an Indian Cultural Centre in Guyana.

The Prime Minister of Guyana thanked the Prime Minister of India for the warm welcome extended to him and the members of his party during their stay in India.

GUYANA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE SOUTH AFRICA LATVIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

India Welcomes Bhutan's Membership of the U.N.

Following is the text of the statement of Shri Samar Sen, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, in the Security Council on February 10, 1971, welcoming the decision of the Security Council to admit Bhutan as a full and active member of the United Nations:

We are, indeed grateful to you and to the Council for having permitted us to participate in this meeting of the Council. Mr. President, apart from congratulating for your Presidency of the Council this month, we should like to extend our welcome to those new members who are elected to the Council during the last General Assembly and also to record our appreciation for those who have retired. As it happens, yesterday's meeting of the Council was not only the first meeting of the Council in 1971, and the first meeting after the conclusion of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations, but it was also the first meeting after the application of Bhutan was circulated on December 22, 1970. We are particularly gratified that such a meeting should have dealt with the proposed membership of Bhutan. We have before us the report of the Admissions Committee under rule 59

of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council. We are pleased that that Committee reported, unanimously and with in a short time, its recommendation that the Security Council should accept Bhutan's application for membership. Even though we ourselves would have preferred the Council to follow the practice for the last 15 years while dealing with applications for membership of the United Nations, we are happy that because of the intensive negotiations conducted informally, it was possible to come to this agreed and welcome decision in a very short period of time. For these negotiations, I have that you, Mr. President, and you predecessor in office, Sir Colin Crowe, were working in a sustained and determined manner. We are grateful to you both, as indeed to all the members of the Council for the decision which has just been arrived at.

In view of the close ties of friendship and cordiality between India and Bhutan, the Government of India was very pleased and privileged to assure the Government of Bhutan that it would assist Bhutan in every possible manner in ensuring that Bhutan became a member of the United Nations in the exercise of its full sovereign rights. It may be recalled that in 1962 India successfully sponsored Bhutan for the membership of the Colombo Plan. In 1969, with our assistance, Bhutan joined one of the specialised agencies of the United Nations, that is the Universal Postal Union. In this background when Bhutan wished to apply for membership during the 25th session of the Assembly and after a special delegation

29

from Bhutan had come and discussed this question with as many delegations as possible in New York, we are indeed glad to give such help as was required of us, by and to the Government of Bhutan. I am sure the decision that the Security Council takes today will bring great satisfaction to the Government and people of Bhutan, and we in India would like to join them in sharing this satisfaction.

The Council's decision supporting Bhutan's candidature for admission to the United Nations is but a final manifestation of Bhutan's independent stature and nationhood. As one of India's closest neighbours, Bhutan has intimate relations with my country in many fields. We have historical, cultural, economic and political links going back to many centuries. Naturally, through the ages we both have had our ups and downs and we both hope that the lessons learnt of the past will help us contribute our utmost in the achievement of the objectives of the Charter. We are, therefore, both proud and gratified that Bhutan is about to enter this great organization to participate, with other members of the United Nations, in the endeavour to promote peace and prosperity all over the world.

In the December 1952 issue of the National Geographic Magazine, there is an interesting article by Burt Kerr Todd, entitled "Bhutan, land of the thunder dragon." This and many other books written on Bhutan bring out, on the one hand, the rich, varied and beautiful nature of the country and on the other hand, show how it had tried, on the whole, to keep away from the daily toil and turmoil of the rest of the world. It is gratifying and wholly commendable that under the able, active and imaginative guidance of the present Monarch of Bhutan, His Majesty King Jigme Dorji Wangchuk, Bhutan is determined to introduce and pursue programmes for full economic and social development in cooperation with the rest of the world. We on our part have done and will continue to do whatever we can to help these developments in Bhutan. While my delegation would like to reiterate on this occasion the Government of India's unqualified confidence in Bhutan's ability to fulfil the obligations of the Charter as a member of the United Nations, we are at the same time confident that Bhutan's membership would be a welcome asset to this organization both in its political and development activities. I would, therefore, conclude by welcoming the decision of the Security Council, by thanking once again the members of the Council for their speed, unity and goodwill and by expressing the

hope that Bhutan will be a full and active member of the United Nations before long. Meanwhile, we pledge our full support to work in cooperation with Bhutan. We have consistently tried to work in harmony with all Asian countries, particularly with our neighbours, and we look forward to the closest bonds of friendship, cooperation and understanding with this new colleague of ours in the United Nations.

INDIA BHUTAN USA SRI LANKA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Statement in the Committee on Natural Resources

Following is the text of the statement made by Shri Samar Sen, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, at the first session of the Committee on Natural Resources on February 23, 1971:

With the convening of the first session of this Committee, an important institutional gap in the U.N. system has been bridged and a long standing anomaly and deficiency in the framework of international co-operation has been remedied. We sincerely hope that the expectations of developing countries from the work of this Committee will be substantially realised during the years to come, and specially during the course of the Second Development Decade. This would require the co-operation of all sides and a serious approach to our tasks here on the basis of high level technical discussions of the various issues.

The course of events during the last few years have emphatically demonstrated

resources. The phenomenal advance in technology applicable and available for the development of natural resources has rendered numerous old methods and techniques uneconomic and inefficient in other ways. Many of these new activities and new technologies should in their application go beyond the limits of national interests and national jurisdiction. The distinguished Under Secretary-General for Economic and Social Affairs in his statement in this Committee yesterday correctly emphasised the importance of "world-wide planning and coordination".

The recent developments require not only an international approach but also an inter-disciplinary approach. We need to put to the optimum use the advances made in diverse fields: chemical, managerial, economic, social, etc., for the solution of individual problems. We believe that the United Nations can show the way in these matters for the benefit of the developing countries.

Thirdly, the last few years have seen an unprecedented expansion of the role of Governments for developing natural resources. This has been due to many factors, some of which have been mentioned in document A/C.712/Add.I in discussing the role of Governments for energy development, and I need not go into their details. However, an ever-increasing responsibility and dominance of Governments in this area calls for further expansion and promotion of intergovernmental co-operation at the bilateral, regional and international levels.

Fourthly, considering the global character of many of the problems of natural resources development and the universal implications of their possible solutions, it is important for the international community to take stock, from time to time, of the total situation, and in particular to relate it to the position of the developing countries in it. Such an assessment would greatly help

in defining the areas and establishing the forms and content of international cooperation in this field; it would also provide impetus to development at the national and regional levels. The countries concerned will then have a broader perspective for planning their own activities. In this respect, we joint the Canadian delegation in emphasising the role of U.N. in presenting a continuing analysis of the overall position, but we believe that such an analysis should not be confined to the marketing aspects but should present as comprehensive a picture as possible, including not only patterns of demand and supply but also of production and cost and their future projections together with relevant technological data. We hope that for the coming sessions of the Committee, it would be possible for the Secretariat to present such an over-all picture, giving separately the positions of developed, developing and centrally-plannedeconomy countries, for all major sectors of natural resources i.e., water, minerals and energy.

The general picture presented in some of the Secretariat documents bring out the vital importance of an increasing flow of capital to developing countries and of their access to the markets of developed countries, for the development of the potentialities of their natural resources. These subjects concern. many other bodies in the United Nations, particularly UNCTAD. It is not necessary for us, in this Committee, to discuss the obstacles relating to capital inflow and access to markets and the various suggestions to overcome them. However, the Committee, by bringing out the many technological and economic possibilities in the area within its jurisdiction, can make its own contribution to larger capital inflows and improved access to markets.

Mr. Chairman, we are of the view that the most important business of this Committee should be to promote transfer of technology to developing countries and its development and adaptation, for the purpose of exploration and exploitation of natural resources. This is one of the most urgent problems confronting the developing countries. They face immense difficulties in finding easy access to latest technologies. Moreover, even where they are available, the costs of acquiring them are prohibitive. There are numerous conditions attached to them with the result that quite often the very purpose of technology transfers is frustrated. Besides, the pattern of trade in world technology is heavily, weighted in favour of those who already have them and discriminates against the 'have-nots'. There is, therefore, no other sector of natural re-

31

sources development permitting a more fruitful international co-operation than the promotion of transfer of technology to developing countries.

The task here is, first of all, the promotion of direct transfer of technology at fair and reasonable costs and terms and conditions. Secondly, it is equally necessary to bring the developing countries up-to-date with the latest in several technological fields, such as the recent developments in the technology for aerial photography of mineral wealth, in oceanography, for desalination, the impact of electronic revolution on the prospection and exploitation of mineral resources and the like. As stated in paragraph 23 of the Secretariat document E/C.7/2/Add.9, "the value of the resources may be determined more by the technology available and access to markets than by the size of the resources".

Though it is true that the technology to be transferred to developing countries should be consistent with their institutional and research infrastructure and their resources, we cannot accept the proposition that some of the latest technologies applicable to the exploration and development of mineral resources are primarily the concern and the interest of the major developed countries. For a number of mineral products, the developing countries have to compete in the world market and if the latest technologies are not available to them for the exploration, development, processing and transportation of these products, their ability to

compete in the world market will be seriously undermined, with inevitable adverse consequences for their economic development.

Another important aspect of the subject that my delegation would like to underline is that, for the natural resources development, there is almost an unlimited scope for co-operation amongst developing countries themselves. They can pool their own experience, expertise and technology to considerable mutual benefit. Some of the technologies, more appropriate to the conditions prevailing in developing countries, can be obtained with greater advantage from other developing countries than from developed countries, where the application of technology is of a highly capital-intensive nature. Co-operation among developing countries can take place not only on a regional or sub-regional basis but also on an inter regional basis, with a view to making the most of the complementarity, existing or latent, among these countries. Moreover, co-operation among developing countries for the development of natural resources could be a part and parcel of wider cooperation involving increase of production on a complementary basis and the exchange of the goods so produced as well as other goods. This may mean joint prospecting and collaboration for the exploitation of natural resources, co-operation for the establishment of manufacturing industries based on the raw material so produced and arrangements for various forms of trade co-operation, including long term bilateral agreements, free reciprocal entry of products or even a much wider agreement for the exchange of quite a large range of products, duty free or preferential, to ensure an over-all reciprocity for all the developing countries concerned. This Committee could and should lend its authority for the further promotion and strengthening of such co-operation amongst developing countries and work out guidelines according to which the United Nations system and the developed countries can assist in such co-operation.

Along with other developing countries of the ECAFE region, India has been trying to develop and implement various schemes of co-operation involving augmentation of production, based on natural endowments of the countries of the region, as a spring-board for mutually beneficial arrangements, for payment, trade and other fields. For the region as a whole, the schemes are still in the process of being finally agreed upon but at the bilateral level with certain countries, we have obtained significant and satisfactory results. We have also been trying to establish similar links with a number of countries of Africa and look forward to such co-operation with the Latin American countries.

The expertise we have developed in many fields of natural resources exploration and development has helped us in building fairly effective institutional and research infrastructure for petroleum, water management, and other energy resources. Recently, we have established a Water and Power Development Consultancy Services Private

32

Limited, which is in a position to make consultancy services available on varied problems of water and power development. We ourselves are in need of importing and developing latest technologies in certain areas in which we have still a long way to go but we would gladly share with other developing countries the experience and expertise which we have been able to accumulate.

Mr. Chairman, as I already stated, because of the implications of rapidly developing technology, the activities in the field of natural resources lend themselves ideally to international co-operation. And yet there ate other aspects of natural resources development, particularly those related to local laws, customs, rules and regulations and other special domestic circumstances which would make it extremely difficult to apply a universal general approach. An attempt, on an indiscriminate basis, to set standards or norms for natural resources development is likely to be self-defeating. One should, therefore, tread very carefully on this delicate and difficult ground. Both the technological aspect and the socio-political and cultural aspects have equally dominant roles. It would be quite short-sighted and inadmissible to discourage or spurn, international co-operation by exaggerating the sociopolitical and cultural factors. At the same time, it would be equally undesirable to ignore these factors and try to bring any aspect of the problem of resources development within the framework of international co-operation, without the express and complete agreement of the Governments concerned. In view of the immense and ever increasing potentialities of international cooperation in this sphere, there should be no difficulty in resisting the temptation to take up such aspects of natural resources development which should better be left to the Governments themselves to take care of

Before I conclude, I should like to comment on one or two specific points raised in the documents before us. In document E/C.7/2 a reference has been made to the declining trend recently of UNDP's participation for the development of natural resources. So far as it relates to the general lack of funds and the need to strengthen the activities of the United Nations by additional finances through the regular budget, we are entirely in agreement with the Secretary-General. However, if it implies preference for projects for natural resources over other projects in UNDP assistance, the Committee should consider this in the context of the new country programming approach recently adopted by the General Assembly. According to this new approach, the decision to include projects within a particular country programme, given the country's indicative planning figure, will primarily rest on the Government concerned. If a country thinks that the natural resources sector of its economy can generate stronger impulses for dynamic growth than other sectors, then it is naturally upto the country itself to include more projects in this field as compared to other sectors. One has to look at this problem from the point of view of the total need of allocating resources to different sectors of the economy to ensure a balanced growth. Of course, this Committee can draw the attention of the

Governments to the possibilities in the field of natural resources and can assist them by formulating suitable guidelines for building the necessary infrastructure, for promoting exchange of information and for providing consultancy services through the pooling of world resources.

While going through the documents before the Committee one could not avoid the impression that they are very much environment-oriented, if not pollution-oriented. We know that the problem of environment is one of the serious concerns of the international community at present. We also recognise that the development of natural resources must constantly take into account its effect on environment. However, this Committee has to establish its priority not only in relation to what the developing countries need on a most urgent basis but also in relation to what is being done by other Committees. We are, therefore, glad that it has already been agreed not to consider the documents relating to the environmental aspect of the development of natural resources. However, we should like to comment on the thesis of one of these documents i.e., document E/C.7/2/Add.4. Here, a case has been sought to be made out for establishing processing industry based on natural resources, in developing countries as a means of keeping the global level of pollution at a tolerable level. Mr. Chairman, I must say

33

that such a justification for the development of processing industry in developing countries is quite misplaced, however well intentioned it may be. The rapid industrialisation of the developing countries, and in this context, the establishment and the development of both manufacturing and processing industries stand on their own merits and they do not need any justification based on any criterion of pollution. First of all, the need for the rapid industrialisation of the developing countries has been recognised by the international community from a large number of U.N. forums. Secondly, it has been powerfully argued by many eminent economists, and accepted in inter-governmental organisations, that the establishment of processing industries in developing countries will increase the value added to these products: and on that basis numerous recommendations have been made for the elimination of differential duties on processed projects imported from developing countries. Thirdly, the need for the diversification of the economies of the developing countries has also been reeognised in UNCTAD, Economic and Social Council and the General Assembly. And fourthly, the provision in the International Development Strategy for the need for structural changes in the economies of developed countries also accepts the implication of the development of processing industries more and more in developing countries themselves. Thus, the promotion of industrialisation in developing countries in general, and the development of processing industries in particular has to proceed on the basis of the deliberate decisions already taken by the international community to help this process; it cannot take place under the threat of the disaster of pollution.

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined some general considerations which the Committee may like to keep in view while dealing with its agenda. I have not tried to comment on the specific proposals before the Committee. My delegation would have many opportunities of expressing its views on them as they are considered one by one. However, I trust that some of the general remarks I have just made would enable the Committee to examine these specific suggestions in a wider perspective, and. would above all, be of some assistance in formulating general policy guidelines for international co-operation in this crucial area of the economic development of developing countries. I am confident that under your able guidance, the Committee would succeed in promoting, stimulating and fostering such a co-operation.

INDIA USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Hijacking of Indian Airlines Plane

The Prime Minister, shrimati Indira Gandhi, imbed the following statement on February 3, 1971 on the hijacking of Fokker Friendship aircraft of the Indian Airlines to Lahore which was later blown up at the Lahore Airport:

The Government and people of India are justifiably indignant at the abetment, incitement and encouragement given by the authorities in West Pakistan in helping of hijacking of Indian Airlines Fokker Friendship aircraft to Lahore on January 30. The delay in the return of the passengers and crew was inhuman and without justification. The refusal to return the aircraft with its bag-gage, cargo and mail is against all canons of international law and the UN General Assembly resolution passed at the 25th Session to which Pakistan is a party.

The blowing up of the plane at Lahore airport under the very nose of the Pakistan authorities by the two criminals who hijacked it to Lahore airport deserves to be condemned by all civilised governments and people. We regret to say we have heard no

34

word of condemnation from Pakistan so far. The authorities in West Pakistan do not perhaps realise the serious repercussions of their, negligence and indirect encouragement to these two criminals who were allowed the freedom of Lahore airport to make trunk telephone calls to their accomplices in Pakistan without hindrance. It is amazing that the Government of Pakistan could not control these two individuals for three whole

days and allowed them to blow up an Indian plane.

We hold the Pakistan Government wholly responsible for allowing this dastardly crime. At the same time, we are glad that the people of Pakistan showed friendliness towards the stranded passengers and crew and waved greetings to them during their road journey from Lahore to Hussainiwala.

We want to strengthen friendship with the people of Pakistan but we will not tolerate any case of vandalism, abetment, incitement or encouragement of subversive elements from Pakistan who may venture to disturb law and order in our country. We should like to tell the Government of Pakistan that encouragement of such activities will lead to serious consequences for which they will be wholly responsible.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

India's Note to Pakistan on Central Labour Laws Bill

Following is the text of the note dated January 8, 1971, (released to the press on February 6, 1971) sent by the High Commission of India at Islamabad to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Pakistan in reply to the protest note of the Government of Pakistan dated December 12, 1970, regarding Central Labour Laws (Extension to Jammu and Kashmir) Bill 1969:

The High Commission for India in

Pakistan presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan, and has the honour to refer to their Note No. In (4)-6/5/69 dated the 16th December, 1970.

The attention of the Government of Pakistan is drawn to the Note given by the Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi to the High Commission of Pakistan in India on 16.9.1969, regarding "Central Labour Laws (Extension to Jammu and Kashmir) Bill 1969". That Note rejected the Note of 3rd September, 1969 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan, on the same subject as it constituted an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of India in furtherance of Pakistan's ambitions on Indian territory. The Government of India reject the Note under reference for the same reasons. It is a matter of regret that the hope expressed earlier about the Government of Pakistan desisting from such interference in future has been belied.

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

PAKISTAN INDIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on British Decision to Supply Arms to South Africa

Following is the text Of the statement issued by the Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, on February 25, 1971 on the

decision of the British Government to supply certain arms to South Africa:

Government of India regret the decision of the British Government to supply certain arms to the Government of South Africa, even before the Study Group, set up at the Commonwealth Heads of Governments' Conference, has met. The earlier understanding and general expectation amongst various members of the Singapore Conference, based on British assurances, was that the British Government would give full

35

consideration to the views expressed at the Conference before taking a final decision. The Study Group was set up to consider the question in greater detail.

We had made it quite clear at Singapore that if the British Government went ahead with the supply of arms to South Africa before the Study Group's report was considered by the Commonwealth Governments, it would render the Study Group infructuous. It is regrettable that the British Government should have ignored the near unanimous consensus at Singapore and the UN resolutions on this subject.

This decision of the British Government creates a new situation in which it is incumbent on the members of the Study Group to reconsider the utility of the Group meeting. Government of India are in touch with the other member-Governments in this regard. In case the British Government's decision is final and irrevocable, it will, in our opinion, be an exercise in futility for the Study Group to meet. If Britain is willing not to make any supply of arms to, South Africa, till the report of the Study Group has been considered by the Commonwealth Governments, we would be willing to reconsider our attitude.

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Talks

Following is the text of a press release issued in New DOM or February 16, 1971 on the discussions held between Yugoslavia and India on trade and industrial cooperation:

A Yugoslav delegation led by Mr. A. Bogoev, Director General of the National Bank of Yugoslavia, visited New Delhi between February 8 to 16, 1971 and held discussions with the Indian Government. The Indian delegation was led by Shri H. Lal, Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade.

During these discussions a review of 1970 trade was carried out and satisfaction was expressed that trade between the two countries had expanded and developed in varied items. India's main exports to Yugoslavia apart from traditional items have been various engineering goods including commercial trucks, jeeps, auto-accessories, aluminium ingots, cables, etc. India's imports from Yugoslavia were mainly manufactured items and capital goods including agricultural and crawler tractors, ship equipments, viscose staple fibre, industrial explosives, gas cylinders, drugs and medicines, chemicals etc.

Both the delegations have exchanged ideas in regard to the mutual trade in 1971. It is expected that during 1971, trade will increase further.

In the field of industrial cooperation it was also agreed that collaboration possibilities might be explored in pharmaceutical industry, manufacture of electronic components, sewing and knitting machines, food processing machineries, wagon building and

crawler tractors.

Both the delegations hold the view that mutual cooperation in third country markets should be developed through joint ventures, joint marketing and utilisation of each other's products for third country projects undertaken on turn key basis.

Discussions also took place on the question of changing the present rupee payment system and adoption of multilateral payment transactions in its place. These discussions will be resumed shortly.

36

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA

Date: Feb 01, 1971

March

	Volume	No	
1995			
Content			
Content			

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII MARCH

No.3

CONTENTS

PAGE

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Shrimati Leela, Damodara. Menon's Statement on British Sale of Helicopters to South Africa 37

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

т			A 11		T 1		
и	recio	ent'c	Address	tΩ	Pari	nameni	ŀ.
	LOSIU	iciii s	Audicas	w	ı aıı	панисти	L

38

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Statement in the Committee on Apartheid 42

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Prime Minister's Message 44

MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Trade Protocol Signed 45

PAKISTAN

Foreign Minister's Statement in Parliament on Recent
Developments in Pakistan 46
Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha 46
Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha 47

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE

48

SWEDEN

Indo-Swedish Agreement Signed 49

UNITED KINGDOM

Parliament's Resolution

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Rajya Sabha

British Aid for Purchase of Ships

Indo-British Agreements Signed

51

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Loan to Aid India's Development 52

(ii)

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA MONGOLIA PAKISTAN SWEDEN USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Shrimati Leela, Damodara, Menon's Statement on British Sale of Helicopters to South Africa

Following is the text of statement made by Shrimati Leela Damodara, Me-non, leader of the Indian Delegation to the 27th Session of the Commission on Human Rights, at Geneva, on March 1, 1971, on British sale of helicopters to South Africa:

The reason for my delegation to take the floor first is that India is the only country, on this Commission, that was included in the 8-Nation Study Group constituted at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in January 1.971 at Singapore as a result of the thorough discussion of the supply of arms to South Africa.

We have the privilege to co-sponsor the resolution before us and I may mention that when the distinguished Ambassador of Senegal spoke last Friday on the delivery of 7 wasp helicopters to the racist Government of South Africa, he indeed voiced the strong feelings of all the non-aligned and Afro-Asian countries. We all begin to feel now the stings of the wasps, if I may say so.

The Government of India had informed the Government of the United Kingdom that it would leave the Study Group in accordance with the reservations made by our Foreign Minister in Singapore, unless the United Kingdom gave assurances that it would not take action to supply arms until the Study Group had met and reported and the Commonwealth Governments had time to consider its report. The United Kingdom Government have rejected this suggestion. We will accordingly not take part in the Study Group.

The motive for the resumption of arms supply to South Africa has been discussed ad nauseum. In all the forums of the United Nations and the Commonwealth. The delivery of the helicopters is one more blow to the legitimate aspirations of millions of Africans living in humiliating segregation, under constant terror and intimidation in a vast police and fascist state, whose purpose in obtaining arms from the United Kingdom is not so much to protect the sea or air

routes as to persist in and continue the crime against humanity by stifling the freedom, fundamental and human rights of the Africans in South Africa, which are their birth right. Sir, if I may ask who is this imaginary enemy of South Africa who will attack her from outside.

The other day the British delegate assured us that these helicopters are unlikely to be used inside South Africa. We are reminded. Mr. Chairman, of assurances given by the then Prime Minister of Britain at another Commonwealth meet held at Lagos for the first time in January 1966, on the question of illegal seizure of power by Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia. While considering the ways and means of dealing with the unilateral decision of Ian Smith. the Prime Minister assured the members that the illegal regime would be toppled in a matter of weeks rather than months. Many many weeks had passed since then. And what is the position today? That illegal regime continues in power, has been and is consolidating its authority with total impunity and with the connivance of South Africa and Portugal, denying 4 million Africans the political, economic, social, cultural and other rights.

The Security Council has placed an embargo on the sale of arms to South Africa. The present action of the U.K. is in direct contravention of that decision. The British

37

will keep stressing the legal obligations under the Simonstown Agreement, which is, as every one is aware is doubtful. The position of India is that it was over ridden by the Security Council's embargo.

Mr. Chairman. The matter becomes poignant and international decision becomes worthless, When the still-born Study Group and its debris have been swept under the carpet.

The implications and the far-reaching consequences of the British action cannot be dismissed lightly by this Commission. The

British Government should not only be held responsible but also positive action be taken to prevent the sale of arms. Otherwise, all our action for the celebration of 1971 as the International Year to combat racism which has been under serious discussion, for the past five days, will be vitiated by this dangerous pollution of its sacredness and solemnity.

This delivery of arms has been the subject of comments in the world press. Writing on the British arms sale, the Daily Nation of Nairobi observed and I quote:

"Britain's decision to sell wasp helicopters to South Africa will have the inevitable result of forcing African nations to seek more military assistance from the Soviet Union and other Commonwealth countries that side with Africans".

The decision is a brazen affront to the Commonwealth. It should be obvious that behind this latest British move lies a whole scheme to resume full-scale arms shipments.

These remarks have found support in the newspaper Die Berger of Cape Town, the relevant extracts from which read thus and I quote: "But there can be no doubt that this limited step is the beginning of fuller military cooperation between South Africa and Britain. Wasps will not be the end of the matter, for a handful of helicopters is not worth the vast political risks involved in the decision". The interference of this even to the meanest intelligence is obvious.

With these words, Mr. Chairman, my delegation, while supporting the Resolution, would commend its adoption by acclamation, as requested by the distinguished Ambassador of Senegal.

SOUTH AFRICA INDIA SWITZERLAND USA SENEGAL REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE PORTUGAL UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC KENYA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Address to Parliament

The President, Shri V. V. Giri delivered the following address to the Members of the Indian Parliament on March 23, 1971:

It gives me pleasure to address this Joint Session of the Fifth Parliament of our Republic and summon you to new endeayours.

The General Election has once again demonstrated that durable political power in a democracy has only one source - the people. It has proved the people's confidence in themselves and their faith in the processes of democracy.

Our people have made their choice. They have asserted their sovereignty through the ballot box. And theirs is a massive mandate for change, peaceful change that must swiftly and visibly alter the picture of poverty and alienation in our land.

38

We have begun this work. But now we have to address ourselves afresh to evolving perspectives, policies and practices even more closely and concretely related to the needs of our people and our times.

My Government have been returned to office on the clear pledge that the central objective of our policy must be the abolition of poverty. To achieve this, my Government are firmly committed to implementing the economic and social transformation out-

lined in the manifesto which has received such overwhelming support of the electorate.

The Government will soon frame specific policies and programmes arising out of the mandate of the electorate. A midterm appraisal of the Fourth Plan will be made. This appraisal will enable us to review and reorient the plan in order to increase the pace and effective use of, investment in the economy. As part of this exercise. Government will also identify the specific directions in which developmental programmes could be furl-her reinforced in a determined effort to deal with the problem of unemployment. The Crash Scheme for Rural Employment which is to be implemented from the commencement of the next financial year will form the nucleus of a comprehensive programme for the expansion of employment. This programme will be linked to schemes for raising the productivity of agriculture. The construction and renovation of minor irrigation sources and the provision of basic amenities such as drinking water supply and link roads will form part of this programme. The problem of the educated unemployed will receive special attention.

My Government are convinced that land reforms are vital for the promotion of an egalitarian social order and for maximising agricultural production. In recent months, various issues relating to land reforms have received special attention of my Government. A Central Land Reforms Committee under the chairmanship of the Union Minister of Food and Agriculture has been set up. As a result of the lead provided by the Government of India, States in which intermediary tenures have not been completely abolished have taken steps to do so. Further legislation has been introduced in some States to give security of tenure, to reduce rents and ceilings and to restrict exemptions.

While recognizing that land reforms come within the legislative competence of the States, my Government will continue to press the State Governments for further action in promoting a more equitable agra-

rian structure. Simultaneously the Government will pursue the objective of imposing a ceiling on urban property.

Extension of credit facilities for productive purposes to areas and classes hitherto neglected is one of the important objectives of my Government. A comprehensive credit guarantee scheme has been launched recently. A Credit Guarantee Corporation has been set up under the auspices of the Reserve Bank of India. As from 1st April, 1971, small loans given by commercial and cooperative bank offices will be eligible for guarantee by the Corporation to the extent of about 75% of the loans advanced. The increasing attention paid by the banks to the genuine needs of productive enterprises, including those of agriculturists whose main resort earlier was to money-lenders, is one of the striking new developments which have served to concretise the benefits of nationalisation for the small man.

Government also attach high priority to the extension of electricity to rural areas and, in particular, to the utilisation of electricity for lift irrigation. The implementation of rural electrification programmes has been appreciably accelerated.

2.66 lakh pumpsets were energised in the first year of the Plan and this tempo has been stepped up in the current year. The Rural Electrification Corporation has begun well with the sanction of schemes of the value of about Rs. 70 crores. This programme will be pursued with increasing vigour.

My Government are keenly aware of the intolerable living conditions of the urban poor. The clearance and improvement of slums and rehabilitation of slum dwellers will figure prominently in the agenda of economic and social reforms which my Government have in view and larger resources will be canalised for this purpose. The Housing and Urban Development Finance Corporation has been set up recently and will become an important agency for the augmentation of housing facilities in metro politan centres and urban areas.

Simultaneously, efforts to improve rural housing conditions will be given fuller consideration. The aim is to allot building sites to landless workers on a larger scale, to legislate for the conferment of homestead rights and to assist in the construction of decent, liveable houses for the rural population. This will necessarily have to be a joint programme of the State and Central Governments.

My Government also propose to:

- (a) appoint task forces to remove obstacles that come in the way of the speedy implementation of investment programmes in the public and private sectors of our industry and to step up the rate of industrial production;
- (b) extend the new technology in agriculture to dry farming, to new crops and to new areas which have not been covered so far. Research and extension programmes for a faster growth in the output of fibres and oilseeds which are articles of mass consumption will be intensified;
- (c) consult leaders of trade unions and managements in order to evolve sound industrial relations and to secure increased productivity consistent with a fair deal for labour. Improvement in industrial relations is as vital as capital and technology for increasing output;
- (d) accelerate changes in the structure and functioning of administrative apparatus, expedite decision making, ensure effective delegation of Powers and responsibilities and streamline financial procedures; and
 - (e) devote special attention to building

up a well-equipped managerial cadre for the public and private sectors.

The economy recorded growth almost at the planned rate in 1969-70, and it is likely to repeat this performance in the current year. A good harvest for the fourth year in succession is expected, raising the foodgrain output to 105 million tonnes - 5.5 million tonnes more than last year. The wheat revolution is by now an accomplished fact. Our agricultural scientists have released a number of higher yielding varieties of rice. The response of farmers to the new technology is limited only by our capacity to reach them effectively.

However, the improvement in the food situation will at best be a reprieve. The results of the new Census will be a grave reminder that the Family Planning Programme has to be pushed forward with much greater vigour. This programme can only be fulfilled if it becomes a movement. The small family must speedily become the accepted social norm. Indeed family planning should be regarded as a vital element in the gigantic task of social transformation that lies ahead.

While the general outlook for the economy is hopeful, my Government are aware that the level of prices in recent months has caused some concern. The wholesale price index is now approximately 3.4% higher than the level about a year ago. But it is important to note that amidst this pressure on prices the foodgrain prices have declined by about 6.5%. The Government have therefore sought to keep the rise in prices in check by arranging larger imports of commodities in short supply while taking steps to increase their internal production.

My Government intend to draw up and execute a National Plan for the application of Science and Technology to development. This paln will be intimately related to and indeed largely derived from our socioeconomic plan. An important feature of such a plan will be the preparation of de-

tailed programmes in a few high priority areas of national endeavour in which science and technology play an important part.

The Government have set up an Electronics Commission to ensure balanced development of the electronics industry. The Commission will concern itself with re-

40

search, development and industrial operations in the field of electronics.

My Government are anxious that rapid economic development should not lead to the pollution of air, water and soil. Them should be rational management of our natural resources taking care not to upset the ecological balance in nature.

The persistence of communal tension in some parts of the country and the occasional flaring up of violence constitute a threat to our secularism and democracy and to the basic values of civilised life which we cherish. The Government are determined to overcome this danger. This problem needs to be treated as national task to ensure national survival.

In the recent past, violence has grown in West Bengal. The murder of Shri Hemanta Kumar Basu, one of our oldest and most dedicated colleagues in the freedom movement, and of other political workers has shocked us all. Nevertheless the conduct and results of the recent elections in West Bengal clearly indicate a reaffirmation by the people of their faith in democracy.

My Government reiterate their unqualified determination to root out law-lessness and to eliminate the "politics" of murder and assault. Simultaneously my Government intend to accelerate the programme for the improvement of Greater Calcutta with the help of public and private investment. The Calcutta Metropolitan Development Authority has begun its work. The Industrial Reconstruction Corporation is about to be launched. Other development works are also being undertaken in West

Bengal.

The West Bengal Land Reforms (Amendment) Act was passed in July 1970 whereby the Bargadar's share of the crop was increased and his right to cultivate land made secure and heritable. A Presidential Act has been enacted recently to reduce the ceiling and fix it in terms of the family as a unit.

You are aware that orders for the derecognition of the Rulers of former Indian States were declared inoperative by a majority judgement of the Supreme Court. However Government's resolve to abolish by appropriate constitutional measures the Privy purses and privileges of Rulers remains unaltered.

Hope and despair continue to co-exist in the larger world around us. There has been a relaxation of tensions between Western and Eastern Europe. We welcome the signing of the agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and Poland. But the situation in South-East Asia and West Asia has worsened.

The situation in Indo-China has deteriorated further. Ever widening areas are engulfed in war embracing Cambodia and Laos. This is inconsistent with the interests of peace. We have urged restraint and pressed our view that the only solution lies in a peaceful and negotiated settlement within the broad framework of the Geneva Accord. It is our belief that the best solution will be an international Agreement or Convention, signed by all the Great Powers and others interested in the region.

There is uneasy truce in West Asia. My Government hope that positive response would be made to the series of initiatives recently taken by the U.A.R. showing its earnest desire to implement the Resolution of the Security Council of November 22, 1967.

We are concerned at the setting up of military bases by outside powers in the

Indian Ocean and the proposed sale of arras to South Africa. As mentioned in the Lusaka Declaration, we should like the Indian Ocean area to be a zone of peace, free from military confrontation and the rivalries of Great Powers.

The attitude of the Government of Pakistan during the recent hijacking of an Indian Airlines plane and its eventual destruction was deeply resented by the Government and the people of India. Friendship and understanding which we seek cannot be achieved by such provocations.

My Government will steadfastly pursue its policy of nonalignment. It will raise its

41

voice whenever peace is threatened, wherever the independence of sovereign nations is eroded. It stands firmly against colonialism whether in its old shape or in any new guise.

Your present session will be a short one confined to the transaction of essential financial and budgetary business. You will be meeting again shortly to consider further business. A statement of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India for the financial year 1971-72 will be laid before you. Bills will also be introduced for replacing the State of Himachal Pradesh (Amendment) Ordinance, 1971, and the Labour Provident Fund Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1971. A Bill for continuing the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 will also be introduced in the current session of Parliament.

Honourable Members, the people of India have given their verdict in unmistakable terms. With that verdict the period of political uncertainty and of the politics of manoeuvre ends. After the din of the election battle, we must bend ourselves to the service of our people. We can take pride that political democracy and parliamentary institutions have grown and have taken deep roots in the hearts and minds of our people. We must serve the cause of democracy by

respecting the will of the people.

The massive majority given to my Government is only the first step on the long and difficult road ahead. To achieve victory in the war against poverty and social injustice requires the sustained and dedicated efforts of the millions of our people. I am confident that Members of Parliament and the people of India, as a whole, will respond, in abundant measures, to the challenge of our times.

INDIA USA LATVIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC GERMANY POLAND CHINA CAMBODIA LAOS SWITZERLAND SOUTH AFRICA ZAMBIA PAKISTAN

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Statement in the Committee on Apartheid

Following is the text of the statement made by Shri Samar Sen. Permanent Representative of India, on March 22, 1971 at the Special Session of the Committee on Apartheid:

As President of the United Nations Council for Namibia, I deem it an honour to participate in this special session of the Committee on Apartheid, whose main purpose, as you stated in your generous letter of invitation, is to exchange views among the participants on steps for further effective action by the United Nations against South Africa.

Although I am certain that the members of the special committee have studied our activities with the same interest and concern as we on the council have done theirs, I believe that the objectives of this special session would be served if I were allowed to delve a little into the history relating to the creation of the council and its mandate, its past activities, successes and frustrations, as well as its future hopes.

Why did the United Nations create the council for Namibia (formerly United Nations Council for South-West Africa)? Not primarily because the council was to help eliminate the policy of apartheid practised by the Government of South Africa but to fulfil the obligations which South Africa had undertaken in regard to the administration of the mandated territory of South-West Africa or Namibia. One of the most important obligations was the prepa-

42 ration of the people of the territory for self-determination and independence.

In the view of the majority of the members of the United Nations, not only had South Africa failed to abide by this obligation but was practising with vigour its policies of Apartheid and its minority rule in Namibia.

The principal responsibility entrusted by the General Assembly to the United Nations Council for Namibia was the same as that given to South-Africa by the League and by its successor, the United Nations.

Although, since its beginning, the Council has been frustrated in its repeated efforts to discharge its principal responsibility due to the persistent refusal by the Government of South Africa to carry any of the numerous resolutions adopted by the various organs of the United Nations, it has nevertheless done everything within its power to assert its legal authority over the territory.

It has attempted to mobilize world public opinion against the policies of apartheid and minority rule in Namibia as well as in Southern Africa, and it has tried to assist the Namibian victims of such policies whose aims have been the denial of human rights,

exploitation of the natural resources of the territory and reprehensible acts of repression.

Let me enumerate some of the steps which the council has taken in the past and others which it plans to take soon in carrying out the mandate which the various United Nations organs have entrusted to it.

The council has concluded agreements with several Governments on the question of recognition of travel and identity documents, which it has already begun to issue at its regional office established at Lusaka to Namibians for purposes of travel. It has also obtained the acceptance of some Governments on the recognition of these documents - a fact which attests to the recognition of its legal authority over the territory and the denial of the same prerogative illegally exercised by South Africa. Such activities will be continued by the Acting Commissioner for Namibia, on behalf of the council, with a view to gaining an even wider acceptance of the travel documents as the symbols of the council's authority.

The council undertook a mission to Africa in 1968 to make known its own actions for serving the cause of Namibians. It is again planning to visit several countries this year, particularly in Africa, to consult with the participants in the scheduled summit conference of the O.A.U., and of the Namibian people on ways and means of removing the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia and its evil consequences.

In order to counteract a massive propaganda campaign mounted by South Africa, the council is planning to take a number of steps which will include publications exposing the extent of South Africa's exploitation of the natural resources of Namibia, its repression of the Namibian people, and its policy of establishing separate 'Homelands' in order to strengthen and consolidate its illegal presence and minority rule. Furthermore, the council plans to request appropriate authorities of the United Nations to issue a series of stamps which are expected

to help U.N. publicity efforts for Namibia.

Acting in accordance with the resolutions of the General Assembly, the council is also working towards the establishment of a United Nations Fund for Namibia and a separate educational and training programme for Namibians. Such a programme will train a crop of Namibians who could assist in the administration of the territory as soon as South Africa's illegal occupation has been brought to an end, and the council has been enabled to carry out its mandate.

These, and other steps still to be taken demonstrate that while the council has been less than successful, it has seized, and will certainly continue to seize, every opportunity which would bring hope, comfort and whatever benefits the international community can agree upon and afford for the unfortunate Namibians. They have been the victims of the inhuman policies carried out by South Africa including the policy of apartheid which has been condemned again and again.

43

The council hopes that its aim of putting an end to the policies of apartheid in South Africa, in Namibia, in Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and anywhere else can be achieved through cooperative efforts by appropriate organs of the United Nations. It, therefore, looks forward to the joint session with special committee on apartheid and the committee of 24 for the purpose of coordinating their actions.

The combined efforts of these organs cannot help focussing world public opinion on the injustice and inhumanity of South African policy of apartheid. They cannot help isolating South Africa further from the rest of the comity of nations which detest and condemn those policies.

Such combined efforts can be far more successful if South Africa were totally, I stress totally, isolated and were denied the assistance, support and comfort it receives in the form of armaments, aid and trade.

That could be possible only if all member states respected both in letter and spirit their Charter obligations, rather than continue to serve what they consider to be their political, financial, and economic interests. To most of the members of the United Nations such an approach, of a limited, very limited few, appear to be totally unjustified, whichever way one looks at it.

Speaking on behalf of my colleagues on the United Nations Council for Namibia, it is my hope that these handful of memberstates would respond to the general desire of the people of the world as a whole and would carry out the United Nations resolutions which have repeatedly condemned what South Africa has done and is doing in Southern Africa, including Namibia, in total defiance of the United Nations.

Recently, the council heard a statement from the legal counsel of the United Nations, Mr. Stavropoulos the Under-Secretary General, about the case on Namibia before the International Court. Mr. Stavropoulos explained the various steps taken by several member-states as also by the U.N. Secretariat, before the Court. While we wait for the judgement, which cannot, under the procedure followed by the court, be expected before the end of May, the council was encouraged to hear that the several moves by the South African Government to divert the world attention by fictitious and unrealistic offer of holding a plebiscite in Namibia failed. The second concrete recent development I should like to report is that the council has now drawn up its programme for the next few months and the Acting Commissioner, who will shortly be visiting Africa in some other connection, will have an opportunity to find out and tell the council in which directions we may expect to move forward. However, I must not leave the Committee with the impression that progress will be speedy or spectacular. Given the attitude of South Africa and some of her friends, the struggle is going to be a long one and we shall have to be constantly vigilant and inch our way ahead with the cooperation of likeminded nations. Fortunately, the number of such nations is very large and we are optimistic of success, however long the journey may be.

INDIA NAMIBIA USA SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA ZIMBABWE

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR ELIMINATION OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION

Prime Minister's Message

Following is the text of the message given by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, on March 21, 1971, on the occasion of the International Day for the Elimination Of Racial Discrimination:

Over the last decade March 21 has been commemorated yearly as International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. It commemorates the killing of 69 unarmed African men, women and children in South Africa for defying the Pass Law. The Day is of special poignance this year because of the United Nations resolution on the International Year to combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

44

Equality is a dominant urge of man. Peace and Justice can be achieved only when the dignity of man, without distinction of race or colour, comes to be honoured. Racialism is a crime against humanity and all forms of racial discrimination must end. Yet millions of non-whites in South Africa and elsewhere still live under the tyranny of racial arrogance and prejudice. The armed strength of South Africa is a threat to the lives of millions of people. The support of powerful foreign States and financial in-

terests has encouraged the racist regime of South Africa to defy the world, community. We deplore all moves which encouraged such attitudes by increasing its military power. We also deplore the segregation policies followed by the illegal regime in Zimbabwe.

On this day, we pay homage to all who have fought and those who have made the supreme sacrifice for a world of equal human beings. The people of India will always raise their voice for racial equality and peace until the goal is reached.

USA SOUTH AFRICA ZIMBABWE INDIA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

Trade Protocol Signed

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on March 1, 1971 on the trade Protocol signed between India and the Mongolian People's Republic:

A Protocol was signed in New Delhi on March 1, 1971 between India and Mongolia extending the validity of the existing bilateral trade agreement for a further period of three years, with effect from February 14, 1971. It will be recalled that the first, ever Trade Agreement had been signed between the two countries in New Delhi on February 13, 1968.

His Excellency Mr. Tsevengombyn Demiddavag, Ambassador of Mongolian People's Republic signed the Protocol on behalf of the Government of Mongolian People's Republic and Shri N. P. Jain, Joint Secretary on behalf of the Government of India.

Both sides agreed to actively explore possibilities of developing two way trade exchanges corresponding to the import needs and export possibilities of the two countries.

Trade between India and Mongolia has so far been negligible. The long distance between the two countries has posed problems in developing mutual trade. The two sides have discussed ways and means of overcoming this difficulty. Further talks on developing shipping facilities are scheduled to take place.

In the course of the discussions, the two delegations have also identified certain lines for expansion of trade. Some of the possibilities are supplies, from the Mongolian side, of raw wool, animal hair, skins etc. and, from India's side, export of a wide range of industrial products.

45

MONGOLIA INDIA USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Foreign Minister's Statement in Parliament on Recent Developments in Pakistan

Following is the text of the statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Parliament on March 27, 1971 regarding recent developments in Pakistan:

The Government of India cannot but be gravely concerned at the events taking place

so close to our borders. We can, therefore, understand the deep emotions which have been aroused in this House and in the entire country.

Honourable Members are, I am sure, fully aware of political developments in Pakistan since November 28, 1969 when the President of Pakistan announced his plan for evolving a democratic Constitution and for the transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people.

The Government and people of India have always entertained the friendliest of feelings for the people of Pakistan. We had, therefore, hoped that a democratic evolution in Pakistan would follow its natural course and that the elected representatives would evolve a Constitution reflecting the urges of the vast majority of the people expressed through the elections held in December last year.

However, events have taken a different and tragic turn. Instead of peaceful evolution there is now a bloody conflict.

According to reports received, the Pakistan Army started taking action on the midnight of 25th and 26th March against units of the East Pakistan Rifles, the provincial police and the people. The reports are that casualties have been heavy. On the morning of March 26th, the Radio Station at Dacca was seized by the Army. Thereafter the Radio Station made an announcement of 15 new Marshal Law Regulations banning, among other things, all political activities, processions, meetings speeches and slogans. Complete censorship of all news, Radio and Television programmes was imposed.

More than two regular Divisions of the Pakistan Army are deployed in suppressing the people of East Pakistan. Our hearts go out in sympathy to the people who are undergoing great suffering.

We naturally wish and hope that even at this late stage it would be possible to resume democratic processes leading to the fulfilment of the aspirations of the vast majority of the people there. We cannot but take note of the fact that such a large segment of humanity is involved in a conflict and that many people are suffering in the process.

Recently, when natural disaster overtook East Pakistan, the Government and people of India along with other members of the international community responded to bring relief to the sufferings of the people there.

We are prepared to make our contribution once again, in concert with the members of the International Community or Intenational humanitarian organisations, concerned with bringing relief to innocent victims of conflict.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha

Intervening in the discussion on the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs an recent developments in Pakistan in the Lok Sabha on March 27, 1971, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said:

The point is that this news (regarding the arrest of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman) has

46

come through Radio Pakistan and, therefore, I cannot say whether it is true or not.

But we should not take it as true because it could be just a propaganda.

Sir, the strength does not lie in words, If my colleague, Shri Swaran Singh, has not spoken with passion, it is not much for lack of feeling either on his part or on the part of the Government but because of the fact that we are deeply conscious of the historic importance of this movement and the seriousness of the situation.

Something new had happened in East Bengal - a democratic action where an entire people had spoken with almost one voice. We had welcomed this, not because we wanted any interference in another country's affairs, but, because there were the values, as one of my hon, friends pointed out, for which we have always stood and for which we have always spoken out. And we had hoped that this action would lead to a new situation in our neighbouring country which would help us to get closer, which would help us to serve our own people better and create an entirely new situation. As our statement has said this has not happened and a wonderful opportunity for even the strengthening of Pakistan has been lost and has been lost in a manner which is tragic, which is agonising and about which we cannot find strong enough words to speak because this again is a new situation.

It is not merely the suppression of a movement, but it is meeting an unarmed people with tanks. We are in close touch, as close touch with the events as is possible in such a situation. I am sure hon. Members will understand that it is not possible for the Government to say very much more on this occasion here.

I would like to assure the hon. Members who asked whether decisions would be taken on time, that obviously that is the most important thing to do. There is no point in taking a decision when the time for it is over. We are fully alive to the situation and we shall keep constantly in touch with what is happening and what we need to do. But I agree with him also that Ave must not take merely a theoretical view. At the same

time we do have to follow proper international norms. But there are various other suggestions made here, about genocide and so on, about which we are fully conscious and which we also discussed with the leaders of the Opposition.

I think at this moment I can only say that we do fully share the agony, the emotions of the House and their deep concern over these developments because we have always believed that freedom is indivisible. We have always raised our voice for those who have suffered, but, in a serious moment like this, the less we as a Government say, I think the better it is at this moment. I can assure the House that we shall keep in close touch with the situation and also we shall keep in close touch with the leaders of the Opposition so that they can continue to give us their suggestions and we can also give them whatever knowledge we have.

PAKISTAN USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha

Intervening in the discussion on the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs on recent developments in Pakistan in the Rajya Sabha on March 27, 1971, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, we have watched the happenings in Pakistan earlier, that is, the election in East Bengal, with great admiration and hope, hope that it was the beginning of a new future for the whole country, future which would make them more

united and strong. But, as my colleague, Shri Swaran Singh, has said, far from leading into this brightness they have turned along a dark path, a tragic path, bringing suffering - in fact, perhaps, suffering is too small a word - to an entire people.

I am sure hon. Members will appreciate that however heavy our hearts may be, however, deeply we may be sharing the agony of the people there, it is not possible for the Government to speak in the same words as hon. Members can do. In fact, it is because we are so deeply conscious of the historic importance of this moment that we are, at the same time, aware of the seriousness of the situation when a wrong step, a wrong word, can have an effect entirely

47

different from the one which we all just intend.

The House is aware that we have to act within certain international norms. It is good to see that the Parties here have expressed certain views. For instance, the Swantantra Party has expressed admiration for the socialist programme of Shri Mujibur Rahman. The Jana Sangh has supported his secular policy and have also said that the people of East Bengal are their brothers. I hope they will extend the same sympathy to all the people Of our own country too.

As I said earlier, we are not unaware of what is taking place in East Pakistan and of what it means not only to the people there but the danger that it holds for us, not for any one part of our country, but for the entire country. So we are interested in this matter for many reasons, firstly as one Member has said that Shri Mujibur Rahman has stood for the values which we Ourselves cherish the values of democracy, the values of secularism and the values of socialism.

We are also concerned with the truly wonderful and unique way in which the people there had stood behind him and behind these values. We are no less full of sorrow and grave concern and even agony at what is happening there but I can only appeal to the hon. Members that this is not a moment when the Government can say anything more and whatever the Government may or may not be able to do it would not be wise if this becomes a matter for public debate.

I do not think that hon. Members expect us to give replies to the various questions that were asked. I think the purpose of this discussion was more that we should know their mind and hear their suggestions. As hon. Members know, I held a meeting this morning with the Leaders of the Opposition which I hope to continue. We are as closely in touch with the happenings in East Bengal as is possible in this situation and I hope to keep closely in touch with the Leaders of the Opposition as well as other Members who would like to come and meet us so that we can know their mind. We cannot always, I must admit, give our mind but we will certainly tell them as much as is possible in this situation.

PAKISTAN USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Parliament's Resolution

Moving the Resolution on East Bengal in both the Houses of Parliament on March 31, 1971 the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, said:

The tragedy which has overtaken our valiant neighbours in East Bengal so soon

after their re joicing over their electoral victory has united us in grief for their suffering, concern for the wanton destruction of their beautiful land and anxiety for their future

I with to move a resolution which has been discussed with the leaders of the Opposition and I am glad to say, approved unanimously.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

This House expresses its deep anguish and grave concern at the recent developments in East Bengal. A massive attack by armed forces, despatched from West Pakistan has been unleashed against the entire people of East Bengal with a view to suppressing their urges and aspirations.

Instead of respecting the will of the people so unmistakably expressed through the election in Pakistan in December 1970, the Government of Pakistan has chosen to flout the mandate of the people.

The Government of Pakistan has not only refused to transfer power to legally elected representatives but has arbitrarily prevented the National Assembly from assuming its rightful and sovereign role. The people of East Bengal are being sought to be suppressed by the naked use of force, by bayonets, machine guns, tanks, artillery and aircraft.

48

The Government and people of India have always desired and worked for peaceful, normal and fraternal relations with Pakistan. However, situated as India is and bound as the peoples of the sub-continent are by centuries old ties of history, culture and tradition, this House cannot remain indifferent to the macabre tragedy being enacted so close to our border. Throughout the length and breadth of out, land, our

people have condemned, in unmistakable terms, the atrocities now being perpetrated on an unprecedented scale upon an unarmed and innocent people.

This House expresses its profound sympathy for and solidarity with the people of East Bengal in their struggle for a democratic way of life.

Bearing in mind the permanent interests which India has in peace and committed as we are to uphold and defend human rights, this House demands immediate cessation of the use of force and the massacre of defenceless people. This House calls upon all peoples and Governments of the world to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to put an end immediately to the systematic decimation of people which amounts to genocide.

This House records its profound conviction that the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of East Bengal will triumph. The House wishes to assure them that their struggle and sacrifices will receive the whole hearted sympathy and support of the people of India.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SWEDEN

Indo-Swedish Agreement Signed

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on March 10, 1971 on

the, agreement signed between India and Sweden on a new Swedish loan to India:

An agreement for a new Swedish loan to India was signed in New Delhi on March 10, 1971, by His Excellency Count A. Lewenhaupt, the Swedish Ambassador and Shri Y. T. Shah, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Finance.

The new loan is for an amount of S. Krs. 125 million (Rs. 18.125 crores) for a three-year period starting from 1971-72. The loan is divided into three segments, one for maintenance imports, one for capital goods imports (priority being given to the requirements of the small-scale sector and of export-oriented units) and one for the import requirements of the dairy development and milk marketing programme. Though amounts have been earmarked separately for these segments, these are flexible and adjustable inter-se within limits. The maintenance import segment will cover the maintenance import needs of the economy generally apart from meeting, some of the requirements of Indo-Swedish joint ventures

As a member of the Aid-India Consortium, Sweden has been extending financial assistance to India for the last several years. The agreement signed today is the fourth such agreement, and brings the total value of agreements signed between Sweden and India so far to S. Krs 248 million (Rs. 35.96 crores).

Like earlier Swedish loans, the new loan will be completely untied and can be

49

used globally to the best advantage. The terms have been considerably softened while the last Swedish credit was repayable in 25 years with a grace period of 10 years and carried interest at 2 per cent, the new credit will be repayable in 50 years with a grace period of ten years and-is interest-free, with only a nominal service charge of 0.75 per cent. There is also an increase in the quantum of aid from S. Krs 75 million

(Rs. 10.375 crores) under the last credit to S. Krs 125 million (Rs. 18.125 crores) under the new agreement. Another important feature of the new credit is that it includes a segment under which allocations can be made for miscellaneous capital goods requirements which are not necessarily part of large projects. Procedural simplifications have also been effected to make the operation of the credit both flexible and easy.

SWEDEN INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Shigh's Statement in Rajya Sabha

Following is the text of the statement made by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, in the Rajya Sabha on March 25, 1971 on the reported decision of the U.K. Government to sell helicopters and other weapons to South Africa even before the eight-member Study Group, appointed at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held recently at Singapore had undertaken any study on the subject:

All aspects of the situation arising out of the proposed supply of arms by Britain to South Africa were considered at great length at the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference held in Singapore in January 1971. The debate at one stage threatened to break up the Commonwealth. In this context, it was decided to set up a Study Group of 8 members, consisting of Canada, Jamaica, U.K., Nigeria, Kenya, India, Malaysia and Australia. The Study Group was to consider the factors affecting the security of the maritime trade routes in

the South Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, and report back to the Heads of Government. India accepted membership of the Study Group on the understanding that the question would be considered in relation to its impact on the Commonwealth. Although Britain, like other members of the Commonwealth, had the right to take such action as was necessary to give effect to its global defence policy, India hoped that Britain would pay heed to the views expressed by various members of the Commonwealth. India could not place any reliance on any assurance of the South African Government that it would not use British arms for aggressive ends as it had violated UN resolutions and flouted the will of the international community on many occasions. However, in the hope that Britain would heed the voice of the Commonwealth and not take any hasty steps contrary to the near unanimous view of its members, India had agreed to serve on the Study Group. It was our hope that circumstances would not arise which would make the Study Group infructuous. However, we made it clear that India would have to reconsider its position, if circumstances changed.

The British Government took a decision to sell certain quantities of arms to South Africa and announced that it had conveyed this decision to the South African Government even before the Study Group could meet. In view of this unilateral action of the British Government, we informed the Commonwealth Secretariat of our inability to participate in the Study Group. The totality of the understanding and reservations at Singapore required that the

50

British Government should withhold a final decision of arms sales to South Africa till the Commonwealth Governments had had a chance to consider the Study Group's report. Moreover, this supply of arms is contrary to the mandatory resolution of the Security Council which clearly supersedes any legal obligations under a bilateral treaty.

The British arms supply to South

Africa would strengthen the White racist policies of South Africa, sustain Portuguese colonialism in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and help to entrench, the racist minority regime in Rhodesia. Their African neighbours to the North would be subject to greater threats and intimidation, causing tension over wide areas of the African continent and reaching out into the Indian Ocean. We are totally opposed to any country supplying arms to South Africa.

UNITED KINGDOM SOUTH AFRICA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE CANADA JAMAICA KENYA NIGER NIGERIA AUSTRALIA INDIA MALAYSIA USA ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE GUINEA-BISSAU

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid for Purchase of Ships

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on the Letters exchanged between India and the United Kingdom on the allocation of funds to finance purchase of ships by the Shipping Corporation of India:

Letters were exchanged in New Delhi on March 22, 1971 between the Ministry of Finance and the British High Commission in New Delhi to allocate Rs. 20.97 crores (æ 11.65 million) out of the British project aid to finance an order for two bulk carriers of 75000 DWT each placed by Shipping Corporation of India on a British shipyard. This will be one of the largest British aided projects in recent years and also the first time that bilateral aid to India has been used on such a large scale for purchase of ships.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Indo-British Agreements Signed

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on March 18, 1971 on the agreements signed between India and the United Kingdom for three loans for the purchase by India of British manufactured capital goods required for Indian development and to cover the British element of major projects:

Agreements for three loans were signed in New Delhi on March 18, 1971 under which Britain committed & 16 million (Rs. 28.8 crores) project aid to India. The three loans are intended to finance the purchase by India of British manufactured capital goods required for Indian development and to cover the British element of major projects.

The agreements were signed by Sit Morrice James, British High Commissioner, and Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

The first loan, for & 12 million (Rs. 21.6 crores), known as the UK/India Capital Investment Loan 1971, covers the import of British-manufactured capital goods. It is allocated to the following purposes:

- (a) œ 5 million (Rs. 9 crores) for the import of capital items by private sector firms in India;
- (b) & 5 million (Rs. 9 crores) for the import of capital items by public sector units in India;

- (c) & 1 million (Rs. 1.8 crores for the import of capital items by firms in the small scale sector through the hire-purchase facilities of the National Small Industries Corporation; and
- (d) & 1 million (Rs. 1.8 crores for the import of capital items by firms

51

which are obtaining finance for the purchase from the Industrial Finance Corporation of India.

The second loan, for œ 1 million (Rs. 1.8 crores), known as the UK/India ICICI Loan 1971, covers the import of capital items by firms which are obtaining finance for the purchase from the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India.

The third loan, for & 3 million (Rs. 5.4 crores), known as the UK/India Mixed Project Loan 1971, covers the cost of British goods and services required for major projects the British element of which is being financed out of British assistance. Several projects are under discussion between the Governments of the United Kingdom and India, including two fertilizer plants in India and the construction of ships in the United Kingdom for Indian shipping lines.

The loans are all on the soft terms granted for all British aid loans in recent years. Capital repayments are spread over 25 years inclusive of an initial grace period of seven years with no interest. They form part of the æ 72 million (Rs. 129.6 crores) of project aid which the British Government have indicated that they will commit to India during the last four years of the Fourth Five Year Plan period.

In September 1970, the UK/India Maintenance Loan for & 26 million (Rs. 46.8 crores) was signed. This loan covered the import of maintenance items from the United Kingdom. With the three loans signed today & 42 million (Rs. 75.6 crores) of British aid has been committed during the financial year 1970-71 against a pledge

of æ 45 million (Rs. 81 crores) made at the India Consortium Meeting in May 1970. A loan for æ 2 million for imports required by UK-oriented firms will be signed shortly and an allocation of æ1 million to the family planning programme of the Government of India is under discussion.

INDIA RUSSIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

U.S. Loan to Aid India's Development

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on March 23, 1971 on the U.S. loan to India to finance a part of the expenditures on several development activities:

The United States has extended a loan of Rs. 48.48 crores to the Government of India to finance a part of the expenditures on several development activities during the current Indian financial year.

Mr. L. Paul Oechsli, Acting Director, U.S. Agency for International Development Mission, presented on March 23, 1971 a cheque covering the loan to Mr. A. T. Bambawale, Joint Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

The loan has been made from the sales proceeds of agricultural commodities supplied to India under Public Law 480 agreements concluded between 1967 and 1969.

Major development activities in the field of agriculture, power and transportation will be partially financed by the loan.

In agriculture, these activities include the development of commercial crops such as groundnuts, cashewnuts and jute; agricultural research; soil conservation; and fisheries.

Financing is also provided for the construction of inter-State grids to link the electric power systems of different States.

The loan will also assist the improvement of existing national highways and the construction of missing links; and the development of the Mangalore and Tuticorin ports.

52

USA INDIA

Date: Mar 01, 1971

April

Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII APRIL

CONTENTS

PAGE

BHUTAN
President Shri V. V. Giri's Speech at Airport Welcoming His Majesty the Druk Gyalpo, of Bhutan

No.4

53

```
Bhutan King's Reply
     53
  Bhutan King's Speech at Dinner in Honour of President Giri
  President V. V. Giri's Reply
     54
  President Giri's Speech Bidding Farewell to His Majesty Druk Gyalpo of Bhu
tan
  Bhutan King's Reply
  Bhutan King's Message to the People of India
     55
CANADA
  Loan Agreement with Canada
     56
FRANCE
  Indo-French Economic Commission
     57
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS
  Shri S. Sen's Letter to the President of the Security Council on
  Pakistan's Complaint on Suspension of Overflights
  Shri S. M. S. Chadha's Statement on Chemical Warfare by
  Portugal in Angola
     63
TOKYO CONVENTION ON HIJACKING
  India's Decision
     64
  MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION
             GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
                         (Continued Overleaf)
PAGE
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
  Indo-Soviet Agreement on Industrial Cooperation
65
UNITED KINGDOM
  Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on U.K. Immi-
  gration Bill
 66
  Foreign Trade Minister's Statement in Rajya Sabha on Tariff on
  Indian Textiles
 67
```

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement for Additional 15 Million Dollar Loan 67

BHUTAN UNITED KINGDOM INDIA CANADA FRANCE PAKISTAN USA CHAD ANGOLA PORTUGAL JAPAN

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

President Shri V. V. Giri's Speech at Airport Welcoming His Majesty the Druk Gyalpo of Bhutan

The President, Shri V. V. Giri, made the following speech welcoming His Majesty the Druk Gyalpo of Bhutan, on his arrival in New Delhi on April 7, 1971:

It gives us very great pleasure to receive you this evening in our midst again. About a year ago, when I had the privilege of visiting your great country, I was overwhelmed by the warmth of your affection and the welcome extended to us. We were impressed by the rapid strides that Bhutan has made towards her economic development and the advancement of her people under your wise leadership.

You are no stranger to us, Your Majesty. With every visit that you make to India, the ties that bind our two peoples together grow stronger.

We are happy that His Royal Highness the Crown Prince is with you on this visit. I bid Your Majesty and the Crown Prince a hearty welcome on my behalf and on behalf of the Government and the people of India, and express the hope that you will find your stay in India comfortable and rewarding.

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

Bhutan King's Reply

Replying, the King of Bhutan said:

It gives me and my son very great pleasure to be here today in the capital city of our Indian friends. We come on the kind invitation extended to us during the historic visit of Your Excellency to Bhutan last year.

The relationship between our two countries, after India attained Independence in 1947, has always been very close and friendly. The visit of the late Prime Minister, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and Her Excellency, Shrimati Indira Gandhi to Bhutan in 1958 ushered a new era of friendship and cooperation between our two countries. Since then, Bhutan has taken a great leap on the road to modernisation. Much of the progress that we have achieved in all fields during the past decade, we owe to the generosity of our Indian friends.

We are deeply touched by the warmth of our welcome today. For us a visit to India is like a visit to our own home, so deep are the ties of religion, culture and friendship between our two peoples. I hope that my visit will bring our two peoples and countries still closer together.

BHUTAN INDIA USA

Date : Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

Bhutan King's Speech at Dinner in Honour of President Giri

Following is the text of speech made by His Majesty the Druk Gyalpo of Bhutan at a banquet in honour of the President Shri V. V. Giri on April 9, 1971:

My son and I have been deeply moved by the great kindness shown to us by Your Excellency during the past three days. Goodwill and affection have been showered upon us in abundance from all sides.

India as our friend and neighbour is helping us in carrying out a comprehensive plan of development in social, economic and other fields. She has financed our first and second Five Year Plans and has pledged

53

support for our Third Plan. As a result of Your Excellency's visit to Bhutan last year determined efforts are being made to develop our traditional handicraft industry by establishing centres for handloom, wood and bamboo work and fine arts.

There is now a general awareness in my country that the development of cottage and small-scale industries is essential for future prosperity. Your Excellency is the main inspiration behind our efforts to develop small-scale industries and I hope that we will continue to enjoy the benefit of your wise counsel and personal guidance in this field. We also deeply appreciate the personal action taken by Your Excellency to send experts in small-scale industries to Bhutan and I would like to assure Your Excellency that we will make every effort

to implement their recommendations.

The chief architect of friendship between our two countries was the great Indian leader and statesman, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. It was his visit to Bhutan in 1958 that led to the opening of a new chapter in the history of Bhutan and in Indo-Bhutan relationship. New links of cooperation in economic and other fields, were added to the traditional ties of friendship thereby giving a new dimension to the relationship between our two countries. We are extremely happy that this policy of friendship and close cooperation started by Pandit Nehru has been further strengthened under the wise leadership of Her Excellency the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

I would now like to request you all to drink a toast to the health and long life of His Excellency the President of India.

BHUTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

President V. V. Giri's Reply

The President of India, Shri V. V. Girl, said in reply:

I am thankful to you for the very warm sentiments expressed by you. I hope in the two days that you have spent in the capital of India, you have noticed something of the warmth and affection of the Indian people for their brethren in Bhutan. Your Majesty, we are aware of the contribution you have personally made in the development of this feeling and the strengthening of bonds that have existed between our two

peoples since times immemorial. We share fully your sentiment that our destinies are linked together. We are conscious that in Bhutan's progress and prosperity lies our own strength. We have seen with deep admiration Bhutan being led by you step by step into a full-fledged modem State. The constitutional, administrative and political reforms which you have brought about in your great country entirely at your own initiative speak volumes of your great statesmanship. We hope and pray that Your Majesty will continue for many more years to come to guide the destinies of youth people and usher her into an era of unprecedented prosperity and progress. I would like to assure Your Majesty that the bonds of history, religion, culture and geography that exist between us are sacred and eternal and it would be our endeavour to make them ever stronger.

May I request all the distinguished guests present to drink a toast to the health and long life of His Majesty the King and His Royal Highness the Crown Prince and convey to the people of Bhutan through them our greetings and best wishes for their continued well-being and prosperity.

BHUTAN INDIA USA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

President Giri's Speech Bidding Farewell to His Majesty Druk Gyalpo of Bhutan

Following is the text of speech by President V. V. Giri, bidding farewell to His Majesty Druk Gyalpo, of Bhutan on April 12, 1971:

Your Majesty, it is with regret that we bid farewell to you today. Your stay in Delhi as a member of our family has been a source of great pleasure to us. You and the Crown Prince have captured the hearts of the Indian people who hold you in the highest regard, esteem and affection. My Government and my people join me in con-

54

veying to you and your people, our sincere good wishes in the tasks that lie ahead of Bhutan under your outstanding leadership.

We are confident that the bonds between our two countries will become stronger. We are grateful for the contribution that you, Your Majesty, have personally made in this behalf. We wish you all health and your people increasing happiness and wellbeing.

BHUTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

Bhutan King's Reply

The King in his reply said:

Your Excellency, my son and I have been overwhelmed by the love and affection which we have received from everyone during our stay in Delhi. We would like to convey our deepest thanks to His Excellency the President and the Government and people of India for the warm and kind hospitality and for all the efforts to make our stay in Delhi so pleasant and memorable. Thank you.

Date : Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BHUTAN

Bhutan King's Message to the People of India

Following is the text of the message broadcast over the All India Radio by His Majesty, the Druk Gyalpo of Bhutan on April 12, 1971 after a six-day State visit:

Our ties with India since ancient times have been deep and varied. In the 8th Century A.D. the Indian Saint, Guru Padma Sambhava, visited Bhutan and converted the country to Buddhism. Since then we have considered India our spiritual home and for centuries devout Bhutanese pilgrims have travelled south over high mountain passes to visit sacred Buddhist shrines in India. Many of our prayers are recited in Sanskrit. Even our written script is derived from an Indian language. To this common cultural and religious heritage, one may add the traditional links of trade and commerce. In the past Bhutanese mountain ponies, musk and lac were prized in India as were Indian silk, salt and arecanut in Bhutan. Presently India is the natural market for our surplus agricultural produce as Bhutan is for the whole range of Indian consumer and manufactured goods.

A new chapter in the relationship between the two countries opened when India became independent in 1947. Under the far sighted leadership of the great Indian statesman, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the foundation for a lasting policy of friendship and co-operation was firmly laid between the

two countries. A treaty of perpetual friendship was signed in 1949. In 1958, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru visited Paro in Western Bhutan. In 1959, work started on the construction of the first national highway linking India to the Bhutanese capital city of Thimphu. This road, completed in 1961, was formally opened by Indian Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1969. In 1970, His Excellency Shri V. V. Giri was the first Indian Head of State to visit Bhutan. These visits of distinguished Indian leaders to Bhutan have helped a great deal in bringing the two countries closer together.

India has played a key role in the process of modernising Bhutan. She has given generous capital and technical assistance for our First and Second Five-Year Plans and has recently pledged support for our Third Plan. The social and economic infrastructure of the country is being built-up through these Plans. A vast network of roads-, telephone exchanges and post offices are being established. Development of education, agriculture and health services are being given top priority. The power resources of the country are being tapped and scientific management being introduced in exploiting our rich forest resources. Geological and botanical surveys are being carried

55

out Schemes for developing the traditional handicrafts of Bhutan for export have been taken up, and determined efforts are being made to establish small and medium scale industries in various fields. Representative institutions like the National Assembly and Royal Advisory Council have been established and strengthened in order to give the people a decisive say in the affairs of the country.

The close co-operation between the two countries have not been limited to the internal modernisation of Bhutan. In the external sphere, we have ended our age old policy of isolation and opened our doors to the outside world. India has already assisted in securing for us admission in the Colombo

Plan and Universal Postal Union, and is now sponsoring us into the United Nations. Small as we are, we wish to play our role in international affairs as a friend and partner of India.

Centuries of close association as neighbours have created strong bonds of goodwill, friendship and understanding between our two countries and peoples. The recent co-operation in social, economic and other fields have added meaning and given a new dimension to this relationship. We share the common aim of giving to our peoples a richer and more dignified life. It shall always be my endeavour, as I know it is that of your leaders, to work for a further strengthening of the bonds of friendship and understanding between our two countries, so that India and Bhutan will stand as a shining example of good neighbourly relationship.

My son and I have been deeply moved by the kindness and love which have been so abundantly bestowed on us by the Government and people of India. I bring to you all warm and cordial greetings of love and friendship from the people of Bhutan.

BHUTAN INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA RUSSIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SRI LANKA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No 1995 CANADA Loan Agreements with Canada Signed

Following is the, text of the press release issued in New Delhi on April 7, 1971 On two new loan agreements signed between India and Canada:

Agreements for two Canadian development loans worth Rs. 30 crores (43 million dollars) were signed here today. one loan for Rs. 28 crores (40 Million dollars) will be used during 1971-72 to finance the import of industrial commodities, fertilisers and fertiliser materials. The second is a Rs. 2 crore (3 million dollars) line of credit for use by the OH and Natural Gas Commission.

The loans are on the usual soft terms granted for all Canadian development loans to India during the last five years. They are repayable in fifty years, including a ten-year grace period and there are no interest, service Or commitment charges. These terms are the softest available to India from any source.

The agreements were signed by Mr. Paul Gerin-Lajoie, President, Canadian International Development Agency, and Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

The Rs. 2 crores (3 million dollars) line of credit will enable the Oil and Natural Gas Commission to secure many of their equipment, material and service requirements in Canada on a continued basis during the Fourth Five Year Plan. The equipment and materials will be used in the ONGC's

56

continuing oil exploration and development programmes. As one of the world's leading gas and oil producers, Canada has a technologically advanced oil and gas equipment industry and is able to supply a wide range of exploration and development equipment.

This is the second loan Canada has provided to ONGC. In the fall of 1969, Rs. 1.4 crores (2 million dollars) were made available for the purchase of oil well casings. In 1964, a Rs. 84 lakhs (1.2 million dollars) grant was also provided to the Commission for the import of construction equipment.

INDUSTRIAL COMMODITY & FERTILISER LOAN

This is the tenth commodity and fertiliser loan agreement signed by India and Canada since 1967. The present loan of Rs. 28 crores (40 million dollars) is one-third larger than those provided (Rs. 21 crores = 30 million dollars) in each of the last three years. The increase is due to the rapid utilisation of earlier loans as well as increased demand for fertilisers and industrial raw materials. The present loan will provide India with funds for the purchase of copper, lead, zinc, nickel, asbestos, woodpulp, newsprint, ferro-alloys, aluminium, synthetic rubber, sulphur and several varieties of fertilisers.

Canadian industrial commodities contribute significantly to the development and operation of important sectors of the Indian economy. While domestic fertiliser production is increasing rapidly, it has not yet caught up with the requirements. Fertilisers from Canada are helping to fill this gap-

Canada has been providing industrial commodities and fertilisers to India since 1953 when copper and aluminium were provided under grant assistance. Since then Rs. 196 crores (280.5 million dollars) worth of commodities and fertilisers have been provided.

CANADA INDIA USA **Date**: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Indo-French Economic Commission

Following is the text of a press release

issued in New Delhi on April 26, 1971 on the Indo-French Economic Commission meeting held in Delhi from 21st to 24th April, 1971:

The Indo-French Economic Commission met in New Delhi from the 21st April, 1971, to 24th April, 1971, and decided to renew the Trade Arrangement for a period of one year from the 1st January, 1971. Various questions relating to the development of trade and expansion of economic, technical and industrial cooperation between the two countries were examined by the two delegations. Avenues for closer cooperation between the two countries in these fields were explored. The Protocol containing the agreed conclusions of the meeting was signed today by Shri V. S. Misra, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade, on behalf of the Government of India and by Mr. Cl. Collin, leader of the French delegation on behalf of the Government of the French Republic.

The Protocol signed today provides for quotas for some of the Indian products which are subject to quantitative restrictions in France.

Both delegations agreed that steps should be taken to increase the volume of trade exchange between the two countries

57

and that it would be in the mutual interest of both countries to have increasing direct trade and commercial relationships.

As a follow-up of the market surveys conducted by Indian experts in France during 1969, both the delegations agreed to initiate a Commercial Development Programme for diversifying and expanding the two-day trade while specially emphasising the export promotion in the French mark-et of Indian manufactured products.

A President-cum-Director General level French Economic Mission is expected to visit India in October, 1971, for exploring possibilities of further expanding trade, economic, technical and industrial cooperation between two countries. It may be recalled that an Economic Mission from France comprising of importers, exporters, industrialists and bankers has already visited India in November-December, 1976, and that this visit has generated an increased interest in France for industrial cooperation with India.

FRANCE INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Letter to the President of the Security Council on Pakistan's Complaint on Suspension of Overflights

Following is the text of the Letter dated 8 April 1971 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council in reply to Pakistan's complaint on suspension of overflights:

I have the honour to refer to the Permanent Representative of Pakistan's letter of 13 February 1971 (S/10116) and, in reply thereof, to state as follows:

My Government ha-, viewed with concern and amazement the attempt made by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan in his letter to magnify a situation far beyond its true proportions, to suppress the truth and to implant a number of misstatements.

2. This letter from the Permanent Representative of Pakistan would not merit a lengthy reply but for the necessity to expose some of gross misstatements made in it, as follows:

- (A) Contrary to the assertion made by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan, the Government of Pakistan never deplored the act of hijacking of the Indian Airlines aircraft.
- (B) Contrary again to the claim made in the letter under reference, Pakistan authorities delayed the return of the passengers and the crew to India a distance of 36 miles by 50 hours, citing difficulties which are not confirmed by eyewitnesses, and they have failed to return the baggage, cargo, mail and other contents of the hijacked aircraft.
- (C) Contrary once more to the statement made in the letter in question, the Pakistan authorities made no effort to disarm and dislodge the hijackers from the aircraft and to take them into custody; on the other hand, they aided and encouraged them in various ways not the least of which was the act of transmitting their so called demands to my government.
- 3. The serious concern of my Government over the possibility of the crime of air piracy being committed in the air space of the Indo-Pak sub-continent was communicated to the Government of Pakistan last year. On 1 September 1971 the High

58

Commissioner for Pakistan at New Delhi was informed by my Government that there was reliable information that there existed a conspiracy in Pakistan to hijack Indian aircraft to Pakistan. The High Commissioner was requested to convey this information to his Government with the request that they take necessary measures to prevent such a happening. Instead of taking action as requested by my Government, the Government of Pakistan simply asked for disclosure of the source of information. After careful consideration of the sequence of facts and circumstances of the incident of the hijacking of the Indian aircraft to Pakistan and its deliberate destruction, my Government came to the conclusion that there was active and direct complicity of the Pakistan authorities, not only in the hijacking of the aircraft but also in its eventual destruction by burning which, curiously enough, was televised, by the Government-controlled Lahore station of Pakistan Television, by extending its normal programme by half an hour. The grounds and the conclusion were communicated in clear terms to the Government of Pakistan in the note dated 9 February, 1971 (copy enclosed).*

- 4. The President of the Council of ICAO was informed by my Government on 1 February 1971 about the hijacking, and to the best knowledge of my Government, Pakistan has yet to take action on the suggestions made by him to the Pakistan authorities. I enclose a copy of the message sent by the President of the Council of ICAO.
- 5. in suspending overflights by Pakistan civil and military aircraft, the Government of India acted in the interest Of maintaining the minimum necessary standards of safety and security of international civil aviation against hijacking and its attendant dangers to life and property. It is universally acknowledged that a material breach by a state of its obligations arising from treaties and agreements entitles a party specially affected by the breach to invoke it as grounds for suspending the operations of the rights and obligations flowing from the treaty, in whole or in part, in the relations between itself and the defaulting State. Pakistan cannot, therefore, take advantage of its own default and pose Itself as an aggrieved party, after violating Its own international obligations. India has not prohibited overflights by aircraft of any other State except Pakistan as no other country has engaged in conduct similar to that of Pakistan. Freedom of transit and transport is extended in the context of the broad and universally accepted objective of fostering international friendship and good neighbourliness. This particular objective has unfortunately been totally negated by Pakistan in the pursuit of its policy of hostility towards my country. It will be recalled that after the unfortunate conflict of August-September, 1965 my Government

had, on a specific request from the then President of Pakistan, agreed to the resumption of overflights even without insisting on prior normalization of relations - which it would have been well within its rights to do. Pakistan has, much to our regret, reciprocated this unilateral gesture of friendship with only a continuation of its policy of confrontation and interference in our internal affairs.

- 6. I have been instructed also to place on record my Government's position that the situation arising out of Pakistan's complicity in hijacking and wanton destruction of, our aircraft is a matter entirely amenable to settlement through bilateral negotiations. This has been reiterated in my Government's communication to the Pakistan Government dated 3 March 1971 (copy enclosed).*
- 7. I have, for obvious reasons, refrained from engaging in an argument over the irrelevant and extraneous matter introduced by the Permanent Representative of Pakistan for the purpose of confusing the issue. It will no doubt be observed that the allegation of a "serious situation" being created by my Government has no substance in fact; indeed, the situation itself can be resolved through Pakistan fulfilling its obligation and entering into purposeful negotiations. With my Government with the object of arriving at a settlement, and not with that of increasing tension.
- 8. I request that this letter be circulated as a Security Council document. (Signed) S. Sen

59

ANNEXURE I

Copy of Government of India's Note No. PSP/411/6/71, dated the 9th February, 1971, to the Pakistan Government:

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the High Commission for Pakistan in India and with reference to the Note-Verbale dated 5 February, 1971, handed over to the High

Commissioner for India, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Government of Pakistan, has the honour to state as follows:

The Government of India categorically reject the disclaimer of the Government of Pakistan of their responsibility for and involvement in the crime of hijacking of the Indian Airlines aircraft to Lahore airport on 30 January 1971 and its blowing up on 2 February 1971. Instead of showing a willingness to settle the matter amicably and agreeing to pay compensation for the loss and damage caused, the Government of Pakistan have sought to confuse the issue by introducing wholly extraneous matters and have even gone to the extent of questioning the sovereignty and territorial integrity of India. The Government of India regard this attitude of the Government of Pakistan as totally uncooperative, negative and obstructive. If the Government of Pakistan are not willing to settle the matter of compensation and to return the two hijackers to face their trial in India, the situation may deteriorate, and Government of Pakistan win be wholly responsible for any consequences that may follow.

The Government of India are fully convinced, on the basis of evidence, that the premeditated criminal act of hijacking and wanton destruction of the Indian Airlines aircraft within the protected area of Lahore International Airport was the direct result of the Government of Pakistan having permitted their territory to be used for instigating, abetting and encouraging unlawful and subversive activities against India. The Government of India wish to remind the Government of Pakistan that on 1 September 1970, they had informed the Government of Pakistan through their High Commissioner in New Delhi about the existence of a conspiracy in Pakistan to hijack Indian aircraft to that country. It was because of the active involvement of agencies of the Government of Pakistan in such subversive activities that the Government of India had recently to declare a member of the diplomatic personnel of the Pakistan High Commission in India persona non grata.

The responsibility of the Government of Pakistan for the criminal hijacking and deliberate destruction of the Indian Airlines aircraft is borne out, inter alia, by the following facts:

- (i) The Government of Pakistan gave asylum to the two self-confessed criminals even while they were threatening to blow up the plane and before they had been disarmed and had surrendered themselves to the Pakistan authorities;
- (ii) They have publicly expressed their solidarity with these criminals and their associates;
- (iii) They refused to disarm the hijackers and take them into custody;
- (iv) They failed to take adequate measures to protect the aircraft and its contents;
- (v) They permitted the two criminals to move and act freely in the airport area and terminal building, including making long-distance telephone calls to their accomplices in Pakistan and meeting political leaders like Mr. Z. A. Bhutto, Mian Mahmood Ali Kasuri, etc., journalists and others freely;
- (vi) The criminals were provided with food and other amenities for three and a half days, thus facilitating their continued unlawful occupation of the plane;
- (vii) The Lahore station of Pakistan
 TV a Government organization
 was obviously with foreknowledge, able to film and later televise the entire sequence of the blowing up of the aircraft;

60

(viii) The two criminals, even after they had come out of the aircraft, were allowed to prevent the local Fire Brigade from fighting the

flames engulfing the aircraft:

- (ix) Crowds were permitted to congregate in the protected area of an international airport when the authorities had all the resources of a Martial Law administration available to them;
- (x) The two criminals were allowed to destroy the aircraft in full view of the troops, police and other airport personnel; and
- (xi) The Government of Pakistan created unnecessary delays and difficulties frustrating the attempts of the Government of India to be of assistance in bringing back to India the passengers, crew and contents of the aircraft besides the aircraft itself.

(The conduct of the Government of Pakistan in relation to this act of air piracy compelled the Government of India to enforce certain measures for ensuring safety of aviation and the restoration of public confidence in air transit. Accordingly, they were compelled to reroute their own services to avoid overlying Pakistan and to suspend overflights across Indian territory by Pakistan aircraft, both civil and military. The violation by the Government of Pakistan of their international obligations under the Tokyo Convention of 1963 on Certain Offences on Board Aircraft, the Solemn Declaration of the Extraordinary Session of the Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organisation held at Montreal in June 1970, the United Nations General Assembly resolution 2645 (XXV), and the Hague Convention of December 1970, and their failure even now to give compensation for the loss and damage caused to India and to prosecute the two hijackers and return them to India make it clear that the Government of Pakistan are not willing to ensure the safety and security of aviation and air transit over the sub-continent. It is, therefore, necessary to continue these restrictions until the Government of Pakistan accept their responsibility and make amends for what has been done and give assurances

about the future.

The Government of India are amazed at the accusation made by the Government of Pakistan that India's action will interfere in the carriage of essential supplies for relief work in East Pakistan. They would like to remind the Government of Pakistan that they had given the extraordinary facilities of a blanket clearance, covering unrestricted number of overflights, even at night, by Pakistan Air Force aircraft across Indian territory, for ferrying relief supplies to East Pakistan, for a period of over two months. Further, it was the Government of Pakistan that created all kinds of difficulties and obstructions in the way of commencing and maintaining the deliveries of relief supplies from India for the cycloneaffected people of East Pakistan. In any case, if the Government of Pakistan, wish to fly any relief supplies to East Pakistan, they can still do so in foreign aircraft. Instead of accusing the Government of India. the Government of Pakistan should ponder whether through their wilful interference in the internal affairs of India they are not creating a situation of confrontation which is not in the interests of the people of India or Pakistan.

The Government of India take serious objection to the reference to the internal affairs of India in the note under reference, and wish to remind the Government of Pakistan of their obligation to vacate their aggression on Indian territory in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir. If the Government of Pakistan persists in its attitude of openly or clandestinely interfering in India's internal affairs, they will be wholly responsible for the consequences of this policy.

The Government of India categorically reject the insinuation in the same note that the Pakistan High Commission in India and its personnel were deliberately subjected to demonstrations, and draw the attention of the Government of Pakistan to the extraordinary behaviour of the personnel of the mission whose fusillade of brickbats and bottles injured the police and other

personnel engaged in the duty of protecting the mission and its personnel. The Government of Pakistan should realize that these spontaneous demonstrations were only a natural expression of the indignation of all sections of the Indian people against the

61

deliberate provocation of the Government of Pakistan. The Government of India categorically deny that any member of the Pakistani mission was injured or even touched by the demonstrators. The Government of India had assured the Pakistani mission that all possible measures had been taken and would continue to be taken to safeguard their security and this assurance has been fully implemented by the Government of India through the very elaborate preventive measures they took. The demands made by the Government of In are logical and simple: first, the Government of India should be compensated for the loss of the aircraft, and secondly, the two criminals who hijacked the aircraft should be surrendered to Indian authorities so that they can stand their trial.

The Ministry of External Affairs avail themselves of this opportunity to renew to the High Commission of Pakistan in India the assurances of their highest consideration.

ANNEXURE II

Copy of Government of India's Note No. PSP/411/6/71, dated the 3rd March 1971, to the Government of Pakistan:

The Ministry of External Affairs presents its compliments to the High Commission for Pakistan in India and, with reference to Note dated 13 February 1971 handed over to the High Commission for India in Islamabad by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Government of Pakistan, has the honour to state as follows:

- 2. The Government of India regret to note that instead of making any effort to seek an amicable settlement of the situation arising from the hijacking and eventual destruction of the IAC aircraft on the lines suggested in the note of 9 February 1971, the Government of Pakistan have again sought to confuse the issue by introducing extraneous and irrelevant matters and by making obviously incorrect statements, e.g. that Indian aircraft continued to overfly Pakistan even after overflights by Pakistani aircraft had been banned. The Government of Pakistan are well aware that overflights of Pakistan territory by Indian aircraft had completely ceased before the ban in question was imposed.
- 3. The Government of India have already stated their position to the Government of Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan's failure to deal with the two hijackers and the manner in which they have dealt with the whole matter cannot but be an open encouragement to the repetition of such criminal acts in future.
- 4 The Government of India wish to remind the Government of Pakistan that after the Indo-Pakistan conflict of August September 1965, they would have been well within their right to disallow the resumption of overflights so long as relations between India and Pakistan had not been fully normalised. However, on a specific request made by the then President of Pakistan, the Government of India agreed, in February 1966, to forego their right to demand prior settlement of outstanding issues and consented to resume mutual overflights. Such overflights by the scheduled services of the civil airlines of one country across the territory of another are, as the Government of Pakistan are aware, a matter of privilege. They constitute a facet of the normal relations between the countries concerned and the privilege in question is extended in the context of the broad and universally accepted objective of fostering better relations and friendliness within the family of nations. In this context, the Government of India would reiterate that the hijacking of the IAC aircraft and its destruction were

the direct result of the policy of confrontation and interference pursued by the Government of Pakistan over the years. In the circumstances, the Government of India are constrained to conclude that the hostile policy of the Government of Pakistan against India and the manner in which they

62

have dealt with the recent hijacking of the Indian aircraft pose a direct threat to the safety of aviation and air transit and the national security of India. The Government of India are therefore perfectly within their right to demand action against the hijackers, compensation for loss and adequate assurances from the Government of Pakistan regarding the future.

- 5. The Government of India take serious objection to the slanderous accusations contained in the note under reply and categorically reject them. They further wish to state that should the Government of Pakistan genuinely desire an amicable settlement of the present question and restoration of normal relations, they should refrain from interfering in our internal affairs. On their part, the Government of India would be willing to receive from the Government of Pakistan directly through normal diplomatic channels any concrete indications of the willingness of the Government of Pakistan to proceed towards a settlement of the question of compensation for the loss of the IAC aircraft, the punishment of the two criminals who hijacked it and adequate assurances regarding the future.
- 6. The Ministry of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the High Commission of Pakistan in India the assurances of its highest consideration

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MALI LATVIA JAPAN

Date : Apr 01, 1971

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. M. S. Chadha's Statement on Chemical Warfare by Portugal in Angola

Following is the statement made by Shri S. M. S. Chadha, First Secretary in the Permanent Mission of India to the UN at New, York, in the Special Committee on Colonialism on April 13, in regard to the petition from Mr. Agostinho Neto, President of the Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola on chemical warfare by the Portguese Government in Angola:

Yet once again we have been informed of the brutal manner in which the Portuguese war in Africa is being conducted. This time it is in the form of a telegram from Mr. Agostinho, Neto, the President of the Movimento Popular de Libertacao de Angola, in which he has referred to the intensification by the Portuguese Government of acts of genocide against the people of Angola. He has referred to the use of chemical substances, herbicides and defoliants by the Portuguese Government in liberated areas, destroying a large amount of crops and killing hundreds of people by chemical poisoning.

As the members of this committee will recall this is not the first time that evidence of such warfare in Portuguese colonies has been supplied to us. From time to time reports have emanated not only from the leaders of the liberation movements in the Portuguese territories in Africa but also from independent and reputable journalists who have reported such matters in the press around the world. It is a matter of regret that these reports have not so far sufficiently stirred the conscience or the world to prevail effectively upon the Government of Portugal to stop these practices.

A little over two years ago this com-

mittee considered the use of napalm by the Portuguese Government in Guinea (Bissau) following an urgent telegram to the United Nations by Mr. Amilcar Cabral, the Secretary General of the Partido Africano Da Independencia Da Guine'e Cabo Verde, in which bombings of all kinds including the use of napalm and white phosphorous, by the Government of Portugal in Guinea (Bissau) were reported. It was also reported that Portugal was actively preparing to employ chemical defoliants and poison gas against the people of Guinea (Bissau).. The committee was quick to take up this matter and it condemned the Government of Portugal for the use of napalm and white phosphorous and for its preparations for the use of chemical defoliants and poison gas in pursuance of its colonial war against the people of Guinea (Bissau). The relevant resolution of the committee on that occasion

63

is contained in document A/Ac.109/L.499. dated September 1968.

Amongst the members of this commite there was a small minority who voiced doubts about the veracity of the facts as they had not been, according to them, independently corroborated. But how do you go about getting independent corroboration when the Government of Portugal has persistently refused to allow any visiting mission of the United Nations into its colonial territories? My delegation would certainly prefer a first hand investigation by the United Nations of such actions by the Portuguese Government in its colonial territories. Indeed the United Nations has a right to insist on such an investigation in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). But the reality of the situation forbids such first hand contact and the best evidence that we can have in view of this is naturally that of independent press correspondents and other visitors to those territories and of the leaders of nationalist movements in those territories.

In this connection it is pertinent to recall that a few days ago at our 739th

meeting, one of the members of this commite quoted a correspondent of the Washington Post to show that napalm and herbicides had in fact been used in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). The correspondent also stated that he had seen nepalm bombs stored at several bases in Angola and that the Commander of the Portuguese forces in Angola, General Francisco Da Costa Gomes, readily confirmed in an Interview that his forces used such substances. My delegation would hope that the statements of this and other correspondents who have visited liberated areas from time to time would set any doubts at rest.

I have referred in my statement to the action taken by the committee on 19th September, 1968. It is useful to remember that the committee on that occasion drew attention to the preparations of the Government of Portugal for the use of chemical defoliants and poison gas in its colonial wars. That has now happened and that is what the telegram from Mr. Agostonho Neto, President of MPLA, which we are considering today is all about. Clearly the Portuguese Government has gradually continued to enlarge its use of chemical defoilants and poison gas. These barbarous acts certainly deserve the strongest condemnation.

Equally the brave freedom fighters of Angola and other Portuguese colonies deserve the greatest sympathy and assistance of the peoples of the world, and it is imperative that the United Nations specialised agencies channel as much assistance to them as possible.

Needless to say my delegation lends its fullest support to the draft resolution that is now before the committee. This is indeed the minimum action that the committee must take and on behalf of the cosponsors I should like to commend it strongly to this committee for adoption.

INDIA ANGOLA CHAD PORTUGAL USA GUINEA GUINEA-BISSAU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC MOZAMBIQUE NEPAL

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TOKYO CONVENTION ON HIJACKING

India's Decision

Following press note was issued in New Delhi on April 1, 1971 on India's decision to accede to Tokyo Convention on Hijacking:

The Government of India has decided to accede to the "Convention on Offences and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft" drawn up at Tokyo on September 14, 1963. Thirty States have become parties to the Tokyo Convention which came into force in December, 1969.

The Tokyo Convention contains some important provisions relating to unlawful seizure of air-craft (Hijacking). Under the

64

Convention, it is obligatory on the part of contracting States to take appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander or to preserve his control of the aircraft when an act of hijacking takes place. Also, a contracting State where the hijacked aircraft lands is under obligation to permit its passengers and crew to continue their journey and to return the aircraft and its cargo to persons lawfully entitled to possession.

In view of the growing menace of hijacking, the Government of India considers the ratification of the Tokyo Convention as a step in the direction of evolving uniform international measures to prevent it. The International Civil Aviation Organisation (I.C.A.O.) and other inter-

national bodies have urged all states to ratify the Tokyo Convention.

The Convention, which applies in respect of offences under penal law and acts, which jeopardize safety of the aircraft or of persons and property, has several imper-Dante provisions regarding powers of aircraft commanders and powers and bolagallons of States to take into custody persons committing crimes on board.

Government will in due course intraduke a Bill in Parliament to give effect to the provisions of the Tokyo Convention.

JAPAN INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Agreement on Industrial Co-operation

Following is the text of the press release, issued in New Deli on April 5, 1971 on, the, conclusion of Indo-Soviet Agreement on Industrial Co-operation:

India and the Soviet Union signed here this morning an Agreement providing for the supply of 20,000 tones (1.1 lacks bales) of raw cotton annually from Soviet Union which would be converted into cotton textiles in India and re-exported to the Soviet Union.

This follows high level discussions held here between delegations of the two cointries to discuss matters relating to trade and industrial cooperation.

The Union Minister of Foreign Trade, Sri L. N. Mishear who led the Indian delegating to these talks, signed on behalf of India. Mr. N. N. Mirotvortsev, Vice-Chair man of the USER State Planning Committee who led the Soviet delegation, signed on behalf of the Soviet Union.

The Agreement is in pursuance of Article 11 of the Indo-Soviet long-term Trade Agreement which was concluded in New Deli in December last. Article 11 of the Agreement envisages the exploration of new avenues in the field of industrial cooperation as well as for further utilization of existing and the creation of additional production capacities in each country on a mutually beneficial basis with a view to bring about further increase in bilateral trade".

Besides the arrangement relating to raw cotton, the two delegations have also held discussions regarding further transact-thins of similar nature which may materiallise in future. These relate to the possible-listless of concluding arrangements in respect of raw wool and supply of pig iron from India to the Soviet Union for conversion into rolled steel and alloy steel and subsetquint re-export to India. Both sides have agreed to hold further discussions in this regard in the near future.

The two delegations also discussed the question of India supplying additional quantities of consumer goods in which the

65

Soviet, side has shown interest. The range of such goods as well as the quantities available for export to the Soviet Union In 1971 have been indicated.

India has invited the Soviet Union to send a delegation representing the conchered organisations in the USER for finalizing the details in this regard. This delegation will also be able to acquaint itself with the products of India's newly emerging industries.

An invitation has also been extended to a Shoved delegation of experts to visit

India for identifying products of Indian automobile industries for export to the Soviet Union.

The Indian delegation has also handed over a list of commodities which India is interested in purchasing from the USER, over and above the provision for such items in the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement 1971.

The Soviet delegation, which arrived here on March 24, had discussions with the Union Minister of Foreign Trade, Sri L. N. Mishear, the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, Dr. D. R. Ganglia, and members of the Indian delegation comprising senior officials of the Government of India. The delegation also visited Bombay for discussions with the Cotton Corporation of India, the Textile Export Promotion Council and representatives of some private sector industries.

The discussions in New Delhi, which were held in a cordial and friendly atmosphere, have concluded on an optimistic note about future collaboration between the two countries in various industrial fields

The Soviet delegation left for Moscow this morning.

USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Parliament on U.K. Immigration Bill

Following is the statement made by the Minister of External Affairs in the, Rajya Sabha on April 1, 1971, regarding the U.K. Immigration Bill and its objectionable features, particularly those affecting persons of Indian origin:

The proposed British legislation on immigration has been carefully examined by us. Some of its features cause concern. The Bill has racial overtones. It introduces the concept of "Partials" as a privileged category for purposes of immigration. Its effect will be to discourage the flow Of collared immigrants into Britain. Its enactmend will make conditions more difficult for collared immigrants. The Bill takes away certain rights now enjoyed by Common wealth citizens in Britain. It contains a number of new restrictive provisions such as compulsory registration with the police, deportation without trial or appeal and work vouchers tying the prospective mimegrant to a specific job at a particular place and for a specified period only. The immigrant will no longer have the right of registration as a citizen after 5 years residence in the U.K. Nor will he be able to bring in his dependents until he passes a means test. These and other similar provisions of the Bill would not be conducive to harmonious and healthy inter-community relations in the U.K. We cannot view with favor any legislation which would have the effect of discriminating against our nationals, Parisscullery on racial grounds.

We have already communicated our views about the Bill to the Government of U.K. It is our hope that the Government of U.K. would give due consideration to our views on this subject and remove its objectionable provisions.

66

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA FRANCE

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

UNITED KINGDOM

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement in Raja Sabah on Tariff on Indian Textiles

Following is the text of the statement made in Raja Sabah an April 6, 1971, by Sri L. N. Mishear, Union Minister for Foreign Trade regarding the reported British move to impose 15 per cent duty on imports of cotton textiles from the Commonwealth Preference Area, including India and its repercussions on Indian economy:

The British Government announced on July 22, 1969 their intention to introduce from January 1, 1972, a tariff on import.; of cotton textiles from Commonwealth preference area including India, on the lines proposed earlier in a report of the British Textile Council. On cotton cloth the main item of export from India the duty would be about 15 per cent ad valorem. From January 1, 1972 the existing general quota system would also be terminated.

Under the existing arrangement, India has a bilateral quota arrangement with U.K. for the export of her cotton textiles. We further enjoy duty-free entry and a margin of preference of 17 1/2 per cent is guaranteed to us under the Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement of 1939. The U.K. is the largest single market for our cotton textiles and our annual foreign exchange earnings through exports of cotton textiles to U.K. has been on an average, about Rs. 21 crores. The proposed change in import regime in U.K. would affect our exports of cotton textiles very adversely on account of tariff being raised on our textiles from zero to 15 per cent, the bilateral quota system being done away with and also duty-free access being continued to certain other countries.

This House is aware of the statement made by my predecessor on July 28, 1969, before this House on the subject. Since then the matter has been under discussion

between the two Governments both at official and technical level.

Recently, we have received a request from the British Government to release them from their obligations regarding textiles under the Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement of 1939. We have asked for official level consultations in the matter. It is my hope that these consultations would lead to a mutually acceptable solution of the problem.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Apr 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement for additional 15 Million Dollar Loan

Following is the text of the press release issued in New Delhi on the, agreement between India and U.S.A. signed on April 22, 1971 increasing U.S. Non-Project aid for 1971 to 170 million dollars:

The United States has extended an additional loan of 15 million dollars (Rs. 11.25 crores) to India for financing essential import requirements,

The agreement for this additional loan signed here today, is in the form of an upward amendment to the 155 million dollars U.S. non-project loan signed last month (March 13). The total U.S. non-project aid for 1971 is thus increased to 170 million dollars (Rs. 127.50 crores).

Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary (Economic Affairs), Ministry of Finance, and U.S.. Ambassador Mr. Kenneth B. Keating signed the amending agreement.

The new loan will help meet the rising import needs of Indian industry, particularly those in the export sector. In addition, other priority industries will benefit from a

67

larger availability of imported raw materials and spare parts. The items financed by the loan include iron, steel, copper and other metals; chemicals, industrial machinery and equipment; and spare parts for diesel locomotives and aircraft.

Extended on concessional terms, the loan is repayable in dollars over a period of 40 years, including a 10-year grace period. Interest is payable at two per cent per annum during the grace period and three per cent thereafter.

68

USA INDIA

Date: Apr 01, 1971

May

	Volume No	
1995		
Content		

Foreign Affair's Record 1971 Vol. XVII MAY

No. 5

CONTENTS

PAGE

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS,

Shri S. Sen's Statement in Social Committee of ECOSOC on Human Rights on May 12, 1971 69 Shri S.' Sen's Statement in Social Committee of ECOSOC on Human Rights on May 17, 1971 73

NETHERLANDS

Netherlands Loan for India 75

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Statement on Situation in Bangla Desh 75 Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Discussion 78 Foreign Minister's Reply to Discussion in Rajya Sabha 80

SWITZERLAND

India-Switzerland Air Agreement 83

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement for Vegetable Oils 84 Agreement for Purchase of Cotton 84

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

INDIA PAKISTAN USA SWITZERLAND

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Following is the text of statement by Ambassador S. Sen, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations in the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council on Agenda item 5 (a) Report of the Commission on Human Rights on May 12, 1971:

Mr. Chairman,

My delegation considers it appropriate to participate in the discussion on this important subject. The current report of the Commission indicates in a most explicit manner that the problem of adequate protection of all human rights is still a serious one. Indeed, the report reflects the concern expressed in paragraph 8 of the Commemorative Declaration adopted at the 25th Session of the General Assembly. The relevant sentence reads: "Although some progress has been achieved, serious violations of human rights are still being committed against individuals and groups in several regions of the world. We pledge ourselves to a continued and determined struggle against all violations of the rights and fundamental freedoms of human beings, by eliminating the basic causes of such violations, by promoting universal respect for the dignity of all people without regard to race, colour, sex, language or religion, and in particular through greater use of the facilities provided by the United Nations in accordance with the Charter".

The Charter itself, in Articles 1 (3), 55 (c) and 56, speaks of international cooperation for ensuring greater exercise of human rights. In 1968, which was declared as the International Year for Human Rights, the United Nations, published a booklet entitled "Human Rights - A Compilation of International Instruments of the Unite Nations". In the last page of this booklet is given a list of 34 instruments dealing with Human Rights. Apart from this list, during the last three years various other

documents, declarations and resolutions have also been adopted. For instance, I should mention the Declaration of Social Progress and Development adopted in 1969, the Declaration of the 25th session to which I have already referred, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations - all these were adopted about only six months ago. Furthermore, the Proclamation of Teheran on Human Rights is also relevant. So also is the Geneva Convention of 1949 relative to the protection of civilian persons in times of war. In addition, the General Assembly adopted last year four resolutions 2674, 2675, 2676 and 2677, all of them dealing with the question of human rights in armed conflicts. India has been a member of the Human Rights Commission all throughout the Commission's existence and has expressed concern to the Commission and to the other appropriate forums of the United Nations about all large-scale and organised violations of human rights. All the instruments I have cited make provisions for discussing the violations of human rights wherever they may occur. The Proclamation of Teheran, adopted unanimously in May 1968, in paragraph 5 says: "The primary aim of the United Nations in the sphere of human rights is the achievement by each individual of the maximum freedom and dignity. For the realisation of this objective, the laws of every country should grant each individual, irrespective of race, language, religion or political belief, freedom of

69

expression, of information, of conscience and of religion, as well as the right to participate in the political, economic, cultural and social life of his country."

Unless, therefore, the international community is prepared to examine violations of such obligations undertaken by States and take whatever remedial measures may be necessary, all that we have said for

the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms becomes a mockery. This view has repeatedly been expressed in different forums of the United Nations on many occasions and I am particularly glad to see that Pakistan, through its distinguished representative Ambassador Agha Shahi, while speaking on violations of human rights in colonial Africa and Palestine, stated on this very item of the agenda at the meeting of the Social Committee held on May 20, 1970:

"There would be and have been other situations in which massive violations of human rights take place which call for examination, investigation and report, if the obligatory provisions of the Charter of the United Nations in regard to human rights and fundamental freedoms are not to become a subject of mockery and purely of academic debate."

It is in this context and with the greatest anguish the Government of India wish to bring to your attention a current example of violation of human rights on an unprecedented scale in our age of many millions of people. In bringing this to your notice, the foremost consideration which my country has in mind is the need for urgent humanitarian relief measures for these millions of people - many of whom have been coming into India in ever-growing numbers as refugees. The problem has assumed such proportions and the sufferings of these people have been so enormous that it cannot but be a matter of international concern.

In order to understand this tragic human problem it is necessary to explain its causes. This will make it possible for the world community to appreciate the consequences that have followed and to consider urgent measures in order to reduce, if not remove, the suffering of millions of people.

The Government of Pakistan have accepted or supported most of the Declarations, Resolutions and Conventions on

Human Rights and it must be a matter of deep concern to the international community that in recent weeks these international obligations have been breached as a result of massive military actions taken in East Bengal. I do not consider it necessary, at this stage at any rate, to analyse in depth and detail, the unfortunate events that have taken place in that region. The facts are well-known, and basically it is the accumulated frustration of the East Bengalis and the inequalities which they have suffered over the years that have brought about a most tragic situation. These frustrations and injustices, which by themselves could constitute major violations of the many documents I have cited, have led to the present chain of gruesome events in East Bengal. Until late in March this year our hope was that these man-made difficulties would be removed by taking into account the freely expressed wishes of the East Bengalis. But this was not to be, the entire democratic process was reversed and a military campaign was launched to wipe out the political consciousness and activities in East Bengal. In a broadcast statement on March 26 the President of Pakistan said, among other things:

"I have decided to ban all political activities throughout the country. As for the Awami League it is completely banned as a political party. I have also decided to impose a complete press censorship. Martial law regulations will very shortly be issued in pursuance of these decisions."

In this context I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the main provisions of the Declaration of Human Rights, a document fully accepted by Pakistan. Article 3 of this Declaration reads: "Everyone has a right to life, liberty and security of person". The repressive measures adopted in East Bengal have denied this right. Article 5 reads: "No one shall be subjected to torture or to

70

cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or

punishment". The reports which have appeared in the international press prove conclusively that this right has been flouted. Provisions of articles 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21 have similarly been brushed aside. I could, Mr. Chairman, select any document relating to Human Rights to which Pakistan has given its support in different degrees and show without a shadow of doubt that almost all its principal provisions have been broken.

The wild destruction of life and property of the people of East Bengal who belong to different ethnic, linguistic and cultural background, by the West Pakistani army has been in contravention of Article 2 of the Convention approved and proposed for signature and ratification by the General Assembly on 9th December 1948 [Resolution 260-A-(III)]. Pakistan is a party to this Convention without reservations. Similarly the declaration of Martial Law, with its most stringent regulations which would inflict death penalty almost on any East Bengali who does not strictly adhere to their draconian severity, has extinguished freedom of opinion, freedom of association and other freedoms which have been considered fundamental by the United Nations.

Article 3 of the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949 deals with protection of civilian life in conflicts not of international character. It specifically prohibits violence to life of any person in particular, murder of all kinds, mutilation, cruel treatment and torture. It also forbids outrage of personal dignity in particular inhuman and degrading treatment. It further bans "the passing of sentences and the carrying out executions without previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognised as indispensible by civilized peoples". All these provisions of the Convention have been callously violated. it is strange that the Government of Pakistan have not even paid the slightest heed to the appeal made in this regard by the International Commission of Jurists. I should like to read to the Committee texts of their telegrams. The telegram of April 2, 1971 states:

"The International Commission of Jurists deeply anxious about the tragic events in East Pakistan. Request all possible steps to reduce death toll and urge moderation and the respect for law in the treatment of political prisoners".

The telegram of April 15 states:

"Further to (our) telegram of the 2nd April, the International Commission of Jurists deplores the reported intention to establish special military tribunals to try the Awami League leaders. Respectfully urge that proceedings before the normal civilian courts will alone satisfy international opinion that the rule of law is observed.

"The International Commission of Jurists has always disapproved of the establishment of special tribunals to try political opponents for alleged political offences. There is nothing easier than to give a semblance of legality to the assassination of political opponents by having them condemned by special tribunals which lack the independence and respect for legal principles of a properly constituted court of legally trained judges. If Sheikh Mujibur Rahman or other Awami League leaders have committed any offence under the law of Pakistan, there is no reason why they should not be brought before the internationally respected civilian courts of the country".

In these circumstances we consider that international opinion, which has already been incensed and shocked, should be expressed in no uncertain manner through this Committee, as the Economic and Social Council is the properly constituted organ of the United Nations concerned with human rights and fundamental freedoms. The largescale massacre, senseless killings of unarmed civilians, including women and children, brutalities and atrocities committed on a massive scale, widespread burning and destruction of property and the multitude of indignities inflicted on the people of East Bengal constitute a problem of such magnitude that international conscience

must be roused and international effort must be made to restore some semblance of civilised existence in this part of the world.

II

But there are other consequences of this massive suppression of Human Rights

71

which also should be brought to the attention of the committee. As a result of the military action taken in East Bengal, the number of refugees into India has already exceeded 1.8 million people. The precise figure as reported to Delhi on May 3 by the Indian authorities near the frontier was 1,481,101. This figure has since increased considerably. By May 3, 141,588 refugees have entered Assam and Meghalaya (an Eastern State in India); 102,205 of these are in camps while 39,383 are outside camps 1,200,962 refugees have entered West Bengal; 532,675 of these are in camps, while 668,287 are outside camps. 136,532 refugees have entered Tripura; 101,532 of these are in camps while 35,000 are outside camps. 2,019 refugees have entered Bihar. Thus the total number of refugees in camps is 738,431 and outside camps 742,670 on May 3. We have set up 156 camps and have approached the Secretary-General and other U.N. agencies such as the UNICR, UNICEF, World Food Programme, world Health Organisation. Apart from these, the Catholic Relief Organisation, CARITAS, is initiating action.

I am glad to say that other efforts both national and international, are being made to help the refugees. Many of these refugees are women and children who have been forced to leave their homes and village under severest pressure and in most difficult conditions. This large influx which continues to grow daily is as I have already pointed out, the result of Pakistan's atrocities in East Bengal; such a large number would not leave their homes and come to India unless they other no other option but to undertake a perilous journey with little food and hardly any personal belongings.

Until the return of normalcy to East Benagal, we have, purely on humanitarian grounds, given shelter to these hungry, helpless and oppressed refugees - a very few of them have even adjuate clothes and many of them are suffering from disease and starvation. It is the duty of the Pakistan Government to stop their repression and create normal conditions under which the safe return of the refugees could be ensured. Until then Pakistan should be held responsible for their safe return to East Bengal. Meanwhile, we shall do our best to look after them while they are fleeing from an oppressive regime and are in need of food, shelter and medical attention. But the amount of relief needed is of such a magnitude that no Government in the world can be expected to bear the strain alone. A most sustained international effort becomes, therefore, necessary to look after these unfortunate people. We are most anxious that these refugees should return home as soon as possible. In order to look after them, while they are still with us, we will gladly accept such aid as may be offered by other Governments and national as well as international organisations. This again is a matter of direct concern of the Economic and Social Council and we hope that the Council will appreciate this problem and endorse this appeal.

Ш

Yet another consequence of the action taken by the Pakistan Government in East Bengal relates to the disruption of economic life there. With the expulsion of all the foreign press correspondents since the end of March - now I believe 5 or 6 selected pressmen have been allowed to go to East Bengal for escorted tours - details of the economic conditions will not be known to the outside world for many months to come. The outbreak of violence has caused complete disruption of transport and distribution systems and other essential services. Since East Bengal depends on the import of a substantial quantity of foodgrains to sustain its large population even at a purely subsistence level, the disruption in economic life evident during the present crisis has

only compounded the havoc already caused a few months back by a disastrous cyclone. Since the military action also coincided with the planting season, the coming harvest would be adversely affected. Under these conditions famine is a possibility and this would usually be accompanied by a further increase of epidemics and diseases. Famine conditions in East Bengal would lead to several more millions of refugees fleeing to India. Famine and epidemic in East Bengal can have their repercussions in India as these do not respect any international boundaries. A situation where millions of refugees continue to pour into India with all the attendant problems and sufferings can only lead to tension and instability in the region. It should, therefore, be a matter

72

of urgent international concern to put an end to the further influx of refugees from East Bengal into India. This can be achieved only if the Council can ensure that Pakistan accepts international relief organisations to help the needy East Bengalis urgently and in a most effective manner. Organised international relief operations alone would be able to remove the consequences of the large scale disruptions of economic life caused by the current crisis.

It is extraordinary that in these circumstances the Government of Pakistan has not only disallowed the International Red Cross team which went to Karachi from proceeding to East Bengal but has not to the best of our knowledge responded to many offers of help. - As early as April 1, U. Thant said that he was "very much concerned about the loss of life and human suffering resulting from the recent developments; in East Pakistan", and added that "if the Government of Pakistan asked the Secretary-General to assist in humanitarian efforts, he would be happy to do everything in his power to help". The response to this gesture by the Secretary-General has just been released - briefly it says 'NOT YET'. In this context we agree with comments made in the New York Times editorial this morning. It says inter alia "Contrary to

bland assurances which continue to emanate from West Pakistan spokesmen, the situation is unquestionably desperate, and will require large scale international relief effort if a tragedy of major proportions is to be averted. We also believe that many other Governments and international organisations have offered to help but without any reaction from Pakistan Government which continues to say that there is enough food in the country". Only a few months ago, a most violent cyclone devastated some parts of East Bengal. At that time, in many Committees and other forums of the United Nations, resolutions were passed for working out a machinery for emergency relief in natural disasters. Then, Pakistan appealed widely for help: many countries, including my own, generously responded to this appeal. Yet it is ironical that when tragedies have accumulated, Pakistan claims that it has enough food.

In the face of this, the first essential step would be for the Economic and Social Council to ask Pakistan to immediately indicate its consent so that concrete plans for organised and well coordinated action programme for relief work can be finalised under U.N. auspices. Since the Secretary-General, U. Thant, has already offered to extend all possible humanitarian help, he should have a vital responsibility in the organisation of such an international humanitarian relief effort.

We hope and trust that there would be no temptation to deny the basic necessities of life and services to the East Bengalis in order to crush their desire to achieve their legitimate aspirations. They have suffered enough and in their hour of trial they will doubtless remember who cared, and deeply cared, and who simply stood and stared.

INDIA USA SWITZERLAND PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Statement in Social Committee of ECOSOC on Human Rights on May 17, 1971

Following is the text of statement by Ambassador S. Sen, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, at the Social Committee of the ECOSOC on Agenda Item 5 (a) Report of the Coinmission on Human Rights, on May 17, 1971:

Mr. Chair-man,

Five days ago, on the 12th of May, I spoke before this Committee about the great humanitarian problems which have arisen as the result of the tragic events in East Bengal. I believe that in spite of many provocations and prevarications, we were able to concentrate on the business before the Committee, human rights and human tragedies which followed the army action violating all the human rights.

Since then many reports have appeared which confirm what we have been saying from the beginning. These reports come

73

from newspapermen who were taken on conducted tours and were supposed to send censored messages. However, some of them were able to file their dispatches from Bangkok and other far away places and were so able to avoid the Pakistani censors. The sum and substance of these reports are to be found in the editorial comments in the Baltimore Sun of the 14th May. I shall not read the entire article, not because it would detract from what I have to say and have said all along but simply to save the Committee's time. I shall read however two paragraphs as it relates directly to the humanitarian problem we are discussing:

"The deaths, by Mr. Rosenblum's rough estimate, may number half a million. The

devastation, he says, defies belief. Millions of people face starvation, from famine and from the halted distribution of relief for earlier, and natural disasters. The picture could not be more grim

"The fact still seems to be, as it seemed to be at the first, that the government of Pakistan was determined not to let the East Bengali Awami League assume the power it had won in a National Assembly election, and that from this determination stemmed the carefully planned onslaught of March."

Indeed, the reports conforming these conclusions are so widespread and so numerous that we do not have to look for fine prints, take quotations out of context or discuss the mechanics of press reporting or deficiencies of the Indian press to realise what is happening and to support some theories without any foundation or data whatever. The picture is clear enough to anyone who takes the trouble to read any newspaper anywhere in the world for a connected account.

Meanwhile, the number of refugees coming to India continues to grow enormously. The figure today has reached nearly 2 1/2 million people, young and old, women and children and broken down men. There are probably scores of members in the United Nations who have a smaller population; for instance Paraguay has a population of less than 21/2 million people and it is as if the whole population of Paraguay has been added to the Indian population. India is a poor country and we cannot obviously look after this ever-growing number of refugees from a neighbouring country because that country has made conditions intolerable for its own citizens. These facts cannot be concealed or skirted round by sophistry or specious theories. These men and women must be looked after and sent back home as soon as possible. While they are with us we shall of course look after them as best as we can and welcome whatever help is forthcoming from outside, but the final solution of the problem can only come about by conditions returning to normal. It is far from normal now - in East

Bengal so that these temporary refugees (evacuees would perhaps be a better term) can return to their own country and live normally and hopefully and exercise some of their human rights. If this cannot be done, this Committee and ECOSOC, and perhaps in course of time the other appropriate organs of the United Nations would indicate how and for what period India would continue to be burdened with this problem created by political short-sightedness and military repression in Pakistan. In this context, the Committee will be interested in an analysis of the situation in East Bengal which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 12 - a newspaper not noted either for sensationalism or radicalism. Since the general debate on this subject is coming to an end, I thought I should place before the Committee the latest developments. I should in addition place before the Committee in concrete form the suggestions I made in course of my first statement 5 days ago. These are:

- (1) The Government of Pakistan should be requested to restore human rights to the people of Pakistan as early as possible and in accordance with the international obligations and declarations that Government have subscribed to or supported.
- (2) The Government of India should immediately be given an kinds of assistance, bilateral or international, official or non-official to look after the refugees from East Bengal until they are able to return home. The Government of India will establish coordination of all relief aids in co-operation and consultation with the international organisations primarily concerned in this field. All other organisations extending relief should also be brought within the

74

purview of this coordinated system of relief.

(3) In order to tackle the problem at its roots, relief and rehabilitation measures require to be undertaken forthwith in East Bengal itself. The Government of Pakistan

must be asked to take these immediately and in close and effective co-operation with appropriate international agencies which should assess the needs of all sections of the people of East Bengal on a continuing basis until the present economic dislocations and disceptions have been fully removed.

- (4) The Government of Pakistan continues to be responsible for the refugees and their early return home.
- (5) The Secretary-General of the United Nations will constantly keep this subject under review and render such advice and assistance as may be necessary to solve these problems.

This subject is of international concern and international action alone will solve it. It is not an Indo-Pakistan problem, although India is immediately affected by the large influx of refugees and the various difficulties and tensions-such a number of poor people suddenly coming to our country inevitably create. We hope it will be possible for the Social Committee to take suitable steps for the solution of these humanitarian problems.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PARAGUAY

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

NETHERLANDS

Netherlands Loan for India

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on May 19, 1971 on the agreement between the Indian Government and the Netherlands Government for loan of 50 million guilders (Rs. 104.17 million) signed on May 18 at the Hague:

An agreement between the Indian Government and the Netherlands Government for loan of 50 million Guilders equivalent to rupees 104.17 million for India's development plans was signed on May 18 at the Hague by the Indian Ambassador, Shri J. N. Dhamija and Mr. P. C. Maas, President of the Netherlands Investment Bank for Developing Countries.

The loan forms financial contribution which the Netherlands Government has undertaken to make to India for the year 1971-72. The loan is repayable in 30 years with eight years grace period at 2.5 per cent interest.

INDIA THE NETHERLANDS

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Statement on Situation in Bangla Desh

Following is the text of the statement of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made in Lok Sabha on May 24, 1971, on situation in Bangla Desh: Mr. Speaker, Sir,

In the seven weeks since Parliament recessed, the attention of the entire country has been focussed on the continuing tragedy in Bangla Desh. Honourable Members will recall the atmosphere of hope in which we met in March. We all felt that our country was poised for rapid economic advance and a more determined attack on the age-old poverty of our people. Even as we were

settling down to these new tasks, we have been engulfed by a new and gigantic problem, not of our making.

On the 15th and 16th May I visited Assam, Tripura and West Bengal, to share the suffering of the refugees, to convey to them the sympathy and support of this House and of the people of India and to see for myself the arrangements which are being made for their care. I am sorry it was not possible to visit other camps this time. Every available building, including schools and training institutions, has been requisitioned. Thousands of tents have been pitched and temporary shelters are being constructed as quickly as possible in the 335 camps which have been established so far. In spite of our best efforts, we have not been able to provide shelter to all those who have come across, and many are still in the open. The district authorities are under severe strain. Before they can cope with those who are already here, 60,000 more are coming across every day.

So massive a migration, in so short a time, is unprecedented in recorded history. About three and a half million people have come into India from Bangla. Desh during the last eight weeks. They belong to every religious persuasion - Hindu, Muslim, Buddhist and Christian. They come from every social class and age group. They are not refugees in the sense we have understood this word since Partition. They are victims of war who have sought refuge from the military terror across our frontier.

Many refugees are wounded and need urgent medical attention. I saw some of them in the hospitals I visited in Tripura and West Bengal. Medical facilities in all our border States have been stretched to breaking point. Equipment for 1100 new hospital beds has been rushed to these States, including a 400 bed mobile hospital, generously donated by the Government of Rajasthan. Special teams of surgeons, physicians, nurses and public health experts have been deputed to the major camps. Special water supply schemes are being

executed on the highest priority, and preventive health measures are being undertaken on a large scale.

In our sensitive border States, which are facing the brunt, the attention of the local administration has been diverted from normal and development work to problems of camp administration, civil supplies and security. But our people have put the hardships of the refugees above their own, and have stood firm against the attempts of Pakistani agent-provocateurs to cause communal strife. I am sure this fine spirit will be maintained.

On present estimates, the, cost to the Central Exchequer on relief alone may exceed Rs. 180 crores for a period of six months. All this, as Honourable Members will appreciate, has imposed an unexpected burden on us.

I was heartened by the fortitude with which these people of Bangla Desh have borne tribulation, and by the hope which they have for their future. It is mischievous to suggest that India has had anything to do with what happened in Bangla Desh. This is an insult to the aspirations and spontaneous sacrifices of the people of Bangla Desh, and a calculated attempt by the rulers of Pakistan to make India a scapegoat for their own misdeeds. It is also a crude attempt to deceive the world community., The world press has seen through Pakistan's deception. The majority of these so-called Indian infiltrators are women, children and the aged.

This House has considered many national and international issues of vital importance to our country. But none of them has touched us so deeply as the events in Bangla Desh. When faced with a situation of such gravity, it is specially important to weigh every word in acquainting this House, and our entire people with the issues involved and the responsibilities which now devolve on us all.

These twenty-three years and more, we have never tried to interfere with the internal affairs of Pakistan, even though they

have not exercised similar restraint. And even now we do not seek to interfere in any way. But what has actually happened? What was claimed to be an internal problem of Pakistan, has also become an internal problem for India. We are, therefore, entitled to ask Pakistan to, desist immediately from all actions which it is taking in the name of domestic jurisdiction, and

76

which vitally affect the peace and well-being of millions of our own citizens. Pakistan cannot be allowed to seek a solution of its political or other problems at the expense of India and on Indian soil.

Has Pakistan the right to compel at bayonet-point not hundreds, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of its citizens to flee their homes? For us it is an intolerable situation. The fact that we are compelled to give refuge and succour to these unfortunate millions cannot be used as an excuse to push more and more people across our border.

We are proud of our tradition of tolerance. We have always felt contrite and ashamed of our moments of intolerance. Our nation, our people are dedicated to peace and are not given to talking in terms of war or threat of war. But I should like to caution our people that we may be called upon to bear still heavier burdens.

The problems which confront us are not confined to Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura and West Bengal. They are national problems. Indeed the basic problem is an international one.

We have sought to awaken the conscience of the world through our representatives abroad and the representatives of foreign Governments in India. We have appealed to the United Nations, and, at long last, the true dimensions of the problem seem to be making themselves felt in some of the sensitive chanceries of the world. However, I must share with the House, our disappointment at the unconscionably long

time which the world is taking to react to this stark tragedy.

Not only India but every country has to consider its interests. I think I am expressing the sentiments of this august House and of our people when I raise my voice against the wanton destruction of peace, good neighbourliness and the elementary principles of humanity by the insensate action of the military rulers of Pakistan. They are threatening the peace and stability of the vast segment of humanity represented by India.

We welcome Secretary General, U Thant's public appeal. We are glad that a number of States have either responded or are in the process of doing so. But time is the essence of the matter. Also the question of giving relief to these millions of people is only part of the problem. Relief cannot be perpetual, or permanent; and we do not wish it to be so. Conditions must be created to stop any further influx of refugees and to ensure their early return under credible guarantees for their future safety and wellbeing. I say with all sense of responsibility that unless this happens, there can be no lasting stability or peace on this sub-continent. We have pleaded with other Powers to recognise this. If the world does not take heed, we shall be constrained to take all measures as may be necessary to ensure our own security and the preservation and development of the structure of our social economic life.

We are convinced that there can be no military solution to the problem of East Bengal. A political solution must be brought about by those who have the power to do so. World opinion is a great force. It can influence even the most powerful. The Great Powers have a special responsibility. If they exercise their power rightly and expeditiously then only can we look forward to durable peace on our sub-continent. But if they fail - and I sincerely hope that they will not - then this suppression of human rights, the uprooting of people, and the continued homelessness of vast numbers of human beings will threaten peace.

This situation cannot be tackled in a partisan spirit or in terms of party politics. The issues involved concern every citizen. I hope this Parliament, our country and our people will be ready to accept the necessary hardships so that we can discharge our responsibilities to our own people as well as to the millions, who have fled from a reign of terror to take temporary refuge here.

All this imposes on us heavy obligations and the need for stern national discipline. We shall have to make many sacrifices. Our factories and farms must produce more. Our railways and our entire transport and communication system must work uninterruptedly. This is no time for any interplay of regional or sectional interests. Everything must be subordinated to sustain our econo-

77

mic, social and political fabric and to reinforce national solidarity. I appeal to every citizen, every man, woman and child to be imbued with the spirit of service and sacrifice of which, I know, this nation is capable.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Discussion

Following is the text of Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's reply to the discussion regarding situation arising out of arrival of refugees from East Bengal in Lok Sabha on May 26, 1971: Mr. Speaker, Sir, may I express my deep appreciation of the sentiments voiced on all sides of the House in regard to the struggle of Bangla Desh? I fully realise that even though some Hon. Members have used harsh words, they have done so out of deep emotion and feelings of concern. They have reflected the anguish which we and the entire country feels at the tragic and heartrending happenings in Bangla Desh. My Government and I share that anguish and deep concern.

It is only natural that with our own traditions of love of freedom, our involvement with the values of democracy and human rights, we should feel deeply concerned when these values are crushed.

We have heard much talk of democracy. The Allies claimed that the Second World War was fought to save democracy. But when democracy is so flagrantly and so brutally being destroyed, we do not hear much comment, nor do we see the sort of spontaneous strong responses which the situation warrants. Could there be a greater or a clearer expression of democracy than the one we witnessed in the elections in Pakistan? Let me remind the House that although the elections were held under the rules formulated by the military regime, immediately afterwards military repression was used mercilessly to halt the process leading to the formation of a democratically elected Government in Pakistan.

We are told by some countries that while they may disapprove of what is being done by the military rulers, they cannot be a party to the disintegration of Pakistan. Is it suggested that we wish the disintegration of Pakistan? Have we not, as many Members have pointed out, at every step tried not only for propriety in our relationship but also for friendship? If there is a struggle between the two parts of Pakistan, it is certainly not of our making but of the rulers of Pakistan. Is it anybody's contention that the methods being used today can achieve any integration or stability worth the name now or in the future?

The question of secession is also raised, if I may say so. This is a distortion of facts. It is conveniently forgotten that the majority of Pakistan's people live in the eastern region. In a democratic system, the majority does have certain rights. They cannot be accused of secession if they assert those rights. However, if today there is such strong feeling amongst our people, it is not merely because the democratic rights and liberties of 75 million people are being crushed but because of the damaging effect which this cruel tragedy is having on our entire country economically, politically and socially.

This is the reality of the situation. It is not propaganda or the figment of anyone's imagination. Our experience of the influx of refugees and the preposterous propaganda by Pakistan has reinforced the fact that what is happening in Bangla Desh does have many-sided repercussions on our internal affairs. That is why I have said that this cannot be considered merely as an internal problem of Pakistan. It is an Indian problem. More, it is a world-wide problem. The international community must appreciate the very critical character of the situation that has now developed. Any failure to do so may well lead to disastrous consequences. For what is happening in Bangla Desh is not just a political and economic problem. It is a problem of the very survival of the people of that whole area, the people of Bangla Desh.

78

It is a problem created by calculated genocide that is resulting not only in the murder of tens of thousands of men, women and children but also forcing many more to seek refuge and shelter in India. It is a problem that threatens the peace and security of India and indeed, of South-East Asia. The world must intervene to see that peace and security is reestablished and maintained.

As Hon. Members, know, yesterday, there was a similar debate in the other

I louse. I had to sit there also for a part of the time, and so, I could not listen to all the speeches which were made here. I was sorry, however, to hear some hon. Members take even this opportunity to cast aspersions on our Foreign Office. I must deplore this tendency to try and find an easy way out by blaming the services. I do not say that we have not made mistakes or that all our representatives are always upto the mark. When there is a mistake, we should certainly find fault. But constant criticism is disheartening and demoralising. We should not blunt the instruments with which we have to-function. Our work here and abroad has to continue. We do realise that any help given to the rulers of Pakistan will be used against the innocent people of Bangla Desh. On this occasion our representatives abroad have worked hard and have done excellent work. They have been as effective as they could possibly be in the prevailing circumstances. Some Governments have set views and even if their sympathies are roused, they are not often willing to take a stand on a matter such as this. I would like to say that all our Services engaged in dealing with the present situation have shown fortitude and a sense of dedication.

If it gives some solace to Hon. Members to abuse the Government and blame them for lack of courage, for lack of direction and even of understanding, I certainly do not want to deprive them of this comfort. To some Members, guts are equated with voice-power and the use of passionate words. I wish life were so simple.

Now, this Government may have many faults; but it does not lack courage nor is it afraid of taking a risk if it is a necessary risk. As I have said many times over, we are not merely concerned with the legal aspect of this situation or, indeed, of any situation. We are concerned with one thing and one thing only - our own national interest and security and naturally that of the heroic people of Bangla Desh. That is why it is important to act calmly. The situation is far too grave for anything else.

The word 'recognition' has echoed from

every side, as if recognition by itself could solve the many difficulties which confront the people of Bangla Desh or the many difficulties which our country faces especially our States on the border, that is, West Bengal, Assam, Tripura and Meghalaya. We have given deep and anxious thought to all aspects of this question. It is, as my colleague has said, constantly under review. We are not waiting to see what other countries will do in the matter. Whatever decision we take in this or other issues is guided by our own independent assessment of the situation and how our interest in the broadest sense are served.

Yesterday, I spoke in very deliberately measured words of our present difficulties and of the likely dangers and burdens, not because I am or ever have been afraid of burden or of danger, but because I want Hon. Members to think deeply about all these matters.

Danger can be faced only when one is prepared for it. This, as I said previously and I should like to repeat, is no time for party rivalry. We must stand together; we must help one another in the economic and other tasks which confront us. Communal tendencies must be curbed. All parties, I think, must help to ensure that the question of Bangla Desh and of the refugees is not reduced to a communal level but is kept on its true level which is a national and an international one. I shall continue to keep in touch with the Leaders of the Opposition and with other Members of this Hon. House on these questions and developments, and I hope that Members will feel free to come to see me to express their views or whatever knowledge they have on the subject. In the meantime, there is not much else that I can say.

I would only say, let us not lose heart. Let us have faith in ourselves and in our people. Let us have faith in the courageous

79

people of Bangla Desh and in their determination to fight for their rights. No great

task is achieved without sacrifice. There is an old saying:

"Is experience gained with a song?

No, it takes all that a man has."

Sacrifice and hardship there must be for all who fight for freedom or for justice or for a great cause. But I have no doubt that the spirit of man and the spirit of freedom cannot be vanquished. We must face this entire problem with this confidence, and do what we have to do with calm and deep thought and with unity amongst ourselves.

It is true that there was an intrusion in part of Assam, and the Chief Minister had phoned to me. But we did send immediate help, and all the intruders were driven out. The situation is under control. They were driven out by five o'clock the day before yesterday.

Any case of spying is always treated with the utmost seriousness, whether in Assam or anywhere else in the country.

This point has been answered on many occasions.

The Hon. Member told me about this yesterday. We are looking into the matter.

So far as I know, all such entrants are being registered except some who manage to avoid registration. Although my colleague, the Minister for, Rehabilitation, is doing all he can to provide tents, tarpaulin-,, etc., there is no doubt that we are not fully equipped to deal with such a large influx. So, there is bound to be discomfort and hardship which we, are trying to minimise to the extent possible.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Foreign Minister's Reply to Discussion in Rajya Sabha on Bangla Desh

Following is the text of Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's reply to the short duration discussion regarding demand for recognition of Bangla Desh in Rajya Sabha on May 25, 1971:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the speeches that have been delivered by the hon. Members representing different political parties reflect the general sentiment that prevails in the country. This sentiment is the natural and spontaneous expression of sympathy for those in Bangla Desh who have suffered so grievously and have faced the barbarous atrocities and ruthlessness of the military regime. Historically the whole situation has been analysed in bits by the hon. Members who have participated in this debate.

Here is a situation which has arisen because the Awami League Leadership got such a solid majority. It appears that the fault of the Awami League was their support by the people of Bangla Desh and the result of the elections was so solid that it confounded the military regime. Although President Yahya Khan initiated some talks.

I agree with the analysis put forward by my esteemed friend, Shri Jain, that it appears, in retrospect, that when these talks were going on, military reinforcements were being moved from West Pakistan to East Pakistan and suddenly the talks were broken off and the military machine with its modern ruthlessness was unleashed against the unarmed people of Bangla Desh. The atrocities that have been committed have been testified to not only by the hundreds and thousands of unfortunate people who have sought shelter in India but by independent observers from various countries of the

world. Groups of people who happened to be stationed in Bangla Desh at the time when the military action against the defenceless peoples started, they have given out their testimony, their evidence of the ruthlessness with which the military machine was swung into action against the people of Bangla Desh. Although the foreign correspondents some of whom happened to be stationed in Dacca, were swiftly asked to leave Bangla Desh and Dacca, and therefore a veil of secrecy was sought to be maintained by the military regime even then those groups of foreign correspondents who visited Bangla Desh several days after the start of the operation have come out with stories which have rocked the entire world and if I say, so, the general public opinion in the world has been more alive and more responsive to the situation than the cautious Governments of various countries. I would like to pay a tribute to the independent

80

Journalists and several other foreigners who have given faithful accounts of the happenings in Bangla Desh. It is because of the manner in which these accounts appeared in the British press and the American press and the European press and even in several countries of Asia that slowly the reality is coming out and it also appears that this is having some influence upon the Government leaders of the world. I would like here to share one piece of information with this lion. House. It is true that many Government leaders have not come out openly in criticism of the action taken by President Yahya Khan's military regime in Bangla Desh but it is a fact that a fairly substantial number of world leaders in Government have assured us that they are aware of the happenings in Bangla Desh and they have further said that they are using whatever influence they have with the Pakistan Government to impress upon them the futility of the policy pursued in Bangla Desh.

As a matter of fact some of them have gone to the length of remarking that the policy pursued by the military regime of Yahya Khan, if it has achieved any thing, has created a situation where Pakistan after this military oppression against the people of Bangla Desh will never be the same Pakistan and all these steps are bound to embitter further the feelings of the people of Bangla Desh and no amount of suppression and oppression can subdue the will of the people and if the military regime and the Government of President Yahya Khan thinks that they can for all time suppress the voice of freedom raised by the valiant fighters in Bangla Desh then they are sadly mistaken. These fires of freedom, these flames, once they are lit, their intensity might be lowered but they never go off. That is the history of the world and the oppression and suppression undertaken by the military regime is not likely to subdue the forces of freedom and the forces that stand for democracy in Bangla Desh. In this situation we are faced with this sad spectacle where, as the Prime Minister pointed out in her statement in this House yesterday, the problem which was described all the time by Pakistan as an internal affair of Pakistan has now become our internal problem and it will be naive for anyone to suggest that this problem that is faced by Bangla Desh and by India is an internal affair of Pakistan. In the situation in which millions of people have found it necessary to flee from East Bengal for their safety and seek refuge in India for anybody to argue that it still continues to be an internal affair of Pakistan is something which cannot be accepted and we have categorically said so. The Prime Minister has very clearly said in her statement that this is a situation which cannot be tolerated. on the ground that it is an internal affair of Pakistan. In this situation where such vast number of evacuees or refugees are in India we cannot accept the Pakistan position acquisced in and supported by certain other countries and somewhat in a subdued tone that this is an internal affair of Pakistan. This is some thing which is totally unacceptable to us.

It is in this background that we have clearly taken this matter up with other countries that this is a matter in which they must act in such a manner that Pakistan has the requisite pressure put on her to create conditions in which in the first place this situation of pushing out people comes to an end straightaway. Secondly, conditions must be created under which all these people who have left Pakistan should feel secure that they can go back and they can live in that part of the world because they are citizens. Thirdly, we have made it absolutely clear that we cannot and we will not accept this as our permanent responsibility. This is as much the responsibility of the international community, and while it is true that India on account of its traditions of toleration would be prepared to give temporary succour and relief to these people, the burden must be shared by the international community because it is an international problem, not a national problem of India. It is in this perspective that we have to view the entire situation.

In the first place it is not customary when we are dealing with such vital problems to disclose or to enunciate all the steps that should be taken if X does not come about or Y does not come about. It is neither wisdom nor is it practical. If you first say, well, this thing should be done by the international community and if it is not done, then what do I intend to do, even that has been said very clearly but with a great sense of responsibility by the Prime Minister in her statement where she has said that we

81

appeal to the international community to see the reality of the situation that this is a matter which should be the concern of the entire international community, this burden of refugees; that this evacuation must come to an end and conditions must be created where these people can go back in safety but if they do not succeed, then we reserve the right to take whatever action we might consider appropriate, and that is the important part of the Prime Minister's statement. It is very easy and perhaps I would say very catching to ask me as to what I will do or the country do if we do not succeed in that. These matters are not discussed in this open manner and we cannot proceed on this basis that Pakistan will be so intransigent or, if I may use the expression, so unwise that they would ignore easily the will of the international community, provided the international community can be mobilised to realise the seriousness of this problem, and it is in this direction that we have to concentrate our attention.

Mr. Varma with his experience of the functioning of Government and also experience of Parliaments knows fully well that no one can say anything about what has happened in the Cabinet, and it is idle for him to expect of me to say what are the opinions expressed in the Cabinet. The Parliament should not have any interest in what goes on inside the Cabinet because it is the Government that matters, and whatever may be the individual opinion of any individual member, so long as I say something I speak on behalf of the Government, not on my behalf or on behalf of anybody else. But I would at the same time like to take this opportunity to say that any suggestion of the type made by Shri Rajnarain and obliquely referred to by Mr. Varma is totally unfounded.

In this respect all the members of the Government are of one mind and there is no difference of opinion. This is a favourite pastime of some friends who might be friendly to us but obliquely critical of us and also of some others to do some kite-flying in the hope that, well, somebody might contradict or confirm it. We do not fall into that trap. Because somebody says something, the responsibility should be cast upon me either to contradict it or confirm it, is a position which is totally unacceptable to any member of the Government. So long as Government decisions are there, Parliament should not at all be concerned about the discussions which precede the ultimate evolution of the decisions or the formulation of the final decisions. That should be accepted as Government, policy.

I have liven a great deal of thought to the problem that has been posed by hon. Members. It is a fact that will of the nation was reflected in the Resolution which was unanimously adopted in both Houses of Parliament in the March Session and there, after describing the situation, Ave had pledged our full sympathy and support to the people...

Now, what is that Resolution? I would like to recall the Resolution because memories are generally short and sometimes we are prone to forget our own resolve. After describing the other things, we say - "Bearing in mind the permanent interest which India has in peace and committed as we are to uphold and defend human rights, this house demands immediate cessation of the use of force and of the massacre of defenseless people."

This was the unanimous demand of the House -

"This House calls upon all peoples and Governments of the World to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to put an end immediately to the systematic decimation of people which amounts to genocide."

That is, we have called for the cessation of the use of force and have also appealed to all the Governments of the world and to the people of the world. This we have faithfully carried out because we have taken it up with most Governments. We have taken it up in the United Nations and in the ECOSOC Social Committee; this matter of violation of the human rights has been taken up with them.

"This House records its profound conviction that the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of East Bengal will triumph."

82

We still continue to stick to this view that it will triumph.

"The House wishes to assure them that their struggle and sacrifices will receive the wholehearted sympathy and support of the people of India." They have undoubtedly received the sympathy and support of the people of India. So, there is no doubt, there should not be. any doubt in the mind of anybody, that there has been any slipping on the part either of the Government or the people of India in the resolve unanimously expressed in this Resolution.

On this question of recognition of Bangla Desh so much has been argued and argued with a great deal of emotion and some honourable members have marshalled facts. This is a question about which we have not the intention to adopt a purely argumentative style. It is not the intention of the Government to try to reply to the various arguments. That does not mean that there are no counter arguments to some of the points that have been urged by honourable members. But we have to approach this problem from a rather bigger angle and we have already enunciated our position in reply to a question which was tabled in the Lok Sabha and a similar question is coming up for reply in this House tomorrow. We are clarifying our position. Our position in a nutshell is that the situation does continue to be fluid. We continue to give our thought to this aspect from time to time. We are constantly in touch with the situation and there is no fixed position in this regard. And if at any time we feel that it is in the interests of peace, it is in our national interest and it also helps the people who are fighting for their freedom, we will not hesitate to take the step even in regard to recognition. But this is a matter in which we have to take all aspects into consideration and as soon as the Government feels that a situation has been reached and a stage has been reached when we should formally recognise the Government, we will not hesitate to do that. There are certain norms that have to be carefully weighed although there are no hard and fast rules even according to international standards. But things like the extent of territory that might be under its control, the extent of Support, the quantum of writ that runs. what it actually means. these are all factors which have to be carefully weighed before a formal decision of

that nature is taken. We have also to carefully weigh the repercussions of it on our relations with even West Pakistan because we have a long border with them, and if we recognise a part of another country which by the United Nations is accepted as one country. it is quite obvious that that country whose part is recognised as a sovereign, independent country, will react. It should be quite obvious to us and it need not be spelt out by me. All these are considerations which, cannot be lightly brushed aside however strongly one might feel at an emotional level on an issue of this nature. I would not go into this matter any deeper. I would like to repeat what we have said on this issue that this is a matter about which we give a great deal of thought from. time to time and if at any stage we feel that a step in the form of formal recognition is necessary, we will not hesitate to take that step. With these words, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I conclude. I do not want to detain this House any longer.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SWITZERLAND

India - Switzerland Air Agreement

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on May 5, 1971 on the exchange of diplomatic notes between India and Switzerland amending Indo-Swiss Air Services Agreement of 1949:

Diplomatic Notes were exchanged today between His Excellency Dr. Fritz Real, Ambassador of Switzerland in India and Shri N. Sahgal, Secretary, Ministry of Tout-ism and Civil Aviation, amending the annex to the India-Switzerland Air Services Agreement of 1949.

Under these arrangements, within an entitlement of six services per week in each

direction on the specified route, Swissair is entitled to operate through two points in India, Bombay or Delhi (in lieu of Calcutta) while Air India's route schedule has been liberalised giving traffic rights between Switzerland and additional points namely Moscow, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Abu Dhabi, Dubai and other points in the Persian Gulf.

Air India is also entitled to operate a total of six services per week in each direction on the specified route through two points in Switzerland, Geneva or Zurich.

At present Air India operates five transiting services a week, three through Geneva and two through Zurich while Swissair operates six services a week through Bombay.

SWITZERLAND INDIA RUSSIA DENMARK NORWAY SWEDEN

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Indo-U.S. Agreement for Vegetable Oils

Following press release was issued in New Delhi on May 7, 1971 on the exchange Of letters regarding supply by U.S. of 27,000 more tonnes of vegetable oils:

In an exchange of letters May 7, the

United States agreed to supply India with an additional 27,000 tonnes of vegetable oil under the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Programme.

This brings the total amount of vegetable oil provided on concessional terms to India under the PL-480 agreement concluded on April 1, 1971, to 102,000 tonnes.

The letters providing for the increased supply were exchanged between Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Mr. Galen L. Stone, U.S. Charge d'Affaires ad interim.

The additional quantity of vegetable oil is valued at \$ 7.5 million (Rs. 5.63 crores).

The entire 102,000 tonnes of vegetable oil provided under the April agreement is expected to be received in India in the course of the next few months. It will help increase the production of vanaspati and is expected to have a stabilizing effect on the price level of edible oils.

USA INDIA

Date: May 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Agreement for Purchase of Cotton

Following is the text of a press release issued in Neu, Delhi on May 20, 1971 or, the exchange of notes between India and U.S. On the, supply Of additional Dollars 800,000 for purchase of Cotton from U.S.:

By an exchange of notes here today, the United States Government is providing an additional \$800,000 (Rs. 60 lakhs) to India for the purchase of cotton under the concessional terms of the Public Law 480 Food for Peace Programme.

The amount meets a shortfall in funds made available under the PL-480 agreement of April 1, 1971, and will enable India to purchase the entire quantity of 250,000 Indian bales of cotton visualized in the agreement.

With today's amendment, the value of wheat, cotton and vegetable oil supplied under the April PL-480 agreement is increased to \$ 158.3 million (Rs. 118.73 crores).

84

USA INDIA

Date: May 01, 1971

June

Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII JUNE

CONTENTS

PAGE

CEYLON
Parliament Statement on Reported Ceylonese Unilateral Action on Citizenship

No. 6

85

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Minister Moinul Haque Choudhury's Statement at UNIDO Meet

85

Indian Representative's Speech at UNDP Governing Council

86

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Shri R. K. Khadilkar's Speech at ILO Conference

86

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Refugee Influx in Rajya Sabha

89

External Affairs Minister's Statement on his Visit Abroad

92

External Affairs Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate

97

SUDAN

Trade Agreement with the Sudan

103

SWITZERLAND

Indo-Swiss Agreement on Milk Production Project

103

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Suspension of U.K. Aid

to Pakistan

104

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement on British Proposal to Impose

Duty on Textiles

104

Aid for Giant Indian Fertilizer Project

105

U.K. Food Aid Agreement

106

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Shipment of U.S. Arms to

Pakistan

107

Sardar Swaran Singh's Address to the National Press; Club,

Washington

108

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Parliament Statement on Reported Ceylonese Unilateral Action on Citizenship

Following is the text of the statement by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shri Surendra Pal Singh in Lok Sabha on 23rd June, 1971 regarding the reported unilateral action of the Government of Ceylon in changing the basis for the grant of Ceylon citizenship:

The Government of India have seen reports in the press that the Ceylon House of Representatives has adopted an amendment to the 1967 Indo-Ceylon Agreement (Implementation) Act, linking the pace of grant of Ceylon citizenship with the number of persons repatriated to India, and not merely to their registration in Ceylon as Indian citizens. According to the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964, the grant of Ceylon citizenship and the process of repatriation shall both be phased over a period of 15 years and shall, as far as possible, keep pace with each other in proportion to the relative numbers to be granted citizenship and to be repatriated respectively. The 1967 Indo-Ceylon Agreement (Implementation) Act related the grant of Ceylon citizenship with the grant of Indian citizenship and not with their actual repatriation.

The Prime Minister of Ceylon on the occasion of moving the present amendment, has stated that the Government of Ceylon intend to implement the 1964 Indo-Ceylon Agreement "both in letter and spirit". The

present amendment is to the Ceylonese domestic legislation of 1967 and not to the 1964 Indo-Ceylon Agreement. Both Governments have agreed that the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964 shall be implemented fully in letter and in spirit.

INDIA USA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Minister Moinul Haque Choudhury's Statement at UNIDO Meet

Following is the statement of Minister of Industrial Development, Shri Moinul Haque Choudhury, made on June 3 in the general debate of Special International Conference of UNIDO in Vienna:

In adopting an International Development strategy for the 1970's the general assembly has set out as one of the objectives of this strategy that the average annual rate of growth in the gross product of the developing countries as a whole during the 1970's should be at least 6% and that this will necessarily imply an average annual expansion of not less than 8% in their manufacturing output.

The adoption of the International Development strategy has highlighted the need for a dialogue between the developed and developing countries so as to explore and execute in the field of industrialisation, as in other programmes of action for inter-

85

national cooperation and harmonisation of policies, no doubt, with due regard to national objectives. It is in this context

that our conference acquires a momentous significance for the developing world.

It is for the very same reason that my delegation would urge that this mechanism of holding an international conference on industrialisation be institutionalised. We should recommend to the General Assembly that an international conference on industrialisation be convened periodically on a regular basis to discuss substantive matters affecting industrialisation of the developing world and to establish a dialogue on programmes of international action as well as to take stock of current progress.

INDIA USA AUSTRIA RUSSIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Representative's Speech at UNDP Governing Council

Speaking in the 12th Plenary Session of the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme, on the item "Approval of UNDP (Special Fund) Programme Recommendations", on June 9, 1971, at Santiago, Indian Ambassador Shri G. J. Malik, Alternate Representative for India, said:

In this Plenary Session the Council is considering the several projects which have been individually discussed in another place. My Delegation wishes to obtain a clarification from the Administrator regarding Projects 43, 44 and 45. These three projects are all located in East Pakistan.

Mr. President, my country is vitally interested in the economic development of this region and the betterment of its people.

Considering, however, the situation of chaos and lack of administration which at present obtains in that territory, my Delegation is very doubtful if these projects are capable of implementation and of serving the purposes for which they are to be sanctioned. My delegation would be distressed to see this Council give its approval to these schemes till the Administrator can give an assurance that orderly implementation is possible. It is not the intention of my Delegation, Mr. President, to raise political questions in this forum. However, India has now more than 5 million refugees on its territory and this is sufficient proof of the chaos prevailing in East Bengal.

Moreover I have been very concerned at some remarks made by Ambassador Mr. Aghashahi of Pakistan in the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council in New York last May. On that occasion, the distinguished Representative of Pakistan admitted that East Pakistan was grossly underdeveloped vis-a-vis West Pakistan. He, however, endeavoured to lay the blame on what he called his country's "mentors" - the World Bank and other aid - giving authorities for having imposed an economic philosophy on his country which had resulted in unequal regional development.

I would like to make sure, Mr. President, that no such allegation is made in the future against the U.N.D.P. Thank you.

INDIA CHILE MALI USA PAKISTAN

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

Shri R. K. Khadilkar's Speech at ILO Conference

Following is the text of the speech at the 56th Session of the International Labour Conference at Geneva on June 8, 1971 by the Minister for Labour and Rehabilitation and Leader of the Indian delegation to the Conference, Shri R. K. Khadilkar:

Permit me, first of all, Mr. President to congratulate you on your election to the

86

high office of Presidentship of the Conference. It is an honour and a distinction which you, by your long service to the Organisation, richly deserve. I have no doubt that with the benefit of your counsel and guidance the conference will have a satisfactory course leading to conclusions and decisions which will further the aims and objectives of the ILO.

The Directorate-General's report on Freedom by Dialogue' is an inspiring document. It is characterised by a comprehensive vision and a robust optimism. The Director-General has raised a number of questions for our consideration. While there may be no easy or simple answers to these questions, the Director-General is entirely right in focusing our attention on them. It is in the intensive pursuit of these issues and in their eventual solution that the path of true endeavour lies. It is only thus that the ILO can be considered to have justified and fulfilled itself.

The Director-General has hailed the "new birth of freedom." Here I must confess my mind is burdened with some doubts. I find it hard to forget that the frontiers of freedom still remain closed to large masses of men in Africa and the grim human tragedy now under way in our part of the world lies heavy on my mind.

It is these intensely human issues, transcending all politics, that I feel myself entitled to raise in this discussion on human freedom. Millions of peasants and workers have been uprooted from their hearths and homes and are fleeing for dear life to take

refuge in my country. We have spared no effort in giving them succour and relief. However, this unending influx imposes all intolerable burden on our struggling economy and is creating tensions which threaten to disturb the order and stability of our society. Mr. President, in my country I happen also to be the Minister in charge of relief and rehabilitation of refugees. I move about a good deal amongst over four Million human beings, - men, women and children, mostly from peasant and working class families - who have taken shelter in our country and I have seen their sufferings. I hope those conditions will soon be created under which these refugees can return to their homeland in a climate of confidence and assurance of freedom and safety. Mr. President, I have referred to these grave and tragic developments in my part of the world because I feel that any discussion on freedom will end in mere futility if it is limited to abstract principles and ideals and takes no account of savage realities.

GAP BETWEEN RICH AND POOR COUNTRIES

The Director-General has referred to the imbalance in development between countries as well as within them and the social tensions that result from such imbalances. If the end of the first Development Decade has left - third of the world's population enjoying 85 per cent of the world's wealth, and if the developed economies are still developing much more rapidly than the less developed ones, the prospects of what may be called international justice would seem to grow steadily dimmer. One of the main causes of this is the widening technological gap which, therefore, cans for a faster rate of advance of science and technology in the developing countries. If we were really convinced in 1944 that "poverty anywhere constitutes a danger to prosperity everywhere", we would have, by now, been moving towards a new order in which prosperity anywhere would provide the means to end poverty everywhere. The unrolling scroll of history will soon prove that prosperity cannot be maintained permanently in only some areas or regions of the world. The world has become one and just as it

cannot be half free and half bound, even so the division between rich countries and poor countries can continue only at the risk of grave threat to the very structure of our civilisation.

POLICY OF DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Why has the gulf between the nations widened? The policies of foreign trade and aid followed by the developed countries are principally to blame. The size of foreign aid has been meagre and a good deal of it has been neutralised by the policies of international trade. The terms of international trade are turning increasingly against the developing countries. At the same time, there is no greater willingness on the part of the developed countries to accept the manufactured and semi-manufactured goods which the developing countries are able to supply. There has to be a division of Labour

87

in the international sense and this implies consequential changes in the structure of the developed economies. This is an important means of giving a fillip and a stimulus to the developing economies. I realise that these matters, important as they are, may not be strictly within the purview of the I.L.O. and that there are other agencies which are seized of the problem, but I cannot help expressing my disappointment and concern that they have not yet fully come to grips with it. If the I.L.O. is to serve its purpose as a tripartite Organisation it is incumbent on it to emphasise these issues and press them steadily on the attention of the governments, the employers and the workers of the developed countries.

REVITALISING AGRICULTURE SECTOR

The Director-General has rightly emphasised that a progressive social policy must be built into the strategy of economic development. It is the wide gulf that divides the rich from the poor in developing countries that constitutes the most serious impediment to progress. The inequalities must be reduced but in a manner that does not inhibit investment for economic growth, and

economic growth itself must be accompanied by social justice. These are difficult prescriptions and in my own country we have learnt how painful the birth-pangs of economic freedom for the masses can be. We have yet a long way to go but in essence the solution consists in injecting more life into the countryside, revitalising rural agriculture and industry, increasing rural employment and thereby reducing the drift from the villages into the already overcrowded and congested cities. The Director-General's observations in all these matters have been of profound interest to me and I greatly appreciate the value of the suggestions he has made. The I.L.O's competence extends to many areas in this field and I am sure the developing countries can count on the I.L.O's assistance through its several projects and programmes in particular those initiated under the World Employment Programme.

PRACTICAL ACTION NEEDED

I would suggest, however, that the content of a progressive social policy should not be judged in terms of compliance with some of the Conventions and Recommendations that ILO has adopted. I am afraid that several of these standards are becoming increasingly unrelated to the conditions prevailing in the developing regions of the world which constitute the majority of the ILO's membership. It is for this reason that the Asian Labour Ministers, when they assembled in my country two years ago, invited the attention of the ILO to the need for a review of some of the existing ILO Conventions with reference- to their consistency with the needs and realities in the Asian countries and developing countries in other parts of the world. I hope there will be increasing efforts in the ILO to meet the new challenges through programmes of practical action rather than through elaborate enunciation of norms and standards. Indeed, I am happy to see that there is already a welcome change in this direction.

RURAL LABOUR

The bulk of the labour force in the

developing countries lives in the villages and rural areas. Not only are the incomes low, but the workers are without the protection of safeguards which Trade Unions provide in the modem, urban areas. These workers are unorganised or at best ill-organised and both Trade Unionism and Governments have largely passed them by. Beyond fixing minimum wages under statutes which, in any case, have encountered numerous difficulties in their practical enforcement, little has been done to ameliorate their lot. Perhaps, we need a pattern of organisation different from the one which has served the urban industrial workers concentrated in large production units. In my own country this problem has been the subject of a good deal of thinking and discussion in recent times. It is right and proper that the ILO as an Organisation charged with protecting and promoting the interests of all workers and not only those in the urban areas, should take an active part in initiating discussion of these issues and in finding solutions to them.

The problem of youth in the developed West are difficult enough, but those in the developing countries have acquired even greater proportions, although for different reasons. These derive essentially from educational systems unrelated to vocational

88

equipment and training, grave social and economic inequalities which breed cynicism and frustration and an economy which does not grow fast enough to provide employment to the large numbers of young people that steadily swell the ranks of job-seekers. If the "generation gap" is to be narrowed and youth enabled to play its constructive role as an instrument and force for social transformation, employment policies have to be closely dovetailed with educational reform, vocational training and employment counselling. We recognise the very useful role which the ILO has played, particularly in my country, in the technical and vocational training and guidance of young people. Other possibilities of ILO assistance in the provision of youth employment deserve to

be explored.

NEWLY EMERGED SOCIAL SYSTEMS

The Director-General's report has raised a number of important matters. I have touched only a few. Before I conclude, however, I would like to refer to the prerequisites of effective dialogue as enunciated by the Director-General. In considering these, I would suggest that this great international organisation should take into account the value-judgements of newly-emerged social systems that have come to stay and have conferred large benefits on millions of workmen, brightened their lives in numerous ways and released vast creative energies. There is growing need for genuine understanding and mutual reconciliation between differing value-judgements of nations arising from different political ideals and principles. The I.L.O. by virtue of its unique position as enjoying the confidence of not only governments with different political and social systems but also the large body of employers and workers is specially fitted for promoting such adjustments. It is only then that the dialogue can be made more rational, meaningful and fruitful. Pledged as we all are to the Constitution of the ILO, whatever else may be controversial among us, there is a common creed and common code that should guide our endeavour to fulfil our long-range responsibilities towards the peoples of the world.

SWITZERLAND INDIA USA PERU RUSSIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Refugee Influx in Rajya Sabha

Following is the text of the statement by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi in Rajya Sabha on June 15, 1971 intervening in the discussion on the, Situation arising Out of the influx of millions of refugees from Bangla Desh:

Sir, I had not expected to intervene in this discussion because we have made our policy very clear. I was rather astonished to hear from one of the Members that our policy is not clear. I think our policy is quite clear. I am astonished at the lack of confidence in our people, in our country, which our Members are constantly displaying. Are we citizens of a great country? Are we citizens who have confidence in ourselves or not? Listening to this debate, it seems to me that this is a far more important question than the question of what is happening to the refugees from Bangla Desh. Because if we have no confidence in ourselves, it doesn't matter what we say, we will not be able to implement it.

I speak here with tremendous confidence in my people and in my Government. I have no doubt at all that we can face the problem which has come upon us. What does this mean? Does it mean that no refugee will suffer? It cannot possibly mean that. When any country has to face a large

89

influx - not an influx over a long period, but a sudden influx within a few weeks, of nearly six million people - it is not a joke; it is not a small thing. I would like to know from hon. Members: Do they know of any country in the world which has faced even one-tenth of this situation before? It is very easy to sit in this House and just criticize and criticize instead of trying to assess the realities of the situation. If even ten thousand refugees arrive in any European country, the whole Continent of Europe will be afire with all the newspapers, the Governments and everybody will be aroused. We are trying to deal with nearly 6 million human beings who have fled from a reign of terror, who have come wounded, with disease, with illness, hunger and

exhaustion. And they have come to our country, which is one of the poorest in the world. We certainly have the fullest sympathy with these war evacuees or refugees, or whatever, you would like to call them.

We are going to do our very best to look after them. Even if we have to sacrifice, even if we have to go hungry, I hope the hon. Members will be the first to initiate a movement of missing a meal. But at the same time we have to see that our own poor people do not suffer, do not die. We have a double responsibility to our people and a responsibility to our friends from across the border.

One hon. Member spoke of our taking a begging bowl to other countries. Sir, I am not in the habit of begging. I have never begged. I am not begging now. And I have no intention of begging. If our emissaries go from this country to other countries, they are not speaking with a voice of weakness; they are not begging. We are sending them because this is an international responsibility. And we are not going to let the international community get away with it. They cannot avoid from their responsibility. They may give help, or they may not give help. But they will certainly suffer from the consequences of whatever happens in this part of the world. We must put this problem to them in its proper perspective. We certainly want help, and the more help we get, the better we shall be able to look after the refugees. But so far this help has been pitiable in proportion to what is needed, it is about one-tenth of what is actually needed so far as we have been able to assess. I hope that this help will increase. This is very important from the point of view of saving lives, of giving better nourishment to children and of giving better treatment to those who are suffering from cholera and other diseases. But the point is not the quantity of help. But our appeal is even mom important from the point of view of putting this problem in perspective. What are we concerned about? We are concerned about the lives and the comforts of the refugees, but we are even more concerned about the problem of

democracy, the problem of Human Rights, the problem of human dignity, which have now been brought into focus before us and the whole world in such a poignant and heartrending manner. And if our representatives have gone, whether they are Members of the Council of Ministers, whether they are non-official people or other people,, it is with this end in view, namely that all the countries should be told about the reality of the situation, and I think that our efforts have succeeded in this in some measure. Today the world press is reacting more sharply and is devoting greater space to this question, I think that we have had something to do with this change of attitude. So, we should not sneeze at all the efforts that are being made. As I said on a previous occasion here, I can understand the emotionalism and the sense of sorrow and of helplessness which hon. Members and many people outside feel. It is understandable and I sympathise with it. But it should lead us to something more. It should not lead us a dead end, to a feeling that nothing is being done, that nothing can be done and that we are going to be engulfed. We are bearing a tremendous burden and as I said - I do not know whether the word is parliamentary or not; if it is not please strike it out, Sir - as I said in my meetings with the people even in the camps where I had gone, we will have to go through hell to meet this situation. But I have no doubt that we can emerge, and we will. It will hurt us in many ways, economically and in other ways, but we will get through if we have the courage, the determination and the endurance. I personally believe that our people do have these qualities and therefore we will be able to handle this situation. But it cannot be done cheaply either as regards-

90

financial effort or the physical effort. The effort may hurt all sections of the people, all along the line. It may even affect some of our essential programmes. But this is something which we cannot avoid because, as I have said on an earlier occasion, what happens in Bangla Desh will have an impact on India. We are concerned with the general principle of democracy but we are

more concerned here because Bangla Desh is so close to our border that its impact will be very much greater than if such a thing had happened in a distant place.

My colleague just now mentioned the much publicised reception centres opened by the West Pakistan Government in Bangla Desh. I do not know what these reception centres are going to do. So far nobody has returned from any of our refugee camps except a small number - about two thousand - who are reported to have gone back from a part of northern India for various reasons which had nothing to do with the opening of the reception centres in East Bengal.

So far as I remember, it was Shri Goray, or may be one of the other hon. Members - who asked something about what we meant by political settlement.

I think he will excuse me; he has put rather an extraordinary interpretation on that word. Does he for a moment believe that we would accept a political settlement which means the death of Bangla Desh, which means the ending of democracy or of those who are fighting for their rights? India could never accept such a state of affairs. When we talked of a political settlement, we meant that a political settlement must be arrived at with those people who are today being suppressed. I am not expressing a view whether such a settlement is possible or not, but clarifying what we have said at an earlier stage. If international pressure through whatever means available to the big powers and to other countries were exerted, I think that a political settlement would have been possible at an earlier stage. Now, of course, with each passing day this possibility becomes more remote.

We are looking after the refugees on a temporary basis. We have no intention of allowing them to settle here nor can we allow them to go back merely to be butchered.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY: May I know what is the implication of that state-

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: One hon. Member said something about China having become free after us. I have not quite understood what this means. So far as I know, China has not been under foreign rule in the way that we have been. It has always been a free country. It is true that earlier it did not have a communist government and now it has one. But it was a free country all along.

There is some confusion in the minds of hon. Members whether refugees are being removed or whether they are to be kept where they are. It is not easy to be clear on this matter because of the magnitude of the problem. Even if we want to remove the refugees it is physically not possible to do so. Each train carries about 1,200 or it may be little more. But with the best will in the world, we can only move a small portion of them. We are trying to move them specially to land which belongs to the Central Government in different States but it is not an easy matter to do and however we may try to move them there still will be a tremendous burden on the States where they are today. And specially as you must have heard from Shri Khadilkar.

SHRI KALYAN Roy: You are depending only on railways. Fleets of trucks may be used to shift them to other places.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We have used trucks; we are using planes; we are using railway trains; we are using goods trains. But with all that - they are six million people - you cannot remove them easily or quickly.

In this country we have a shortage of practically everything which they need. We have a shortage of tarpaulins; we have a shortage of corrugated iron sheets; we have shortage of every possible thing you can think of. We have tried to round these items from every part of the country we are rushing them to the camps. But, no

matter what we do - I am sorry to say -we cannot keep the refugees on anything remotely resembling comfort because of the nature of the problem. And I am glad to say that wherever I have been the spirit in these camps has really been magnificent. They are living under extremely difficult conditions but they understand and appreciate our difficulties. So, we should continue to try and do our best but we should always keep in view the long-term aspect of the problem and specially the aspect that it will mean tremendous hardship for all of us and for our people. We must all, as leaders or members of political parties, as citizens of this country prepare our people for this period of hardship because without it we can neither help the refugees nor deal with the larger problem.

This House has always shown a great deal of understanding. I know that it is necessary from time to time to have an opportunity to blow off steam and to work off emotions. This is natural and understandable but when all is said, I am grateful to the House for the understanding it has showed and for the cooperation which it gives.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

External Affairs Minister's Visit Abroad

Following is the text of the statement in the LokiRajya Sabha on 25th June by the External Affairs Minister Sardar Swaran Singh on his return from visits to Moscow, Bonn, Paris, Ottawa, New York, Washington D.C. and London, from 6th June to 22nd June, 1971:

Between 6th and 22nd June, 1971, I visited Moscow, Bonn, Paris, Ottawa, New York, Washington and London, in that order. In each of these capitals I had detailed discussions, with the head of Government and the Foreign Minister. At the U.N. Headquarters I had discussions with the U.N. Secretary-General U. Thant and his colleagues. I also met in every capital a number of other Government leaders, legislators, editors; social workers and leaders of public opinion.

In these discussions the focus of attention and emphasis was all along on the grave and serious situation created for India by the influx of 6 million refugees from East Bengal, and the continuing crisis caused in our region due to the massive killings by the West Pakistani military machine in East Bengal.

In Moscow, Bonn, Paris, Washington and London statements were issued at the end of my visits, on behalf of the respective Governments, in consultation with us and these indicate the general line of the reaction of host Governments. In Ottawa Foreign Minister Mitchell Sharp made a statement in the Canadian House of Commons which indicates their general line.

Copies of all these Statements are being laid on the Table of the House.*

As a result of my talks with the Governments of countries visited by me, the following areas of agreement emerged:

- (i) That there could be no military solution and all military action in East Bengal must stop immediately;
- (ii) That the flow of refugees into India from East Bengal must immediately stop;
- (iii) That conditions must be created enabling the refugees to return to their homes in peace and security, and that this could happen only if

- the refugees could be assured of a secure future in their respective homes in East Bengal;
- (iv) That a political solution acceptable to the people of East Bengal was the only way of ensuring a return to normalcy;
- (v) That the present situation was grave, and fraught with serious dangers for the peace and security of the region.

92

It was generally agreed that the burden placed upon the resources of the Government of India by this massive influx of 6 million refugees into this country from East Bengal, a process crowded into just a few weeks, was intolerable, and that the international community must give assistance in this effort, both in cash and in kind.

I made it clear in each capital that any assistance to the refugees from East Bengal was essentially an assistance given to Pakistan, for they are nationals of that country, uprooted through deliberate and wanton action on the part of their own Government. I also clarified, and it was by and large accepted, that any military assistance to the military rulers of Pakistan at this juncture would have the effect of encouraging and sustaining them in their anti-people activity; and any economic assistance to them would be tantamount to condoning their deplorable actions in East Bengal, so fully and so irrefutably documented by eye-witness accounts which have been appearing in the world press all these weeks. I pointed out also that, in fact, any economic assistance, excepting that given on humanitarian considerations to the victims of oppression in Bangla Desh under international surveillance, would have the effect of maintaining in power the military machine of the minority now engaged in oppressing the majority of the people of that country, and thus would constitute an unfortunate form of interference in their internal affairs.

I found in all these capitals great appreciation for the generosity displayed by the Government and people of India in look-

ing after this large influx of refugees, which was recognised as an unprecedented one in human history, a man-made calamity for the people of East Bengal, and also for this country. The gravity of the situation, the enormity of the burden-placed on us, for no fault of ours, and the serious repurcussions for the peace and security of this entire region if the present situation was not brought under control speedily, was recognised everywhere.

ANNEXURE I

TEXT OF INDO-SOVIET STATEMENT ON THE CONCLUSION OF THE FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT TO MOSCOW - ISSUED ON JUNE 8, 1971

From 6 to 8 June 1971 Mr. Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs of India paid an unofficial visit to Moscow as a guest of the Soviet Government.

- 2. In the course of discussions and talks held in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding a wide range of questions of Soviet-Indian relations, and topical international problems of interest to both States were touched upon.
- 3. The two sides expressed their conviction that Soviet-Indian friendship will further strengthen and develop in the interests of the peoples of both countries, and in the cause of strengthening peace in Asia and in the whole world.
- 4. The sides recognised the necessity to continue to develop friendly ties and contacts at various levels and exchange of opinion between the Governments of the USSR and India on major international issues.
- 5. The sides noted the coincidence of points of view of India and the Soviet Union on all major international problems. They stressed the necessity of efforts of all peaceloving countries to settle such important problems affecting the interests of universal peace as termination of the war in Indo-China, political settlement of the Middle-

East crisis, ensuring European security and achieving general and complete disarmament.

6. During the negotiations was also discussed the serious situation created by the continuing stream of millions of refugees from Fast Pakistan coming into the adjoining states of India. The Minister of External

93

Affairs of India expressed his sincere thanks for the frank and clear understanding of the difficulty of this situation expressed in the message of the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Mr. N. V. Podgorny to the President of Pakistan on 2nd April, 1971, in which the conviction was expressed that the resort to peaceful methods for achieving political settlement would correspond to the interests of the entire Pakistani people, the cause of preserving peace in this region.

- 7. The Indian Foreign Minister explained the social, economic and political problems as also the tensions created by the development of events in East Pakistan. He stated that the problem of ensuring that food and shelter was made available to these millions flooding into India from East Pakistan, has been further complicated due to the outbreak of epidemics.
- 8. The two sides, after a detailed discussion on the various aspects of the problems created in this context, consider that it is imperative for immediate measures to be taken in East Pakistan which would ensure the stoppage of the influx of refugees from East Pakistan. Simultaneously, it is desirable to take further steps to ensure that peace is restored and all conditions of security are created for the return of the refugees to their homes in East Pakistan. Taking into account the seriousness of the situation, the two sides agreed to remain in touch with each other in order to review the situation.
- 9. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of India thanked the Soviet Government for

the warm and cordial reception accorded to him.

10. The sides are of the opinion that the visit of Minister of Foreign Affairs Swaran Singh, his meetings and talks with Soviet statesmen will serve the cause of the further development of friendly relations and fruitful cooperation between the two countries.

ANNEXURE II

STATEMENT MADE ON JUNE 12, 1971 By SPOKESMAN OF THE FRENCH FOREIGN MINISTRY AFTER FRANCO-INDIAN TALKS

The Minister of Foreign Affairs received the Indian Minister of External Affairs on June 12. In the course of his talk with Mr. Swaran Singh, Mr. Schumann took note of the information he was given on the massive influx of refugees from East Pakistan into the border regions of India. He confirmed to his interlocutor the decision of the French Government to respond favourably to the humanitarian appeal launched in favour of the refugees by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. He expressed his concern at these developments and expressed the wish that no effort be neglected to provide a political solution to this crisis which stops the flood of refugees and enables their return to their homes.

ANNEXURE III

TEXT OF STATEMENT By FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY ON THE CONCLUSION OF FOREIGN MINISTER'S VISIT TO BONN

On the invitation of the Federal Government, Foreign Minister of India, Mr. Swaran Singh visited the Federal Republic of Germany on 9th and 10th June 1971 in the course of his world tour.

On 10th June, the Foreign Minister

had talks with the Federal Chancellor, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs and the State Secretary Doctor Frank.

On 9th June, the Minister was received by the Government of North Rhine Westphalia and in the afternoon had the occasion to meet the representatives of relief organisations and the representatives of press

94

and television. In the evening he had an opportunity of talks with the Speaker of the Parliament (Herr Von Hassel), Minister of Economic Cooperation (Herr Eppler), the Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Parliament (Doctor Schroeder) and other distinguished personalities.

In talks with the Federal Foreign Minister, subjects of mutual interest were discussed. The Indian Foreign Minister expressed great concern of his Government about the huge influx of refugees into India, numbering about 5 million, in a matter of few weeks, as a result of the developments in East Pakistan. The Minister pointed out that this had not only imposed heavy financial burdens on the Government of India but that it had also created socioeconomic tensions and posed a threat to the peace and security of the region.

The Indian Foreign Minister thanked the Federal Government for all official and private assistance which was being offered in the context of refugee relief and for the under-standing and concern displayed by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for the difficult situation created in India. The German side expressed interest of the Federal Government in peace and stability in the sub-continent and stated that it followed the developments with great concern and was aware of the dangers to the security of the region. There was agreement that India alone was not in a position to solve the enormous task of caring for the refugees. The German side pointed out that the Federal Government in response to the appeal by the Secretary of the United Nations had already made available

first contribution to the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and that the Federal Cabinet was going to consider the question of more assistance for the refugees at its meeting on 10th June.

The two Foreign Ministers agreed that an early political solution of the problem was essential for the return of the refugees to their homes.

The Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs explained to his Indian guest the present state of the problem of Germany and Berlin and German relations with the countries of the East and West Europe.

The Indian Foreign Minister conveyed high appreciation of the Government of India for the initiative undertaken by the leadership of the Federal Republic in the interest of detente, rapproachment and cooperation in Europe.

The discussions took place in a spirit of friendship and understanding which characterise the relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and India.

PAKISTAN RUSSIA CANADA FRANCE GERMANY USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA CHINA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

ANNEXURE IV

STATEMENT MADE BY ACTING PRIME MINISTER AND FOREIGN MINISTER OF CANADA, Mr. MITCHELL SHARP IN THE CANADIAN HOUSE OF COMMONS ON 16TH JUNE, 1971 AFTER HIS TALKS WITH THE FOREIGN MINISTER.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are pressing for a political solution. It is the only possible Way of dealing with the present situation. Unless there is a political settlement in pakistan, the refugees are going to remain in India and continue to be a thorn in the side of Peace, if I may put it in that way. Therefore we are all working with everything at our command and using every possible means of impressing on the Pakistan Government the need for a settlement, one that is democratic and made under civilian control.

Mr. Speaker, if you will permit a short answer, the preferred settlement, or course, would be one in which those individuals who have been elected pursuant to the recent elections in Pakistan should be given responsibility of governing Pakistan, particularly East Pakistan.

95

ANNEXURE V U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT SPOKESMAN'S STATEMENT ISSUED ON JUNE 17, 1971

The Indian Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh has been in Washington in order to discuss with U.S. officials the problems faced by India in connection with the heavy influx of refugees from East Pakistan.

The Foreign Minister has called upon the Secretary and the President. He was guest of honour at a lunch given on June 16 by the Secretary and attended by senior officials of the State Department.

The discussions with US officials were friendly and constructive. US officials welcoined the restraint which India has shown in dealing with the East Pakistani refugee problem and expressed hope that restraint would be continued on both sides.

It was recognised that prompt refugee relief was essential, and the Indian Government was informed of the full support Of the United States for the efforts of Sadruddin Khan, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and the U.S. intention to provide additional financial support to that already announced.

It was also recognised that relief in itself is not enough and is not a solution to

the present problem.

An end to an early reversal of the flow of refugees is an important first step which in turn would be greatly facilitated by progress toward a restoration of peaceful conditions in East Pakistan and a political accommodation.

ANNEXURE VI

AGREED STATEMENT AFTER THE SECRETARY OF STATE'S MEETING WITH MR. SWARAN SINGH ISSUED ON JUNE 21, 1971

Mr. Swaran Singh arrived in London on 19 June and leaves again for India this evening. On 21 June he was the guest at lunch of the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary and later called on the Prime Minister and afterwards was received by Sir Alec Douglas-Home at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

In their discussions Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Mr. Swaran Singh agreed that it was important that the flow of refugees into India from East Pakistan should cease and that conditions should be created for enabling them to return to their homes. It was recognised that this would only be possible if they were assured of a secure future. Sir Alec Douglas-Home and Mr. Swaran Singh agreed that a Political solution must therefore be found which was acceptable to the people of East Pakistan.

Sir Alec Douglas-Home told Mr. Swaran Singh that Her Majesty's Government wished to help India shoulder the burden of the refugees and were working, through the United Nations and the India Aid Consortium. Britain had already made available over f 2 million to them and was ready to make further contributions.

Sir Alec Douglas-Home paid tribute to India's restraint and generosity in dealing with the problem of the refugees. The

Foreign Minister of India expressed appreciation of the sympathy and support for the refugees from East Pakistan given by the people and Government of Britain.

The discussions were friendly and constructive and the two governments agreed to keep in close touch.

96

CANADA USA PAKISTAN INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

External Affairs Minister's Reply to Lok Sabha Debate

Following is the text of the speech of the External Affairs Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, replying to the debate in Lok Sabha on his visit to foreign countries and shipment of U.S. arms to Pakistan on June 28, 1971:

The whole discussion before this House is about the two statements that I made, one is about the American supply of arms to Pakistan and the other, the result of my tour to various capitals of the world. In this connection quite naturally the observations that the hon. Members made covered wider ground, and several other issues have been raised.

I shall try, briefly, to make my observations about some of the matters which have been raised by hon. Members and I shall also try to give briefly the objectives that I had before me when I undertook this tour...

The hard reality that we had to face was that among a fairly large number of countries there was this unfortunate tendency to treat this situation in Bangla Desh as an internal affair of Pakistan and it was very necessary therefore to take a very clear stand about this issue, and it was also necessary to project the basic issues involved in the situation to persuade the governments concerned and also the non-official leaders, Opposition, Press, commentators and other makers of public opinion.

It was also necessary to dispel the erroneous impression that unfortunately Prevailed that it was an internal affair of Pakistan.

These were some of the basic objectives and I can say that there is a great deal of understanding, almost perfect understanding, among the non-officials, Press, people, non-official thinkers, commentators, Members of Parliament and others.

What are these basic issues that have been enunciated here by honourable Members from time to time. I would, for the purpose of putting them on record, try to reiterate very briefly the basic issues involved in the situation.

Here is a situation which has been created by the Pakistani military regime by resorting to ruthless repression and unleashing the military machine against unarmed people with the objective of negating the results of democratic election. This is the basic issue that is involved.

We have also to keen in mind all the time that elections in Bangla Desh and in West Pakistan, in fact the elections in the entire region, were not an ordinary election but an election undertaken to enable the elected representatives to frame their constitution. The ideas that were put across by various parties in their election manifesto which contains some elements of the future set up of Pakistan were therefore extremely relevant.

After obtaining such overwhelming

support from the electorate for implementing those items which were projected in their election manifestoes, it was nobody's concern to start any negotiations to whittle down what was contained in their election manifesto. It was for the new constituent assembly of Pakistan to take any decision about the future set-up of Pakistan. It is therefore a matter of surprise that people should have been taken in by high pressure propaganda that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's attitude was unreasonable in the course of talks which Yahya Khan had initiated with him.

As a matter of fact, President Yahya Khan in this background had no business to undertake any talks. They had won the elections on a certain programme and it was for the elected representatives, when they sit in the constituent assembly, to take any decision. Therefore, it was absolutely redundant, in fact against all principles, to have any talks whatsoever. The whole world now realises that these talks were also a smokescreen behind which military supplies, equipment and troops were moved and suddenly these talks were broken and the military oppression was resorted to. In a situation like this, when this basic issue is involved, and as a result of which about six million people have actually crossed over into Indian territory, for anybody to say

97

that it continues to be an internal affair of Pakistan is something which is totally unacceptable and absolutely unreal, and it is in this respect that international opinion has to be mobilised. To a certain extent it has been mobilised, but we have still to continue our efforts and mobilise public opinion in this respect.

About the question of refugees, I would like to say very categorically that some honourable Members who, in a moment were normally carried away either by their own voice or by their own enthusiasm have not done justice when they said that I had gone out to ask for aid or to ask for any help in meeting the expenditure that we incur on

these refugees. In fact they said this was the main objective with which I had undertaken the tour. To dispel any feeling, if ever there was, in any part of the world.

The point is that we had to project to the entire international community. There was an unfortunate feeling which was growing, that this is a situation in which India faces a great economic burden, that India's own plans are going awry, and therefore in such a big human problem, the problem of human suffering, if the international community can mobilise enough support to enable India to tide over this thing, then perhaps that is the answer. It was very necessary, therefore, to dispel this erroneous impression, and this does not fit in with the description that some honourable Members have said that I had gone there to beg for aid or ask for aid. I never raised this question of aid. In fact wherever this was mentioned, I always took the precaution to point out that this to me is a peripheral matter and it touched only the symptom and did not go to the root of the problem, and unless the root of it is tackled, by simply tackling the symptom or touching the periphery of the problem and not the basic problem, it was no use. It should be made clear that this was one of the objectives that I had before me.

On the question of refugees, is it only a question of these large numbers? Of course the problem is overwhelming. It causes all manner of strains, financial, organisational, and also it causes political and economic tensions. Therefore, for that reason, it is a much bigger issue, and any attempt by anybody either here or abroad, to try to quantify it in terms of money is a complete injustice and a complete misunderstanding of the problem. It is from this angle that we have to deal with this problem and project it to the international community.

What is then the problem of refugees? We have made it clear - it was necessary to do so - because some quotations from some responsible people in our own country were being unfortunately quoted in foreign chanceries and foreign countries to the

effect that India has got vast resources and a large population; they have in the past on many occasions taken in refugees and looked after them; on this occasion also although it is a big problem, perhaps given the help and necessary wherewithal, India may be able to cope this problem also. This is precisely the thing which we have to negative very strongly. These are Bangla Desh citizens. They have to go back to their own country. They are on trust with us, primarily on behalf of Bangla Desh and secondarily on behalf of the entire international community. Therefore, we should reiterate our determination that they have to go back to their own home and hearth. They cannot go back to their home and hearth merely because President Yahya Khan makes a statement that refugees are welcome. He did make some such statement. That was also a highly qualified statement. He said, genuine refugees are welcome. What was the effect of that statement which he made on May 22nd or 21st? After that statement, about two and a half million people have actually crossed over from Bangla Desh to India. What is the credibility of a statement of this nature? When will these refugees go back and how? They can go back only if the affairs of Bangla Desh are in the hands of elected representatives. It is none else except Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Unless he and his party are in charge of the affairs in Bangla Desh, there will never be the atmosphere for these refugees to go back. Therefore, let us try to understand in depth the real problem involved. When we talk of the refugee problem, although their rehabilitation is a colossal problem the basic problem is that they have to go back to Bangla Desh. If we express our determination in unmistakable terms, there will be understanding for this. It is there to a very large

98

measure in several of these statements with varying dgree. One cannot, when dealing with the international community, impose ones own words hut this idea is broadly acceptable to all. In every statement, whether it is a unilateral statement or a

joint communique there are two things. One is, the flow of refugees must stop. It will stop only if this ruthless military action stops. Otherwise, it cannot stop. Secondly the refugees will never go buck unless the affairs are in the hands of the responsible leaders who got such an overwhelming majority - 167 out of 169 seats. This is the approach that has to be projected consistently. These objectives received fairly wide support amongst the international community. I think the essentials of the problem are such that they will continue to receive international support.

Now a great deal has been said and there appears to be some misunderstanding, or some sliding back, as was mentioned by some honourable Member, when we used the term "political solution". I want to clarify this in a threadbare manner.

We are firmly of the opinion that continued military action will not resolve the problem. When we say that it is quite consistent with the resolution that we have adopted in which we have said that the entire international opinion should be mobilised and pressures should be put on the military regime to stop their military action and ruthless atrocities in Bangla Desh. This was an essential element in the resolution which was adopted by this parliament. When we say that military action will not result in any solution, then the other alternative is political solution.

About political solution, I have not left any country in any doubt, both in the public statements, and during my talks with the leaders of those countries, governmental and non-governmental. What is that political solution? The political solution is one which is acceptable to the elected represen. tatives led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. On this issue we should be very clear in our mind. It will not be a very good and acceptable strategy for us to spell out the content of that political solution, but it will be something for which there will be wide support when we say that this solution has to be acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh; acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh

means acceptable to those who have been elected with the overwhelming majority, that is, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Therefore, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is the only person who, on behalf of the people of Bangla Desh, can enter into a solution. Therefore, when we talk of political solution and something which is acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh, this is what we mean. I am not saying anything here which I have not said, perhaps in more clear, terms to the leaders abroad, whether they were official or non-official.

At the same time, I also warned them about this loose talk or vague talk of inducting a civil regime for a military regime, that it will not serve the purpose. I disabused their mind on that that this can never happen. In fact, the expression that I used was that it is immaterial if the people who exercise irresponsible and dictatorial authority wear uniform of a general, or are admiral or ordinary civilian; if he is not responsible to the people, which means not responsible to the elected representatives of the people then it is immaterial whether the authority is wielded by the military general or by the civilian. Then again they talked vaguely of having some government in which the Awami League elements are involved. That is again a very dangerous line on which some honourable Members have already made some comments. My friend opposite, Shri Mukherjee referred to it and so also several other members. This was precisely the danger that I also sensed. All of us sensed it here in this government. Therefore, it was very necessary for us to point out in very unmistakable terms that any regime which consists of breakway elements from the Awami League of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman or which consists of persons who might have been won over, cajoled or coerced and thus become willing tools in the hands of the military regime who were given the facade of the Awami League but who were really puppets or quislings of the military regime will never be acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh.

So these are the vital issues involved when we talk of the basic questions. Now,

when we talk of the refugees being the responsibility of Bangla Desh, the refugees cannot go back so long as the military regime continues and so long as these atro-

99

cities continue. As long as a government responsible to the elected representatives is not established these people will never go back.

This is the whole structure within which we have been using this expression of stopping of military action or and arriving at political settlement, We have not left anybody in doubt. I do not know if they will be willing to go with us. I cannot make a tall claim like that. But on the first issues there is broad agreement that their flow should stop, that they are not our responsibility and that they should go back. About the rest some countries have said it openly this is not possible unless there is satisfactory political solution: some have said unless it is a political solution acceptable to the people; the others have said it has to be with Awami League. These are various steps. Quite understandably you cannot get open statements from governments. even though they might be feeling that anything short of that might prolong the agony of the people.

I would like to mention one other aspect. I have a distinct feeling that there is a great deal of awareness that the position of Bangla Desh today is such that whatever military regime might try to make out these People who have embarked upon this vital struggle for their existence, for their survival, for their liberty that they cannot be suppressed by military means. There is a great deal of appreciation and assessment on these lines. And I would like to say that if they are slowly moving from the original position of treating this as a purely internal matter when they see this is the direction in which things are moving then they also for no other reason - for sheer selfinterest - start taking attitude which may later on not turn, out to be an entirely different from the aspirations of the 75 million people

of Bangla Desh and to that extent everyone wants to keep their options open. It is a hard fact of international life with which we have to cope with: we have to realise that countries generally want to keep their options open. It will perhaps be unrealistic for anybody to imagine that they always go by what is just according to us or by what is wrong according to us. The interests of various countries, their shortterm interests, their long-term interests, they do not want easily to sacrifice whatever may be the justice or non-justice of the case. As a matter of fact if this doctrine were accepted by the international community not as sort of just slogan but something in which they firmly believe then I have no doubt that most of the troubles of the world would come to an end. We have to realise all these aspects and even the selfinterest of many countries who may have interest in this region, who may have interest even in Bangla Desh, if they see that Bangla Desh is bound to come, it is only a question of time and that eighty thousand or ninety thousand military people howsoever ruthless their methods may be they cannot for all times or for any length of time or for any sizeable length of time suppress by military means the flame of liberty which is now lit there in unmistakable manner whatever sufferings of these people may be; this thought itself is a great factor which moves them nearer towards the position of realising that the future of this area is in a direction different from what they conceive it today.

This freedom struggle is bound to succeed. It is in this context that we have to view this situation.

It was one of my efforts to point out that this is a situation which cannot be bought out. Affluent countries can always have the feeling that a situation can be bought out. This was one effort and I think now it is realised. If I may also share this thought with you, even if aid comes, it will never come by our asking for it but by our taking a clear attitude. Even the quantum of aid that you will get will be much more than if you were to pass your hat round and

ask for various types of help in order to look after the refugees.

As to the response from other countries if I may say, on the basic issues there is understanding. Some of them are prepared to say openly, others are not prepared to say it openly. Some honourable Members say, "Give an ultimatum to the international community; tell them that if they do not do this within 15, 20 or 30 days, we will do this." I think, this will be an approach which is not justified. Whatever our country wants to do and whatever are our objectives, no one can pull them out for us. The main burden, even of refugees if all the money

100

comes, will be ours. All this socio-economic tension that is generated, all this upheaval which our country faces, this general attitude in which almost the entire governmental machinery is switched on to look after this problem sometimes on the ground sometimes in the international community and sometimes in an organisational manner - is all this capable of being determined in terms of money? These are problems which we have to face and unless the basic problem, the root problem, is resolved, there cannot be a satisfactory solution of this problem.

Having said that, I would very briefly like to say a couple of sentences on each of the specific questions that were raised. Three honourable Members including Professor Rao, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad and Shri Krishna Menon, raised the question of raising this question in the appropriate Organisation. With my long experience, which this Parliament has enabled me to obtain by going to these international gatherings, I would like to say that this is a gathering not of judges or jurists or of people who take decisions on what is spoken to them but these are governmental bodies in which unless there is governmental support at. their capitals, merely making hard or tall speeches does not take us any farther. So we have first to mobilise all the efforts in the various capitals and if there is support

for any proposition only then it is worthwhile taking it to a U.N. organisation.

We cannot forget that on several earlier occasions it has not been our long speeches that have saved the situation but a veto of a friendly country that has saved us on some very crucial occasions. So, I would not like to give a false sense that the United Nations or these organisations can pull us out of our troubles and difficulties.

These are very difficult questions. I am not opposed to taking it up at the U.N. But I do not believe in the efficacy of strong speeches to enable us to get the results. We have first to persuade the various governments. These are governmental bodies. The people behind the mike are absolutely impervious to the speeches that are made. Even eloquence does not work with them because mostly it is lost in interpretation. The more eloquent speech it is, the worst it gets in simultaneous interpretation. One has to be direct and straight in making these speeches. Therefore what matters is the attitude of the government. Before the man says, yes or no, he has to consult his capital, he has to consult his government, saying, "this is the issue India has raised, should I say, yes or no?" If his government says, yes, he says, yes; if his government says, no, he says, no.

We have to prepare first the ground before we take it up to the Organisation by taking up this matter bilaterally at most of the capitals, and with their Ambassadors. I would say that we have initiated that process and, depending upon the support we gather, we will definitely take it up at the UN Organisation. At the same time, I would not leave any doubt in the minds of the honourable Members. It is good to raise it in the UN because the matter is highlighted, it receives publicity and it generates various types of pressures sometimes inside the countries which again have influence upon their governments. But if anybody has any illusion about the effectiveness of the UN to work out a solution, I for one am not very hopeful of any such thing. There may be pious resolutions. What is effect of this on West Asian

situation? There is a unanimous resolution also accepted by both sides. But still Israel is where it was and the international community notwithstanding the unanimous resolution has not been able to vacate the aggression.

There are limitations from which these UN organs, these UN organisations function. I am not opposed to taking it up with the U.N. We will definitely take up. But we will take it up after we prepare the ground. This will be ancillary and supplementary to our main effort. This will not be and cannot be a substitute to whatever steps we want to take in order to realise our objectives which I have tried to spell out on an earlier occasion.

Another important matter that has been raised by my Honourable friend from the C.P.M. is that there is a U.S. radar station in India. I would like to say very categorically that this is an absolutely false

101

and unfounded statement. I would like to contradict it with all the emphasis at my command.

Shri K. D. Malaviya said that delegations from foreign countries should be invited. We are already doing that. It is a good suggestion.

Then, as regards visits of Ministers to foreign countries, they have come in for some criticism. I would not like to say much about it. I would only like to say, if you expect really that by showing our face, we can convert other counties, you are mature enough not to be under any illusion on that score. But there is no doubt that if we raise it at a sufficiently high level and this is raised by a sufficiently high person in governmental authority here it raises the level of discussion even in those countries at a very high level and some concentrated attention is given and we know precisely where we stand. This is a great advantage of taking it up at a high level. I would like to assure you that these visits are not taken

in a thoughtless manner. They are necessary and they can be supplemented by other efforts also.

Some unkind words have been said about Missions abroad. The honourable Members are perfectly entitled to say the most unkind and most strong words against me. Because I am responsible for them and, if they have failed, I have failed and I take the responsibility.

There is another matter regarding my statement about the supply of US arms to Pakistan. On that, I must say that the more I have looked into it deeply, the greater is the concern that I feel on this score and I fully support the. broad approach of my dear colleague, Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad, supported by others that in this respect the attitude of the United States Government is, to say the least, extremely.... (interruption) ... callous - Yes. They make one statement today and make another statement to-morrow.

I think our ambassador was quite right when he said that it is very difficult to accept what is said by their spokesman and by their representative. So, I would not like to give an impression that even now there will not be any further supplies from the United States to Pakistan because they still continue to say that whatever authorisations that were made before the 25th March they are not prepared categorically to make any statement that they would take steps to cancel them. They go on saying that they do not know if anything under that is moved or not.

I think it is my duty to report to the House that I am completely dissatisfied with the explanations that have been given by the United States or by their spokesmen and the Parliament is quite right in reacting in the manner in which they have done that this is something definitely against our interests and we cannot accept the explanations which I cannot understand. Therefore, I agree with the broad disapproval that has been shown by the honourable Member.

There is one matter about which I have

not replied. Before I come to that, I would like to say one thing. A great deal has been said by several members as if we are altering our attitude if we take into consideration the resolution which was unanimously adopted by this august House.

I would like to say that this is not correct. There were three elements in that Resolution. One was: "this house demands immediate cessation of the use of force and of the massacre of defenceless people". When we secure international support for stoppage of flow of refugees, this is definitely in pursuance of this directive which has been given by the House.

When we say - "this house calls upon all peoples and Governments of the world to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to Put an end immediately to the systematic decimation of people which amounts to genocide" - this is precisely what we have been urging all governments to do, to exercise all their levers. We have mentioned to them that whatever levers they have got, - whether they are levers of giving economic aid or giving military aid - military aid in any case should stop, because this is being used for killing innocent people even economic aid should stop so long as these atrocities continue and so long as they continue to embark upon this policy of repressing people.

102

Then, Sir, about our whole-hearted sympathy and support, I do not think that the country has in any way deviated from this resolve of the sympathy and support from the people and from the Government. because, all that we have been doing is support of their freedom movement. There is no apology for that because this is what we have decided and we are continuing that thing.

About recognition, I have nothing more to say to what has already been said that we still feel that this is a matter which is constantly under review. If at any stage we

feel that the situation can improve by our recognition or that objective is achieved by recognition we will not hesitate to do that, but I might say, the present stage is not one in which I could straightaway announce that we have recognised Bangla Desh.

This covers all the points that have been raised. I am grateful to the honourable Members for broadly lending their support to the efforts that the government is making in order to carry out the Resolution which was unanimously adopted by the House.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM ISRAEL

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No	
1995	
SUDAN	
Trade Agreement with the Sudan	

Following is the press note issued in New Delhi on 11th June, 1971 on the successful conclusion of Indo-Sudanese trade negotiations held at Khartoum:

India and the Sudan signed the agreement on trade between the two countries for next 18 months beginning 1st June 1971.

The Agreement came at the end of the visit of the Indian Trade Delegation to Khartoum led by Shri Mohd. Yunus, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade. The Sudanese Delegation was led by H.E. Sayed Haroum. Elawad. Permanent Under Secretary of the Ministry of Economy Commerce and Supply.

The two delegations noted with satisfaction growing trade and economic rela-

tions between the two countries and agreed to continue the present pattern of the arrangements.

During the next 18 months, India will import substantially more raw cotton than in previous periods. It is expected that 350,000 bales would be available for supply from the Sudan during current marketing season. India will be the largest buyer of the Sudanese cotton this year. India is also expected to import substantial quantities of gum Arabic and raw hides.

India will export tea, jute manufactures, textiles, spices and lentils. Export of non-traditional items, particularly engineering goods, is anticipated to show a subs. tantial increase.

The planned annual increase in total volume of trade between the two countries is over 22%.

SUDAN INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SWITZERLAND

Indo-Swiss Agreement oil Milk Production Project

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on June 17, 1971 on the agreement signed between India and Switzerland on project to increase milk production in Punjab:

An agreement was signed here today for an Indo-Swiss project to increase milk production through cross breeding in Punjab State. In addition to cross breeding of local cattle with Brown Swiss cattle, the project envisages the establishment of a deep frozen semen laboratory and semen bank, development of fodder production and ex-

103

tension activity on cattle improvement in selected areas of Punjab.

The Government of Switzerland will provide 150 Brown Swiss Heifers and 15 bulls, equipment for an artificial insemination laboratory, the semen bank and field insemination service and the services of Swiss specialists and training for Indian nationals in Switzerland; their contribution, excluding the cost on Swiss experts, is expected to be of the order of Rs. 28.7 lakhs for the first two year phase of the Project.

The Government of Punjab would provide the necessary Indian staff, land and buildings, local cattle and the running costs of the project; its contribution during the first two-year phase will be more than Rs. 15 lakhs.

The agreement will last five years. It was signed on behalf of Switzerland by the Ambassador, His Excellency Dr. Fritz Real, and on behalf of India by Shri N. R. Reddy, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

SWITZERLAND INDIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Suspension of U.K. Aid to Pakistan

Following statement by the Minister of External Affairs was made in Rajya Sabha on June 1, 1971, regarding the refusal by the Government of U.K. to suspend, aid to Pakistan on a suggestion reported to have been made by the Government of India in view of the present situation in Bangla Desh:

The Government of India has been in constant touch with foreign Governments including the British Government, on the events in East Bengal. One of the points which we have emphasised is that those countries which are in a position to do so should use their influence with the Government of Pakistan to persuade the rulers of Pakistan to stop military action against the unarmed people of East Bengal and to solve the problem politically and not by the use of force. We have also been pointing out that economic help to the rulers of Pakistan to rehabilitate the shattered economy of Pakistan as a result of their military action in East Bengal would, in the circumstances prevailing in Bangla Desh, amount to condoning their oppression and will make them more intransigent and enable them to divert economic help for military purposes, thus prolonging the conflict.

It has been stated in the British Parliament that it is the British Government's objective to do everything possible to bring about a political solution and that it has been British policy to deal with aid regardless of the political aspects of a country's national life. It also believes that the reconstruction of the Pakistan economy cannot be undertaken till stability has been restored.

PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM USA INDIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

UNITED KINGDOM

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement on British Proposal to Impose Duty on Textiles

Following is the text of the statement by the Union Minister of Foreign Trade, Shri L. N. Mishra in the Lok Sabha an June 8, 1971 in reply to a calling attention notice regarding the reported decision of the British Government to scrap the Indo-British Trade agreement of 1939, following their decision to impose a 15 per cent import duty on Indian textiles from January 1, 1972:

In April, 1971 the Government of India had stated that they would take all possible steps to convince the British Government of India's case in the matter of the imposition of a 15 per cent duty on imports of cotton

104

textiles from the Commonwealth Preference Area including India with effect from January 1, 1972. As the House is aware, the British Government had made a request for a waiver to release them from their obligations regarding textiles under the Indo-UK Trade Agreement of 1939.

Official level discussions as well as Ministerial level discussions were held in London from May 5, 1971 between the representatives of the Indian Government and the British Government.

During the Ministerial discussions, I had reiterated India's opposition to the British proposal. I strongly impressed upon them that the present proposal was discriminatory, unequal, had been taken unilaterally and must be reversed. This was also inconsistent with international obligations of the UK towards developing countries like India. I had explained at great length the serious adverse effects that this move would have on India's exports of cotton textiles to the UK market without providing the expected protection to the

British textile industry.

The Government of India is not aware of the reported decision of the British Government to scrap the Indo-British Trade Agreement of 1939.

The British Government's reply, when received, will be examined by the Government of India with a view to taking further appropriate action.

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Aid for Giant Indian Fertilizer Project

Following is the text of a press note issued in New Delhi on June 18, 1971 on the conclusion of the agreement for the British and U.S. aid for an Indian fertiliser complex in Gujarat:

Britain and the United States today committed aid loans totalling Rs. 28 crores for a giant fertilizer complex to be built in Gujarat by the Indian Farmers Fertilizer Cooperative Ltd. (IFFCO).

This is the first time Britain and the United States have collaborated on a single development project in India. Their combined loans will meet almost all the foreign exchange costs of building and equipping the complex, which will be the biggest of its kind in India.

The complex will be completed in 1974 and is expected to produce fertilizers sufficient to increase India's food production by

more than 2.2 million metric tons.

Agreements covering the British and U.S. loans, which are guaranteed by the Government of India, were concluded here today at a joint ceremony.

The agreement for the British credit by the œ 7,000,000 (seven million pounds sterling) (Rs. 12.6 crores) was signed by Shri Y. T. Shah, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, and Sir Terence Garvey, British High Commissioner.

Shri Udaybhansinhji, Chairman of IFFCO, Shri A. T. Bambawale, Joint Secretary in the Finance Ministry, and Mr. Galen L. Stone, U.S. Charge d'Affaires ad interim, signed the agreements providing for the American loan of 21 million dollars (Rs. 15.75 crores).

The project has been undertaken with the cooperation of Cooperative Fertilizers International, a non-profit organisation owned by 13 U.S. cooperative organisations. CFI is donating one million dollars (Rs. 75 lakhs) to IFFCO.

The most sophisticated equipment manufactured in India, America and Britain will be used to produce a wide range of fertilisers suitable for the soils of ten Indian states: Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Mysore, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and Uttar Pradesh. Distribution of the fertilisers will be handled by societies belonging to the group of more than 30,000 co-operative societies which have joined together to form IFFCO.

105

The first stage of the fertiliser production process will be at Kalol, where a giant factory will convert gas from the area's natural-gas fields into ammonia. U.S.-financed equipment will primarily be installed here.

Most of the ammonia produced will be converted in an adjacent plant into Urea,

a nitrogen-rich fertiliser. Equipment purchased with British aid funds will constitute the core of this Urea plant. British equipment will also be used to a large extent in the plant for the manufacture of compound fertilisers to be elected at Kandla port, sonic 250 miles from Kalol.

A considerable amount of Indianmanufactured equipment will be used in the Project. The proportion of Indian machinery in this project will accordingly be very high.

The Kandla fertiliser plant will depend on two sources for its raw materials. A continuous chain of rail tankers will bring it part of the ammonia manufactured at Kalol. At the same time, imported Phosphoric Acid and Potash will be processed with the ammonia to provide Indian farmers with fertilizers rich in nitrogen, phosphate and potash, the three principal plant foods.

Cooperative Fertilizers International is making available to IFFCO the expertise and experience of U.S. Cooperatives which have long been active in the production and distribution of fertilizers. Apart from providing assistance to the Gujarat project through its formative and initial operating years, CFI will arrange for the training of Indian personnel in U.S. cooperative plants.

INDIA USA RUSSIA **Date**: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

U.K. Food Aid Agreement

Following is the text of agreement signed in New Delhi on June 17, 1971 bet-

ween. India and the U.K. formalising an offer of grant of U.K. aid to India for the purchase of wheat, grain and flour during the harvest year 1970-1971:

An agreement was signed today formalising an offer made some time ago whereby the U.K. is giving India a grant of æ 5,00,000 (Rs. 90 lakhs) for the purchase of wheat, grain or flour during the harvest year 1970-71. The exchange of Notes covering this arrangement were signed in New Delhi by Sir Terence Garvey, British High Commissioner, and Shri A. T. Bambawale, Joint Secretary, in the Ministry of Finance, Government of India. This is the third year in which such grants have been made by the British Government to India.

This gift fulfils part of the obligation which the United Kingdom accepted under the tern-is of the Food Aid Convention which came into effect in 1968. Under this Convention the United Kingdom agreed to provide 2,25,000 tonnes of grain or the cash equivalent each year for three years as assistance to developing countries.

This grant is additional to the financial aid and technical assistance which the United Kingdom makes available to India each year.

106

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA MALI

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement on Shipment of U.S. Arms to Pakistan

Following is the text of the statement

by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran, Singh in the both Houses of Parliament on June 24, 1971 regarding the shipment of American arms to Pakistan:

Government appreciate and share the concern of all sections of this House about the reported shipment of certain items of military equipment from the United States of Pakistan recently. The New York Times' report of June 22 about two ships, "Sunderbans" and "Padma" flying the flag of Pakistan, having sailed from New York on May 8 and June 21 respectively, with cargo of the United States military equipment seems to be substantially correct. Our Ambassador in Washington took up the matter immediately on receipt of this report with the Under Secretary of State on the evening of June 22. The matter was also taken up with the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi on June 23. According to the U.S. Governments, no foreign military sales to Pakistan have been authorised or approved since March 25, and no export licences have been issued for commercial purchases in U.S. since March 25; nor have export licences been renewed since that date. The U.S. Government has further stated that the New York Times article is incorrect in stating that such shipments included 8 aircraft. According to them, no aircraft are on board these vessels. The U.S. Government have, however, admitted that it is possible that foreign military sales items authorised or approved prior to March 25, have been delivered to the dock-side since that date and may be aboard the two Ships referred to in the New York Times. They have further stated that it was also possible that commercially purchased items where export licences were required and were issued before March 25, may be aboard these ships. Further, there are some items for which export licences are not required. So it is possible that some such items are also on the ships. They have stated that it is thus probable that these ships do carry items of military equipment resulting from actions taken prior to March 25.

The Under Secretary of State has appreciated our concern and expressed regret

that this loophole regarding past authorisations had not been brought to our notice. He has further explained that full facts regarding what had been covered by exports licences issued in the past, the shipments of which have not been effected, were still not known and he could not, therefore, say that there would be no further shipments yet to be made. He has, however, added that up to the moment they had not come to any conclusion on this subject and they were examining the matter.

We have pointed out to the U.S. Government that, any accretion of military strength to Pakistan, particularly in the present circumstances when military oppression and atrocities are being let loose on the unarmed and defenceless people of Bangla Desh, would not only pose a threat to the peace and security of this sub-continent but the whole region. What is more, it would not only amount to a condonation of these atrocities, but could be construed as an encouragement to their continuation. We have stressed that this is not merely a technical matter, but a matter of grave concern involving social, economic, political and security considerations. We have, therefore, urged the U.S. Government that they should try to stop the two ships which have already sailed, from delivering military items to Pakistan and, in any case, to give an assurance that no further shipments of military stores will be allowed even under "Past authorisations". The United States Govern-

107

ment have promised to give urgent consideration to this matter and we are awaiting their response.

We hope that the U.S. Government which cherishes the principles of democracy and freedom, will not encourage the wanton violation of these principles which is taking place in Bangla Desh today by the shipment, of any kind of military weapons, spare parts, etc. as long as the military authorities of Pakistan do not stop their military atrocities and come to a peaceful political settlement with the duly elected representatives of

Bangla Desh and thus bring about a stoppage of the further influx of refugees and the safe and early return, under credible guarantees, of the large number of refugees who have already crossed over into India.

USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date: Jun 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Sardar Swaran Singh's Address to the National Press Club, Washington

Following is the text of speech delivered by Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh at the National Press Club of Washington., D.C., U.S.A., on June 17, 1971:

I value and appreciate the invitation to address the National Press Club. There is a special reason for this. I have come here to seek, together with your leaders, a just, peaceful and enduring solution of a problem which has been reported upon so well and in such detail by your press. So, I am happy to have this opportunity to speak to this distinguished gathering of the representatives of the American Press who play such a vital role in shaping public opinion.

The tragedy of East Bengal looms large on the horizon of India today. It looms large on the horizon of Asia. It poses a grave threat to peace and progress in our region.

The facts of the situation in East Bengal are well known, to you. But I wish to dram your attention to the dangerous potential of this problem for us and for our region. We should also consider the consequences that the world may have to face tomorrow, if

today, due to a sense of indifference or helplessness, or out of some misplaced feeling of delicacy towards the perpetrators of the tragedy, we permit the situation to drift further.

The concern and anxiety which this situation in East Bengal causes to us in India are not ours alone. They are yours too. The character and the magnitude of the happenings in East Bengal are such that they are bound to have repercussions beyond the frontiers of Pakistan and be a source of concern to the international community.

DEMOCRACY BRUTALLY SUPPRESSED

Besides, our two countries have a common commitment to democratic principles and values. These same values and principles are being brutally suppressed in East Bengal.

The suppression of democratic principles by the army in East Bengal, I would remind you, cannot be defended on the ground that it is an attempt to deal with a secessionist movement. The elections took place in Pakistan in December last year for an assembly to frame constitution for that country. The Awami League, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, swept the polls on a programme demanding greater control over state affairs in East Bengal within the union of Pakistan. The League's six-point programme was not a manifesto for secession or independence. The demand for independence of Bangla Desh came, it should be remembered, in the wake of the bloodbath which began on March 25. The case is therefore, clearly one of a minority, equipped with gifts of money and arms from abroad. trying to undo, through the use of brute force, the verdict of popular vote.

One of the results of this reign of terror unleashed by the army is that 6 million people have fled their homes in East Bengal

108

and have sought refuge in India. There is no end yet in sight to this mass exodus.

Each day some 100,000 East Bengalis are driven by the Pakistan Army across the border of East Bengal into our country. The dimensions of this exodus will, perhaps, be better understood if I say that we are receiving one refugee every second.

We offer these refugees such succour and relief as we can afford. In our states bordering on East Bengal, the schools of our children have had to be closed down to provide shelter for the refugees. Our health services are stretched thin, and there are shortages of transport and tentage, food and medicine and other resources needed to cope with this grim tragedy. In the Indian State of Tripura today, there is one refugee from East Bengal to every two local inhabitants. West Bengal, already heavily populated, is groaning under the weight of this endless influx.

Clearly, the humanitarian task of providing food, shelter and medicines must have high priority. The cost of relief will run into hundreds of millions of dollars. We had made a token provision of 80 million dollars in our budget for the current year, but even this token provision represents 30 per cent of the additional tax burden which our people will have to bear this year.

While we are doing the best we can within our resources, the financial burden of looking after the refugees is beyond our resources. We have welcomed such assistance as has been forthcoming from foreign governments, from voluntary organisations and agencies and from private citizens. Even though these contributions may not be very large, our Government and people appreciate the sentiment behind them.

Nevertheless, the task is a very large one and we in India have our own pressing problems of poverty and unemployment to attend to. We, therefore, hope that the United States, a prosperous country or generous humanitarian instincts and, indeed, other countries of the world, may, before long, address themselves more adequately to the problems and needs of relief.

But necessary as relief is, it is a palliative and not a solution to the problem which lies at the root of the situation. It is immediately necessary to stop further influx of refugees from Pakistan, and that will come about only if the military action in East Bengal is ended forthwith. The international community must persuade and pressurise the Government of Pakistan to that end.

Equally, conditions must be created for the return to East Bengal of those who were forced out of their homes and had to take shelter in India. The Government of Pakistan must be made to accept its proper responsibility for the rehabilitation of these refugees in their homes. In the meantime, their properties in East Bengal should be preserved and protected under international supervision pending their return.

The return and resettlement of refugees in their homes will obviously take a while and relief measures will be necessary and camps will have to be set up for the purpose. It seems to us that temporary relief camps should be set up in East Bengal itself and the refugees now in India should be transferred to those camps.

The Pakistan Government claims to have set up camps or reception centres in Fast Bengal, but refugees are not returning there, because they apparently do not trust the Pakistan Government's declarations of amnesty. It is, therefore, necessary to restore their confidence that they will be well treated on return, that they will enjoy safety of per-son and property and that bonafide measures will be taken to rehabilitate them and protect their rights and interests.

As a measure in that direction, an area in Pakistan may have to be set aside for temporary camps, to be administered by the refugees themselves under international supervision.

The basic problem is a political one, and it calls for a political solution. Without such a solution, the atmosphere of confidence and security, which is necessary for the return of refugees, will not be generated. There are two essential prerequisites:

First, the necessary political solution must be found urgently, and

109

Secondly, the solution to be effective and enduring must be in accord with the wishes of the people of East Bengal and their elected leaders.

Any effort to set up a regime in East Bengal which is not truly representative will only prolong the agony, and harden attitudes and pose hazards to peace of the whole region.

CONCERN FOR MUJIB

We feel great concern for the personal safety and well-being of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. He is a leader of very high stature and rare human qualities, who commands the affections of the entire people of East Bengal. We hope that the international community will spare no effort to persuade the rulers of Pakistan to release Sheikh Mujib, and to join with him in search of a political solution acceptable to the people of East Bengal. He symbolises the urges, aspirations and hopes of 75 million people which were expressed as late as December last. These will not be extinguished by his incarceration.

We would urge the international community as a whole, and countries friendly to Pakistan in particular, to bring their influence to bear on the Pakistan Government for a political solution on these lines.

Our views with regard to the grant of military aid to Pakistan are well-known. A situation has now arisen in which even the grant of economic aid to that country, in present circumstances, is bound to be used for the suppression of the majority of Pakistan's people. It is, therefore, not out of any ill-will for the people of Pakistan, but in the desire that the agony of strife in Pakistan should end as quickly as

possible, that we urge that all countries should suspend all military and economic assistance to Pakistan till a political solution acceptable to the people of East Bengal is found.

INDIA THREATENED

I hope that the people of this country will under-stand and appreciate our grave anxiety over the situation in East Bengal. We in India have been at the receiving end of the results of the reign of terror and killings that has gone on in East Bengal since March 25. The point has now been reached where the actions of Pakistan's military Government threaten to disrupt the economic, social and political fabric of our society and our state. These actions threaten to engulf our region in a conflict the end of which it is not easy to predict.

We have acted with patience, forbearance and restraint. But, we cannot sit idly by if the edifice of our political stability and economic well-being is threatened.

In the 23 years since our independence, we have struggled to give economic and social meaning to our political democracy. We have not succeeded in eliminating poverty and hunger and disease from our land, but the lives of our people are a little better than they were 21/2 decades ago. We have doubled our food production, we have vastly expanded the availability of education, medical care and the opportunities of work to our people. The rate of annual increase. In our exports touched a high of 7 per cent last year, and our growth rate has moved up to 5 per cent per annum. The United States has helped us in our endeavours, and, I am sure you share our pride in these achievements.

CRISIS OF PAKISTAN MAKING

After our General Elections in February, which gave our Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, and our party, the Indian National Congress, a massive verdict of peoples' support for our programmes, we were getting ready for a powerful assault on our economic and social problems. And then came this crisis of Pakistan's making, which threatens to wipe out our gains, and destroy the prospect of peace and progress for our children.

To any responsible Government, this would be an intolerable situation. Hence our anxiety that a political solution should be forged in East Bengal which is acceptable to the Bengali people and their elected representatives, so that peace may return to

110

that troubled land, and the refugees who have come to our country should go back to their homes.

We face a grave situation, but we continue to have faith and hope that concerted and determined action of the world community will help a satisfactory solution, and lift the threat to India's stability and to the peace of the region. It Was in that spirit that I undertook this tour which has brought me to Washington. I have found here understanding of our apprehensions and sympathy with our objectives.

111

USA INDIA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jun 01, 1971

July

Volume No 1995 Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII JULY

No. 7

CONTENTS

PAGE

CANADA

New Canadian Loan to India

113

COLOMBO PLAN ANNIVERSARY

President's Message

113

DENMARK

Indo-Danish Project for Small-scale Industries 114

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Air Agreement

115

FOREIGN AFFAIRS DEBATE IN PARLIAMENT

External Affairs Minister's Speech on Non-official Resolution on

Indo-Chinese States

115

Reply to Debate on Budget Demands

118

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri N. Krishnan's Statement in the 51st Session of the Economic and Social Council

124

Indian Delegate's Speech at 521st Plenary Meeting of the Con-

ference of Committee on Disarmament

125

UNDP Project on Television Training

126

Shri Samar Sen's Speech on South Africa at U.N. Security Council

127

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE

NEPAL

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Sino-Nepal Agreement for Survey of Terai Border 130

PAKISTAN

External Affairs Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on the Reported Supply of Arms to Pakistan by the U.S.S.R. and France 131

Statement on Pakistan President's Threat to Declare War

External Affairs Minister's Intervention in Lok Sabha Debate 132

POLAND

Press Statement on Conclusion of Shri Kumaramangalam's Visit to Poland 133

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreement for Cargo Ships 134 Prime Minister's Tribute to Sovie

Prime Minister's Tribute to Soviet Cosmonauts 135

UNITED KINGDOM

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement on Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement 135

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Additional U.S. Non-Project Aid to India

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Reported U.S. Decision to Supply Arms to Pakistan

Rajya Sabha Statement on Implications of Continued U.S. Arms Supply to Pakistan 137

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique on Talks with Dr. Karan Singh, 138

Indo-Yugoslav Committee on Trade and Economic Co-operation 138

WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Prime Minister's Message to the Conference on World Peace Through Law 139

(ii)

CANADA INDIA SRI LANKA DENMARK USA GERMANY SOUTH AFRICA NEPAL PAKISTAN FRANCE POLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CANADA

New Canadian Loan to India

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on July 16, 1971 on the signing of development loan between India and Canada:

A development loan agreement for about Rs. 7 crores (\$ 10 million) was signed here today between India and Canada. This loan will facilitate, under a line of credit arrangement supply from Canada of machinery, equipment and services. It is expected that the greater part of the loan will be utilised for the supply of highly sophisticated electronic and mechanical equipment required for India's airport expansion programme.

The loan is free of interest and service charges and is repayable over 50 years, including a 10-year grace period. These lending terms are the softest available to India from any source.

The agreement was signed by the Canadian High Commissioner, Mr. James George, and Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary, Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

This is the third development loan Canada has extended to India during the current year. The other two, amounting to Rs. 30 crores, were agreed to in April, one for import of industrial commodities and fertilisers worth Rs. 28 crores (\$ 40 million), and the other for a Rs. 2 crores (\$ 3 million) line of credit for use by the oil and Natural Gas Commission. it is expected that Industrial Lines of Credit will become an increasingly important feature of the Canadian development assistance to India in future.

CANADA INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

COLOMBO PLAN ANNIVERSARY

President's Message

Following is the text of the message by President V. V. Giri on the occasion of Colombo Plan's 20th anniversary on July 1, 1971:

I am happy to convey my greetings and good wishes on the occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Colombo Plan. The occasion is particularly of special significance to me as I had the privilege of being a delegate to the Commonwealth Foreign Ministers' Conference in Colombo in January, 1950, when this Plan was first conceived. Since then I have been watching its progress with keen interest.

Those were the years when we in India and some of our neighbours had newly achieved independence and were faced with the problem of economic development. It was with the purpose of pooling the resources of such countries for developmental programmes that the Conference was held. Initially, there were only seven members who subscribed to the Plan which was, more or less, a Commonwealth affair. Gradually this family has been expanding and presently we have over two dozen members including a number of non-Commonwealth countries. This in itself speaks volumes of the tremendous progress made by the Plan within these twenty years. What was then only a Commonwealth venture has now become an international enterprise. The basic concept of the Plan is development through negotiation and co-operation. This co-operation involves exchange of products as well as know-how. The various countries enter into direct mutual consultations as to what extent they can help each other. Their efforts are further supplemented by the liberal and generous participation of the more developed countries. The idea has been that countries have to negotiate on co-operative basis. This idea has moved from multilateral negotiation to bilateral discussion for helping each other.

Apart from capital aid for development projects, the assistance facilities include supply of food grains, equipment for industries, and exchange of experts. The Plan extends from Philippines to Iran and Korea to Indonesia serving Over ninety crores of people. It covers the socio-economic fields and is a symbol of international co-operation and help.

I hope that this Plan will not only continue to flourish and enlarge its area of operation but will also inspire similar ventures all over the world and thus create a new spirit of international friendship and understanding.

I wish the Anniversary Celebrations every success.

SRI LANKA INDIA USA IRAN KOREA PHILIPPINES INDONESIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

DENMARK

Indo-Danish Project for Small-scale Industries

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on July 8, 1971 on the signing of an agreement for a Tool Room in Bangalore to manufacture tools, dyes and moulds for small-scale industries:

An agreement was signed here today for an Indo-Danish project for a Tool Room in Bangalore to manufacture tools, dyes and moulds for Small-scale industries.

The main objective of the project is to develop small-scale industries by establishing a Technical Training Centre for tool makers and a Service Centre. The training centre Will provide training in press tools, jigs and fixtures and moulds for plastics and metal. The Service Centre will employ about 20 to 24 tool makers. The project will be administered by the Mysore Small Industries Corporation under the supervision of the Ministry of Industrial Development.

Denmark will provide equipment not available in India costing about Rs. 71.5 lakhs, the services of five Danish technicians and facilities for training 10 Indian technicians in Denmark.

The Government of Mysore will provide Indian staff, land and buildings and the running costs of the project. Its contribution towards the rupee costs of the project would amount to Rs. 44.5 lakhs.

The agreement will run for five years. It was signed on behalf Of Denmark by the Ambassador, His Excellency H.A. Biering, and on behalf of India by Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

114

DENMARK USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Indo-German Air Agreement

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on July 29, 1971 Oil exchange of diplomatic notes amending air agreement between India and Federal Republic of Germany:

The air services agreement between India and the Federal Republic of Germany was amended here today with the exchange of diplomatic notes between Mr. Guenter Diehl, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany and Shri N. Sahgal, Secretary, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation.

Under these arrangements, the national carriers of the two countries, Lufthansa and Air-India are each entitled to operate six services per week to or through each others' territory and increase these to seven services per week after December 31, 1972. Both airlines have also been authorised to introduce Jumbo Jets on some of these services.

At present, Air-India is operating six services per week through the Federal Republic of Germany, of which three services are being operated with Jumbos. Lufthansa. Is operating six services per week through India with Boeing 707 aircraft, four via Delhi and two via Bombay.

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AFFAIRS DEBATE IN PARLIAMENT

External Affairs Minister's Speech on Non - official Resolution on Indo-Chinese States

Intervening in a debate on non-official resolution on "national movement in Indo-Chinese States and recognition of South Vietnam and other States," External Affairs Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, made the following speech in the Lok Sabha on July 16, 1971:

The news that Dr. Henry Kissinger, while on a visit to Pakistan, paid a secret visit to China has come both from Peking and also from the United States of America. We do not have details of what transpired at Henry Kissinger's meeting with the Chinese Prime Minister. It has, however, been announced that arrangements have been made for the American President to pay a visit to China. We have noted President Nixon's acknowledgement that there could be no stable peace in the world without the participation of the People's Republic of China and its 750 million people-It seems USA is on the verge of a rediscovery of China and its importance to the world.

We have always welcomed the normalisation of relations between all countries and peoples and, in particular, the great powers. We will, therefore, welcome any steps towards normalisation of relations between USA and the People's Republic of China as it would be a step leading towards reduction of tensions. We also hope that such a normalisation would help in bringing about a speedy, peaceful and political settle-

ment of the problems of Indo-China that is, the problems of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. At the same time, we hope that the normalisation of relations between USA and China is not conceived within the framework 115

of power politic or real-politik. This provides fresh evidence, if evidence was necessary, of correctness of India's consistent effort, irrespective of changing circumstances to support entry into UN of the People's Republic of China.

I would not like to say anything more at this stage because we should watch carefully the developments and then we can assess in the light of the new situation as to what are the implications of it in this region and on peace in the world.

Some parties may have jitters and many parties which had been urging that the only safety for India is to seek the help of a country like USA to meet our situation might feel disappointed. But we have consistently pursued a policy which in the light of these developments is quite obviously the best policy, the wisest policy from the point of view of our own national interest.

What are the implications of this development on the Vietnam situation? Some observations have been made by Shri Indrajit Gupta. I would not like to enter into a debate on that aspect at the moment. But whatever may be the motive, the development is significant and, I think, this will pave the way for a satisfactory settlement of the difficult and complicated problem of Indo-China.

So far as our own stand is concerned we have consistently taken the view that the problem of Vietnam is the central problem and a solution of the problem of Vietnam will provide a key to the solution of the problems of Cambodia and Laos. With regard to the solution of the Vietnam problem, we have consistently taken the view, as late as in the last General Assembly session, when we clearly enunciated our stand with regard to the possible lines on which a solution of the

Vietnam problem is possible. This was a complete withdrawal all troops and, in its process, the United States should make the start. We have also said that a stage should be fixed for complete withdrawal of troops and, thereafter, we have said that the solution should be such as is acceptable to the people of Vietnam without any interference from any quarter whatsoever.

This continues to be our stand and I would also like to say that the latest proposal - the 7-point proposal, made by Madam Binh in Paris is according to our view the best proposal that has been put forward so far. We feel that these proposals can be the basis of a satisfactory negotiated settlement which might bring to end war-like situation in Vietnam and might form the basis for a negotiated settlement. We do regard that these proposals are an advance on all previous proposals and it is hoped that in this background, the war-like situation in Vietnam would speedily come to an end.

Therefore, Sir, we have to view the situation in this background, as to whether this has come about because militarily the victory which South Vietnam or the Americans sought they have not been able to achieve, or whatever else may be the reason, these developments, according to our assessment, are positive developments and we should, therefore, do everything possible to help in the speedy ending of war in that area and for facilitating in a satisfactory manner the progress of the talks in Paris.

In view of this, any other historical discussion about the Vietnam situation, its origin etc. would, at the present moment, appear to be unreal.

I have mentioned this before and I would like to repeat this, namely, that both in Laos and in Cambodia it is the extension of the situation that has gripped Vietnam particularly the situation in South Vietnam. On the other side, although they gave different emphasis, ultimately, the whole thing is traced to the situation in Vietnam.

Therefore, we have always taken the view that a settlement of Vietnam is very essential before we can think of satisfactory settlement either in Laos or in Cambodia and it is in this background that I would like to say that our attitude in this respect has been consistent and I would like to say these developments are in line with our own thinking and we hope that as a result of these developments the Paris talks will now make a satisfactory progress.

There has been some talk of a Paris conference and whether the solution can be found in Paris talks itself or whether a

116

separate conference is to be held. I think, it is yet too premature to make any comment on that. But, we had always welcorned the holding of a conference in which the problem relating to Indo-China may be satisfactorily solved.

Having said that, now we are left with this question of recognition of these Governments

On that also, I would like to state our position very precisely, instead of taking long over it.

So far as the question of recognising the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam is concerned, this can be considered only in the overall context of a peaceful political settlement of the Vietnam question. Government have de facto relations with both North and South Vietnams through Consulates-general at present. Government hope that as soon as a peacefully negotiated political settlement of the Viet Nam question is arrived at Government will be in a position to accord full recognition to a duly elected representative Government in South Vietnam...

Our relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are developing satisfactorily. The question of giving full recognition to that government continues to be under

Government's consideration and action in this regard will be taken at the appropriate time. Government have also de facto relations with both North as well as South Korea through consulates-general.

The question of granting full diplomatic recognition to the two Koreas cannot be considered at the present moment and this can be considered only in the overall context of a peaceful political settlement of the Korean question when it takes place. We am dealing with both South and North Korea in a de facto manner. Both of them have consulates-general here and we have also consulates-general in the two Koreas.

As far as the German Democratic Republic is concerned, I would like to acknowledge with appreciation the stand that the German Democratic Republic have taken in 1965 and also on the question of Bangla Desh, and I would like to share the satis, faction that has been expressed by several hon. Members about the outcome of Dr. Karan Singh's visit to the German Democratic Republic, and the joint communique that has been issued is a good communique and it is on the same lines as we want this question on Bangla Desh to be satisfactorily resolved.

Our relations with the German Democratic Republic have been developing in a very satisfactory manner. The House would no doubt be aware that for the first time we established an office of the State Trading Corporation in the German Democratic Republic in the year 1967. Then, we established a trade mission in October, 1969. Then, we established a consulate-general in September, 1970. I think it is a satisfactory development of relations between us and the German Democratic Republic both in the commercial field as well as in the political field, because we have a consulate-general there and they have also got a consulategeneral here.

We have also noted with satisfaction the negotiations and talks that are taking place between the Federal Republic of Germany and GDR. I have already made statements welcoming the Moscow Treaty and the general detente that has emerged as a result of that treaty between East Europe and West Europe. Things are proceeding in a highly satisfactory manner. We have supported the admission of GDR to the various UN organs on the principle of universality of UN membership. We have supported their admission to UNESCO when the question came under consideration. We will do so when this question comes up for their admission into other organs of the UN because we have always supported the principle of universality so far as UN organisations, are concerned.

This process of development is in the right direction and I would appeal to the hon. Member not to hasten the pace. We are seized of the problem and we are proceeding in that direction in recognising the realities of the situation, and we will continue to pursue this line.

117

VIETNAM PAKISTAN CHINA USA MALI LAOS INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CAMBODIA FRANCE KOREA GERMANY RUSSIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FOREIGN AFFAIRS DEBATE IN PARLIAMENT

Reply to Debate on Budget Demands

Replying to the Debate on Demands for Grants for the year 1971-72 of the Ministry of External Affairs in the Lok Sabha on July 20, 1971, the Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman, I have heard with

great attention the contribution that has been made by Members in the present debate. Although, at the present moment, there are some very vital and immediate problems, about which our attention has to be concentrated, it is a healthy sign that, besides these immediate problems, some general problems about the world situation, the problems of Peace and war, of disarmament, nuclear bomb and the question of space and several other matters of general importance to the international community have been highlighted, and comments have been offered on these important aspects of international life.

I am also conscious of the fact that a very large number of Members of this House have participated in this debate - as many as 34 members have already spoken. Much as I would have liked to reply to all the points that have been raised, it may be appreciated that it is not possible to do so. I will, however, endeavour to say something about some of these important points, and will not try to answer each and every point that has been raised. I would, at this stage, assume the Members that what they have said will be very carefully examined in the Ministry and by me. We will go into the suggestions that have been made, and we will examine with the greatest care the observations and opinions that have been expressed by the Members on the floor of the House.

Before I come to the current matters of interest, first of all, I would like to say something about some matters which have been raised in the course of the debate, particularly in relation to our neighbours, and our general policy about them and about our success in establishing friendly relations with them. Although some comments have been made and some of them not well-informed, I would like to say that our relations with our neighbours, excepting two, are friendly and close, and there is a great deal of understanding and goodwill between India and her immediate neighbours. Our relations with Burma, Nepal, Ceylon and Afghanistan, which are our immediate neighbours besides Pakistan and China, have been traditionally

friendly, and there is a great deal of understanding, goodwill and friendship between India and these neighbours. We may not always agree with their policies and they may not always agree with our policies and this is not uncommon. But, basic friendship and understanding do exist between us, and I would appeal to the Members not to lose sight of this. This we have been able to achieve by pursuing consistently a policy of befriending our neighbours.

BURMA

With our neighbour Burma our relations have been extremely friendly and close. There has been co-operation in several fields, As a result of an agreement arrived at between India and Burma about the demarcation of the boundary, more than 700 miles of boundary has already been demarcated, and the work is proceeding in a satisfactory manner. I would also like to remind the Members that in several other fields also there are close co-operation and complete exchange of information about matters in which we are vitally interested and the Government of Burma are also vitally interested: particularly, in their northern part and in our north eastern part there is very useful exchange of information between our two governments.

CEYLON

With Ceylon, we have friendship; and it is good that we were able to resolve a matter which had been outstanding between us since the time Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri was Prime Minister. I am glad the agreement has been arrived at, because that was one matter which stood in the way of closer relations between India and Ceylon in the economic and several other fields. I have no doubt that when this agreement is implemented and both Governments have expressed their determination to implement this agreement the relations will become even more close. We have very good eco-

118

nomic relations with Ceylon, and we will

continue to cooperate to our mutual benefit in the economic field, and in the technical and cultural fields. This is a development which should receive the blessing of the House.

NEPAL

With Nepal, we have very close relations, and we have participated in the development efforts of Nepal in a very significant manner. The extent of aid that we have given in the development efforts of Nepal in helping them to build their infrastructure, in helping them to open up their road system, and in helping them to establish several projects of benefit to their people, is a record of which any country can rightly be proud. The treaty of trade and transit has been a subject matter of some difference of opinion between the two countries, but I would like to remind the House that, although the treaty had expired several months ago, we took special care to ensure that all the essential supplies from India reach Nepal so that the people of Nepal may not suffer, and I have also every reason to believe that this treaty will be finalised before long. Already there has been consultation between the appropriate organisation in Nepal and our Ministry of Foreign Trade, and I would also like to recall that Government leaders in Nepal have made statements saying that they are anxious to conclude this treaty in a manner satisfactory to both countries, and I have every reason to hope that before long this treaty will be concluded.

AFGHANISTAN

With Afghanistan, we have traditional friendship. Afghanistan has got its own problems, problems of trade and transit - being a land-locked country. And the logistics and means of communications are such that it has to depend to a very large extent on Pakistan for movement of most of their goods into Afghanistan and also out of Afghanistan. Notwithstanding this dependence on Pakistan, our relations with Afghanistan have always been very friendly and very close. I visited Afghanistan some

months ago and was greatly impressed by the goodwill expressed by the Government leaders of Afghanistan to the people and Government of India. And this is the basis upon which there has been a great deal of not only understanding but co-operation in several fields, educational, cultural and economic, and our efforts to still further strengthen these relations will continue unabated.

I would like to say that although our relations with these four countries -- which are our neighbours - have been good, unfortunately our relations with our two other neighbours - Pakistan and China - have been uneven, have been either hostile at times or indifferent or tense.

I would like however to clarify that this is not of our seeking, and if we find that our relations with these two neighbours on the west, east and north have been of this nature, we have to see the background.

PAKISTAN

The hostility that Pakistan has always entertained for India is the result of the basis upon which India was partitioned. And, subsequently, Pakistan was fed by several outside powers in the belief that it was in Pakistan's interest to continue the policy of confrontation; and Pakistan, in this respect, had been receiving a great deal of encouragement, not only moral and political, but substantial in the sense of economic aid, military aid and all manner of support - even for causes which appeared to be, on the face of it, absolutely unjust. We have, therefore, to frame our attitude and our policy, knowing this background.

CHINA

In relation to China, the matter has been explained on several occasions and I do not want to go over the entire history. But, even before the Chinese attack in 1962, their attitude was taking a certain shape which smacked of hostility and friction against India.

It is in this background that we have to see as to whether the policy that we have been pursuing in relations to our neighbours - both those who are friendly, as well as those who, for no fault of ours, are not friendly to us, but are actually hostile to us - is the correct policy to be pursued.

119

NON-ALIGNMENT

A great deal of effort has been put in by several Members to show that our policy of non-alignment, the policy that we have pursued so far, has not yielded result. I had, however, been very careful and attentive to find out if any alternative was suggested by any Member to the policy of non-alignment that we had been pursuing. So, what could be the alternative of the policy of non-alignment? Can it be a policy of aligning ourselves with any of the power blocs? Obviously, no one has suggested this, and no one can, in any seriousness, suggest this.

A Member: Independent, nationalist policy?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Independent, nationalist policy is precisely the policy of non-alignment and it is that policy that we have been pursuing so far.

I agree with those Members who have said that this policy of non-alignment means that we decide our-selves what our attitude should be in any particular situation; not that others should take steps or action as a result of which we would find that we have to adopt a particular policy or oppose a particular policy. If we have not subscribed to any of the defence pacts, if we have nor aligned ourselves with any of the power blocs, it has been with a view to ensure independence of our action and independence of our approach in any situation.

I was amazed when some Members propounded a strange theory that if we get any arms from any country then we become aligned with that country. That is a pro-

position which is very dangerous; that is a proposition which we can never accept and should never accept. I have said on more than one occasion that where our own national interests are involved, where our own security is involved, when we stand in need of any military equipment of a sophisticated nature or of a type which we do not manufacture in our country, I shall have no hesitation in getting that equipment or that material from any source whatsoever, and I do not see why there should be any objection to that.

A Member: How is Pakistan different?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Pakistan is a member of actual defence pacts, and, therefore, they are getting arms from those countries with whom they are allies and are members of defence pacts. This is an entirely different situation as compared to the situation of a non-aligned country like India getting arms from any source whatsoever. To suggest that we can be deflected in the pursuit of our independent policy merely because we acquire arms from one source or the other is a wrong idea, and I think that those Members who made that suggestion are playing into the hands of those who want to malign India by saying that because India is getting arms from a particular source, therefore, they are aligned to that country. That is a great error and pitfall, and I would warn Members not to fall into it.

We have pursued this policy; we will continue to pursue that policy because that is the best policy that is in our interest, and I have no hesitation in saying that we will pursue it and we will get help and equipment from whatever source it may be available. I have no inhibitions whatsoever in that respect, and I do not see why we should not have confidence in our own country to see that merely getting help from any other country does not in any way compromise us.

COLONIALISM

I would like to say that there are

other matters of importance to the world community such as the questions of war and peace, questions of disarmament, questions not only of the remnants of colonialism in whatever form they exist, but of ending the apartheid and racist regimes in South Africa, Rhodesia etc. These are matters on which we have always lent our full support in all forums; whether it be the conference of non-aligned countries, whether it be the United Nations in its various organs or committees, or bilaterally in the forum of the Commonwealth, we have steadfastly adhered to the pursuit of the policy where our opposition to colonialism in any form has been clear, forthright and unequivocal. We have steadfastly stood for helping freedom fighters engaged in the task of freeing them-

120

selves from colonial clutches of the Portuguese in Angola and Mozambique; also, our sympathy and support has always been for those who am fighting against the apartheid regime in South Africa and the racist regime in Rhodesia. Our pre-occupation with our problems does not mean that we can adopt an attitude of isolation from the contribution we must make in the affairs of the world. We have always pursued a policy where we have made our position absolutely clear, and have used all our influence in order to further those causes and the causes of those who are suffering.

UNITED NATIONS

At this stage, I would also like to say that it was farthest for me to say anything which might have the effect of denigrating the U.N. organisations or the international community or the various organs in which we function. That was not my object, but we must be realistic in this respect. It is a hard reality that these U.N. organisations are political bodies where governments of countries are represented. I am also conscious of the fact that the U.N. did a great deal of admirable work in focussing world attention on problems of colonialism and several other matters; and it was mainly on account of the pressure built up in U.N.

organs that the colonial powers found it difficult to hold on to their colonial empires, and progressively country after country became free and independent. But we must also keep this in mind that the U.N. being a body in which Governments are represented, for getting support for any particular proposition which we want a particular U.N. Organisation or group to adopt, we must first have sufficient support in the capitals of the countries represented in the appropriate U.N. body: Wit is with this object in view that we have been mobilising Support in various capitals and also through their representatives in U.N. headquarters at New York, at the U.N. organisations headquarters in Geneva, also here in Delhi, by having contacts with the representatives of the countries concerned; also, sometimes, even by special missions, not always of Ministers, but of experts, sometimes of professors, lawyers and other knowledgeable people to convince those Governments of the correctness and justice of our case.

We have already raised the question of Bangla Desh in ECOSOC, and depending on the response we get, and also depending on whether it will serve our purpose and interest, we will certainly raise it in the other appropriate organisations of the U.N. - provided we are assured of sufficient support for any formulation or proposition we expect that particular organ of the U.N. to adopt.

RECOGNITION OF G.D.R., D.R.V.N., ETC.

The question of recognition of certain countries has again been raised by several members - recognition of G.D.R., D.R.V.N., the Provisional Revolutionary Government of Viet Nam, etc. I am afraid, I have nothing to add to what I said the other day when a non-official Resolution - precisely in relation to this - was debated on the floor of the House. This matter was discussed here and I made my observations and clarified Government's stand 'as best as I could.

NORMALISATION OF RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Several members have made suggestion

that we should take some step to normalise our relations with China. Several members have expressed this desire. Some have even suggested that some concrete action should be taken. I would like to say a few words about this matter.

Some members have suggested that we should defuse our relations with China. I entirely agree that we should not only defuse, but try to normalise relations with China. However, normalisation does not depend upon one party alone. There has to be a mutual normalisation. If and when the Government of the People's Republic of China is willing and ready to take concrete steps towards normalisation, we shall be equally ready and willing to do so. It must however, be clearly understood that normalisation can take place only on the basis of mutual respect for each other's integrity and sovereignty, and on the principle of noninterference in other's internal affairs. We welcome the change in the style of China's diplomacy which has been in evidence of late, and we hope that it will also lead to a change in substance.

121

SINO-AMERICAN DETENTE

Something has been said, and quite rightly, about the new development that has taken place according to which it has been announced that President Nixon will visit Peking. President Nixon's Adviser, Dr. Kissinger, has already visited Peking in a secret, clandestine manner. I have made some comments already on this development when I was replying to the debate on the non-official resolution about recognition.

I should like to make some comments on the Sino-American process of detente. In this connection, I should like to recall that I have already made a statement on 16th July. While we welcome the rapproachment between Peking and Washington, we cannot look upon it with equanimity if it means the domination of the two powers over this region or a tacit agreement between them to this effect. We maintain the

right of each and every country and people to decide their own destiny without any interference from outside.

This applies as much to Bangla Desh as to Vietnam or the Palestine problem. We shall not allow any other country or combination of countries to dominate us or to interfere in our internal affairs. We shall, to our maximum ability, help other countries to maintain their freedom from outside domination, and their sovereignty. We have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, but this does not mean that we shall. look on as silent spectators if third countries come and interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, particularly our neighbours, as our own national interest could be adversely affected.

I sincerely hope that any Sino-American detente will not be at the expense of other countries, particularly in this region. However, we cannot at present totally rule out such, a possibility. It can have repercussions on the situation in this sub-continent, as well as in this region. We have, therefore, for sometime been considering ways and means of preventing such a situation from arising, and meeting it if it should arise.

In this, we are not alone, and there are other countries, both big and small, who may be more Perturbed than we are. We are in touch with the countries concerned and shall see to it that any Sino-American detente does not affect us or the other countries in this region adversely.

Several observations have been made about the motives that may have been the mainspring for the development of the Sino-American detente. Several points have been suggested that one party may be motivated by this aspect and the other country by another motive. Whatever may be the motives, this is a very important and very significant development. We shall have to watch very carefully the effects of this, and we shall have to take every possible step to safeguard our own interests.

I know that several countries have al-

ready given their reactions. Some of them have been critical. Some have expressed their fears. But there is no doubt that in the months to come this will be the most important event of the year, and a great deal of thought will have to be given to the aftereffects of this, and how it unfolds itself. We need not rush to any conclusion straight away. We have to be careful and watchful, and take adequate steps both political and otherwise in the international field and inside our own country to safeguard our interest.

Several Members have made reference to the press report of an interview given by President Yahya Khan. I should like to remind the Members that the report in this case is from Mr. Maxwell who put forward the theory of India's war in relation to the Sino-Indian conflict. It is very difficult to make any comment upon a press report of that nature, but there are some points in that statement which require notice. I would like to take this opportunity to state Government's viewpoints with regard to some of the matters which have been highlighted in the press report and the statement attributed to President Yahya Khan.

President Yahya Khan is reported to have said that if India made any attempt to seize any part of East Pakistan, he would declare war and Pakistan would not be alone. Pakistan has been trying for sometime to mislead the world into thinking that Pakistan's problem is with India and not with the people of Bangla Desh. It is the

122

military regimes own action, the brutalities committed by the Pakistan army in Bangla Desh, that have landed Pakistan in a morass in East Bengal, and only a settlement with the elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh will enable it to extricate itself from this morass. So long as Pakistan does not recognise this, the activities of the Mukti Fauj are bound to continue and increase. If the Mukti Fauj succeeds in liberating the territory in Bangla Desh, and Pakistan uses it as a pretext for an attack

on us, then I must make it clear that we are ready to defend ourselves.

President Yahya Khan talks about his willingness to meet our Prime Minister in response to efforts of mediation. That is also mentioned in that statement. I would like to make it clear that this is not a problem between India and Pakistan, if mediation is required, it should be between President Yahya Khan and the people of Bangla Desh. The people of Bangla Desh have in an unequivocal manner demonstrated their faith in the leadership of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the Awami League by winning as many as 167 out of 169 seats. So, those friends of Pakistan, who want to do any mediation, would be well-advised to carry on their mediation efforts between the military regime, that is President Yahya Khan, and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the leaders of the Awami League. There is no use in diverting the attention of the world by saying or by suggesting that there should be mediation between President Yahya Khan and Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. This is a fight which is going on between the people of Bangla Desh and the military rulers.

I would like to say very categorically that these efforts to divert the attention of the international community and to project this liberation fight that is being carried on in a relentless manner by the freedomfighters - this we have to scotch; and we have made it absolutely clear to all important countries that this is a matter between the Awami League, between Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the military rulers, and any attempt to divert the attention of any international community by projecting this as an Indo-Pakistan dispute is something which is totally unacceptable to us.

SHEIKH MUJIBUR RAHMAN

I would like to say about the report that has come out about Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. The report says that there is a proposal to try Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Even if he should be tried as it is - as mentioned in

some reports - by a military court in which they say he may have a lawyer, but not a foreigner as a lawyer - all this shows, if any proof was required, that there (in Pakistan) is no judicial system of the type with which we are familiar. Any trial of that nature will be a farce. It is not a legalistic matter, or a matter in which we should devote so much time to these procedural matters, whether it is in Camera or not. It is obviously a political matter in which we have taken a consistent stand that the military regime having embarked on these atrocious activities against the unarmed people of Bangla Desh, they have to reverse that trend, stop military action, and have discussions with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the Awami Le-ague. That is what we have been implying when we talked of giving up military means and trying to find a political settlement, which means a settlement acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh, acceptable to the Awami League, and to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who is the undisputed leader of the Awami League and the people of Bangla Desh. Any attempt, therefore, to take any action against Sheikh Mujibur Rahman will be follow-up action on the statement that President Yahya Khan made on 28th June, which has paved the way completely for the emergence of an independent Bangla Desh. Any further action of this type will be a mad action, which will result only in making the freedom-fighters more determined in the pursuit and realisation of their objective namely, freedom for Bangla Desh and for the people of Bangla Desh. So, we would like to warn that any action taken against Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who is the elected leader of the People of Bangla Desh, and any continuation of these atrocities, and any steps taken to pursue this mad policy and continued military action against unarmed people - this is something which will make the freedom-fighters even more determined, and if I may say so, it is the determination and the effectiveness of these freedomfighters which appear to have rattled president Yahya Khan, and he is now trying

to find excuses by saying that it any area is liberated, then he would declare war. It is obvious that now that he feels the pressure of the activities of the freedom-fighters, he has tried to divert the attention of the international community in another direction.

Our attitude has been made clear from time to time. This Parliament has unanimously adopted a resolution pledging sympathy and support, and we are pursuing that resolution in the best possible manner, and we are doing everything possible to lend support to the freedom-fighters.

So far as the foreign office and our missions abroad are concerned, I would like to assure you that they know fully well the implications of this issue. Let us not forget that this is a matter which is very vital for us, which is vital for our existence and for our survival. Therefore, we have to take major steps, we have to exercise all, the wisdom, but still, in a relentless manner, pursue our objective, the objective being the will of the people of Bangla Desh expressed in such over-whelming manner by returning Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the Awami League, and giving him such massive support. unless an administration and Government which is controlled by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and the Awami League is installed there. I do not see any hope of these refugees going back, because it is not by statements alone that any confidence can be instilled into the minds of these refugees to enable them to return to their homes and hearths. There is no substitute for experience, and the experience that they have had before they fled for their lives is an experience which cannot be wished away merely because somebody is making a statement that these refugees are welcome and they can return. What was the effect of the statement that President Yahya Khan made? After that, 3 1/2 million more refugees crossed into Indian territory. So, this is the response to the statement made by President Yahya Khan. Therefore, their confidence cannot be restored by statements or assurances by the U.N. people. It is very strange that they think that if they merely establish camps these refugees can be induced to go into those camps. That again is not likely to happen. Therefore, they will not go unless the root cause is tackled, unless the basic problem is solved, and the basic problem is the fight between the people and the democratic forces on one side and the military regime on the other. In this, we are committed to support the freedom-fighters and that is the objective that we have to realise.

USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA AFGHANISTAN BURMA NEPAL CHINA PAKISTAN RUSSIA MALI ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE SOUTH AFRICA SWITZERLAND VIETNAM UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri N. Krishnan's Statement in the 51st session of the Economic and Social Council

Following are extracts from the statement by Ambassador N. Krishnan, leader of the Indian Observer Delegation to the 51st Session of the Economic and Social, Council. on July 9, 1971:

With these promising growth trends characterising the Indian scene during the last few years the country was poised for a breakthrough in several new directions leading to sustained and substantial progress. Indeed after the General Elections which took place in February this year, my Government was getting ready of a determined attack on our economic and social problems. Our plans for continuing an accelerated tempo of development in the economic and social fields have however, received a severe jolt due to

the tragic turn Of events in East Bengal which have resulted in a massive influx of refugees from there into India. The influx still continues unabated and has already reached a phenomenal figure of 6.3 million by the end of June. It is clear that the task of providing food, shelter and medicines to them must receive high priority. Even the token provision of 80 million in our budget for the current year for this purpose has meant an additional tax burden of 30 percent on our people. We are therefore appreciative of the sympathetic response of the world community in sharing this burden with us and the efforts of the UN system to channel this assistance. However, much still remains to be done to cope with the gigantic relief needs of the ever increasing number of refugees. At the same time, relief efforts, even on an expanded and accelerated scale, could at best be only a temporary palliative. The real and truely humanitarian solution. as the international community has come to recognise and accept, lies in stopping the flow of refugees and in expediting their return to their homeland, in conditions which would assure them full freedom and security and create in them confidence and faith for the future.

My delegation is grateful for the initiative taken by Yugoslavia and New Zealand in asking for a discussion on this item during the current session of the Council and the support expressed in their statements by the delegations of the Soviet Union, U.K., Hungary, Norway, and others. We await with interest the statement which the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees is expected to make before the Council next week. We are confident that the discussion will highlight the need to mobilise further assistance on a substantial scale to meet the pressing relief needs of these unfortunate refugees and focus attention also on the urgency of their speedy and voluntary repatriation. We do hope the ECOSOC during its deliberations will consider the problem in its overall perspective and endorse a viable and lasting solution.

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Delegate's Speech at 521st Plenary Meeting of the Conference of Committee on Disarmament

Following is the text of the speech by the Indian Delegate, Mr. N. Krishnan, at the 521st Plenary meeting of the Conference of the Committee of Disarmament held in Geneva on July 15, 1971:

I should like to take this opportunity of welcoming, on behalf of my delegation, Ambassador Cvorovic of Yugoslavia and Ambassador Khosbayar of Mongolia, who have recently joined us. I wish them every success in our common endeavours.

A new stage was reached in our consideration of the question of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons when the socialist States members of the Committee submitted on 30 March 1971 a draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of biological weapons and toxins only (CCD/325/Rev. 1). The debate on whether or not there should be a joint or simultaneous prohibition of both chemical and biological weapons, which had characterized our deliberations over the last two years, has given place to efforts directed towards reaching a consensus on a draft convention on B weapons and toxins, accompanied by a continuing discussion on how best we can still achieve progress in securing also the prohibition of chemical weapons.

In this new situation it is essential to bear in mind three main considerations:

First, the Geneva Protocol of 1925

(A/7575/Rev. 1, Annex VI) should be safeguarded and nothing should be done which might either adversely affect the Protocol or cast doubts on its continuing validity;

Second, negotiations should be actively continued with a view to reaching agreement on a convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons also;

Third, there is an integral link between B and C weapons and the Geneva Protocol

125

of 1925 is founded on that principle. Even if, for reasons of expediency, a separate convention on B weapons has to he concluded in anticipation of a prohibition of C weapons also, thus making the prohibition comprehensive, that link should be preserved.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament has before it for its consideration two drafts of a convention on B weapons and toxins - the revised United Kingdom draft convention, which has the support of the United States and certain other members of the Committee, and the draft convention submitted by all the socialist States members of the Committee. Also various delegations have put forward specific proposals and suggestions which pertain to either one or both of those drafts. The task before the Committee is to negotiate a draft convention on B weapons and toxins which would have the general support of members of the Committee and which subsequently would be acceptable to the general membership of the United Nations.

A consensus has already emerged in the Committee that the socialist draft convention should be the main basis of our work as it enjoys the broad support of members of the Committee in regard to its framework, concepts, and even most of its formulations. However, certain changes and improvements would need to be made in its preambular part, particularly so as to satisfy the principal concern of the international community that the inseparable link bet-

ween B and C weapons, on which the Geneva Protocol of 1925 rests, would be fully reflected and respected. For the same reason, article IX in the operative part of the socialist draft convention would need to be amended so as to strengthen the commitment to continue negotiations on the prohibition of chemical weapons as well.

The Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would also need to devote its urgent efforts to making further concrete progress towards the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons. The mandate of the General Assembly is clear and unambiguous. In adopting General Assembly resolution 2662 (XXV) of 1970, we have committed ourselves unequivocally to a comprehensive solution of the problem of both B and C weapons. A convention on B weapons only, accompanied by an undertaking, however solemn, to continue negotiations on C weapons, would not conform to the will expressed by the General Assembly and would not satisfy the demand of the international community. We need to show more tangible evidence of advancement towards a solution of the admittedly difficult issues relating to a prohibition of C weapons. We have had - and may expect to have many useful exchanges of views which serve to enlarge our understanding of the problem. But, in our opinion, this is not enough. it is essential that the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament should also reach agreement during this current session on at least the principal elements of a draft convention on C weapons. This would not only help set the guidelines along which we should proceed next year but also give concrete shape to our earnest resolve to continue and to conclude negotiations on a C weapons convention.

The delegation of India would be ready to cooperate with all other delegations in working out an agreed draft convention on B weapons and toxins and in reaching agreement on the principal elements of a draft convention on chemical weapons.

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

UNDP Project on Television Training

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on July 15, 1971 on the signing of a plan of operation with UNDP for assistance in licensing programme for expansion of television:

The United Nations Development Programme is to assist India in launching a man-power training programme for expanding the use of television media for adult education, family planning and intensified agricultural production.

Under the project, which is the first of its kind, a television training institute will be established at Poona. This will turn out

126

qualified personnel of various categories to man new television centres which will become operational in Bombay and Srinagar in 1972 and in other State capitals in subsequent years. A television centre has been functioning in New Delhi for several years now.

Technical execution of the project will be the responsibility of UNESCO in asso. ciation with the International Tele-communications Union, while the Government of India's cooperating agency will be the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. The UNDP will provide television and other equipment for the institute and eight international experts at an estimated cost of nearly 1.2 million dollars in foreign exchange. Eighteen Indians will also be trained abroad, through UNDP fellowships, who will take over from the foreign experts at a later date. The Government of India will contribute 11.7 million rupees, mostly in kind, by way of buildings and local facilities and counterpart staff.

The plan of operation, for the project was signed here today by Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of Government of India, and by Dr. John McDiarmid, Resident Representative on behalf of UNDP. It had been signed earlier on behalf of UNESCO.

The first phase of the project will be organised with the existing television production facilities of All India Radio, New Delhi to train personnel for the T.V. centres to be opened in Bombay and Srinagar next year. The second phase will begin when an altogether new complex of buildings at Poona is completed by the end of 1972.

NEW DIMENSION TO MASS, COMMUNICATION

The project gives a new dimension to mass communication as it will be linked with two UNDP projects - one for a centre for the development of educational mass media in New Delhi and the other for expansion of the experimental satellite communication earth station at Ahmedabad.

The Poona Institute will offer courses designed to meet the requirements of both these projects. The Courses will include the entire range of TV programme production, communication research, feed back systems, application of TV and satellite communication to the fields of education, family planning, development of agriculture and conducting broadcasting experiments.

INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Sen's Speech on South Africa at U.N. Security Council

Following is the text of speech by India's Permanent Representative Shri S. Sen at the U.N. Security Council on July 17, 1971 on South Africa:

The struggle against the aggressive and oppressive action of South Africa started nearly three quarters of a century ago when Mahatma Gandhi led the movement of popular defiance against racial discrimination. Since then this movement has grown considerably and has spread throughout the world. It was the delegation of India that first brought to the notice of the United Nations the practices of the racist regime of South Africa. Some people have never forgiven us for it; but we are, none the less, proud that we did so, and over the years our initiative has gathered more and more strength and South Africa stands today universally condemned and can find real solace only in the embrace of colonial Portugal.

It is with this background that I have asked to speak before this Council, and I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and the other members of the Council for permission to do so. I should also like to offer our congratulations to you on your Presidency of the Security Council for the month of July, and to express our thanks to the distinguished Ambassador of Nepal for his Presidency of the Council last month.

For more than twenty-five years the international community has expressed its disapprobation and moral condemnation of apartheid. The present request has been supported by forty Member States, and many

more would have joined had there been to consult and contact them. However, the question is important, and the Council will have to decide on practical steps that may have to be taken in order to carry out its earlier resolutions.

It is quite clear that the numerous resolutions of the United Nations calling upon the South African Government to desist from its discriminatory policies have had little or no effect. Resolutions calling upon Member States to take measures of a political and economic nature against South African policies have also not produced result. Meanwhile, South Africa has not only intensified its racist practices but has also built up a formidable military. machine to oppose the freedom movement and to spread and to support by force or arms its racist doctrine and practices in the neighbouring Territories of Namibia, Portuguese colonies and Southern Rhodesia. South Africa indeed poses a grave challenge and threat to the peace of Southern Africa. There are few parallels in history where the views and voices of so many have been ignored by so few and for so long.

We have read with great interest the recent debate in the British House of Lords on the intended plan of the Government of the United Kingdom to renew arms supply to South Africa. Lord Caradon, who was with us until the other day, moved an amendment which would inhibit the present British Government from pursuing its objective. It does not surprise us that in the British Upper House Lord Caradon's motion was decisively defeated.

The arguments used by the British Government can be summarized as follows: it is bound by the Simonstown Agreement. May I remind the Council that all Members of the United Nations are also bound by the United Nations Charter. Secondly, it was said that the defence requirements of the British Government, both in their narrower and their wider contexts, call for the resumption of arms supply to South Africa. This argument was adequately met by Lord Chalfont, who did so much as a British

Minister for disarmament in the last Government in promoting East-West dialogue in the recent meetings at Rome of the- NATO Powers. Lord Chalfont pointed out that the Simonstown Agreement is outdated and outmoded for any defence preparations or strategy of the present-day world; indeed they are irrelevant.

Of course, the arguments about communism and Soviet influence in the area were used religiously: but I wonder how much of it is really believed. We have heard similar arguments about communism in South-East Asia and also in the Middle East. I do not know who is winning these battles, but I do know that because of these pot theories, hundreds of Asians and, losing their lives daily, their countries are being laid waste, their fields, factories and homes are being destroyed, and their human persons and dignity are being maimed and defiled in numerous ways. I assume that it is no one's intention that similar tragedy should be let loose in southern Africa. I also wonder what a Youth Assembly of any independence and character will have to say about such a development.

Then the argument was used that the sale and supply of arms to South Africa will bring money to those who provide these weapons. We understand that argument, but I am sure such cynical cupidity, such dangerous greed, cannot be expected, to be endorsed or approved by this Council. Obviously, many aristocrats and plutocrats are interested only in money, although their polished manners forbid them to speak about it in public or in private.

Then, we are regaled with two other arguments; the arms would be used only against external dangers and not for suppressing the local population. Our colleague from Mauritius has already explained this aspect of the problem in great detail, and I shall therefore not dwell on it. We. have heard this type of argument so often that I would merely be wasting the Council's time in trying to expose its fallacy. We have heard the theory of supplying arms to be used only for specific purposes and for no

other. We do not have to go deep into history to realize what has happened when particular Governments have decided to use such arms for purposes very different from what the donors had in mind.

The United Nations has also adopted resolutions encouraging liberation movements. Will those arms help or hinder such

128

movements even if they are used for external purposes? Is it not the blacks against whom those arms will be used, even internally?

Equally offensive is the theory that the supply of arms does not in any way reduce the detestation which donor countries feel towards apartheid or towards regimes based on total racial discrimination. I suppose those countries will expect us to believe that such a supply of arms does in fact discourage those racial practices and racist regimes Logic and norality can be perverted in many ways, and I suppose that some Christian gentlemen are more adept at it than their barbaric ancestors, heathens and such other inferior breeds.

We believe that the British Government wishes to consult the Commonwealth countries and weigh all other factors before coming to a decision. As a Commonwealth country, we are, of course, gratified by this attention. But all Commonwealth countries are bound by the Council's resolution as well. Besides, it does not need much imagination to decide how each individual Commonwealth country would react to any proposal for resumption of arms supply to South Africa. However, we are grateful to know that no hasty decision will be taken.

The only threat to peace and security in and around the southern half of Africa comes from the South African regime's covert aggression and subversion against the neighbouring independent countries and peoples under the colonial yoke, struggling for their freedom. This is proved by the data on South Africa's defence budget,

which, over the last decade; has increased from R 44 million to R 272 million a year. Ambassador Farah has already given many other details. Of the nearly \$1,000 million spent on defence during that period, more than half was on the acquisition of weapons, aircraft, naval stores, and other heavy equipment. The South African air force is being geared to the task of combatting "terrorists" - which simply means the struggle for freedom of the oppressed people. The contention that South Africa is receiving those weapons for external defence and not for the purpose of enforcing apartheid has not been borne out by the facts, nor has it ever been accepted by the Security Council. On the contrary, the Security Council, during its deliberations in 1963-1964, recognised that there was little chance of persuading South Africa to discard its racist policies without an effective embargo on the supply of arms to South Africa from other countries. This was reflected in resolution 181 (1963) of August 1963, 182 (1963) of December, 1963, and 191 (1964) of June 1964. The Security Council thus became committed to a certain course of action aimed at weakening South Africa's capacity to impose its racist policies in southern Africa. But neither these nor other measures, such as the cutting-off of economic and trade, relations and the prevention of the flow of investments, have had much result, because of the actions of certain states whose exports to South Africa alone make the crucial difference between success and failure of the embargo. Many loop-holes have been found to circumvent the purpose of those resolutions. A favoured technique has been the claim that weapons are being supplied under old contracts, the terms of which are rarely specified. In a country like South Africa, where the indigenous people are kept in a state of virtual serfdom, even the supply of shotguns and hunting equipment by South African's trading partners adds to the oppressive apparatus of that country.

The policy of surreptitious support for South Africa's war machine has done much damage by undermining effective United Nations actions against apartheid.

In the light of the foregoing, my delegation proposes that the Security Council, keeping in mind that threat to peace which has arisen from South Africa's action in the whole of southern Africa, take immediate action to implement its relevant resolutions and call upon Member States to do the following:

Firstly, to take effective steps to prevent the flow of arms and military hardware to South Africa, directly or through third countries. Member States should be asked to implement fully the various resolutions on the arms embargo, without reservations or restrictive interpretations.

Second, to withhold the supply of, and spare parts for, all vehicles and equipment for the use of the South African armed forces.

129

Third, to prohibit all kinds of investment and technical assistance, including licences for the manufacture of arms and ammunition, naval aircraft, and the like.

Fourth, to discontinue military training, and other forms of military co-operation, for the South African armed forces.

The Security Council might also consider the possibility of keeping the specific question of an arms embargo under constant review. It might also consider, the establishment of a sub-committee to deal with this question of arms, among other questions. An expert committee was established in 1964, but its report was not discussed by the Security Council.

As a supplementary measure, the Secretary-General might also be requested to keep this subject under continuing review, either directly or through a special representative, and be authorized to intercede if need be, with those Governments that supply arms and equipment to South Africa and persuade them to discontinue such supplies.

I agree with all that the two previous

speakers have said. I do not wish to make any propaganda or speak for effect. There are many specialists in such dissertations. I speak out of agony and desperation, and I hope that this Council will be sensitive to the feelings of a very large number of Member States. Some of us are entitled to wonder how many of the present permanent members, but for the protection of the Charter, would have passed the bar of peaceful intentions - an argument which has often been used to deny the legitimate rights of another permanent member.

Time is running out. Africa is angry, and rightly so. Youth is disillusioned, and we older men and older countries must not be so hypocritical as to say, day in and day out, that we wish to work for our children and their children, and then proceed to destroy all their prospects for a full and happy life. The Africans and the young may tolerate us for some time, may forgive us our lack of wisdom - but not for very long.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA USA PORTUGAL NEPAL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NAMIBIA ITALY MAURITIUS GREECE RUSSIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Sino-Nepal Agreement for Survey of Terai Border

Following is the text of statement by the Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh in Lok Sabha on July 20, 1971 in reply to calling attention notice regarding the reported agreement between Nepal and China wherein China has been permitted by Nepal to survey Terai border near Indian border: Government are aware that letters were exchanged on July 16th between the Chinese Ambassador in Kathmandu and the Finance Secretary, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, by which the Chinese Government are to conduct a survey in the Butwal area of the Nepal Terai in order to ascertain whether cotton cultivation is possible. This agreement formalises the earlier position which we were aware of, viz. that a few Chinese experts were in the area to look into the question of cotton cultivation. What is proposed to be undertaken is a feasibility report on the possibility of growing cotton.

The agreement provides for Chinese technicians to conduct investigations in the area, with the cooperation of the Nepalese Government.

130

NEPAL CHINA INDIA MALI

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

External Affairs Minister's Statement in Lok Sabha on the Reported Supply of Arms to Pakistan by the U.S.S.R. and France

Following is the text of the statement by the Minister of External Affairs in LOT-Sabha on July 6, 1971, regarding the reported supply of arms to Pakistan by the USSR, and France and the reaction of the Government thereto:

Government have seen Press reports to this effect. Government have been in touch with the Governments of the USSR and France both in New Delhi and their respective capitals. The Soviet Ambassador has told us that the Press reports about USSR Government having supplied arms to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh are incorrect.

The French Government had informed us that they have not entered into any new contracts for the supply of arms to Pakistan after the military action in Bangla Desh. They had also informed us towards the end of June that they would not make any deliveries of arms even on old contracts. We have, however, expressed our grave concern to the French Ambassador about the reported supply of arms to Pakistan. We have asked our Ambassador in Paris and the French Ambassador in New Delhi to take this matter up with the French Government.

In view of the prevailing practice of clandestine sale of arms through private parties in Western Europe, the possibility of Pakistan acquiring arms through such sources cannot be ruled out.

PAKISTAN FRANCE USA INDIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Statement on Pakistan President's Threat to Declare War

Following is the text of statement made, by the External Affairs Minister in Rajya Sabha on July 21, 1971 regarding the reported threat of the President of Pakistan to declare war on India and the reaction of the Government thereto:

President Yahya Khan is reported to have said that "if India made any attempt to seize any part of East Pakistan" he will declare war.

Pakistan has been trying for some time to mislead the world into thinking that the situation in Bangla Desh is a matter between Pakistan and India whereas in fact it is a matter between the military rulers of West Pakistan and the people of Bangla Desh. It is the Pakistan regime's own actions, and the brutalities committed by the Pakistan Army in Bangla Desh, that have landed Pakistan in a morass in Bangla Desh. Only a settlement with the already elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh will enable the military rulers of Pakistan to extricate themselves from this morass.

So long as Pakistan does not recognise this, the activities of the Bangla Desh freedom fighters will continue and increase. When the freedom fighters succeed in liberating territory in Bangla Desh and Pakistan uses it as a pretext for attacking us, then I must make it clear that we are ready to defend ourselves.

We have no desire "to seize any part of Pakistan". President Yahya Khan is either trying to mislead his people and the world at large or preparing them for an aggression against India by making such unwarranted and baseless statements.

131

PAKISTAN INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

External Affairs Minister's Intervention in Lok Sabha Debate

Intervening in the Lok Sabha debate

on non-official resolution urging recognition of Bangla Desh, the External Affairs Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh interalia made the following speech on July 2, 1971:

The main objective which we have set before us is contained in our Resolution which we all unanimously adopted, in which we said that we support and have every sympathy for the cause of freedom in which the people of Bangla Desh are engaged. We are also unanimously pledged to support that cause. As to what should be done in pursuance of that Resolution, is a matter about which there can be a difference of opinion. But we should try to resolve that and should try to concentrate our attention for realising that objective, rather than on insisting that a particular step at a particular stage is the only way to resolve that problem. This is the crux of the entire matter.

Coming to the statement that President Yahya Khan has made, to a certain extent I had already touched upon certain features which I suspected might be contained in the statement that was expected to be made by President Yahya Khan. But I must say clearly that the statement that President Yahya Khan has made has created a situation where this action of President Yahya Khan alone will be mainly responsible for strengthening the resolve of the people of Bangla Desh to carry on their determined struggle for their freedom and for getting rid of the military stranglehold which the military regime of Pakistan had been trying to perpetuate.

If you examine that statement, the conclusion is irresistible that for all times to come he has negatived any chance of reversion to the democratic way of life. Instead of the elected members of the Pakistan National Assembly being entrusted with the task of framing the Constitution, some experts will frame the Constitution. There are also several other highly obnoxious features in that statement which clearly show that a determined bid has been made by the military regime to perpetuate their own hold and the process of democratic emergence

upon which the country, it appeared, had embarked after the last elections, which gave such outstanding victory to the Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, has been completely negatived by the statement that President Yahya Khan has made.

The entire philosophy behind the election to the Constituent Assembly was that the elected representatives will have the right to frame their Constitution. Now, that is taken away from them. Then, again, what is most surprising is that the military regime will decide as to who loses the elective post. It is most surprising that the administration has arrogated to themselves the right to declare that a particular party or a particular individual has indulged in such activity which in their judgment has created a situation where he will lose his seat. There cannot be any more cruel joke to their profession of still reverting to a democratic way of life if this power is sought to be assumed as President Yahya Khan has tried to assume by making the statement that the administration will decide as to who will remain a member or who will lose his membership because, they say, if any party is guilty of what they describe as indulging in secessionist activity, then they will decide as to whether they still retain the right to be the members of the National Assembly.

This is, to say the least, the complete negation of the democratic idea. There is another highly unsatisfactory feature of the statement according to which it is said that regional parties as such may be called upon not to participate in the process of Constitution making or even in the matter of political functioning unless they are parties which have got branches all over the country. This is something which I think, cuts at the root of any democratic set-up. There are far reaching implications of this not only for Bangla Desh but even for different constituents in West Pakistan itself. This might mean a party, for instance, consisting of Baluchis to respond to the aspirations of Baluchi people or a party which might try to project the aspirations of the people of North West Frontier Province can also, on this basis, be said to be

not national parties but regional parties which can be superseded and their political activities curbed.

132

These are some of the features which are so patently objectionable from the point of view and from the standard of democratic ideals that any hope that was still left that there could be a possibility of the restoration of democratic rights of the people which according to us means entrusting the responsibility of 'administration to the elected representatives led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman has been dashed to the ground.

So far as the question of recognition is concerned, I would like to say that this is a proposition about which we do not take a negative view. We have always said that we are not opposed to recognition.

This is a matter which is constantly under review.

And I would like to say that at the appropriate time, if we find it is necessary to recognise, we will certainly recognise. So at the present stage, I would appeal to the lion. Members that some new factors have also been introduced and we have to review our attitude in view of the completely negative statement that has been made by President Yahya Khan... It will not be proper to hustle us to take a view. When we say that we are not opposed to recognition, it will not be quite proper for those who may feel strongly about our going ahead with recognition. They should realise that this is something upon which we do not take a negative attitude. We can certainly examine it, re-examine it and keep the position under review. So far as our efforts to help or support those who are engaged in the struggle, that is already contained in the Resolution which has been unanimously adopted by this House.

About the last question, I fully share the concern expressed about the health of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. In fact, on this issue Prime Minister herself and all of us have been impressing upon the Governments that they should take it up very strongly with Pakistan. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is an outstanding leader who has won such outstanding victory and who commands the obedience and respect and confidence of such vast numbers of people in Pakistan. In fact he commands majority if we take Pakistan as a whole. He is such an outstanding leader. We have said that every effort should be made by the international community, by the Governments and by others, to ensure about the safety of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Only this morning it is said that he is critically ill. Some days back it has been reported that he is keeping indifferent health. This is one of important points we have been highlighting with all Governments that they should specifically urge and impress upon the military rulers of Pakistan that the safety of a leader of this stature and of the popularity and type of confidence that he commands, as Sheikh Mujibur Rahman should be ensured.

In fact, we have also suggested that every effort should be made to see that he is released. Some lion. Members had said that we had not said that he should be released. I would like to submit that in fact I had gone much farther and said that a government which was headed or controlled by or which had the support of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was the one condition which would create a type of atmosphere in which the refugees could go back, because he had the majority support behind him. So, we have always been in favour of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman being released and we have urged all Governments.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

POLAND

Following is the text of the, Press Statement issued in Warsaw on July 11, 1971 on the conclusion of the visit of Shri S. M. Kumaramangalam, India's Minister of Steel & Mines:

Yesterday after a four day stay Member of the cabinet of the Government of India, Minister of Steel and Mines Shri S. M. Kumaramangalam ended his visit to Poland,

During his stay in Warsaw, Minister Kumaramangalam, conducted talks with Prime Minister Piotr Jaroszewicz, Vice Prime Minister Mr. Jan Mitrega and with

133

the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. S. Jedrychowski, the Minister of Foreign Trade Mr. Kazimierz Olszewski and the Minister of Heavy Industry Mr. Wlodzimierz Lejczak.

During the visit paid to Prime Minister Jaroszewicz and Minister Jedrychowski, Minister Kumaramangalam informed of the difficult problems which India faces in connection with the influx of over 6 million refugees from East Pakistan and of urgent necessity of finding political solutions which would create conditions for refugees to return to their homes.

The situation as presented by Minister Kumaramangalam was heard with concern and understanding. Talks were held in an atmosphere of full confidence and friendship demonstrating will on both sides to maintain peace.

During his stay in Katowice Minister Kumaramangalam was received by Vice-Chairman of Council of Ministers Mr. Jan Mitrega. Meetings and talks in Silesia were marked by cordiality and real interest in the development of the bilateral relations in the field of coal industry and metallurgy.

The Indian Guest visited a modern mine "Jan" in which all modern achievements of mining were exploited and also the Institute of Nonferrous Metals in Gliwice.

On the eve of our guest's departure from Poland, the Ambassador of India Kanwar Natwar Singh gave a Dinner which was attended by, among others, the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Stefan Jedrychowski, the Minister of Foreign Trade Mr. Kazimierz Olszewski, the Vice-Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Stanislaw Trepozynski, the Vice-Minister of Heavy Industry Mr. Jozef Talma.

Minister Kumaramangalam's stay in Poland demonstrated once again the attempt of Poland and India to develop further relations based on full mutual understanding and true friendship which connects the nations of Poland and India.

POLAND USA INDIA PAKISTAN

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Agreement for Cargo Ships

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on July 20, 1971 on the signing of a contract between India and U.S.S.R. for purchase of four cargo ships:

India is to get four cargo liners from the U.S.S.R. at a cost of about Rs. 18 crores. A contract to this effect was signed today between the Shipping Corporation of India and Messrs Sudoimport of the U. S.S.R.

The cargo liners are fast modern vessels with a speed of 17.5 knots. They are equipped with large hatch openings and are pro-

vided with the cranes which make them specially suitable for handling cargoes like, iron and steel, heavy machinery and equipment. Loading and unloading operations in the cargo liners would be faster than a conventional cargo ship.

It may be recalled that the Shipping Corporation has now a fleet of 78 vessels of nearly 14 lakh tons. On the basis of the firm orders by the end of the Fourth Plan period, the Corporation's fleet is expected to go upto 93 ships of 17.55 lakh DWT in the Fifth Plan period.

The contract was signed by Shri C. P. Srivastava, Chairman and Managing Director, Shipping Corporation of India Ltd. and Mr. G. Schenkov on behalf of Messrs Sudoimport of the U.S.S.R.

The Union Minister of Shipping and Transport and Parliamentary Affairs Shri Raj Bahadur and the Soviet Ambassador to India Mr. Pegov were also present on the occasion.

134

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Tribute to Soviet Cosmonauts

Following is the text of the statement by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in Lok Sabha on July 1, 1971, on the death of the three Soviet Cosmonauts;

The true spirit of science is the spirit

of sacrifice and search for knowledge. The exploration of outer space has re-awakened in all of us a sense of wonder. Whether cosmonauts belonged to the Soviet Union or to the United States of America, we have regarded them as representatives of all mankind. We have felt personally involved in their journey, following their every move, sharing the anxiety of their families and of their country. We have felt exhilarated by their achievements.

The tragedy of the death of the Soviet cosmonauts, Lt. Col. Georgi Dobrovolsky, Flight Engineer Vladislav Volkov and Test Engineer Viktor Patsayev is all the greater because it happened at the very end of a successful exploration. As the House knows, they spent a record number of 23 days abroad the Salyut, the 25-tonne orbiting laboratory launched on April 19. The experiment was a success. They gathered very valuable information, and even though they themselves are not here to share in it, I know that it was a contribution to progress.

May I request you, Sir, on behalf of. this House to express our deep sympathy with the Soviet Union and especially the families of these gallant courageous youngmen?

USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement on Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement

The Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra, made the following statement in the

Lok Sabha on July 2, 1971 in response to Calling Attention Notice regarding the reported six months' notice served on India by the British authorities to terminate the Indo-UK Trade Agreement of 1939:

On the 8th of last month. I had made a statement in the House on the British Government's announcement to impose a new tariff on imports of cotton textiles from the Commonwealth Preference Area, including India, with effect from January 1, 1972. I had apprised the House of the discussions held in London in May in which India's opposition to the British proposal had been reiterated. During the discussions, we had pointed out that the present proposal was discriminatory, inequitable and inconsistent with the international obligations of the U.K. towards developing countries like India. Since their present import regime on cotton textiles is broadly in line with that of the EEC, we clearly told them that by giving effect to their proposal, they would be unnecessarily creating problems of harmonisation of their regime with that of the EEC, in the event of their entry into the EEC, Their proposal to impose a tariff on Commonwealth Preference Area without in any way changing the import regime from other EFTA members violates the understandings with which the Government of India had given the waiver to the U.K. at the time of her joining the European Free Trade Area.

135

The British Government informed us that they could not contemplate postponement or modification of their declared policy in any way. They, however, recognised that the change in their import, regime for cotton textiles would hurt. exports from India. They made an offer of a loan of 110 million on interest-free terms tied to the purchase of British goods and services and requested us to grant them a waiver under the Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement in respect of cotton textiles.

As the House is aware, we have always held the view that aid was no substitute for trade. We accordingly informed them that we do not find it possible to agree to their request for the waiver.

On June 30, Government of India received from the British Government six months' notice of termination of the Indo-U.K. Trade Agreement of 1939. We are awaiting the official text of the speech regarding the notice of termination which was made on June 30 in the House of Commons by the British Minister for Trade.

It is most unfortunate that the British Government had not found it possible to accept the points that were made to them by us, which could lead to a mutually acceptable Settlement of the issue. I would like to express the hope that even at this stage the British Government will see the reasonableness of our stand and that they would not like to take the responsibility for breaking up the historical trade relationship between our two countries.

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Additional U.S. Non-Project Aid to India

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on July 7, 1971 on an amendatory loan agreement between India and United States for 20 million dollars in non-project aid:

The United States and India today concluded an amendatory loan agreement for 20 million dollars (Rs. 15 crores) in nonproject aid bringing to 190 million dollars (Rs. 142.50 crores) the amount of such aid

made available in 1971.

Announcement of this loan was made last week as part of a new United States 70 million dollars (Rs. 52.50 crores) assistance package. Of that amount 50 million dollars (Rs. 37.50 crores) is for relief of the refugee situation in India. The remaining 20 million dollars (Rs. 15 crores) non-project loan will be used to finance imports of fertilizers, industrial raw materials, components and spare parts.

Dr. I. G. Patel, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, and U.S. Ambassador Kenneth B. Keating signed the formal agreement today. The original agreement for this year, signed on March 13, was for 155 million dollars (Rs. 116.25 crores). This was amended upward on April 22, when an additional 15 million dollars (Rs. 11.25 crores) was made available.

Extended on concessional terms, the loan is repayable in dollars over a period of 40 years, including a 10-year grace period. Interest is payable at 2 per cent per annum during the grace period and 3 per cent thereafter.

136

USA INDIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

External Affairs Minister's Statement on Reported U.S. Decision to Supply Arms to Pakistan

Following is the text of statement by the Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh in Lok Sabha on July 12, 1971 regarding the reported decision of U.S.A. to supply arms worth, 35 million Dollars to Pakistan under personal orders of President Nixon:

Government have seen the text of the statement made by Senator Church on July 7, 1971, that an estimated \$ 35 million worth of military equipment is still in the arms pipeline for delivery to Pakistan. On 8th July, 1971, a State Department Spokesman stated that "the average approximate figure over the last five fiscal years has been in the order of \$ 10 to 15 million a year.

Senator Church is a well-informed Senator and has been taking great interest in the question of arms supply by USA to different countries. It is possible that his figure may not be far from correct. In any case, amounts in dollars do not give a clear indication of the nature and quantum of military equipment involved. Equipment purchased from certain governmental sources is valued much below the normal market price. All spare parts which may cost very little can reactivate deadly weapons.

Government shares the concern of all sections of the House about the continued supply of military equipment by USA to Pakistan. I would like to assure the House that our views on the subject have been conveyed in unequivocal terms to the US Government.

Government feel that supply of arms to Pakistan by any country in the present context amounts to condonation of genocide in Bangla Desh and encouragement to the continuation of the atrocities by the military rulers of Pakistan. It also amounts to an intervention on the side of the military rulers of West Pakistan against the people of Bangla Desh. We have left US Government in no doubt about the dangerous implications of such a policy on the situation in Bangla Desh and on the peace and stability of the sub-continent and the region as a whole.

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Rajya Sabha Statement on Implications of Continued U.S. Arms Supply to Pakistan

Following is the text of the Statement by the Minister of External Affairs in the Rajya Sabha on July 19, 1971 regarding the continued arm supply by the USA to Pakistan and its implications thereof:

I regret to inform the House that since the issue of shipment of American arms to Pakistan was discussed last in this House, there has been no change in U.S. policy. On the contrary, it has come to our notice that U.S. military equipment still in the pipeline for delivery to Pakistan may be even more than has been publicly admitted by the U.S. Government. While the U.S. State Department spokesman mentioned on July 8, 1971 that the average approximate annual figure for the last five years of supply of arms to Pakistan has been in the order of \$ 10 to 15 million, Senator Church quoted an estimated figure of \$ 35 million, in respect of military equipment still in the pipeline. We have reason to believe that his figure is nearer to the correct one. In any case amounts in Dollars alone do not give a correct picture. As we know, Pakistan has been in the past obtaining equipment from certain governmental sources at throw-away prices. Spare parts which may cost very little can reactivate deadly weapons.

I would like to assure the House that our views on the supply of arms to Pakistan have been conveyed in unequivocal terms to the United States Government. We have explained to them the adverse impact it could have on the peace and stability of the sub-continent. It could have an impact on Indo-US bilateral relations as well. it is surprising that the US Government which

137

has been counselling restraint to us should have itself taken a measure which will aggravate the situation.

The supply of arms by any country to Pakistan in the present context amounts to condonation of genocide in Bangla Desh and encouragement to the continuation of atrocities by the military rulers of Pakistan. It also amounts to intervention on the side of the military rulers of West Pakistan against the people of Bangla Desh.

USA PAKISTAN

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-Yugoslav Joint Communique on Talks with Dr. Karan Singh

Following is the text of statement issued on July 2, 1971 in New Delhi at the end of the 3-day visit by the Union Minister of Tourism and Civil Aviation, Dr. Karan Singh, to Belgrade:

The Minister for Tourism and Civil Aviation, Government of India, paid a short official visit to Yugoslavia as the guest of the Federal Executive Council in the capacity of the Special Envoy of the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. During his stay in Belgrade Dr. Karan Singh was received by the President of Yugoslavia, Marshal Josip Broz Tito and had friendly talk with him. The Minister Dr. Karan

Singh also had talks with the Vice-President of the Federal Executive Council Mr. Miso Pavicevic and with the Member of the Federal Executive Council Mr. Miran Mejak. During these discussions, Dr. Karan Singh gave detailed account of the events which have led to the present tragic situation in East Pakistan. He pointed out that the millions of refugees from East Pakistan are an extremely heavy burden for India and emphasised that this problem is a danger to peace in the area.

In this connection both sides stressed that the problem of caring for such a huge number of refugees must be the concern of the entire world community and that broad and effective international action should be undertaken immediately to alleviate this difficult situation. In this respect it is essential to put an immediate stop to further inflow of refugees from East Pakistan to India.

Yugoslav side considers that the situation in the Indian sub-continent poses a danger to international peace and reiterated that the sole way out is to find a political solution, that is to transfer power to the elected representatives of the people of East Pakistan. This would accelerate normalization of the situation in East Pakistan and create conditions for the safe return of refugees to their homes.

Dr. Karan Singh expressed sincere appreciation of the Government of India for the under-standing of this problem shown by Yugoslavia and for the humanitarian assistance rendered by the Yugoslav Red Cross for refugees from East Pakistan in India.

It has been agreed to continue exchange of views on this issue in the common interests of peace.

The visit of Dr. Karan Singh is a new contribution to the strengthening of the existing friendly relations and cooperation between the two countries.

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Indo-YugosIav Committee on Trade and Economic Co-operation

Following is the text of a Press Communique issued in New Delhi on July 14, 1971 On the discussions between the Yugoslav delegation led by His Excellency Mr. Miran Mejak, Yugoslav Minister of National Economy and the Indian delegation led by the Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra:

A Yugoslav delegation led by H.E. Ing. Miran Mejak, Member of Federal Executive

138

Council, visited New Delhi between July 12 to July 15, 1971, for a meeting of the Indo-Yugoslav Joint Committee on Trade and Economic Cooperation. The Indian delegation was led by H.E. Shri L. N. Mishra, Minister of Foreign Trade, Government of India.

The two delegations informed each other of the economic situation in their countries and reviewed the growing cooperation in the trade and economic fields.

As a result of these discussions, it was decided that the current Trade and Payments Agreement be extended upto December 31, 1972, and thereafter all transactions in respect of trade between the two countries will be conducted in convertible currency.

Today's agreement to extend the current Rupee Agreement upto the end of 1972 will enable India to acquire a sufficient

trade surplus during 1972 which will cover the net repayment liability of India towards Yugoslavia. This, coupled with the contract for supply of 3600 railway wagons to Yugoslavia, means that in 1973 when multilateral system of trading is introduced between the two countries, all of India's old liabilities will have been discharged through the exports of Indian goods as originally contemplated.

In 1972, India is expected to export over and above the traditional items a large variety of non-traditional goods,,, such as jeeps and commercial vehicles, castings and forgings, wire ropes, garrage equipment, aluminium products, tyres and tubes, linoleum, transistor radios and other engineering items as well as consumer goods, apart from chemical and plastic materials.

So far as India's imports are concerned, there is persisting interest in fields such as agricultural and crawler tractors, high pressure gas cylinders, ship building, automobile ancillary industries, viscose staple fibre, steel material, capital goods, nonferrous metals, non-ferrous manufactures, fertilizers, mercury etc.

The two delegations exchanged views on promoting industrial cooperation between the two countries and noted that possibilities exist in fields such as pharmaceutical industries, manufacture of electronic equipment, domestic sewing machines and knitting machines, food processing machinery, wagon building, crawler tractors, etc.

The talks took place in a friendly and cordial atmosphere and it was agreed that the next Joint Committee meeting will take place in Yugoslavia in the beginning of 1972.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA IRAN RUSSIA

Date: Jul 01, 1971

Volume No

WORLD CONFERENCE ON WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW

Prime Minister's Message to the Conference on World Peace Through Law

Following is the text of the Message sent by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi to the World Conference on World Peace Through Law, held in Belgrade on July 21, 1971:

The contemporary man is deeply concerned with the creation of a better world. Hence his involvement in search for peace and his interest in international law. The road to peace through law is often paved with good intentions, but these are not always matched by action, especially as regards the human rights and disarmament of those who guide the destinies of nations. There can be no peace when the principles of law are by-passed and there is resort to force for the achievement of objectives. And without peace there is a tragic break-down of human values. Peace through law is dependent on respect for the rights of man. The people are the source of law. Laws must, therefore, conform to their aspirations.

I send my good wishes for the Belgrade World Conference on World Peace Through Law.

139

YUGOSLAVIA USA **Date**: Jul 01, 1971

August

Volume No

1995

Content

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII AUGUST

No. 8 CONTENTS

PAGE

CANADA

Canadian Loan for Kandla Port 141

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Loan for Agricultural Development of Nilgiri 141

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Independence Day Message 142 Prime Minister's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad 144

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement in Rajya Sabha on Reported Finalisation of Plans for U.N.
Team of Observers
144
India's Aide Memoire to U Thant on Observers on India-East
Bengal Border
145

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on External Affairs Minister's Visit 148

NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Treaty of Trade and Transit 149 Joint Communique

Shri L. N. Mishra's Speech at Signing Ceremony

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi's Message to Heads of Government

Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's Message to U.N. Secretary-General 156

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Reported Pakistan President's Statement on Mujibur Rahman 157

Rajya Sabha Statement on Pak Threat to Execute Mujibur Rahman 157

RUMANIA

Indo-Rumanian Economic Talks 158

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Foreign Minister OF U.S.S.R. Mr. Gromyko's Statement on Arrival 159

Statement by Foreign Minister in Parliament on the Indo-USSR Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation 159

Speech by Sardar Swaran Singh at Signing Ceremony 162

Gromyko's Reply 162

Soviet Joint Statement 163

USA CANADA GERMANY INDIA INDONESIA NEPAL PAKISTAN

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

CANADA

Canadian Loan for Kandla Port

Following is the text of the press release issued in, New Delhi on August 12, 1971 on the Indo-Canadian loan agreement for development of Kandla Port:

A Canadian development loan agreement for about Rs. 70 lakhs (\$ 1 million) was signed here this morning. The loan will facilitate the procurement from Canada of certain machinery required for the fertilizer bulk handling facility to be constructed at the port of Kandla. It is expected that this new facility will permit considerable savings in foreign exchange since fertilizers can be purchased in bulk at much more competitive prices than specially packaged or bagged fertilizers.

The loan is free of interest and service charges, with repayments amortized over 50 years including a 10-year grace period. These lending terms are the softest available to India from any source.

The loan agreement was signed by the Acting Canadian High Commissioner, Mr. G. A. H. Pearson and Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance.

This is the fourth development loan extended to India by Canada during the current year. The three others include a Rs. 28 crores (\$ 40 million) loan to finance the import of a wide range of industrial commodities and fertilizers, a Rs. 2 crores (\$ 3 million) line of credit for use by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and Oil India Limited, and a recently signed Rs. 7 crores (\$ 10 million) general line of credit agreement to permit the import of equipment and services by end-users in the private and public sectors.

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Loan for Agricultural Development of Nilgiri

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on August 10, 1971 on Me signing Of Indo-German agreement on agricultural development of Nilgiri:

An accelerated pace of work in the Indo-German Agricultural Development Project, Nilgiri, Tamil Nadu, is envisaged in the agreement signed here today between the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and the Government of India. The Signatories were His Excellency Mr. Guenter Diehl, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Shri T. P. Singh, Secretary of the Union Ministry of Agriculture.

141

The most important feature of this supplementary agreement to the original Indo-German Agreement of 1966 relates to the setting up of a revolving fund for small loans to farmers in the project area. The Federal Republic of Germany will make available up to 550.000 German marks for this fund.

The Agreement which covers the operation of the programme up to June 30, 1972, highlights the promotion of vegetable and potato cultivation and the building up of a potato seed multiplication chain.

Assistance in the administration of Stateowned farms and advisory work in the agri-

cultural development of the district of Gudalur are also included in the Agreement.

The Federal Republic of Germany will supply up to 650 tonnes of plant protection chemicals which are to be used for controlling potato root eelworm infestation in the area. The Federal Republic of Germany has also agreed to provide up to twelve specialists for general agriculture, plant disease, soil science, water management, marketing, etc.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

President's Independence Day Message

Following is the text of President Shri V. V. Giri's message to the Nation on the eve of the Independence Day:

Friends and Comrades,

I greet you all on the eve of the 24th anniversary of the Independence Day. As we enter the twenty-fifth year of our Independence, our minds are filled with anguish over the grim tragedy that is being enacted across our eastern border. The exodus of millions of men, women and children into India today far exceeds in magnitude and poignant pathos any migration known to history. Apart from the sheer tragedy of it this has imposed on us well nigh intolerable economic and social burdens, throwing into Jeopardy both our national development and our security. This problem, which is not of our seeking, is a challenge not only to us, but to all mankind.

It is a challenge at once massive and subtle, which can be met only by courage and determination, patience and clear thinking and above all, by national unity and international effort. We must balance the drives of the present moment with long term perspectives for the crisis facing us is of a fundamental nature and can affect the future not only of this country and continent but of the world. It is in fact, a crisis of conscience for all mankind. We are holding the refugees from Bangla Desh temporarily as a trust on behalf of the international community. They will all have to go back to their homeland irrespective of caste or creed as soon as credible conditions for their safety and honour are created for their return. If peace is indivisible, so are human rights. And the nations of the world cannot, in the name of internal sovereignty or the primitive concept of balance of power, turn their backs upon the colossal and long drawn sufferings of over seventy-five million human beings.

In the wider international field history has taken a new turn vindicating the vision of the man who founded and formulated India's approach to the world. India is not, 'and need not be, a stranger in this new world which we had envisioned and which is emerging rather belatedly from the clouds of the cold war. To play our full part in this new world, we shall have to ensure internal harmony and work with unity and determination for the development of our country and for the prosperity of our masses.

142

I am convinced that India has an important role to play in the next stage of history that is unfolding. There are no short cuts to the attainment of our rightful place in the world except the straight path of unity and hard work. And I am sure that our people will rise to the occasion and meet the challenge of the times. We as a nation must remember that our freedom, peace and progress depend on our own strength. It is our economic capability, political unity and social justice that will decide our future,

We believe in peace and progress. Our

hand of friendship is stretched to all nations. I heartily welcome the Treaty of Friendship, Peace and Cooperation that we have just signed with the USSR. It is a major step in furtherance of our policy of non-alignment and I am confident the treaty will be an important factor in the maintenance of peace in this region, in Asia and throughout the world. This has indeed come at an appropriate moment in our history.

The recent elections have brought us a welcome measure of political stability. This is an achievement for which we must be thankful to the nation. what however remains to be achieved is a firm bedrock of political unity based on national consensus. For this, I have suggested in the past and suggest once again that our political parties must engage one another in constructive dialogues with open hearts and minds. Again, while facing national crisis we must, learn to sink all our party differences and place national interest uppermost.

In some parts of the country there are eruptions of violence. Some of our young people have been converted to the mistaken belief that destruction of existing institution will by itself bring in social good. May 1, as a humble worker, who has spent years in the service of the poor and the downtrodden, utter the warning that without a clear concept of the alternative system, mere destruction is suicidal and can only be self-defeating.

For building a strong economic base and an egalitarian society, it is necessary for each to contribute his mite. Equitable distribution of wealth must go hand in hand with higher productivity. If we are concerned only about equality and if we come to feel that in the socialist society we shall have the rights of the owner but not his cares and obligations we are gravely mistaken. This way would lead not to welfare through socialism, but equality in poverty. As an old trade unionist, I would strongly urge self-discipline and hard work to the men and women who work in our fields and factories, our offices and public utilities.

Our agriculture has taken a leap forward. But this should not make us complacent for the green revolution has been only in the area of wheat cultivation. We are yet to reach a comfortable balance with our requirements of rice. The pulses, raw cotton, raw jute and edible oil seeds vet remain untouched by this revolution. In raw cotton, particularly we are facing a critical shortage and we must bend our efforts to reach self-sufficiency if we are to avoid rising import bills. And in spite of our over-all advance in agriculture, we are still very much at the mercy of the vagaries of nature, with droughts in some areas and floods in others causing enormous damage.

In the industrial sphere too, there is a critical shortage of steel, while with our advantage in iron ore we ought to be exporting it. And the engineering industries, with their unlimited potential for employment opportunities have to be fully utilised.

If I speak again and again about the need for creation of job opportunities for our Youth, it is because the security of social foundation far transcends the realm of economics. While the prospect of an additional mouth to feed may be alarming, the additional two hands that are offered for work should not be kept idle. I gave the formula some time ago "Every house a cottage industry and every acre a pasture". This is not an empty slogan but is one which is capable of finding an immediate solution to our gigantic problems of poverty and unemployment. Obviously, this formula involves a very high degree of self-employment.

In view of this urgent need for expanding employment, I am happy that we are trying to plan from a new angle and making efforts at planning from below as well as from the top. Henceforward it will be planning at two levels with coordination on all sides so as to ensure the intensive partici-

143

pation of the people and the optimum utilisation of our national resources. We must harmonise the different pulls and elicit the Understanding cooperation of all sections of our people. We in this country can never afford to forget Gandhiji's unfailing talisman: "Recall the face of the poorest and weakest man who you have seen," he said, "and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it? Will it restore him control over his own life and destiny?"

Friends, we are living in a period of great stresses and strains. Troubled times are ahead and we have to make enormous sacrifices. The days of soft living are gone. We can afford no longer to lean on the cushion of foreign aid. On this auspicious day, then let us take the vow of hard-work and austere living. This is not too high a price to pay for revitalizing our culture and building a new society on the lines laid down by the leaders who won for us the freedom which we celebrate today.

USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HOME AND FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Prime Minister's Message to Indian Nationals Abroad

Following is the text of the Independence Day message from Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi to Indian nationals abroad:

On independence day, I send my greetings and good wishes to all Indian nationals abroad.

In the last year you may have had many anxious moments because of political. and economic difficulties here but I hope you have also felt pride in the fact that the

country has faced these situations with courage.

Just as we were Poised for rapid economic advance, developments across our borders have brought new tensions and entirely new problems. The denial of political rights to the People of Bangla Desh as well as of every province of West Pakistan has spread resentment all over that country against the military regime. In Bangla. Desh this unwarranted action has led to a reign of unimaginable terror. The influx of nearly eight million evacuees has imposed a heavy financial burden and has given rise to political, social and security problems for us. It is but natural that our people should feel deeply concerned about this tragedy and its impact on our country.

This is the greatest challenge we have faced since Independence. I am confident that the people of India have the capacity and courage to meet it. They have demon-Strated their unity and resolve to resist all threats to our freedom and integrity.

We expect understanding and support from all those who care for liberty and human dignity.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement in Rajya Sabha on Reported Finalisation of Plans for U.N. Team of Observers

Following is the text of the statement by the Minister of External Affairs Sardar Swaran Singh in Rajya Sabha on August 3, 1.971 regarding the reported finalisation of the plans for posting a large team of U.N. Observers in Bangla Desh and the reaction of the Government of India thereto:

Hon'ble Members must have read press reports of the U.N. Secretary-General's

144

memorandum to the President of the Security Council and his Aide Memoire, to India and Pakistan as well as our reply to the letter. Copies of these three documents are placed on the Table of the House.

As Hon'ble Members will see, we are totally opposed to the posting of any U.N. Observers on our territory. So far as the posting of observers on the Bangla Desh side is concerned, it is our considered view that the mere posting of observers in Bangla Desh, particularly on the border, is not likely to create the necessary feeling of confidence among the refugees who are now in India. What is needed is an immediate stoppage of the military atrocities so that the further influx of refugees may cease, and a political solution acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh through their already elected representatives is brought about.

The mere Posting of observers will only create a facade of action as a cover for the continuation of the present Policies of the military rulers of Pakistan and further aggravate the suffering of the people of Bangla Desh.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

India's Aide Memoire to U Thant on Observers On India - East Bengal Border

Following is the text of the Aide Memoire sent by the Government of India on August 29, 1971 to the U.N. Secretary General in reply to the Aide Memoire dated July 19, 1971 of the Secretary General of the United Nations, U. Thant on the subject of Posting of U.N. Observers on the border of India and East Bengal:

Government of India share the view of the Secretary-General that the repatriation of the refugees from East Pakistan, now in India, is a matter of utmost concern and urgency. Of even greater concern and urgency is the need to stop military atrocities in East Pakistan and the consequent daily flow of refugees into India at the rate of 40,000 to 50,000 a day. The refugees already in India are unlikely to return as long as this further exodus continues. Government of India have noted with infinite dismay and grave concern that far from encouraging return of refugees or stopping or reducing the further flow of refugees from East Pakistan to India, their number has increased by nearly four million since President Yahya Khan made his statement on the 25th May that he would agree to allow these Pakistani citizens to return to their own country.

2. The root cause of the inflow of over seven million refugees into India and the daily exodus that still continues can only be explained by the total absence of such conditions in East Pakistan as would encourage or enable the refugees to return to their homes. The chaos and the systematic military repression and the decimation of the Bengali-speaking people in East Pakistan continue unabated, as indeed is clear to any objective reader of the international Press. This has been further corrobrated by the recent reports of the World Bank and the Public statements of over 1,000 independent foreign observers who have visited East Pakistan and heard the tales of woe from the refugees themselves in their camps in India.

3. The burden on the Government of India in looking after millions of refugees, whose number is still increasing eery day, has been recognised by all. It has equally been recognised that in Pakistan efforts to cope with the results of two successive disasters. one of natural and the other manmade. are increasingly hampered by the lack of substantial progress towards political reconciliation and consequent effect on law and order and public administration in East Pakistan. An improved political atmosphere in East Pakistan is an indispensable prerequisite for the return of the refugees from India. The conflict between the principles of territorial integrity of States and selfdetermination is particularly relevant in the situation prevailing in East Pakistan where the majority of the Population is being suppressed by a minority military regime which has refused to recognise the results of the elections held by them only in December last year and had launched a

145

campaign of massacre, genocide and cultural suppression of an ethnic group, comprising 75 million people. Unless this basic cause for the influx of refugees into India is removed, all attempts to solve this problem by unrealistic experiments are bound to fail. Not only will they fail but they will tend to divert attention from the main issue and so encourage the continuation of military repression undertaken in so wide and horrifying a manner as in East Bengal.

4. Prince Sadruddin told the Prime Minister of India in New Delhi some time ago that the process and organisation of repatriation would be hampered by posting a number of personnel drawn from different parts of the world, speaking various languages with diverse backgrounds and following an assortment of techniques. UNHCR made no suggestions in the ECOSOC meeting held in Geneva on 16th July that the establishment of a limited representation of High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides of the border would in any way encourage the return of refugees to their home in East Pakistan.

- 5. In these circumstances, the Government of India are Unable to understand what pur-Pose the posting of a few men on the Indian side of the border will fulfil. Our conviction is that they can in no way help or encourage the refugees to return home and face indiscriminate and deliberate massacre by the West Pakistan military authorities. By attempting to subdue, through brute force, 75 million people of East Pakistan and by refusing to recognise political, economic, social and administrative realities of the situation Prevailing there, Pakistan Government has not only made it impossible for the refugees already in India to return, but is deliberately forcing further inflow of refugees into India.
- 6. India has no desire to prevent the refugees from returning to their homeland, indeed we are most anxious that they should go back as soon as possible and as a first step, conditions must be created in East Pakistan to prevent the further arrival of refugees into India. In this context, the Secretary General must have seen the report and statement of 30th June by the UNHCR refuting Pakistani allegation that India is obstructing the return of refugees. Prince Sadruddin is further reported to have said there was absolutely no evidence for the host Government having obstructed the refugees if they wanted to go. Again in Paris on 10th July the Prince in reply to a question said that it would not be logical to say that India was in any way holding back their return. On July 19, at Kathmandu, two volunteers of the British Organisation "War on Want" described as "rubbish" Pakistani allegation that India was holding refugees and preventing their return. At Calcutta on July 22 Mr. Manfred Cross, an Australian MP, described as "impossible" the Pakistani propaganda that refugees are being prevented in returning to Bangla Desh. Hon'ble Mr. Cornelius E. Gallagher, Member of the US House of Representatives, made a statement on the 10th of July in the House stating that "the response of the Indian Government to the crisis created by the action of the Government of Pakistan has been magnificient. They have demonstrated almost unbelievably restraint in view of the provo-

cative effects of the army's brutal sweep, and they have shown inspiring compassion to the refugees. If it can ever be said that any Government is truly moral and humanitarian, the Government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has earned that distinction in the weeks since the first refugee crossed her border. The sheer number of refugees is irrefutable evidence of the brutal policies pursued by the Government of Pakistan to crush the people who won the election-Based on interviews I conducted with a cross-section of the refugees, I now believe that a calculated attempt to crush the intellectual life of the Bengali community Occurred because of mass killings of professors, students, and everyone of any distinction by the Army. This, in MY judgement, gives credence to the charge of genocide". Apart from these and many other statements of this nature, not even a single responsible and reputable report has ever indicated that the return of refugees Or their continued inflow is due to any Other cause except the intolerable and tragic conditions Prevailing in East Bengal.

7. In this background, Government. of India must express their total opposition to the suggestion for the induction of a "limited representation of the High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides" and must categorically state that they resent any insinuation that they are preventing the

146

refugees from returning to East Bengal. They allowed them to enter India purely on humanitarian grounds in spite of the most serious impact on her social, political and economic structure. Government of India are anxious that they return as soon as possible. The presence of the United Nations or UNHCR representatives cannot help in this. On the other hand, it would only provide a facade of action to divert world attention from the root cause of the problem which is the continuation of military atrocities, leading to further influx of refugees and absence of a political settlement acceptable to the people of East Pakistan-and their already elected leaders.

- 8. The UNHCR has a fairly strong team of senior officers located in Delhi and they have been given every facility to visit refugee camps. In fact, Mr. Thomas Jaimeson, Director of Operations of the UNHCR who is the Chief Representative of the UNHCR's office in India, has recently returned from a second tour of the refugee camps. He was allowed access to all the refugee camps and was given facilities to visit these camps including those in the border areas. Apart from this a thousand foreign observers have visited these refugee camps, and most of them have publicly stated that the refugees have taken shelter in India from the military oppression in Bangla Desh and are not willing to return unless suitable conditions are created ensuring their safe return through a political settlement with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the acknowledged leader of East Pakistan and his already elected colleagues. In the light of the information available to Government of India and to the interested Governments and organisations, they have painfully come to the conclusion that the time is past when international community can continue to stand by, watching the situation deteriorate and merely hoping that the relief programmes, humanitarian efforts, posting of a few people here and there, and good intentions would be enough to turn the tide of human misery and potential disaster.
- 9. While, therefore, the Government of India have no wish to lend their support to any proposal which will deflect attention from the basic problem or diffuse concern from the fate of the unfortunate refugees they would welcome any action by the United Nations which would ensure and guarantee, under adequate international supervision, that the refugees lands, houses and property will be returned to them in East Pakistan and that conditions are created there to ensure the safe return under credible international guarantees without threat of reprisal or other measures of repression from the military authorities of West Pakistan. It is painful to note that even the handful of refugees who ventured to return to East Bengal have not only been not allowed to go back to their homes and

villages but have been subjected to endless indignities and inequities and even made to do forced labour and face many other difficulties. Government of India should like to draw the 'Secretary General's attention in this context to the New York Times report and photographs published on the 27th july, 1971. In these circumstances it is unrealistic to hope that these circumstances will begin to be changed by the posting of any personnel on the Indian side of the border. The Government of India cannot support such a facade of action in the full knowledge that it is unrealistic, unhelpful and even dangerous. They find therefore the proposal totally unacceptable.

10. The crux of the problem is the situation inside East Bengal where an army from a distant territory is exercising control by sheer force and brutality. If - the international community is serious about the need for return of refugees to East Bengal the first step that has to be taken is to restore conditions of normalcy inside East Pakistan through a political settlement acceptable to the people of East Bengal and their already elected leaders, and take such internationally credible measures as would assure the refugees their safe return without reprisals etc.

147

INDIA USA PAKISTAN SWITZERLAND FRANCE NEPAL AUSTRALIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDONESIA

Joint Communique on External Affairs Minister's Visit

Following is the text of Joint Com-

munique issued at the end of the visit of Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of external Affairs, Government of India, to Indonesia, from 12th to 15th August, 1971:

At the invitation of His Excellency
Adam Malik, Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Indonesia, His Excellency
Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External
Affairs of the Republic of India paid a visit
to Indonesia from the 12th to 15th August,
1971. He was accompanied by Mr. P. N.
Menon, Secretary to the Government of
India, Ministry of External Affairs, Mr. R. D.
Sathe, Joint Secretary of the Ministry of
External Affairs and Mr. E. Gonsalves, Joint
Secretary of the South East Asia Division
of the Ministry of External Affairs.

During his visit the Minister of External Affairs of India was received by His Excellency President Soeharto. He had talks with His Excellency General A. H. Nasution, Chairman of the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly, His Excellency Adam Malik, Minister for Foreign Affairs and His Excellency Dr. Sjarif Thayeb, Deputy Speaker of Parliament. At these talks the Minister of External Affairs of India was assisted by members of his Delegation and by His Excellency N. B. Menon, Ambassador of India to Indonesia.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia was assisted by Mr. R. B. I. N. Djajadiningrat, Director General for Political Affairs of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Ismael Thajeb, Director General for External Economic Affairs of the Department of, Foreign Affairs, Mr. Her Tashing, Director General for Security and Communication of the Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. A. B. Lubis, Director of the Foreign Minister's Cabinet and Mr. Nurmathias, Director for Asian and pacific Affairs of the Department of Foreign Affairs.

Discussions between the two Foreign Ministers were held in an atmosphere of cordiality and understanding and covered a wide range of subjects of common interest and various recent developments in international affairs. Among the subjects on which there was a mutual exchange of views were the situation in South East Asia, the Indian Ocean, cooperation among non-aligned nations, the recent treaty of peace, friend-ship and cooperation concluded between India and the Soviet Union and regional economic cooperation.

In discussing the problems of the region both sides reaffirmed their belief in the policy of non-alignment as an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world. This is particularly appropriate in the present conditions prevailing in Asia where the people of each country should be left to determine their destiny free from outside interference. They recognize the need for consolidating the sovereignty and independence of all nonaligned nations in this region in the spirit of the Declaration of the Lusaka Summit. They reaffirmed their belief that recent developments in Asia had made it necessary for those countries of South and South East Asia following a policy of nonalignment to strengthen their by mutual consultation and agreement directed towards creating a climate for peace, security and stability. It was also desirable for all non-aligned countries to continue to meet frequently to further the policies laid down at the Lusaka Summit.

The two Foreign Ministers discussed the situation arising out of the flow, of refugees into India from East Pakistan and expressed concern at the tragic events which had led to this situation. They agreed on the urgent need to work for the creation of such conditions as would be conducive for the return of the refugees to their homes.

The Minister for External Affairs of India conveyed the appreciation of the Prime Minister of India for the message

148

received from the President of Indonesia in this connection, expressing his abiding concern over the humanitarian problem involved, and conveying that the Government of Indonesia will spare no effort to assist whenever possible in the attainment of peaceful and stable conditions in this part of the world.

They affirmed the view already expressed at previous meetings that the problems of Indo-China could only be resolved through a peaceful political settlement through negotiations which will enable the people of those states to decide their future free from foreign interference.

In reviewing the bilateral relations between the two countries both Foreign Ministers emphasised the need to make continuous efforts to promote the existing good relations between the two countries in various fields.

The two Ministers also reviewed bilateral cooperation within the framework of the Cultural and Educational Agreement of 1955. They noted with satisfaction the increased exchanges that have taken place during the past two years and agreed to continue efforts to expand the scope of mutually beneficial cooperation in the fields of education, science, technology and culture.

The two Foreign Ministers noted with pleasure the increasing bilateral exchanges between the leaders of the two countries in a great variety of fields and felt that this development should continue to grow so that the relations between the two countries would grow ever deeper and stronger. In this connection they reviewed the programmes for economic and cultural cooperation between "the two countries. The two Foreign Ministers discussed arrangements to identify areas of economic and technical cooperation, for the promotion of trade and development of joint industrial ventures.

The Foreign Ministers reaffirmed the need to intensify the concrete steps being taken towards achieving the goal of regional economic cooperation. In this connection they paid tribute to the initiatives being taken by the Asian Council of Ministers of ECAFE.

The Foreign Ministers recognized the need to intensify cooperation in all fields of economic and social activity at international forums, on the basis of the principles and conclusions of the First and Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the provisions of the Charter of Algiers, and the Objectives of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

The Foreign Minister of India expressed his sincere thanks and appreciation to the warm welcome and cordial hospitality accorded to him and his party during his visit to Indonesia. He extended an invitation to the Foreign Minister of Indonesia to visit India.

INDONESIA INDIA USA MALI ZAMBIA PERU PAKISTAN CHINA ALGERIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Indo-Nepal Treaty of Trade and Transit

Following is the text of the Treaty of Trade and Transit between the Government of India and His Majesty's Government of Nepal, signed in Kathmandu on August 13, 1971:

The Government of India and His Majesty's Government of Nepal (hereinafter referred to as the Contracting Parties),

Being conscious of the need to fortify the traditional connection between the markets of the two countries, Being animated by the desire to strengthen economic cooperation between them, and Impelled by the urge to develop their economies for their several and mutual benefit,

149

Have resolved to conclude a treaty of Trade and Transit in order to expand trade between their respective territories, encourage collaboration in economic development and facilitate transit of trade with

Have for this purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries the following persons, namely,

THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA SHRI LALIT NARAIN MISHRA, MINISTER OF FOREIGN TRADE

HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT OF NEPAL

SHRI NAVA RAJ SUBEDI, MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

who, having exchanged their full powers and found them good and in due form, have agreed as follows:

TRADE

ARTICLE I

The Contracting Parties shall promote the expansion and diversification of mutual trade in goods originating in the two countries and shall to this end endeavour to make available to each other commodities which one country needs from the other.

ARTICLE II

Both the Contracting Parties shall accord unconditionally to each other treatment no less favourable than that accorded to any third country with respect to (a) customs duties and charges of any kind imposed on or in connection with importation and exportation, and (b) import regulations including quantitative restrictions

ARTICLE III

Notwithstanding the provisions of

.

Article II and subject to such exceptions as may be made after consultation with His Majesty's Government of Nepal, the Government of India, with a view to providing the primary producers of Nepal access to the Indian market, agree to exempt from customs duty and quantitative restrictions such primary products as are produced in Nepal and imported into India.

ARTICLE IV

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article II, and subject to such exceptions as may be made after consultation with His Majesty's Government of Nepal, the Government of India agree to promote the industrial development of Nepal through the grant on the basis of non-reciprocity, of specially favourable treatment to imports into India of industrial products manufactured in Nepal in respect of customs duty and quantitative restrictions normally applicable to them.

ARTICLE V

With a view to facilitate greater interchange of goods between the two countries, His Majesty's Government shall endeavour to exempt, wholly or partially, imports from India from customs duties and quantitative restrictions to the maximum extent compatible with their development needs and protection of their industries.

ARTICLE VT

Payments for transactions between the two countries will continue to be made in accordance with their respective foreign exchange laws, rules and regulations. The Contracting Parties agree to consult each other in the event of either of them experiencing difficulties in their mutual transactions with a view to resolving such difficulties.

ARTICLE VII

The Contracting Parties agree to co-

operate effectively with each other, to prevent infringement and circumvention of the laws, rules and regulations of either country in regard to matters relating to foreign exchange and foreign trade.

TRANSIT ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting Parties shall accord to "traffic in transit" freedom of transit across their respective territories through routes mutually agreed upon.

Each Contracting Party Shall have the right to take all indispensable measures to

150

ensure that such freedom, accorded by it on its territory, does not in any way infringe its legitimate interests of any kind.

ARTICLE IX

The term "traffic in transit" means the passage of goods including unaccompanied baggage across the territory of a Contracting Party when the passage is a portion of a complete journey which begins or terminates within the territory of the other Contracting Party. The transhipment, warehousing, breaking bulk and change in the mode of transport of such goods as well as the assembly, disassembly or re-assembly of machinery and bulky goods shall not render the passage of goods outside the definition of "traffic in transit" provided any such operation is undertaken solely for the convenience of transportation. Nothing in this article shall be construed as imposing an obligation on either Contracting Party to establish or permit the establishment of permanent facilities on its territory for such assembly, disassembly or re-assembly.

ARTICLE X

Traffic in transit shall be exempt from customs duty and from all transit duties or other charges except reasonable charges for transportation and such other charges as are commensurate with the costs of services rendered in respect of such transit.

ARTICLE XI

For convenience of traffic in transit, the Government of India agree to provide at point or points of entry or exit, on such terms as may be mutually, agreed upon and subject to relevant laws and regulations prevailing in India, warehouses or sheds for the storage of transit an-go awaiting customs clearance before onward transmission.

ARTICLE XII

The procedure to be followed for traffic in transit to or from third countries is laid down in the Protocol hereto annexed. Except in case of failure to comply with the procedure prescribed, such traffic in transit shall not be subjected to avoidable delays or restrictions.

ARTICLE XIII

Passage of goods from one place to another in the territories of one Contracting Party through the territories of the other Party shall be subject to such arrangements as may be mutually agreed upon.

ARTICLE XIV

The freedom of transit shall apply to goods required by each Contracting Party and to goods available for export from that Party, but shall not extend to the products of the other Contracting Party. Subject to such exceptions as may be mutually agreed upon, each Contracting Party shall prohibit and take effective measures, and cooperate with the other, to prevent

- (a) re-exports from its territory to third countries of goods imported from the other Contracting Party and products which contain materials imported from the other Contracting Party exceeding 50% of the ex-factory value of such products:
 - (b) re-exports to the territory of the

other Contracting Party of goods imported from third countries and of products which contain imports from third countries exceeding 50% of the ex-factory value of such goods.

ARTICLE XV

In order, to enjoy the freedom of the high seas, merchant ships sailing under the flag of Nepal shall be accorded, subject to Indian laws and regulations, treatment no less favourable than that accorded to ships of any other foreign country in respect of matters relating to navigation, entry into and departure from the ports, use of ports and harbour facilities, as well as loading and unloading dues, taxes and other levies, except that the provisions of this Article shall not extend to coasting trade.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE XVI

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, either Contracting Party may main-

151

tain or introduce such restrictions as are necessary for the purpose of:

- (a) protecting public morals,
- (b) protecting human, animal and plant life
- (c) safeguarding national treasures,
- (d) safeguarding the implementation of laws relating to the import and export of gold and silver bullion,
- (c) safeguarding such other interests as may be mutually agreed upon.

ARTICLE XVII

Nothing in this Treaty shall prevent either Contracting Party from taking any measures which may be necessary for the protection of its essential security interests or in pursuance of general international conventions, whether already in existence or concluded hereafter, to which it is a party relating to transit, export or import of particular kinds of articles such as opium or other dangerous drugs or in pursuance of general conventions intended to prevent infringement of industrial literary or artistic property or relating to false marks, false indications of origin or other methods of unfair competition.

ARTICLE XVIII

The Contracting Parties shall take appropriate measures to ensure that the provisions of this Treaty are effectively and harmoniously implemented and to consult with each other periodically so that such difficulties as may arise in its implementation are resolved satisfactorily and speedily.

ARTICLE XIX

This Treaty shall come into force on the fifteenth day of August 1971 and shall remain in force for a Period of five years. it may be renewed for a further period of five years by mutual consent, subject to such modifications as may be agreed upon.

Done in duplicate in Hindi, Nepali and English languages all the texts being equally authentic at Kathmandu on the thirteenth day of August one thousand nine hundred and seventy one, corresponding to the twenty-eighth day of Shravana, Bikram Samvat two thousand and twenty eight. In case of doubt, the English text will prevail.

Sd.- L. N. Mishra Sd.- Nava Raj Subedi for the Government for His Majesty's of India. Government of Nepal.

NEPAL INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

Joint Communique

Following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in Kathmandu on August 13, 1971 on the occasion of signing of the new Trade and Transit Treaty with Nepal:

At the Invitation of Ms Majesty's Government of Nepal, Shri Lalit Narain Mishra, Minister of Foreign Trade of the Government of India visited Kathmandu on August 12 and 13, 1971. At the conclusion of the visit, a Treaty of Trade and Transit between India and Nepal was signed by Shri Mishra on behalf of the Government of India and Hon'ble Shri Nava Raj Subedi on behalf of His Majesty's Government of Nepal. During his stay in Kathmandu, India's Foreign Trade Minister was received in audience by His Majesty the King. Shri Mishra also called on the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister.

The Treaty was concluded at the end of negotiations which commenced in Kathmandu on August 4, between an Indian Delegation led by Shri Harivansh Lal, Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade, Government of India and Nepalese Delegation led by Dr. Pushkar Nath Panth, Secretary, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, His Majesty's Government of Nepal. The Indian Delegation included Shri K. S. Raghupathi, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade; Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Shri M. G. Abrol, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance, Dr. I. P. Singh and Shri S. C. Prabhu, Counsellors, Embassy of India, Kathmandu, Shri N. R. Varma, Deputy Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Shri D. Kamath, Assistant Legal Adviser, and Shri

152

R. S. Verma, Officer on Special Duty, Ministry of Foreign Trade.

The Nepalese Delegation included Professor Yadunath Khanal, Secretary to His Majesty's Government: Mr. Nayan Raj Pandey, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Industry and Commerce; Mr. Nara Kanta Adhikar Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance; Mr. Tribbuwan Pratap Rana, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Law; Mr. Laxmi Lal Shrestha, Director, Industries; Mr. Raja Sunder Sainju, Director of Commerce; Mr. Kedar Prasad Acharya, Customs Liaison Officer, Calcutta; Mr. Kedar Prasad Koirala, Under Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Mr. Siva Shumshere Rana, First Secretary, Royal Nepalese Embassy, New Delhi and Dr. Nidhendra Raj Sharma, Director, Trade Promotion Centre.

His Excellency Shri L. P., Singh, Ambassador of India to Nepal and His Excellency Sardar Bhim Bahadur Pande, Royal Nepalese Ambassador to India were also present during the discussions.

The discussions were held in a cordial atmosphere and in a spirit of deep understanding of each other's problems and of mutual cooperation. The new Treaty of Trade and Transit which comes into force on August 15, 1971 will remain in force for a period of five years. It may be renewed for a further period of five years, subject to mutual consent and such modifications as may be agreed upon.

The new Treaty embodies the desire of the two countries to strengthen economic cooperation between them and to develop their economies for their several and mutual benefit and to facilitate transit of trade with third countries.

In the field of trade, the Treaty aims at the expansion and diversification of the mutual trade of the two countries in goods produced in their territories.

The Most Favoured-Nation Treatment will be accorded by the two countries to each other's products. In addition, the primary products of Nepal will have unrestricted entry into Indian market, exempt from cus-

toms duty.

Besides, in order to promote the industrial development of Nepal, India has extended specially favourable treatment on a non-reciprocal basis to manufactured articles of Nepal made from Nepalese, and Indian materials. These manufactured articles will have access to the entire Indian market without any quantitative restrictions and will be exempt from customs duty.

Concessions in excise duty available to small units in India will also be available to products imported from small units in Nepal.

Other manufactured articles which may have third-country materials will receive favourable treatment, if the value of Nepalese material and labour added is at least 50% of the ex-factory value of the product. The nature and extent of access to the Indian market and the tariff preference to be given to such products will be decided on the merits of each case, having regard to all relevant factors.

While His Majesty's Government of Nepal will be free to impose import duties on Indian products on the most favoured nation basis, it has been agreed that where excise and other duties have been collected by the Government of India, such duties will be refunded direct to His Majesty's Government of Nepal to the extent of the import duty chargeable in Nepal.

Both India and Nepal have agreed to cooperate effectively with each other to prevent infringement and circumvention of foreign exchange and foreign trade laws and regulations. An understanding has been reached on the areas of cooperation to prevent deflection of trade. Each country will prohibit the export from its territory of the products of the other country, as also of products made mainly from raw materials of the other country and will take effective measures to enforce the ban. Similarly, reexports to the other country of goods imported from third-countries and all goods which contain material from third countries in excess of 50% of the ex-factory value of

the goods are prohibited.

Provision has been made in the Treaty for mutually acceptable overland routes to be used by the two countries, within the framework of regional cooperation agreements among the countries concerned.

The new Treaty also provides for transport of goods between Calcutta and Nepal

153

by road. The warehousing and other facilities available to Nepal will be considerably augmented. Customs procedures have been simplified.

In signing the Treaty, the two Ministers recalled the unique character of the trading arrangements between the two countries and of the need to ensure that the availability of a large and growing market to a land-locked developing country is not jeopardised by the abuse of facilities provided in the new Treaty.

The Nepalese Minister of industry and Commerce extended a hearty welcome to the Hon'ble Minister of Foreign Trade and expressed his appreciation for his contribution to the conclusion of the Treaty.

The Indian Minister of Foreign Trade thanked the Hon'ble Minister of Industry and Commerce of His Majesty's Government of Nepal for the warmth and cordiality shown to him and to his colleagues in the Indian Delegation during their stay in Kathmandu and for the hospitality extended in such abundant measure.

NEPAL USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

Shri L. N. Mishra's Speech at Signing Ceremony

Speaking after the signing of the new Treaty of Trade and Transit between India and Nepal in Kathmandu on August 13, 1971, the Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra said:

We meet here this morning in this ancient city of Kathmandu for the conclusion of the Trade and Transit Treaty between the two friendly countries of Nepal and India. In the process we dedicate ourselves to the commitments enshrined in the Preamble of the Treaty for fortifying the traditional connections between the markets of the two countries in our urge to strengthen economic cooperation between us for mutual benefit of the twin economies of Nepal and India.

It was about eleven years ago in this very city that we entered, for the first time, into an arrangement of this kind and by which we replaced the old Treaty of Trade and Commerce. No trade treaty, howsoever perfect, can serve the commercial and economic interests of any country for all times to come, much less a treaty between two countries involved in the process of rapid transformation in an attempt to guarantee to their people a minimum standard of life consistent with human dignity.

The process of negotiations has been an attempt to reconcile the dynamic changes which have taken place in the economies of the two countries over the last decade.

When we are in a process of rapid economic changes, any contemporary explanation on how well an old arrangement has worked and how closely it has fulfilled the objectives for which it was initially conceived, would be liable to different interpretations. Fortunately it has all ended

happily.

The meaning of close cooperation does not imply a close agreement on all the points. As our great leader, Jawaharlal Nehru, who strengthened the foundations of our ancient friendship, put it fifteen years ago. speaking in this very city of Kathmandu, and I quote, obviously it is expected of both Nepal and India that we help each other and cooperate with each other to the extent they can and the important thing is the feeling behind such cooperation. This does not mean that one accepts all that the other says. This is not the meaning of friendship between two countries. But it is necessary that our hearts should be clear, that we should look at each other with eyes of love and trust each other.

Today we pass on from a stage of negotiations to a stage of implementation. What will matter from now on is not the difficulties which went into the making of this Treaty but the cooperative endeavour in which we implement this Treaty.

On the threshold of the Seventies, we are witnessing the individual and global

154

efforts of the Third world to evolve a programme of action for bringing about rapid economic changes commensurate with the needs and aspirations of the people of developing countries.

In India over the years we have endeavoured through a definite programme of action to accelerate our rate of economic development so as to bring a substantial improvernent in the per capita income of our people within a short span of time.

Your Excellency, you are no doubt aware that with the confidence and an over-whelming mandate of the electorate of India in the programme of our Prime Minister, Smt. Indira Gandhi, we are committed to a Policy of economic development coupled with social justice. Our Government is pledged to strengthen and, where-ever necessary, introduce measures to bring about rapid transformation of the social

system within the framework of democracy and socialism. We are convinced that the lamentable situation in which limited sectors of population stay in affluence while the larger part suffers from abject poverty, not only contributes to the aggravation of social tensions but adversely affects the prospects of stable economic growth. In pursuance of this policy we have already taken steps for assigning to the public sector an increasing and more predominant role in the management of our external trade.

The problems of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have a degree of identity which distinguishes them from the characteristics of a developed country. However. the Problems of the two developing countries of India and Nepal have even a greater degree of identity - we have the common problems of improving our agricultural output, common problems of rural unemployment, diversification of our industrial structure and the compelling need to guarantee a pace of progress which is in consonance with the needs and aspirations of our people. It is no doubt true that in the solution of some of these problems India is in a somewhat advanced stage. We are anxious to join you in the constructive partnership to solve these problems which are of common concern to both of us. The need for constructive partnership exists not only in the field of trade and commerce but covers the wider field of economic policy ranging from joint ventures in the Industrial field, measures for industrial diversi. fication and the diffusion of technological knowledge and skills.

I can assure you, Your Excellency, that our Prime Minister is anxious to emphasize that the inter-dependence of the interest and the common destiny of the people of India and Nepal are based on considerations which are larger than matters of technical detail, or for that matter, any cooperation restricted to the field of trade and commerce. From a larger point of view and in the long run it is these wider and more vital considerations which govern the basis of our cooperative endeavour and our common design to achieve a rapid and more balanced deve-

lopment of the two countries.

The relationship between India and Nepal is shrouded in antiquity and the bonds of geography, history and culture have been strengthened through the ages. Because we are so close, utterances of this kind may sound too formal. I say this with some feeling because in a small way I have been associated with the joint endeavour of Nepal and India to improve their economic conditions since over a decade. You might be aware, Your Excellency, of my close association with the mobilisation of public support for the execution of Kosi Project which has brought benefit to both Nepal and India.

We have throughout admired the untiring effort of the people and Government of Nepal to effect rapid economic advancement. It is clear that it is in our mutual interest to widen and deepen our areas of cooperation for the mutual benefit of the peoples of the two countries and for the benefit of this region as a whole.

In this process, we may be often confronted with the difficulties but I again take comfort in what Shri Jawaharlal Nehru said, and I quote "It is obvious that sometimes when two countries are faced with different problems, such problems have to be solved by them separately. It is the mark of the nation's freedom that it should take its own decisions and that nothing is done that would create difficulties in taking these decisions. But, as I have said, history, culture and so many things have so moulded us together that the ties become unbreakable.

155

By concluding this Treaty today, we have tied one more firm knot to the existing ties which have moulded us together. It is my hope and conviction that our deeds would justify our words and our acts in implementing this Treaty will justify the trust and value of constructive cooperation between us.

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi's Message to Heads of Government

The Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, addressed the following message to Heads of Government on August 10, 1971:,

Government and people of India as well as our Press and Parliament are greatly perturbed by the reported statement of President Yahya Khan that he is going to start secret military trial of Mujibur Rahman without affording him any foreign legal assistance. We apprehend that this so-called trial will be used only as a cover to execute Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. This will aggravate the situation in East Bengal and will create a serious situation in India because of the strong feelings of our people and all political parties. Hence our grave anxiety. We appeal to you to exercise. your influence with President Yahya Khan to take a realistic view in the larger interest of the peace and stability of this region.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

The Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, sent the following message to the UN Secretary-General, U Thant, on August 10, 1971:

We are distressed and shocked at the announcement made in Rawalpindi that they propose to commence Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's trial from tomorrow. This announcement comes in the wake of the several categorical statements which have lately emanated from President Yahya Khan about Sheikh's culpability in waging war against Pakistan and in having indulged in treasonous activities Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is an outstanding leader of his people, much beloved and much respected. His victory at the polls in December 1970 was perhaps the most magnificent one, in any similar election eny where in the world, in recent years. Our people, press, Parliament and Government are all convinced that the problems which have been created for us by Pakistani action in East Bengal will be multiplied ten-fold if the Government of Pakistan do something precipitate and extreme in the context of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's life and welfare. We would like to appeal to Your Excellency to take urgent steps to request Government of Pakistan not to take this action which is certain to make their difficulties and ours very much worse. Anything they do to Mujib now will have grave and perilous consequences.

156

PAKISTAN USA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in Lok Sabha on Reported Pakistan President's Statement on Mujibur Rahman

Following is the Statement by the Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, in Lok Sabha on August 9, 1971 regarding the reported statement by President Yahya Khan of Pakistan that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman may be executed:

Government view with grave concern press reports of President Yahva Khan's statement that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman would be "court martialled" and that he could not say whether or not the Sheikh would be alive when the so-called Pakistan National Assembly meets. President Yahya Khan himself had, in one of his earlier statements, referred to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman as "the future Prime Minister of Pakistan". As the leader of the Awami League Party which won 167 of the 169 seats to the National Assembly from Bangla Desh, and thus had a clear majority of votes in the National Assembly of Pakistan, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman held a unique position as the acknowledged leader not only of East Pakistan, but of the whole of Pakistan. What happened after the 25th of March this year is known to the whole world. The denial of the verdict of the people and letting loose of military oppression and trampling on the fundamental human rights of the people of Bangla Desh stand self-condemned. Instead of respecting the verdict of the people and acknowledging Sheikh Mujibur Rahman as the elected and undisputed leader of Bangla Desh, the Pakistan Government has launched a reign of terror and carried out a calculated plan of genocide, the like of which has not been seen in recent times. To stage a farcical trial against Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is a gross violation of human rights and deserves to be condemned by the whole world.

We have repeatedly expressed our concern for the safety and welfare of Sheikh

Mujibur Rahman and his family who also are under house arrest or in prison. We have conveyed our concern to foreign governments and asked them to exercise their influence on the Government of Pakistan in this regard. Should any harm be caused to the person of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman or his family and colleagues, the present situation in Bangla Desh will be immeasurably aggravated and the present Pakistani rulers will be solely responsible for the consequences. We share the concern expressed by about 500 Members of Parliament in this regard. We appeal to the conscience of humanity to raise their voice against the action that the President of Pakistan proposes to take. We express our condemnation of the proposed action and warn the Government of Pakistan of its serious consequences.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Rajya Sabha Statement on Pak Threat to Execute Mujibur Rahman

Following is the text of the statement by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shri Surendra Pal Singh in Rajya Sabha on August 12, 1971 regarding the trial of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman by the military authorities of Pakistan and the threat giver, by President Yahya Khan that the Sheikh may be executed:

According to reports, the trial by court martial of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman has started in West Pakistan on the 11th August for "waging war against Pakistan". This trial is being held in camera without allowing any foreign legal assistance to him.

Earlier, in the course of several statements, President Yahya Khan had warned that the punishment could include death penalty and that he could not say whether or not the Sheikh would be alive when the so-called Pakistan National Assembly meets. Government view with grave concern these developments. President Yahya Khan himself had, in one of his earlier statements,

157

referred to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman as "the future Prime Minister of Pakistan". As the leader of the Awami League Party which won 167 of the 169 seats to the National Assembly from Bangla Desh and thus had a clear majority of votes in the National Assembly of Pakistan, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman held a unique position as the acknowledged leader not only of Bangla Desh but of the whole of Pakistan. What happened after the 25th of March this year is known to the whole world. The denial of the verdict of the people and letting loose of military oppression and trampling on the fundamental human rights of the people of Bangla Desh stand self-condemned. Instead of respecting the verdict of the people and acknowledging Sheikh Mujibur Rahman as the elected and undisputed leader of Bangla Desh, the Pakistan Government has launched a reign of terror and carried out a calculated plan of genocide, the like of which has not been seen in recent times. To stage a farcical trial against Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is a gross violation of human rights and deserves to be condemned by the whole world.

We have repeatedly expressed our concern for the safety and welfare of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his family who also are under house arrest or in prison. We have conveyed our deep anxiety and concern to the Secretary General of the United Nations and foreign governments and asked them to exercise their influence on the Government of Pakistan in this regard. Should any harm be caused to the person of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman or his family and colleagues, the present situation in Bangla Desh will be immeasurably aggra-

vated and the present Pakistani rulers will be solely responsible for the consequences We share the concern expressed by all members of Parliament in this regard. We appeal to the conscience of humanity to raise its voice against the action that the President of Pakistan is taking. We express our condemnation of the action and warn the Government of Pakistan of its serious consequences.

PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

RUMANIA

Indo-Rumanian Economic Talks

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on August 7, 1971 on the conclusion of Indo-Rumanian talks:

A Rumanian Economic Delegation, led by Mr. Nicolae Nicolae, First Deputy Foreign Trade Minister of Rumania, visited India from July 26, 1971 to August 6, 1971.

The Delegation had discussions with the Ministry of Foreign Trade and other economic ministries/departments of the Government of India, as also with the State Trading Organisations and with some private enterprises.

During the discussions, a review was made of the present state of implementation of the Trade Plan provisions for 1971.

The possibilities for further expansion of the trade between the two countries during the current year and the following years were examined.

Both sides expressed satisfaction at the development of trade exchanges between the two countries and agreed that there were considerable potentialities for further development of the economic relations and of the industrial and economic cooperation between the two countries.

The Rumanian Delegation left this morning.

158

INDIA USA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Foreign Minister Of U.S.S.R. Mr. Gromyko's Statement on Arrival

Following is the statement at the Airport by the Foreign Minister of USSR, Mr. Gromyko on arrival in New Delhi on August 8, 1971:

In reply to the invitation by the Indian Government and in reply to the visit of the Indian Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh to Moscow we have come to friendly India on an official visit. I wish to express the hope that the forthcoming exchange of views and talks with Indian leaders will be fruitful and useful, that they will promote the cause of further developing and deepening the friendly cooperation between our two countries. That corresponds to the interests of the Soviet and Indian peoples, to the interests of the consolidation of peace in Asia and throughout the world.

I take this opportunity to convey our greetings to the citizens of Delhi and to all the Indian people.

USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Statement by Foreign Minister in, Parliament on. the Indo-USSR Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation,

The following statement was laid on the table of both Houses of Parliament on August 9, 1971 by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs,

I have the honour to lay on the Table of the House a copy of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation, signed today by me on behalf of the Government of India with Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Foreign Minister of the USSR Government, who has signed it on behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Government welcome this Treaty as a further step towards strengthening friendship and co-operation between India and the Soviet Union. The Treaty will, we are convinced, provide a stabilising factor in favour of peace, security and development not only of our two countries, but the region as a whole. It is not aimed against any third country. In fact, we hope that this Treaty will provide a pattern for similar treaties between India and other countries in this region. Such treaties between countries of this region would stabilise peace and strengthen their independence and sovereignty.

I should like to emphasise in particular

that this Treaty is, in its true sense, a Treaty of peace. It strengthens our policy of non-alignment, respect for which is expressly mentioned in the Treaty. We sincerely hope that the policy of non-alignment will be futher strengthened and will become an effective instrument for the safeguarding of our national interests as well as an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world.

It is a Treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation. It is also a Treaty of nonaggression. It further provides a credible assurance that in the event of an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such a threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries. This should act as a deterrent to any powers that may have aggressive designs on our territorial integrity and sovereignty. It is, therefore, in essence, a Treaty of Peace against War.

Sir, the world is presenting a rapidly changing and dynamic picture. There is a change in the configuration of various world

159

forces. Our policy of non-alignment is a dynamic policy which can be adapted to these changing situations. I should like to assure Hon'ble Members that our policy of peace stands firm as ever. We have no designs on the territory of other countries. At the same time, we shall not tolerate aggression or threat of aggression from any country. We do not want to provoke war with any country. We shall do everything in our power to defend peace and prevent war.

Following is the text of the Treaty: TREATY OF PEACE, FRIENDSHIP AND CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE REPUBLIC OF INDIA AND THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

DESIROUS of expanding and consoli-

dating the existing relations of sincere friendship between them,

BELIEVING that the further development of friendship and cooperation meets the basic national interests of bath the States as well as the interests of lasting peace in Asia and the world,

DETERMINED to promote the consolidation of universal peace and security and to make steadfast efforts for the relaxation of international tensions and the final elimination of the remnants of colonialism,

UPHOLDING their firm faith in the principles of peaceful coexistence and cooperation between States with different political and social systems,

CONVINCED that in the world today international problems can only be solved by cooperation and not by conflict,

REAFFIRMING their determination to abide by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter,

The Republic of India on the one side, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the other side,

HAVE decided to conclude the present Treaty, for which purpose the following Plenipotentiaries have been appointed:

On behalf of the Republic of India: Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, On behalf of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs,

who, having each presented their Credentials, which are found to be in proper form and due order,

HAVE AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

ARTICLE I

The High Contracting Parties solemnly

declare that enduring peace and friendship shall prevail between the two countries and their peoples. Each Party shall respect the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the other Party and refrain from, interfering in the other's internal affairs. The High Contracting Parties shall continue to develop and consolidate the relations of sincere friendship, good neighbourliness and comprehensive cooperation existing between them on the basis of the aforesaid principles as well as those of equality and mutual benefit.

ARTICLE II

Guided by the desire to contribute in every possible way to ensure enduring peace and security of their people, the High Contracting Parties declare their determination to continue their efforts to preserve and to strengthen peace in Asia and throughout the world, to halt the arms race and to achieve general and complete disarmament, including both nuclear and conventional, under effective international control.

ARTICLE III

Guided by their loyalty 'to the lofty ideal of equality of all peoples and Nations, irrespective of race or creed, the High Contracting Parties condemn colonialism and racialism in all forms and manifestations, and reaffirm their determination to strive for their final and complete elimination.

The High Contracting Parties shall cooperate with other States to achieve these aims and to support the just aspirations of

160

the peoples in their struggle against colonialism and racial domination.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of India respects the peace loving policy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics aimed at strengthening friendship and co-operation with all nations.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

respects India's policy of non-alignment and reaffirms that this policy constitutes an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world.

ARTICLE V

Deeply interested in ensuring universal peace and security, attaching great importance to their mutual cooperation' in the international field for achieving those aims, the High Contracting Parties will maintain regular contacts with each other on major international Problems affecting the interests of both the States by means of meetings and exchanges of views between their leading statesmen, visits by official. delegations and special envoys of the two Governments, and through diplomatic channels.

ARTICLE VI

Attaching great importance to economic, scientific and technological co-operation between them, the High Contracting Parties will continue to consolidate and expand mutually advantageous and comprehensive co-operation in these fields as well as expand trade, transport and communications between them on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual benefit and mostfavoured-nation treatment, subject to the existing agreements and the special arrangements with contiguous countries as specified in the Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement of December 26, 1970.

ARTICLE VII

The High Contracting Parties shall promote further development of ties and contacts between them in the fields of science, art, literature, education, public health, press,- radio, television, cinema, tourism and sports.

ARTICLE VIII

In accordance with the traditional friendship established between the two

countries each of the High Contracting Parties solemnly declares that it shall not enter into or participate in any military alliance directed against the other party.

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other Party and to prevent the use of its territory for the commission of any act which might inflict military damage on the other High Contracting Party.

ARTICLE IX

Each High Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from providing any assistance to any third party that engages in armed conflict with the other Party. In the event of either Party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries.

ARTICLE X

Each High Contracting Party solemnly declares that it shall not enter into any obligation, secret or public, with one or more states, which is incompatible with this Treaty. Each High Contracting Party further declares that no obligation exists, nor shall any obligation be entered into, between itself and any other State or States, which might cause military damage to the other Party.

ARTICLE XI

This Treaty is concluded for the duration of twenty years and will be automatically extended for each successive period of five years unless either High Contracting Party declares its desire to terminate it by giving notice to the other High Contracting Party twelve months prior to the expiration of the Treaty. The Treaty will be subject to ratification and will come into force on the date of the exchange of Instruments of Ratification which will take place in Moscow within one month of the signing of this Treaty.

ARTICLE XII

Any difference of interpretation of any Article or Articles of this Treaty which may arise between the High Contracting Parties will be settled bilaterally by peaceful means in a spirit of mutual respect and understanding.

The said Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty in Hindi, Russian and English, all texts being equally authentic and have affixed thereto their seals.

Done in New Delhi on the ninth day of August in the year one thousand nine hundred and seventy one.

On behalf of the Republic of India Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

(Sd.) Swaran Singh (Sd.) A. A. Gromyko

Minister of External Minister of Foreign Affairs. Affairs.

USA INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Speech by Sardar Swaran Singh at Signing Ceremony

Speaking after the signing Ceremony, Sardar Swaran Singh said:

Your Excellency,

On this happy occasion I should like,

first of all, to welcome you and your delegation. The signing of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation today between our two Governments represents an important milestone in the path of our relations which have been steadily getting closer and closer since the time of the visit of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru to your great country in 1955. He laid the foundations of this unique and great friendship. Our friendship has stood the test of time. Our friendship has not only survived many stresses and strains, but has come out stronger from them. This Treaty represents the purposes and aims of our friendship, viz. peace, co-operation and development of comprehensive bilaterial relations in all fields. We are convinced that this Treaty will serve as a shining example of how relations between two friendly countries can be and should be developed and how they can serve not only the interests of two countries, but be an important stabilising factor for strengthening peace and security in this region and throughout Asia and the world.

Your Excellency, I should like to express our deep appreciation of your visit to our country which was long overdue. Your visit coincides with developments in this part of the world which are a matter of common concern to both our countries and could jeopardise peace and security. It is an indication of Our common determination to defend peace and to avoid war.

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. Gromyko's Reply

Replying Mr. Gromyko said:

Esteemed Mr. Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dear Indian Friends and Comrades,

There are momentous events in relations between States which come as fruits of dozens of years prepared by the previous development of these relations. The Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation which has just been signed is one such most important landmark for the Soviet Union and India.

The significance of this Treaty cannot be over-estimated. It crowns the principled and consistent policy of our two countries aimed at cooperation and friendship. In India the basis of that policy was laid down by the outstanding national leader and statesman Jawaharlal Nehru. He found his true successor in, the esteemed Prime Minister of India Mme. Indira Gandhi.

162

The Soviet Union, on its part, following the Leninist foreign policy, has always, from the very first days of independence won by the great Indian people, set the firm and invariable course at achieving ever stronger and wider friendship with India. At all times, both in hardship and in jubilation we have been together. It was so in the past, it is so at present for friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India, far from being motivated by considerations of the moment, is firmly rooted in the long-standing vital interests of our peoples and States, in their concern for the preservation of peace. Our relationship rests on mutual trust, equality, respect and noninterference in the internal affairs of each other. The conclusion of the Soviet-Indian Treaty provides an even stronger political and legal basis for these relations.

Alongside this the Treaty is a document of great international importance contributing to the consolidation of peace in Asia and elsewhere, peace which is needed by all nations, including those of the continent of Asia.

The Soviet Union comes out for strong peace in Asia, in Europe and in all other parts of the globe. Our programme of struggle for peace and the development of international cooperation and against aggression is a matter of common knowledge.

We are happy that in this noble work in defence of peace India and the Soviet Union are acting hand in hand and we are convinced that this will continue in future.

May I express the confidence that the Soviet-Indian Treaty will be met with satisfaction by all those who cherish the cause of peace and friendship among nations?

INDIA USA

Date: Aug 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Joint Statement

The following Joint Statement was issued in New Delhi on August 11, 1971 at the conclusion of the talks between Mr. A.A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. and Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs of India:

On the invitation of the Government of India, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R., His Excellency Mr. A. A. Gromyko, paid an official visit to India from August to 12, 1971.

During his stay in New Delhi,. the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R called on the President of India, Shri V. V. Giri, and was received by the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. He also met the Food and Agriculture Minister, Shri Fakhruddin Ali Ahmed, the Finance Minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan and the Defence Minister, Shri Jagjivan, Ram. He had several meetings and talks with Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs of India.

The meetings and talks were held in an atmosphere of warm friendship and cordiality. It was noted with deep satisfaction that the friendly relations and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India in the political, economic, cultural, technical and scientific fields are developing successfully and hold great promise for further expansion. The political and legal basis for this cooperation is further strengthened by the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the USSR and India, which was signed in New Delhi by Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs of India and Mr. A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

Both sides consider that the conclusion of the Treaty is an outstanding historic event for their two countries. The Treaty is a logical outcome of the relations of sincere friendship, respect, mutual trust and the varied ties which have been established between the Soviet Union and India in the course of many years and have stood the test of time. It corresponds to the basic interests of the Indian and Soviet peoples and opens up wide prospects for raising the fruitful cooperation between the U.S.S.R. and India to a higher level. Alongside other provisions concerning bilateral Soviet-Indian

relations the Treaty provides for the two sides maintaining regular contacts with each other on major international problems and holding mutual consultations with a view to taking appropriate effective measures to safeguard the peace and security of their countries.

The Treaty between the USSR and India is a real act of peace expressing the community of policy and aspirations of the

U.S.S.R. and India in the struggle to strengthen peace in Asia and throughout the world and for safeguarding international security. All provisions of the Treaty serve those purposes. The Treaty is not directed against anyone; it is meant to be a factor in developing friendship and good-neighbourliness, in keeping with the principles of the U.N. Charter.

The Governments of India and the U.S.S.R. are confident that the conclusion of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation will meet with complete approval on the part of all those who are really interested in the preservation of peace in Asia and throughout the world and on the part of the Governments of all peace-loving States.

In the course of the meetings and talks, both sides noted with satisfaction that their positions on various problems discussed were identical or very close. The Minister of External Affairs of India explained the heavy burden placed on India's resources due to over 7 million refugees who had entered India. Both sides, after a detailed discussion, reiterated their firm conviction that there can be no military solution and considered it necessary that urgent steps be taken in East Pakistan for the achievement of the political solution and for the creation of conditions of safety for the return of the refugees to their homes which alone would answer the interests of the entire people of Pakistan and the cause of the preservation of peace in the area.

The Indian side expressed its gratitude for the understanding of the problem shown by the Soviet Union as was evident from the Appeal addressed on April 2, 1971 to the President of Pakistan by the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Mr. N. V. Podgorny.

Both sides held the view that outside interference in the affairs of Indo-China should immediately cease. They consider that it will be futile to attempt to impose any settlement not acceptable to the peoples of the area. They welcomed the recent

7-point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam as a concrete step forward which could form the basis of a peaceful political settlement.

On West Asia, both sides were convinced of the urgent need for the implementation of the Resolution of the Security Council of November 22, 1967, so that the consequences of aggression are liquidated.

Both sides considered that all international problems, including border disputes, must be settled by peaceful negotiations and that the use of force or the threat of use of force is impermissible for their settlement.

Both sides declare that they are strongly in favour of an early agreement on General and Complete Disarmament, includ. ing both nuclear and conventional weapons, under effective international control.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R. expressed his gratitude for the cordial reception given to him by the Government of India.

164

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CHINA VIETNAM

Date: Aug 01, 1971

September

	,	Volume No		
1995				
Content				

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII SEPTEMBER	No. 9
CONTENTS	PAGE
CEYLON	
Press Statement on Foreign Minister's Vis	sit 165
COMMONWEALTH	
Shri Chavan's Speech at Commonwealth F	Finance Ministers' Meeting 166
HUNGARY Indo-Hungarian Trade Talks	169
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS	
Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's State General Assembly	ement in the U.N.
Shri Raj Bahadur Falicitates New U.N. Memb	pers 177
INTERNATIONAL ATOMS FOR PEACE (CONFERENCE
Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Mess 8	sage 17
IRAQ	
New Indo-Iraqi Trade and Economic Coopera 9 Joint Communique on Iraqi Delegation's Visit 9	
NEPAL	

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

18

18

Foreign Minister's Address to Nepal Council of World Affairs

Joint Communique on Talks Between Shri Kirti Nidhi Bista and

Sardar Swaran Singh

(Continued Overleaf) PAGE

ROMANIA Text of Memorandum of Discussions	183	
SINGAPORE		
President Giri's Speech at Banquet in Singapore	185	
Shri Giri's Speech at Reception by Singapore Chamber of Commerce 186		
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS		
Text of Joint Soviet-Indian Statement	18	
Prime Minister's Speech at Soviet Prime Minister's Lunch	19	
Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner for Soviet Leaders 2	19	
UNITED KINGDOM		
British Aid for New Indian Ship Order	19	
4 New Loan Agreement 4	19	
(ii)		

HUNGARY INDIA IRAQ NEPAL OMAN ROMANIA USA REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No 1995 CEYLON Press Statement on Foreign Minister's Visit

The following is the text of a Press Statement issued by the Ministry of Defence and External Affairs, Government of Ceylon after the conclusion of the visit to Ceylon of Shri Swaran Singh, Minister Ministry of External Affairs:

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister of
External Affairs of the Government of India,
visited Ceylon as a guest of the Government
of Ceylon from September 9th to 11th, 1971.
He was accompanied by Shri S. K. Banerji,
Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs,
Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary,
Ministry of Finance, Sarvshri R. D. Sathe
and E. Gonsalves, Joint Secretaries, Ministry
of External Affairs of the Government of
India.

During the course of his visit the Minister of External Affairs called on His Excellency the Governor-General, Mr. William Gopallawa, the Honourable Prime Minister, Mrs. Sirimavo R. D. Bandaranaike, and the Hon. Minister of Irrigation, Power and Highways, Mr. Maithripala Senanayake.

The Minister of External Affairs of the Government of India had discussions with the Prime Minister of Ceylon on a broad spectrum of bilateral and international issues. Among them were South-Asian problems, the proposal for an Indian Ocean Peace Zone, Treaty of Friendship, Peace and Co-operation between India and the Soviet Union, and questions of economic and industrial co-operation between India and Ceylon. The discussions-took place in an atmosphere of friendship, cordiality and warmth characteristic of the relations between the two countries.

In a review of developments in South Asia, the Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs considered the question of the influx of refugees in large number into India and agreed that this posed to India. social and economic problems of immense magnitude. Apart from the difficulties created for India, the refugees were a problem of humanitarian concern to the international community. The settlement of this problem was a matter of urgency. and while stressing Ceylon's policy of non-inter-

vention in the internal affairs of States, it was agreed by the Prime Minister that accelerated political and constitutional procedures in Pakistan would facilitate the return of the refugees.

The Prime Minister and the Minister of External Affairs reaffirmed faith in nonalignment as a positive force for maintaining world peace and lessening international tensions. They emphasised the importance of peaceful co-operation and co-existence among nations of different social, economic and political systems. The Prime Minister of Ceylon brought to the attention of the Minister of External Affairs in this connection, Ceylon's efforts to give more concrete shape to the concept of a Peace Zone in the Indian Ocean. The Minister of External Affairs affirmed his Government's support for the concept and confirmed the Government of India's commitment to the preservation of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace and for the elimination of Great Power rivalries and tensions in the Indian Ocean.

They also discussed certain questions relating to the implementation of the Indo-Ceylon Agreement of 1964 and expressed general satisfaction at its smooth implementation.

Discussions between the two delegations on economic matters were of a comprehensive nature. The Indian side agreed to

165

extend new lines of credit of Rs. 60 million (Indian). India also agreed to assist Ceylon's programme of industrialisation by providing a market in India for goods produced by selected industries. For the purpose of identifying such industries, it was agreed that feasibility studies would be jointly undertaken by Ceylonese and Indian consultants. It was further agreed that a study should be made of the possibility of linking the Indian and Ceylon electricity grids. The question of improving the telecommunication links between the two countries was discussed.

Both sides agreed that it was necessary

to have consultations on economic matters at regular intervals. For this purpose, it was agreed that a standing sub-committee of the Indo-Ceylon Committee for Economic Cooperation should be constituted and that it should hold regular meetings in Colombo. It was also agreed that the two existing sub-committees for industries and trade should be merged to form one single sub-committee with appropriate modifications to service Ministerial meetings of the Indo-Ceylon Committee for Economic Co-operation and the merged sub-committee should meet at least once in six months.

Trade between the two countries was also discussed in the context of Ceylon's current trade deficit with India and it was agreed that India would attempt to increase her purchases from Ceylon. It was further agreed that both countries would co-operate closely in attempts to liberalise trade in the ECAFE region.

The Minister of External Affairs expressed his sincere thanks for the friendly welcome and warm hospitality extended to him and to members of his delegation. On behalf of the Prime Minister of India the Minister of External Affairs extended a cordial invitation to the Prime Minister of Ceylon to visit India. The Prime Minister of Ceylon gladly accepted the invitation. She also took the opportunity to thank the Minister of External Affairs for his visit to Ceylon.

USA INDIA LATVIA PAKISTAN SRI LANKA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

COMMONWEALTH

Shri Chavan's Speech at Commonwealth Finance Ministers, Meeting

The following is the text of the speech by the Finance minister, Shri Y. B. Chavan, at the Commonwealth Finance ministers annual meeting at Nassau, Bahamas On September 23, 1971:

Mr. Chairman, we are meeting this year at a time when the machinery for international economic co-operation that we have built up so patiently over the past 25 years or so is under considerable stress and strain. There is talk of revising the IMF charter and even of holding another Bretton Woods Conference. The third replenishment of IDA is heading for the same fate as the second one. The third UNCTAD Conference will take place soon without any tangible evidence that the objectives of the second UNCTAD have been achieved to any significant extent. In the field of trade, recent events have cast a shadow on the effectiveness of the GATT and on the prospects for the general scheme of preferences. Within our own family of the Commonwealth, the United Kingdom seems to be all but set for membership of the European Economic Community.

If ever there was any purpose in a meeting of the Commonwealth Finance Ministers, it is on this occasion when so many decisions in the inter-national economic field are imminent. I would like, Mr. Chairman, therefore to devote my remarks even at this stage to some aspects of the machinery for international economic co-operation about which

166

we, in India, and I am sure in most other developing countries, feel seriously concerned. I will add towards the end a few remarks on the current economic situation in India. We have before us excellent reviews of the world economic situation as it affects the developed and the developing countries respectively, and I do not wish to comment on what is admirably stated in these papers. But there are overriding issues concerning the relationship between the two groups of countries which deserve to be noted at the outset.

There has been a great deal of questioning of late of the emphasis in the IMF charter on stability of exchange rates and orderly changes in them. We, in India, are not averse to a greater degree of flexibility being introduced in the system and to any extensive realignment of exchange rates in the present situation. Indeed, we are not averse to the whole IMF charter being subjected to a detailed review with a view to radical reform. But we do feel that if there is to be a change whether in the present alignment of currencies or in the basic tenets of the IMF charter, these changes must be made within the four corners of the Fund and not for all practical purposes in a group of 6 or 10 or 16 however wealthy and powerful it may be. You cannot have a spectacle of the wealthy and the powerful deciding things on their own without impairing the image and effectiveness of the institution we have nourished and nurtured over so many years.

As far as we are concerned, we favour a solution in terms of stable exchange rates and orderly changes in monetary system. A regime of floating rates creates additional problems and uncertainties for our overstretched economies and administrative machinery. We have said it on more than one occasion that going beyond any immediate realignment of exchange rates that may be necessary, we are prepared to agree that somewhat wider margins around parities may be necessary to discourage speculative capital flows. At the same time, we cannot help wondering whether in the name of freedom we have not disregarded the sound principle adumbrated at Bretton Woods, namely, that freedom of capital movements can often be an enemy of freedom on the current account. We also feel that the sound emphasis on appropriate discrimination of Bretton Woods has somehow been replaced by indiscriminate non-discrimination whereby for the sins of the developed countries the less developed countries are also punished by imposition of duties and reduction in, aid. Cannot the Commonwealth countries at least agree that they are not in favour of such meaningless and even harmful non-

discrimination?

If the IMF Charter is to be amended, the amendment cannot be with referenceonly to the issues thrown up by the recent difficulties of the industrial countries. We, in the developing world, also find the present Charter unsatisfactory in many ways. Most important, we feel that the system of weighted voting and representation with weightage given in terms essentially ofwealth and prosperity is an anachronism as it gives to more than 100 developing-Members hardly one-third share in the total. The inequity of the situation has been aggravated in recent years when the same formula of weightage reflected in the voting structure has been made the basis for the distribution of special drawing rights.

We also feel, Sir, that in the presentpreoccupation with major currencies, thecentral issues of the creation of SDRs, beyond the present three years period is likely to be obscured. We regard the creation of SDRs as the greatest achievement under theauspices of the International Monetary Fund. We consider that there should be a continuing and regular creation of SDRs and action for the period beyond 1972 should beinitiated immediately and decisions taken wen before the end of 1972. In this connection, I would also mention that we aredissatisfied with the Progress made in the-Fund on the consideration of the proposal to link SDRs and Development Finance-

WORLD BANK

Coming to the World Bank, it is well-known that the establishment of that institution was more or less an afterthought. The British who were the brain behind Bretton Woods were mainly interested in the Fund and the Bank was added on more as a temptation held out to the Soviet Union and other East European countries to join in the interest of reconstruction of their war-ravaged

167 economies. There was hardly any thought given at that time to what might be entailed

in a process of development for two-thirds of mankind.

The developing world was the colonial world at that time and had little say in drawing up the Charter of the World Bank. And yet even today after 25 years when the vast majority of the Membership of the Bank consists of countries which were never represented at Bretton Woods, vital and important issues are decided in the Bank Board by a reference to some ill-considered provisions in the Bank Charter. Thus we are told as if it is part of some Holy Writ that only project financing is proper and that non-project financing is to be undertaken only in exceptional circumstances. What is even worse, international tendering even extending to civil works and construction jobs in building roads or dams or irrigation canals is considered the corner stone of the Bank philosophy. The absurd length to which this doctrine is carried was illustrated recently when I believe in the case of one Commonwealth country even the construction of primary school building had to be submitted for international tendering.

Sir, I feel rather strongly on this because there is a danger that our multilateral institutions will become the instrument for the pursuit of the commercial and political interests of their richer Members. There is now a growing feeling that aid from multilateral agencies is better than bilateral aid, but if multilateralisation of aid results only in the pursuit of the same bilateral policies by the richer countries with the added authority of an international institution, I am not sure that we could have succeeded in doing anything more than replacing King Log by King Stork-

We are grateful once again to Canada and the U.K. for making advance contributions to IDA to make up for the delay in the US contribution. But the fact that the third replenishment has faced the same difficulties as the second one lead to the conclusion that something needs to be done to remove the present uncertainty and put the funding of IDA on a firmer and continuing basis. That is why we favour the link between SDRs and development finance. Some

scheme should be devised to lower the rates of interest on bank loans. UNCTAD III then would be in vain if it cannot settle some of these issues, including some definite code of conduct on the level and terms of bilateral aid and some definite norms for genuine debt relief by bringing the terms of all past loans on par with the norms now accepted or with the present practice if it happens to be better.

FUTURE OF STERLING

On the future role of sterling, I will make only one comment. As long as countries have to hold reserves, these reserves have to be held in sterling or in something else, and if the U.K. does not wish the sterling to perform the same role as at present, we are quite prepared to consider alternative arrangements.

There is also another very important point. If national currencies are no longer to be used as reserves, let us not create the same problems over again by talking of some other currency or cocktail of currencies acting as reserves in the future. 'Exit sterling' should not be a prelude to 'enter Europa'. Since sterling or dollar cannot be replaced by gold, the only other alternative is SDR's. But the SDR's earn a low rate of interest. If the present obligations of the U.K. or the U.S. which are both highly liquid and high interest-bearing, are to be replaced, the countries concerned deserve adequate compensation both in terms of liquidity and return. As far as the return is concerned, perhaps some mechanism can be devised whereby it is provided not by the international monetary system but by the countries which are enabled to Pass on what they regard as a burden to the international community.

ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN INDIA

Finally, Sir, if I may make a few remarks on economic conditions in India, I am happy to say that we have had yet another good agricultural year with foodgrain output reaching some 108 million tonnes. There are today some 9 million tonnes of wheat and rice in stock in India and we are now

able, as we had hoped for earlier, to dispense with food aid altogether from next Year Onwards. This is, therefore, a good occasion for me to thank our Commonwealth Partners, notably Canada and Australia, who have

168

given us valuable food aid in the past. I hope they feel now relieved that we too share with them, at least for the present, the burden of carrying abundant stocks of grain.

Industrial production has been sluggish, but there are no acute shortages except in the case of steel. Of late, prices have been under pressure because of the heavy burdens on the budget. But the foreign exchange position is satisfactory, although imports are increasing rapidly. What causes us the greatest concern, however, is the mounting burden of refugees which in financial terms alone already amounts to some 20 per cent of our development budget in the current year and threatens to grow month by month.

In recent months, we have had to receive in India some 9 million citizens of another country. The responsibility for looking after these refugees is an international responsibility. I wish I could say that barring a few countries the response of the international community has been anywhere near commensurate with need. While we have accepted for the present the burden of supporting the helpless people who havehad to seek shelter on our soil, I hope my colleagues will not misunderstand me if I say that we expect these people to return soon to their homes and hearths in safety and honour and that we regard the cost of maintaining them as a responsibility of theinternational community which it must legitimately bear. I am grateful to all those countries who have responded to the call ofthe United Nations High Commissioner for-Refugees. But a great deal more needs to. be done and done urgently; otherwise thevery real and substantial prospects for rapid economic growth that the Indian economy otherwise faces are likely to be seriouslyjeopardised.

Sir, before I conclude, I should not fail to convey to the Government and the people-of Bahama islands our gratitude for the-gracious hospitality and excellent arrangements made for this Conference. I am grateful to you for giving us a frank and clear account of the discussions in the group often which will assist us in assessing the-situation and considering future action.

BAHAMAS INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CANADA UNITED KINGDOM AUSTRALIA

Date: Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Trade Talks

Following is the text of a Press release issue issued in New Delhi on September 16,1971

on the Indo-Hungarian trade talks in Budapest:

India's Minister of Foreign Trade, Shri L. N. Mishra, has completed a two-day official visit to Hungary. The Indian Foreign Trade Minister called on Prime Minister, H.E. Mr. Jeno Fock and Deputy Prime Minister, H.E. Mr. Peter Valyi.

The discussions which were held in a very cordial atmosphere covered Indo-Hungarian bilateral relations, international economic situation and problems relating to peace and stability in the Indian Sub-continent. In the prolonged discussions with the-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Trade, H.E. Dr. Biro, issues concerning deepening, expanding and diversification of Indo-Hungarian commercial relations were examined in detail. The two Ministers agreed that im-

plementation of the Annual Trade Plans. should be fuller.

It was agreed the bilateral trade exchanges should be increased by fifty per cent over the existing level and special emphasis. laid on export of non-traditional products from each country to the other in promoting: and increasing trade exchanges. The Minis-

169

ters have also agreed to increase the scope of Indo-Hungarian commercial relations by promoting joint ventures and marketing in Third-countries. Agreement was also reached on promotion of commercial, industrial and: technical cooperation between organisations of the two countries.

A Joint Memorandum outlining measures to be taken to achieve the objectives, agreed upon was signed by the two Ministers Later, when Shri Mishra met H.E. Mr. Horgos, Minister for Metallurgy and Machine Industry and Mr. Lorincs, First Deputy Minister of Heavy Industry, problems relating to promotion of Indo-Hungarian industrial and technical cooperation were discussed.

HUNGARY INDIA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's Statement in the U.N. General Assembly

Following is the full text of Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's address to the 26th session of the U. N. General Assembly on September 27, 1971:

Mr. President:

On behalf of the people of India, we offer you our warmest congratulations on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly. This is a fitting tribute to your achievements as the Foreign Minister of Indonesia and to your interest in the political and economic problems of the world. As a fellow Asian, I take particular pride in your elevation to this high office. Indonesia and India have worked together in so many fields since we both achieved our independence, and we have so much in common through history and geography, that I need hardly 'assure you 'of our fullest co-operation in the discharge of your responsibilities. We should also like to compliment our outgoing President Ambassador Edvard Hambro of Norway, for the skill, independenee and patience with which he guided our deliberations, and for his stewardship of the commemorative session last year. The world may not care for, nor long remember the millions of words we utter here, but the important documents which we adopted last year will certainly guide and inspire us in our work for years to come. For this achievement, much of the credit must go to President Hambro.

During the year that has just passed our Secretary-General U Thant has once again manifested his devotion to the cause of world peace by his scrupulous regard for the purposes and principles of the charter, and, by his indefatigable efforts to improve our organisation in all possible ways. We can still hope that his decision to relinquish this rewarding though onerous office, is not final. The Secretary-General of this Organisation has always to be a person of the highest calibre, sensitive to the changing needs of the world situation and fully prepared to meet the administrative requirements of an evergrowing institution. He should also be able to contribute to the creation of conditions in which all nations. big or small, can live in peace and friendship and work in their own ways for their national progress and prosperity.

We extend our special welcome to the three new members that joined us a few days ago: Bhutan, Bahrein and Qatar. We look forward to working in the closest cooperation with these new members with whom we have had long and friendly association in several spheres. Their entry into the United Nations should increase the value of our debates and the strength of our decisions.

170

One of the most important issues that we hope will be settled during this session is the question of the rightful representation of China in this organisation. There is only one China: There is only one Chinese seat and only the Government of the People's Republic of China is entitled to occupy it in the United Nations. We have always been convinced that the presence of the People's Republic of China will make this Organisation more effective. Too long have we postponed a realistic decision on this issue-, Let us not procrastinate any further.

We have also repeatedly pleaded for the universality of representation in the United Nations and we believe that the entry of the divided nations into our Organisation would help in the reduction and removal of tensions. They could also contribute effectively to our work in many other fields.

For India, the year 1971 opened with many promises. The economy was poised for a high rate of growth. In March we had our General Elections. Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi was returned to power with an overwhelming majority. Her success reflected the solid support of our people for a concerted programme for socioeconomic progress. Externally we had tried to establish warmer relations with all countries, particularly with our neighbours. The fact that Pakistan had a little earlier in December 1970 held its First ever General Elections was welcomed in India. The introduction of a democratic process in Pakistan would, we hoped, bring about improved relations with this important neighbour of ours. Yet, the entire picture was changed overnight

when the events in the Eastern Wing of Pakistan took a catastrophic course. An International problem of utmost gravity and concern was created. Several Governments and International authorities have recognised the International character of this problem. The Secretary-General U Thant has not only brought the situation to the attention of the members of the Security Council, but has included his views in the introduction to his annual report. The Assembly has already heard the concern which the outgoing President, Ambassador Hambro, expressed in his speech on the 21st.

By the middle of April, it had become clear that Pakistan had no intention. of abandoning its military methods and that we would be faced with an unprecedented flow of Pakistani refugees into our country. The refugee camps had to be, speedily organized, and the systematic and detailed registration of the large number of foreigners had to be undertaken. The Ration Cards and temporary permits for stay in India had to be issued, transport and food supplies had to be organised and medical attention had to be provided. These relief measures could however, meet only a fraction of the needs of the refugees. We asked the international community for help, and although the response to the Secretary-General's appeal has been warm, it is but a very small part of what is needed. By far the largest contribution, towards their upkeep had to be made by India from her badly needed resources. We are sheltering and looking after the refugees on behalf of the international community. We simply do not have the capacity and the resources to bear this burden. While we have given them on purely humanitarian grounds, shelter and refuge when they were fleeing for their lives, we have made it repeatedly clear that they are with us only temporarily and must return home. This has been accepted and endorsed by the world community. It has been impossible to make any firm estimates of what it would cost us in the coming months but on the basis of the present figure the total cost may well be more than Dollar 800 Million by the end of next March.

The consequences of this massive influx - some have called it a civilian invasion of refugees into India cannot be deter-mined in terms of money alone. We are facing grave social, economic and political consequences. In the areas where the refugees are now living in difficult conditions in camps, all our schools had to be closed to find shelter for them. AR our hospitals in these areas have had to tend to the urgent needs of the refugees rather than to the normal needs of the local inhabitants. Prices are rising as a result of a higher demand for essential commodities. Wages are falling crimes of various kinds are on the increase. Local friction and tensions are not unknown. Our local administration had to be diverted to the work of looking after the refugees and this in turn further affected adversely all our development projects. The fear of epidemics is ever present, even though the outbreak of cholera has been controlled.

171

The refugees must go back. The question simply is: How? Can anyone in reason expect them to go back when thousands and thousands are daily fleeing from the same area? Pointless declarations and exhortations will not make them go back. On May 21 President Yahya Khan called upon the refugees to go back and yet, since then more than 5 million have come into India. They will go back only when they are sure themselves that they can live in their own homeland in safety and freedom, when they are allowed to work as they wish and when they are assured that their properties would be returned, their jobs restored and their daily life not interfered with.

To appreciate and understand the background to this situation, it is necessary to recall the conditions prevailing in East Pakistan throughout Pakistan's existence as an independent country. Pakistan, is a unique country, in the sense that two parts of the country are separated by a distance of 1000 miles of Indian territory. The majority of the people, 75 million, live in the Fast, and the West has a total population of less than 60 million. Nonetheless, political, military and economic power was concentrated in the West, while the East con-

tinued to produce basic raw materials, such as jute and tea, and provided the largest Source of foreign exchange for Pakistan. Even the Government of Pakistan has accepted that persistent discrimination and exploitation of Fast Pakistan by West Pakistan had taken place ever since the country became independent. Just to give one example, in the entire civil service and in the armed forces of Pakistan, the Bengalis did not have a share exceeding 10 per cent. The East Pakistanis continued to protest and agitate against this discrimination and exploitation, and, for want of any effective remedy, their grievances accumulated.

However, after the fall of President Ayub Khan in the middle of 1969 a new situation arose. Another General, President Yahya Khan, took over, and declared that he would hold General Elections for the first time in the entire country. These elections were to be based for the first time, on adult franchise with representation to both the wings, proportionate to their population. For the first time the people of Pakistan saw in this democratic process, a possible rectification of the injustices from which East Pakistan had suffered all these years.

The elections were held in December 1970 after being postponed twice. The results of the elections were greeted in Pakistan as a success of democracy, as indeed it was. The broad results of the election are worth noting. Out of a total of 313 seats, 169 had been allotted to East Pakistan. Of these 169 seats, the Awami League, led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, won 167. Winning 98% of the seats in East Pakistan, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman gained an absolute majority in the National Assembly and would have in normal circumstances been in a position to form the Government and become the Prime Minister of Pakistan. For the elections, the Awami League adopted a six-point programme to obtain specifically a greater degree of autonomy for East Pakistan with a view to putting an end to discrimination and exploitation. Apparently, the results of the election so startled the rulers of Pakistan that they saw in them the risk to their economic, military and political domination over the Eastern Wing; this explains their swift action and their desire to continue military rule.

So, on the fateful night of 25/26th March, the armed forces set out to crush the verdict of the 75 million Bengalis. Before, however, the army was given the signal to let loose the reign of terror, protracted negotiations started: In the meantime the strength of the armed forces in East Bengal was considerably increased.

What the army did, and is continuing to do, in its massive assault on the civilian population is now well-known and I do not wish to take up the time of the Assembly in describing the innumerable instances of killings and atrocities. A reign of terror prevailed and still prevails. The leader of the Awami League Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, was arrested and is still in prison. He is now being secretly tried in a military court on a charge which carries the death penalty. The freedom of the press and civil liberties were totally suppressed, and the foreign journalists were expelled. The International Red Cross was not allowed to visit the area and all attempts were made, not always successfully, to conceal what was happening in that part of the world. Killing, raping,

172

burning and looting became widespread. The inevitable consequences followed: The people fled from terror and violence to India, leaving behind all that they had. Their number rose from less than a million at the end of April, to nearly 4 millions at the end of May, crossed the six million mark before June was over and has been rising steadily. Their number now exceeds 9 million and the exodus still continues. This is an exodus of refugees, unprecedented in history across any international frontiers.

Pakistan's military action and the snuffing out of all human rights, and the reign of terror, which still continues, have shocked the conscience of mankind. There is a popular revolt against these actions. Some have fled from the terror while the

others are resisting it as best as they can. The hard core of this resistance was provided by thousands of men who had defected from the army and the police and various paramilitary organisations at the time of the military crackdown. They have been joined in ever-increasing numbers by people of all ages.

The Pakistani authorities have torn up solemn declarations and conventions to which Pakistan had subscribed. It has desperately tried to divert attention from its outrageous action. Pakistan's actions have made so many serious inroads into much that our charter stands for, that it would indeed be a travesty of international law and a mockery of international justice to suggest that what is involved is an internal issue. It is even less of an internal issue when one keeps in mind that other nations are having to support the enormous cost of the massive exodus of refugees into India.-

Apart from accusing others for their own most unwise and deadly activities, the rulers of Pakistan have taken a number of measures which are no more than an eyewash. How unrealistic these measures are, can be judged from the impact they had on the flow of refugees. The President of Pakistan had from time to time called upon the refugees to go back: Yet, the flow continues in ever-increasing numbers into India. A so-called civilian Government has been formed in East Pakistan which consists of men who have no representative character whatever, and who are mere figureheads obliged to take orders from their military commanders. An amnesty is proclaimed but, Mujibur Rahman and other elected representatives are at the same time treated and tried as traitors. We witness the strange spectacle in which the party which would have been, by right, the Government of Pakistan, has been banned and disqualified from political activities. Half the elected representatives have been disqualified from. sitting in the National Assembly. In our view, the flow of refugees will not stop, nor will the refugees already in India begin to go, back, until a political solution acceptable to the elected representatives of the people has

been found. Secretary-General U Thant and many other distinguished statesmen, politicians and leaders of public opinion have consistently maintained that the problem it essentially political. As a first step towardsa political solution, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the leader of the Awami League should beset it liberty without delay, and negotiations should be started with him. It has been proved beyond doubt that he alone can speak on behalf of the people of East Bengal. He, and he alone symbolises, and represents the. aspirations and will of the people of East Pakistan. Apart from these actions, which the Pakistanis themselves can take, what can the international community do in thesecircumstances? The first and foremost action which this assembly and all other international organs, within or without the-United Nations system, can take is to impress. on the military regime of Islamabad the fact that force will not succeed, and that therefore, a political settlement between the military regime and thealready elected leaders is essential. We consider it wholly shortsighted to wait until worse crises have arisen. Bilaterally, all governments can do their utmost to ensure, by whatever means are available to them, that the military regime stops its repression, enters into negotiations with the elected leaders to achieve a political settlement with their consent, and sends the army back to the barracks. Only by these measures will the flow of refugees be stopped and refugees already in India can return home. Our only fault has been that we gave temporary shelter to minions of refugees homeless, foodless, clothless, sick and aged, men and women, helpless children and dying infants who were fleeing from terror and many of whom bore marks of recent army brutality. Only by the measures, I have

173

suggested, can the threat of famine be alleviated and normalcy restored. If these measures are not taken, and if attempts are made to divert attention by false analysis or wrong accusations, then the prospect is indeed gloomy. We here in this assembly may argue in a sophisticated manner as long as we like, but those who have been the victims of

aggression and who are fleeing from terror, and massacre will not have such a tolerant outlook. They will not forgive us or those who did not stand by them in their hour of trial.

It is only natural that I should have devoted some time to an important matter which is uppermost in the minds of most Indians, but we are not insensitive to other important issues that the world has faced during the last year. We believe that the world scene is changing, and rearranging itself in a manner which is often difficult to comprehend and even more difficult to analyse. Whether it is in Europe or Asia, in Africa or in the Americas, several trends am noticeable which can affect our traditional values and even some of the con cepts on which the charter is based. During the last twelve months there have been many welcome signs of reduction of tensions among the great powers. The progress in SALT, though slow, is an important step forward. The treaty between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany and the four power agreement on Berlin are important landmarks, and should lead to a better understanding of the German problem. The greater degree of accommodation now evident will contribute to European peace, progress and prosperity. We congratulate all those whose untiring efforts have resulted in an accord over some of the most difficult issues facing the international community.

At the same time I must utter a note of caution. The concerns of the nations assembled in this hall are far wider than the preoccupations of the great powers. One of the basic concepts underlying the setting up of the United Nations was that in the solution of world problems, and in the achievement of the objectives, political, social and economic, of the human race, all sovereign states should have a voice. While talks between the great powers can on suitable occasions be helpful, the viewpoint of other states, and particularly of the developing countries, must not be ignored. The concept of non-alignment of which Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the principal exponents was meant to modify the

bipolar view of the world. The relevance and validity of non-alignment are not diminished, by the lessening of East West tensions in some fields. Indeed, with the lessening of the tensions of the cold war, the importance of non-alignment has become even greater. The issues are no longer so clear cut and therefore the non-aligned countries would have to examine the everchanging situations in a much more detailed and comprehensive manner. The decisions can then be based on principles, taking into account all the factors. It is for those reasons that the Lusaka declaration was widely welcomed by many speakers in this assembly last year. It is also for those reasons that we have found it necessary to continue discussions among the non-aligned countries on all important problems. Such a regular and systematic exchange of views should enable us to come to some agreed conclusions even at short notice. As this assembly is aware, in two days', the non-aligned group of countries would be meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers.

In Asia a new political equation is discernible with rapid industrialisation and economic development in several countries. Not only is a new relationship emerging not only among the Asian countries themselves, but several outside powers are working for the establishment of new contacts and relations with Asian countries, including China. India is conscious of these developments and is adjusting her own attitude in the context of these important changes. The agony of the people of Vietnam has not yet ceased. Their freedom is still to be achieved, although large scale warfare and massive slaughter are not so much in evidence. Raids, local fighting and the daily toll in lives continue throughout Vietnam. We regret particularly that there has been a recent resumption of bombing in parts of North Vietnam. The politics, especially in South Vietnam, has not shown any signs of moving towards the goal

174

for which many lives were sacrificed and for which the people of Vietnam have suffered so much. We welcome the American and other foreign troop withdrawals that have already taken place. We hope that through negotiations in Paris and elsewhere the agony of Vietnam will be put to an end without further delay, that American and other foreign troops will finally be withdrawn by Ft definite date, and the people of Vietnam will be allowed to settle their own future in accordance with their own wishes without any outside interference. In this context the seven point proposals made in Paris appear to us to provide a reasonable basis for a negotiated settlement. In the Middle East the lack of progress in the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 (1967) is creating new tensions. The cease fire, accepted as a temporary measure to help the parties negotiate a settlement through Ambassador Jarring, has unfortunately tended to freeze the situation in favour of the aggressor despite the willingness shown by the Arab countries to go to the farthest limit in meeting their obligations under the Security Council Resolution. Our own conviction that no country should be allowed to retain foreign territories taken by force of arms remains unshaken and we would reiterate that this problem will not be solved unless Israel withdraws from the Arab territories which she has occupied since 5th June, 1967, and restores the legitimate rights of the Palestinian refugees.

In Latin America too, new economic and political forces are emerging. Various developments in different states in that continent have proved beyond doubt that the conflict between traditional politics and a growing awareness of national interest is adding a new dynamism to the situation. This will, no doubt, have an impact on international issues.

The result of all these trends and tendencies has been to bestir people to new lines of thinking and to a new realisation that problems of great concern to the world cannot be solved by force. It is in this context that our discussions this year on the question of international peace and security will assume added significance. Such a discussion by enabling all member states to express their considered views would substantially increase the effectiveness of the

United Nations.

India pointed out at the 25th Session of the General Assembly that post war developments had amply shown that disputes in the traditional sense are not the only situations which become a threat to international peace and security, the structure of which today is more often, than not imperilled by actions which amount to systematic violations of many other important objectives and principles of the charter. This organisation must develop and acquire the skill and strength necessary for dealing effectively with complex problems which have far reaching consequences. The declaration on strengthening of international security adopted by the General Assembly last year recognised the integral link between, peace on the one hand, and disarmament, decolonisation and development on the other-General and complete disarmament under effective international control remains the imperative and most urgent need of ourtime. We are concerned with the threat to mankind posed by the ever increasing arms race, by the existing large stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction and by the impending new qualitative advance towards even more devastating nuclear armaments. We are pleased at the emergence of an agreement on bacteriological weapons as a result of the discussion in the conference of the committee on disarmament and look forward to early steps towards an effective agreement on chemical weapons. We are pleased of course that the USA and USSR continue their discussions in the field of disarmament and that these contacts are helping to lessen suspicion and creating and improving the atmosphere for negotiations in many other fields. However, the proceedings of the conference of the committee on disarmament have not been marked by any significant progress this year and we should consider how to strengthen further the mechanism of the Committee on Disarmament. We could perhaps do it by adopting the suggestion made by the Secretary General in the introduction to his report on the work of the organisation. It is imperative that China and France participate in its deliberations. India also believes that it would be useful to convene a world disarmament conference, after due preparation, with participation of all the countries of the world.

175

The fourth conference on atoms for peace has demonstrated the need to make nuclear energy and technology available to a greater extent to the developing countries of the world. We are convinced of the important contribution that the technology for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy can make to the economy and progress of the developing world.

If the lack of progress towards total disarmament continues to be a threat to peace and security, there are other factors Which also contribute to this threat. Colonialism and racialism have taken many forms in recent years and all the efforts of the U.N. have been unavailing in bringing about the independence of such large and important colonial territories as Angola, Mozambique, Guinea, Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. We are gratified about the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on Namibia and our efforts should be concentrated on concrete steps to be taken in asserting the U.N. authority in Namibia. The liberation movements in other colonial territories need to be encouraged. We are disappointed that the progress in these fields has not been significant and we shall, at an appropriate stage, propose steps which can be taken to bring all colonial territories to independence.

Mr. President, Security and political stability cannot be achieved if the international community does not organise economic cooperation for speedy development in a rational and dynamic way. The strategy for the second development decade was a major step forward but the developments which have taken place since the strategy was adopted are causing us some uneasiness. The commitments made in the strategy are still to be fulfilled and yet attempts are being made to take advantage of the differences of interests which undoubtedly exist in the developing countries, to modify this commitment. We hope that these attempts will not

succeed, and that on the one hand the developing countries will present a united front on their basic needs and on the other hand, the developed countries will fulfill to the utmost, the obligations they have accepted.

The world today is facing a major economic crisis comparable to the one when the sterling went off the gold standard and new trade barriers began to disrupt world trade. Something similar is threatening the system of international trade and payments which had been built up after world war IL The GATT, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have not between them been able to provide the kind of orderly and balanced growth in world economy which was hoped for. The developing countries, which had little say at the time of their formulation, have long cherished the feeling that a new look at the articles of these three bodies is called for, if the widening gap between the rich nations and the poor nations is not to grow wider each year, as it has unfortunately been in the last two decades. In the crisis that now confronts them, some of the most developed nations also have begun to feel that the charters of these institutions do not provide adequate answers to the emerging problems. What we are unhappy about is, the attempts to ignore and by-pass these institutions and to try to seek solutions to the world's economic problems in a small group of the 10 richest countries. We believe that while we must reform these institutions, we must not wreck them. Concerted thinking on the ways in which a new dynamism can be imparted to them has to be given in a forum, which is truly representative of developed and developing countries alike. Already someof the measures that have been taken to solve the Problems of prosperous nations have created serious problems for the less developed countries. Their trade is confronted with new obstacles. The inflow of capital so essential to their growth and development, which is well below the target of one per cent of GNP adopted by the U.N. is in danger of being reduced. Poor countries of the world are victim of measures taken in the name of alleviating the Payments

crisis of the richest nation in the world, even though they themselves had not contributed to the crisis in any conceivable manner. Without a concerted and cooperative approach, such progress as was made in the First development decade can easily be wiped out in the Second. Last year the assembly gave much time and attention to formulating a just regime on the utilization of the resources of the Sea and for the preservation of the human environment. During this year some progress has been made for the solution of these problems but much more remains to be done. Similarly On the Problem of Outer space, we have achieved some success, Parti-

176

cularly in formulating a liability convention. We would like to record our appreciation to the United States of America and to the Soviet Union for reaching agreement regarding expanded cooperation towards developing compatible rendezvous and docking systems for the spacecraft of both the nations. We look forward, as a developing country, to increasing benefits for progress, in the field of earth resources, surface remote sensing and other connected matters.

I have mentioned all these specific problems in order to take into account the various major factors which are changing the conditions of the world we live in. The U.N., reflecting all these concerns, has to adjust itself to these changing conditions. Our charter was drawn up 26 years ago. Our methods of work and the procedure of our debates. as indeed our budget - all subjects of separate studies - have to be adjusted and adapted to new demands and conditions. We must maintain a flexible attitude towards these matters and we hope that the present Session of the Assembly would, in coming to decisions on substantive problems, keep in mind the need for this adjustment. No organisation in the rapidly changing world of ours can hope to face successfully new trends and new developments unless its basic concepts can be modified speedily and effectively. Last year we had a world youth conference. Although the people who attended this conference did not achieve any concrete results, they did demonstrate a need for the world organisation to be more responsive to the changing situation.

The Prime Minister of India, while speaking at the last General Assembly Session, had referred to the unfinished revolution the completion of which is our common purpose We have endeavoured to fulfill this purpose though we may not have succeeded fully in our efforts: the world still continues to be in turmoil and subject to natural and man made disasters and tensions. In such an atmosphere of strife and ferment, the United Nations remains the only hope for states and peoples all over the world. The ideals of the charter are not static norms to. which we rededicate ourselves for form's sake every year. Each year distinguished delegates from member countries assemblehere to reaffirm their faith in the objectives and activities of this august organisation. It is strange, therefore, that in spite of these declared commitments the conscience ofmankind finds itself reticent and cautious in face of crises born of violation of the very principles of the charter - violations which are at times deliberate and calculated. If this organisation is to survive and contributeconstructively toward a new world in which. the rights of the individual are safe, and his welfare ensured in a just and honourableenvironment, it is essential that the U.N. assumes a credible image on the basis oftangible activities. The foundations for this purpose were laid during the last commemorative session. It is for all of us now to see if we have the strength to build on these foundations. It is my earnest hope that distinguished delegates assembled in this Session would give thought to this imperative necessity and act in concert to make this organisation an instrument of their common endeavour to achieve peace, stability and justiceall over the world.

Thanks you, Mr. President.

INDIA INDONESIA NORWAY CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA BHUTAN QATAR CHINA PAKISTAN POLAND GERMANY ZAMBIA VIETNAM FRANCE ISRAEL ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE NAMIBIA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Raj Bahadur Felicitates New U.N. Members

Following is the text of statement made by Shri Raj Bahadur in the U.N. General Assembly on September 21, 1971 on the unanimous approval of Bhutan and other states by the U.N. General Assembly for admission to the United Nations:

On behalf of the delegation of India, I am very happy to welcome Bhutan, Bahrein and Qatar as new members of our family of nations. My country's relations with Bhutan! date back to many centuries and have always been close and friendly. It is, therefore, a matter of particular gratification to us in India that Bhutan has entered this Organisation.

His Majesty the King of Bhutan is perhaps the only monarch in the history who. has of his own accord handed over full

177

powers to his people. The people of Bhutan are most peace-loving and friendly and they are justly proud of their own traditions and culture. They are also forging ahead along with the path of modern development. It has been India's privilege to participate in cooperative efforts with the Government and people of Bhutan in this task under the wise and able leadership of His Majesty King Jigme Dorji Wangchuck. Bhutan has chosen for itself the path of peace and non-alignment. We are confident-that under the continued leadership and inspiration of His Majesty the King, Bhutan will make rapid strides in her development plans.

Our relations with the Arabian Peninsula and the adjoining Gulf are also very close. For centuries we have been partners in trade and developed ties of friendship. We welcome Bahrein and Qatar as members of this great family of nations. We hope that with their membership not only will the universality of this Organization be further strengthened but also that peace will be strengthened and tension reduced in this region.

INDIA BHUTAN USA QATAR

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INTERNATIONAL ATOMS FOR PEACE CONFERENCE

Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Message

Following is the text of the message of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, to the Fourth International Atoms for Peace Conference in Geneva:

New technologies open the doors of opportunity but also raise new problems. Nuclear technology is proving true to this record. So great are its scope and power that its potential contribution to human welfare is appreciated in the developing countries no less than in the industrialised countries. But the promotion and application of nuclear science and technology raise awesome social and political problems, within nations and between them. Amongst the important challenges facing mankind is the solution of these problems on the basis of equality of opportunities, benefits and responsibilities. We, in India, look to the Conference to chart the route and indicate the milestones.

Twenty years ago, when the generation of electricity through atomic reactors was still a dream, the possibility of securing clean power was amongst the most exciting prospects involved. Today when many nations have launched or are about to launch, major nuclear power programmes, the situation is different and a source of concern. I hope that this Conference will be an occasion for mankind to pledge its collective ingenuity, integrity and self-restraint to ensure that nuclear industry becomes an ally rather than a threat to the quality of our environment.

In India, we believe that science and technology are a means to our objective of improving the quality of life of our People as rapidly as possible. This is the spirit which has led us to promote nuclear science and technology and to apply them for Peaceful purposes. We are resolved to pursue that course with steadfast determination. while actively striving to ensure that the benefits of atomic energy are extended to all within the framework of a just international system.

On behalf of the people and Government of India, I sent greetings and good wishes to the Conference.

178

SWITZERLAND USA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

IRAQ

New Indo-Iraqi Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreement

Following is the text of the press release issued in New Delhi, September 24, 1971 on the signing of the new Indo-Iraqi Trade Agreement:

India and Iraq signed a new Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreement here today, providing for a three-fold increase in trade, trade in new items and cooperation in economic fields including joint ventures.

The Agreement was signed by Dr. Fakhri Kaddouri, Member of the Economic Bureau of the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq who led his country's delegation and the Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra. Today's Agreement follows discussions between the delegations of the two countries which began in New Delhi on September 19.

Under the Agreement, the scope of trade between India and Iraq has been increased nearly three-fold from its previous level. The total trade exchange envisaged during the period 1.9.71 to 31.3.73 is of the order of near ∞ 23 million as against exchange of nearly ∞ 7 million annually until now.

Crude oil and sulphur have been added to the list of imports from Iraq to India. Hitherto, India used to import only dates from Iraq. It has now been made possible-to achieve a balance between India's imports from and exports to Iraq. With this rise irk level of trade, India would be able to export tea worth about æ 1.7 million per annum, and other goods viz. jute manufactures,. cotton textiles chemicals, drugs and pharmaceuticals: and engineering goods worth. æ 6 million per annum. The Agreement also, provides for holding trade fairs by one. country in the other.

The Agreement provides for identifying new fields of economic cooperation including joint ventures, e.g., oil refinery in India based on Iraq crude oil and steel mill in Iraq based on Indian iron ore, and turnkey projects in Iraq such as cement plants and railway communication systems.

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

IRAQ

Joint Communique on Iraqi Delegation's Visit to India

The following Joint Communique was issued in New Delhi, September 27, 1971 at the end of the visit of the official Trade Delegation from Iraq:

An Iraqi Trade Delegation led by H.E. Dr. Fakhri Kaddouri, Member of the Economic Bureau of the Revolutionary Command Council of Iraq visited India from September 19 to 26, 1971. During their stay the Iraqi Delegation had friendly and cordial discussions with the various Ministers of Government of India and officials of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and other Ministries of the Government of India. As a result of these discussions a new Trade Agreement between India and Iraq has been concluded. Ibis Agreement provides for import by India from Iraq of crude oil and sulphur, besides dates which used to be the only commodity imported by India from Iraq. With the addition of these items the scope of trade between the two countries has been considerably increased making it possible to achieve a balance in trade.

The Agreement also provides for the opening of trade centres by one country in, the other for facilitating and promoting trade.

A trade arrangement for the period 1.9.71 to 31.3.73 has also been finalised.

179

Under this arrangement it is envisaged that the total trade exchange between Iraq and India would increase three-fold over the levels reached in the last year. The arrangement provides for identifying new fields of economic cooperation including joint ventures, e.g. an oil refinery in India based on Iraqi crude oil and a steel mill in Iraq based on Indian iron ore; and turn-key projects in Iraq such as cement plants and railway communications.

The leader of the Iraqi Delegation has extended an official invitation to the Minister of Foreign Trade to visit Iraq. The invitation has been accepted and the time of the visit will be decided at a later date.

IRAQ INDIA USA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

NEPAL

Foreign Minister's Address to Nepal Council of World Affairs

Following is the text of Foreign Minister Sardar Swaran Singh's address to the Nepal Council of World Affairs, in Kathmandu an September 4, 1971:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen,

I am grateful to the Nepal Council of World Affairs for giving me an occasion to address you today. I am aware how very distinguished this Council is and how conscious the members of this Council are of developments in the world at large. It is a truism, to say that the relations between India and Nepal are close and cordial yet like other truisms, one is inclined to take

the things for granted. History, geography and our cultural ties have bound us to each other for centuries and what happens in one country cannot but be of importance to the other country.

As I said on the last occasion when I addressed you in 1964, we are both members of the Afro-Asian world as it is known in the larger international community. We in India decided to follow a policy of non-alignment soon after our independence when the world was divided into two blocs; this enabled us to assess international issues on their merits and take decisions independently of the Super Powers.

In the domestic field, we have steadfastly adhered to the principle of democracy based on adult suffrage and have been engaged in the mighty task of promoting economic development with social justice for our people. Our experience shows that adherence to these policies has served us well.

We believe that the welfare of the people of India and Nepal is inter-linked. We have, therefore, cooperated with Nepal in the development programmes undertaken by the Government of Nepal for raising the living standards of the Nepalese people. I am glad that our aid programme to Nepal which started in 1951 in a. small way has grown manifold over the past 20 years and has yielded mutual benefits in communications, irrigation and power, education and various other fields. I would like particularly to mention that schemes such as the Kosi and Gandak Projects executed with the cooperation of Nepal, have greatly benefited vast numbers of People in India.

The recent Treaty of Trade and Transit concluded with Nepal has many provisions to enable Nepal to develop in the field of industry. India has extended specially favourable treatment on a non-reciprocal basis to goods manufactured mainly from Nepalese and Indian raw materials. These manufactured articles will have access to the entire Indian market without any quantitative restrictions and will be exempt from customs duty. other manufactured articles

which may have third-country materials will also receive favourable treatment. It is in our common interest to prevent infringement and circumvention of foreign exchange and foreign trade laws and regulations. In a spirit of mutual cooperation, we have reached an understanding to prevent deflection of trade.

We stand in the inaugural year of the second United Nations Development Decade. For the Seventies, as you are aware, the U.N. General Assembly has at its 25th Session adopted a global strategy for development embracing developing and the developed world. This is the first ever comprehensive programme adopted by the United Nations covering all sectors of activity for concerted and convergent action by countries at different levels of economic development and with different socio-economic systems, to combat the problem of poverty. Although in adopting the strategy a major commitment has been given by the developed countries to contribute to the attainment of the targets stipulated in the strategy, we cannot afford to deny that the primary responsibility for development rests on our own shoulders. We should, therefore, give the highest priority to cooperation amongst ourselves. The myth of parallelism in the economies of developing countries and fallacy that there is no complementarity between our economies have now been exploded. It has been proved that there is much greater complementarity amongst our economies than that exists between the economies of different developed nations. Yet we find that some of these advanced nations have forged instruments of economic cooperation amongst themselves which have produced spectacular results.

The Government of India has accepted the validity of cooperating with other sister developing countries in this development process and to share with them the benefits of India's own experience in this field. India has adopted an outward looking path for its development a path which despite her continental proportions leads towards seeking development as a part of the globe as a whole. India is widely sharing its technical know-how, capital goods, skilled expertise in industrial production with other developing countries through joint industrial ventures. Many of them have already gone into production and many more are in the process In considering her commercial and trade policies, India has welcomed the possibilities of an increase in imports from the sister developing countries. India has strongly supported increasing trade exchanges between the developing countries and fully subscribed to the view contained in the declaration on Non-alignment and economic progress, adopted by the Heads of States Governments of non-aligned countries in Lusaka in September 1970. pledging themselves to a programme to foster mutual cooperation among developing countries to impart strength to their national endeavours and to contribute to each other's economic and social progress by an effective utilisation of their respective resources and requirements. In so far as Nepal is concerned, I may reiterate that we shall extend fully to Nepal our hand of cooperation in furthering the economic and social progress in whatever way we can. We are motivated by the concept of mutual inter-dependence in the belief that a prosperous and stable Nepal will be in India's interest too.

As you are aware we have recently concluded a treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation with the U.S.S.R. In a large measure this treaty provides for a juridical basis for the relationship between India and the Soviet Union as it developed over the last 15 years or so. There is cooperation between the two countries in economic, cultural, and technical fields, and India has established several projects in India as a result of this cooperation. Both countries have functioned in the international field for ending colonialism and racialism and have worked for strengthening peace and for lowering tensions. The continuance of this cooperation is incorporated in the relevant clauses of the treaty.

As we in India attach special impor-

tance to the policy of nonalignment in international affairs, we have ensured in Article IV of the Treaty, acceptance by USSR of the validity of non-alignment as an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and in the lessening of tensions in the world. The Soviet Government have further reaffirmed their respect for India's policy of non-alignment in the same clause. While fully safeguarding India's independent policy in in-

181

ternational affairs, we have agreed upon taking appropriate steps for strengthening peace. In the event of either party being subjected to an attack or a threat thereof, the two countries shall immediately enter into mutual consultations in order to remove such threat and to take appropriate effective measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries. The central point in the Treaty, as you will appreciate, is to prevent war and to stabilise the forces of peace. No peace-loving country should have anything to worry about this treaty.

I am sure all of you expect me to acquaint you with the salient features of this problem that has been thrust upon us by the tragic situation that prevails in East Bengal, a region in the close neighbourhood of both India and Nepal. What is happening in East Bengal is a flagrant violation of human rights and suppression of the will of the people. What originally started as an internal affair of Pakistan has created a situation for India and for the international community which has to be viewed in a realistic manner. India has provided shelter on humanitarian grounds to over 8 million refugees who have crossed over into Indian territory to escape the fury of concerted military action. These refugees are being looked after by India with some humanitarian aid from other countries as a trust on behalf of the international community. We are not only facing a huge financial and organisational burden but the presence of such a large number of persons potentialities of generating tensions in a politically and economically sensitive area. We have made it known unmistakably that these refugees have to return to the country from which they have been uprooted. This position has been accepted by the international community. The first step in this connection is that further flow of refugees into India should stop immediately and it is quite obvious that to achieve this the military action against the unarmed people should end. These unfortunate refugees would not return to their homes and hearths merely to be butchered. For realisation of the objective of the return of these refugees to their country, conditions will have to be rapidly created which would instill the requisite confidence and assurance in the minds of the refugees that they can return to their homes in safety and in honour. This is the central point in the entire situation and it is to achieve this objective that a concerted effort will have to be made by the entire international community. It is our firm belief that the military approach will have to be abandoned and the problem will have to be approached from a political angle. A lasting and durable solution would obviously be one which is acceptable to the people of East Bengal. These people have in unmistakable terms given their verdict at the time of the recent elections.

We are living in a fast-changing world and unless we are able to adapt out-selves to changing conditions and adopt a dynamic attitude we shall always be in danger of being overtaken by events. It is in this context that we welcome an opportunity such as this to exchange views with our friendly neighbour Nepal so that we may appreciate each other's problems with greater understanding.

Thank you, Mr. President.

NEPAL USA INDIA LATVIA RUSSIA ZAMBIA PAKISTAN

Date: Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

NEPAL

Joint Communique on Talks Between Shri Kirti Nidhi Bista and Sardar Swaran Singh

The following Joint Communique was issued in Kathmandu September 5, 1971 at the end of the talks between the Prime, Minister of Nepal, the Rt. Hon'ble Shri Kirti Nidhi Bista and the Foreign Minister of India, Sardar Swaran Singh:

The Foreign Minister of India, Sardar Swaran Singh, paid a goodwill visit to Nepal from 3rd September to 5th September 1971 at the invitation of His Majesty's Government of Nepal. He was accompanied by Shri P. N. Menon, Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Shri Thomas Abraham, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, and Shri S. Venkataraman, Under Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs.

During his visit, the Minister of External Affairs of India had an audience

182

with His Majesty the King of Nepal. He had talks with the Rt. Hon'ble Shri Kirti Nidhi Bista, Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, His Majesty's Government of Nepal, and also paid a courtesy call on the Hon'ble Shri Gyanendra Bahadur Karki, Minister of Education, Land Reform, Food, Agriculture and Forest.

The Ambassador of India in Kathmandu, His Excellency Shri L. P. Singh, and the Royal Nepalese Ambassador in New Delhi, His Excellency Sardar Bhim Bahadur Pande, Shri B. R. Bhandary, Foreign Secretary, His Majesty's Government of Nepal and Shri P. N. Menon, Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, assisted the Ministers during these talks.

The Prime Minister and Foreign Minister discussed in depth and perspective the relations between India and Nepal in various fields. They reiterated their mutual respect for, and interest in each other's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and the principle of non-interference in internal affairs. They emphasized the age-old close links between the two countries and peoples in various fields, and stressed the need to further strengthen them to their mutual benefit.

The Minister of External Affairs of India appreciated the all-round progress made by Nepal under the wise guidance of His Majesty the King.

His Excellency the Prime Minister of Nepal expressed appreciation of His Majesty's Government for the assistance given by the Government of India to Nepal and expressed the hope that this cooperation would continue. The Foreign Minister of India assured the Prime Minister of Nepal that the Government of India would continue their efforts to widen the areas of co-operation between the two countries.

The two Ministers expressed satisfaction over the recently concluded Treaty of Trade and Transit and expressed the hope that this Treaty would help Nepal to implement rapidly its policy of industrialisation and diversification of her trade.

The Prime Minister of Nepal and the Minister of External Affairs discussed the international situation and reiterated their continued adherence to the policy of non-alignment as an important factor in the maintenance of universal peace and international security and the lessening of tensions in the world.

The Prime Minister of Nepal noted the social and economic implications to India as a result of facing the problem of millions of refugees from East Pakistan. The two Ministers agreed on the urgent need for the creation of conditions for the return of the refugees to their homes.

The Foreign Minister of India thanked

the Prime Minister of Nepal for the hospitality and courtesies extended to him and his party during their stay in Kathmandu. On behalf of the Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, he extended a cordial invitation to His Excellency the Prime Minister of Nepal to visit India as soon as convenient which has been accepted.

NEPAL INDIA USA PAKISTAN

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

ROMANIA

Text of Memorandum of Discussions

Following is the text of the MEMO-RANDUM of the discussions held on the occasion of the visit to the Socialist Republic of Romania of Shri L. N. Mishra, Minister of Foreign Trade of India:

At the invitation of the Minister of Foreign Trade of the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Minister of Foreign Trade of India, Mr. L. N. Mishra paid a visit to the Socialist Republic of Romania from September 9 to 11, 1971. During the visit, Mr. L. N. Mishra, the Minister of Foreign Trade of India, was received by the President of the Council of State of the

183
Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae
Ceausescu and by the President of the
Council of Ministers, Ion Gheorghe Maurer.

The Indian Minister had discussions with the Minister for Foreign Trade of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Cornel Burtica, as well as with Nicolae Cocos, Deputy Minister of Machine Building Indus-

try of Romania. Mr. Than India's Ambassador in Bucharest was also present during these discussions.

Further discussions were also held between Mr. Nicolae Nicolae, First Deputy Minister for Foreign Trade of Romania and Mr. V. S. Misra, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Trade of India.

During the talks, the Ministers for Foreign Trade of the two countries appreciated positively the development of the commercial exchange and economic and technical cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Romania and India, and agreed upon the necessity of taking additional measures for deepening, expanding and diversifying them on an enduring basis.

- 1. It was agreed upon between the two sides to raise the volume of trade exchanges by increasing to the extent possible the quantities of the goods already being exchanged between the two countries, and more particularly by diversifying the range of items in the trade plans. In pursuance of this, the two sides have already presented their first list to each other and it has been agreed that additional lists will be sent to each other as early as possible.
- 2. For ensuring a steady character of the trade exchanges between the two countries, sustained support will be given for conclusion of long term contracts. The lists of goods which are amenable to such contracts will also be finalised during the negotiation of the Trade Plan for 1972,
- 3. Recognising wide possibilities for the development of the technical and industrial cooperation between the Socialist Republic of Romania and India, the two sides agreed to support the cooperation activities between the Romanian and Indian industries and to give special attention to cooperation in the field of machinery and equipment.
- 4. For ensuring promotion of trade exchanges between the two countries, it was agreed by both sides that the two Ministries of Foreign Trade should encourage contacts

between the commercial organisations of the two countries and facilitate reciprocal visits to enable both countries to know each other's requirements.

It was also agreed to set up in both countries Indo-Romanian groups under the auspices of the Chambers of Commerce and other appropriate organisations as well as other joint groups of specialists in order to bring about a positive contribution to the Promotion of the economic relation between the Socialist Republic of Romania and India.

- 5. Attaching importance to the development of the economic cooperation between the two countries by setting up joint ventures and other forms of co-operation in Third countries, it has been agreed by both sides to nominate specialised organisations in both countries to identify jointly ways and means of securing the objective.
- 6. The two sides have recognised the importance of full implementation of the Annual Trade Plans, Trade and Payments Agreement and the Agreement for Economic and Technical Cooperation in force between India and the Socialist Republic of Romania, and have stressed upon the necessity of achieving a significantly higher rate of growth in the trade exchanges between the two countries through the Annual Trade Plans, and other forms of Indo-Romanian Commercial Cooperation.
- 7. The two Ministers have agreed to take special measures for the implementation of the Trade Plan provisions for 1971.
- 8. To this end, it has been agreed to hold the negotiations for finalising the Annual Trade Plan for 1972, within the long term Trade and Payment Agreement existing between India and the Socialist Republic of Romania, as far as possible within the last quarter of 1971. The Romanian side expressed its wish to hold these negotiations latest in November 1971 so as to allow 1972 contracts being concluded in due time. The precise date of the negotiations will be mutually agreed upon by both sides.

184

The Minister of Foreign Trade of India, Shri L. N. Mishra invited the Minister for Foreign Trade of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Cornel Burtica, to visit India. The discussions were held in a cordial atmosphere of mutual understanding.

OMAN ROMANIA USA INDIA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

President Giri's Speech at Banquet in Singapore

Speaking at the banquet given in his honour by the president of Singapore September 15, 1971, the president, Shri V. V. Giri said:

On behalf of my wife and myself I thank Your Excellency for your warm words of friendship and welcome. I am grateful to you, Mr. President, for the cordial invitation you had extended to me which has enabled me to visit Singapore. I am deeply touched by the warmth of welcome accorded to me and my wife ever since our arrival here. This is not the first time I am visiting Singapore, the Lion City, for 55 years ago, in 1916 I spent a pleasant fortnight here on my way back to India from U.K. after my studies. I can never forget the hospitality and the affection that was shown to me by the people of this place. In fact your kindness and affection is such that anyone coming to Singapore feels at once at home with you.

The year 1916 to the year 1971 is Indeed a far cry and changes of great magnitude

have taken place throughout the world and your country and mine are no exceptions. The progress that your State has made in many directions is indeed phenomenal and this has become possible, thanks to the dynamic leadership of your popular Prime Minister, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew as well as to your own able guidance, Mr. President. Singapore owes a lot to the drive, imagination and initiative of its great leaders. During my one day stay here, I have already been able to get a general idea of the progress and prosperity of Singapore. The society that you have built up and the economic levels it has attained am an object lesson for all and demonstrate how hard work, discipline and self-sacrifice can achieve even in a country with limited natural resources such good results.

We are no strangers to each other; for centuries there has been constant traffic between our two countries in trade, commerce and other fields. We are both- developing countries and members of the non-aligned and Afro-Asian group. Like you, we are a country of many religions and many languages and your success in building a common identity for your people from various races is an effort which we admire. Nation-building is a task common to all countries in this region. However, because of our size and population our problems are magnified many times. When we became independent we gave ourselves a constitution which set before us the goal of economic development and social justice for our people to be achieved by means of a democratic system based on adult suffrage. If freedom is to be preserved and economic progress is to be achieved within a framework of balanced development in our various regions. we cannot afford to be impatient or ignore the opinion of our people; on the contrary we must give our people a sense of active participation in nation-building activities. our efforts in the achievement of our goals have met with success because of the willing cooperation and sacrifices of our people through all the stresses and strains of the past many years.

The recent influx of over eight million

refugees across our eastern borders has created special problems for us. We are

185

sharing with these neighbours our limited resources. We have given them temporary shelter as a trust for the international community till such time as these people can return to their homeland in safety and honour. The creation of the necessary conditions to achieve this objective is the urgent need of the hour.

We both believe in non-alignment as the basis of foreign policy and in cooperation with reach other to further our economic development. In the south-east Asian region, there has been a fresh urge towards regional cooperation. We fully support this and are prepared to play our part in increasing cooperation among the countries in this region. There is already a considerable exchange of information and knowledge in various fields between Singapore and India. I am sure that this cooperation will increase in the coming years to our mutual benefit.

My visit to your young and beautiful country is a reaffirmation of the goodwill and affection of the Government and people of India towards Singapore and its people.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I invite you to rise and drink a toast to the President of the Republic of Singapore and the people of Singapore.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Shri Giri's Speech at Reception by Singapore Chamber of Commerce

Following is the text of the speech by the President, Shri V. V. Giri, at a reception held by the Singapore Chamber of Commer- in his honour on September 16, 1971:

At the outset, let me express my happinest and pleasure to be with you all today. Since my arrival in Singapore, I have been deeply conscious of the friendship and affection which has been manifested towards me my wife and the members of my Party by the Government and people of Singapore. I am conscious that this is an expression of the strong feelings of sympathy and friendship which exist between the peoples of our two countries

We in India admire greatly the rapid pace of and technological progress made by Singapore during the short period since the achievment of her independence. I shall carry beck with me many lessons gained from the remarkable progress and achivement which the people of your nation have made in the economic, industrial and sociological fields. On a somewhat vaster comes, India seeks the same goal of harmonising our ancient traditions with the demands of rapid economic development and social Justice for our people using the weapons of modern technological development. Facing ourselves the problem of national integration, there is a special fascination for us to watch the evolution of your country into a multi-racial society. We too share the same fundamental objective of maintaining a secular state. I must, therefore, voice my tribute that this audience proves the efficacy of the efforts made by Singapore to integrate the various racial and religious sectors of your people into an harmonious whole.

We have a happy tradition of personal contacts between our leaders and I hope that these are sustained by regular visits to each other's country in the future. We have always emphasised the value of the cooperation between our two countries. Both our peoples have derived satisfaction and advantage from such cooperation. We have expressed a desire on various occasions that the economic relations, particularly between

Singapore and India, should grow and that there should be increased exchanges between businessmen, industrialists, and the Chambers of Commerce of the two countries.

Singapore and India have always attached the highest importance to the concept of regional economic cooperation and supported each other in international forums in this matter. We in India feel that the most convenient platform for economic cooperation would, be a broad based approach so that all the countries in the region

186

could effectively participate on a multilateral basis. It is for this reason that we have advocated a greater role for the Asian Council of Ministers under the auspices of the ECAFE. We believe that Singapore also can benefit from such a participation as her complementarity with the economies of other countries in the region will continue to grow with the increased industrialisation of our region.

In taking leave of you, May I once again convey my greetings and good wishes and express the hope that the bilateral economic and commercial exchanges between our two countries will show further increases in the years to come.

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Text of Joint Soviet-Indian Statement

Following is the, text of the Joint Soviet - Indian Statement released on

September 29, 1971:

At the invitation of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, paid a State visit to the USSR from September 27 to 29, 1971.

The Head of the Government of friendly India and her party were accorded a warm welcome testifying to the profound feelings of sincere friendship and respect of the Soviet people towards the great Indian people and India's leaders.

During her stay in Moscow, the Prime Minister laid wreaths at the Mausoleum of V. I. Lenin and the Tomb of Unknown Soldier

At a solemn meeting of Indo-Soviet Friendship Society the Soviet public warmly greeted the Head of the Indian Government. The Lomonosov State University of Moscow conferred on Shrimati Indira Gandhi the Degree of Doctor of Science, Honoris Causa.

The Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, had talks and discussions with the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, the Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Mr. N. V. Podgorny, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, Mr. A. N. Kosygin.

Taking part in the talks were:

On the Soviet side: Mr. N. S. Patolichev, Mr. S. A. Skachkov, Mr. V. V. Kuznetsov, Mr. N. P. Firyubin, Mr. N. M. Pegov, and Mr. A. A. Fomin.

On the Indian side: S/shri D. P. Dhar, T. N. Kaul, K. S. Shelvankar, R. D. Sathe, K. P. S. Menon, A. P. Venkateswaran, A. K. Damodaran, K. K. Bhargava, S. V. Purushottam and M. M. Malhoutra.

The talks. which were held in an atmosphere of cordiality and mutual understanding, covered a wide range of subjects of Soviet-Indian bilateral relations as well as important current international problems of

mutual interest.

Both sides expressed their profound satisfaction at the successful development of relations of friendship and fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and India in the political, economic, trade, scientific, technical, cultural and other fields.

They declared their conviction that this cooperation acquires still more firm political and legal basis in the Treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the

187 USSR and India, signed in New Delhi on August 9, 1971.

The two sides fully agreed that the conclusion of the Treaty is an event of outand historic importance for both countries and has further strengthened the relations of sincere friendship, respect, mutual confidence and good-neighbourly cooperation existing between the Soviet Union and India.

The conclusion of the Treaty reaffirms that Soviet Union-Indian friendship is based not on any transient factor, but on long-term vital interests of the peoples of both countries and their desire to develop to the utmost many-sided cooperation with each other for the purpose of economic and social progress, for safeguarding peace as well as the security of both countries.

Both sides declared their firm determination to be guided by the letter and spirit of the Treaty in regard to the further development of Soviet-Indian relations.

They expressed their satisfaction at the fact that the Treaty has met with the full and unreserved support of the peoples of the Soviet Union and India and has been widely welcomed throughout the world.

They noted with satisfaction the successful development of mutually beneficial economic and technical cooperation between the two countries and emphasised the fact that there are favourable prospects

for the further expansion and deepening of such cooperation, particularly in the fields of iron and steel industry, including special steel, alloys and non-ferrous, metallurgy, survey, exploration, and refining of oil and natural gas and in the field of petrochemical industry.

The two sides expressed satisfaction at the recent steps taken by them to identify new forms of mutual cooperation in the economic and technical fields, including such spheres as space research, utilisation of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, productive cooperation between industrial enterprises of both countries, etc. They consider it necessary to identify additional new fields in which such mutual cooperation could be expanded.

In this connection agreement was reached that experts of both countries would meet and work out specific proposals on the above-mentioned questions.

The two sides decided to set up an Inter-Governmental Commission on Economic, Scientific and Technical Co-operation. Both sides recognised the need in accordance with the Treaty, to develop contacts and ties at different levels, to enlarge and to make more comprehensive the exchange of views between the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and India on major international problems.

The Soviet side expressed its respect for India's policy of non-alignment aimed at lessening tensions in Asia and throughout the world and for strengthening peace and international co-operation.

The Indian side expressed its respect for the Soviet Union's peaceful foreign policy aimed at strengthening peace, friendship and international co-operation.

The exchange of views on current international problems revealed identity or proximity of the stands of the U.S.S.R. and India in regard to them.

The two sides paid primary attention to the development of the situation in Asia, to the hotbeds of tensions and military conflicts existing there, to the discussion of ways to stop and prevent the acts of aggression and to consolidate the foundations of peace on the Asian continent.

The two sides expressed their concern over the grave situation which has arisen on the Indian sub-continent as a result of the recent events in East Bengal and declared their determination to continue efforts aimed at the preservation of peace in that region.

The Prime Minister of India informed the Soviet side that the presence in India of over nine million refugees from East Bengal had engendered serious social and political tensions and economic strains in India.

This has caused a serious setback to the socioeconomic programmes of India.

188

The Soviet side highly appreciated India's humane approach to the problem created by the influx of these refugees from East Bengal and expressed its understanding of the difficulties confronting friendly India in connection with the mass inflow of refugees.

The Soviet side took into account the statement by the Prime Minister that the Government of India is fully determined to take all necessary measures to stop the inflow of refugees from East Bengal to India and to ensure that those refugees who are already in India return to their homeland without delay.

The Soviet side reaffirmed its position regarding the problem of refugees and other questions which have arisen as a result of the events in East Bengal as laid down in the appeal of the Chairman of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet Mr. N. V. Podgorny to the President of Pakistan Yahya Khan on the second of April, 1971.

Taking note of the developments in East Bengal since 25 March 1971, both sides consider that the interests of the preservation of peace demand that urgent measures should be taken to reach a political solution of the problems which have arisen there paying regard to the wishes, the inalienable rights and lawful interests of the people of East Bengal as well as for the speediest and safe return of the refugees to their homeland in conditions safeguarding their honour and dignity.

Taking into account the seriousness of the situation which has developed in the Indian sub-continent the two sides agreed to maintain further mutual contacts and to continue to exchange views on the questions arising in this connection.

The two sides expressed their profound concern over the situation in South-East Asia and pronounced themselves in favour of the necessity to withdraw all foreign troops from Indo-China in order to ensure peace and security for the peoples of that region, the realisation of their legitimate rights to shape their own future in accordance with their national interests and without any foreign interference.

They welcomed the recent seven-point proposal by the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam as an important step towards the creation of a basis for a peaceful political settlement and declared their support for these proposals.

The two sides expressed their serious concern over the tense situation in the Middle East. They stressed the need for all States concerned to make efforts with a view to achieve a lasting, stable and just peace on the basis of the full implementation of the U.N. Security Council Resolution of 22 November 1967.

Desirous of contributing to the improvement of the international situation, the Government of India highly appreciates the proposal to convene an all-European Conference on the questions of security and cooperation as an important step aimed at the relaxation of tensions not only on the European continent but throughout the

world.

Both sides believe that the cessation of the arms race and the achievement of general and complete disarmament, covering both nuclear and conventional types of weapons under strict and effective international control, are of primary importance for the preservation and strengthening of peace and security.

In the opinion of the two sides the convening of a world disarmament conference with the participation of all countries for achieving practicable and generally acceptable ways of solving pressing disarmament problems could be of great importance. The two sides consider it important to achieve in the near future an Agreement on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of biological weapons and toxins and on their destruction, as the first step on the way to the complete prohibition of chemical and biological methods of warfare.

The Prime Minister of India reaffirmed that the Indian Ocean area should be made a zone of peace. The Soviet side expressed its readiness to study this question and to solve it together with other powers on an equal basis.

The Soviet Union and India call for the speedy and complete elimination of the vestiges of colonialism and unqualified implementation of the U.N. Declaration on the

189

granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. They unequivocally condemn racism and apartheid in all forms and manifestations.

The two sides reaffirmed their adherence to the principles of peaceful coexistence among States with different social systems and pronounced themselves in favour of all questions at issue in relations between countries being solved by peaceful means.

The Soviet Union and India attach great importance to the United Nations.

Both sides confirmed their determination to seek the strengthening of the U.N.O. and the enhancing of its effectiveness in maintaining universal peace and security in accordance with the U.N. Charter.

Both sides expressed their confidence that the visit of the Prime Minister of India to the Soviet Union and the talks and discussions which were held with Soviet leaders during the visit, will promote the further development of friendly cooperation between the two countries and the strengthening of peace and international security.

The Prime Minister of India extended a cordial invitation to the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., Mr. L. I. Brezhnev, and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. A. N. Kosygin, to visit India. The invitations were accepted with thanks.

INDIA USA RUSSIA PAKISTAN CHINA VIETNAM

Date: Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Soviet Lunch

Following is the text of the speech of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at lunch given in Moscow on September 28, 1971 by Mr. A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers:

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to be in Moscow once again at the kind invitation of the leaders and the Government of the U.S.S.R I am especially glad that I have been able to come here so soon after the signing of the Soviet-Indian Treaty for Peace, Friendship and Cooperation.

The Treaty has been widely acclaimed throughout our country and in the Soviet Union. Even the traditional critics of Indo-Soviet friendship in various parts of the world have recognised the importance of the Treaty. Yet there are some in India and abroad, who are trying to misinterpret its meaning and purpose. However, I am convinced that in the coming months and years they also will realise that the Treaty will help the evolution of a saner, more peaceful international situation.

The essence of Soviet-Indian friendship as it has developed over the years, is mutual recognition of the importance of our two vast aggregates of territory and population and of the benefits that our two nations and the world will derive if our work for peace and development can be correlated and reinforced. There have of course been many and varied links in the course of our long histories. I remember seeing in the Leningrad Museum a reference to the gift of an elephant from India long ago. Tolstoy's influence on Mahatma Gandhi's thinking is well-known. After independence, it was my father who initiated our policy of friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union and laid the foundation of India's policy of nonalignment. I am glad that both these Policies have gained strength ever since.

Long before we liberated ourselves from colonial rule, we admired the great experiment of social reconstruction which you had undertaken in your country, the results of which we can see around us. The Indian people respect the vision which has inspired your achievements. In the same way, I should think that your regard for India springs from your recognition of our aims, endeavours and our potentiality.

I hope that my country, which encompasses one-seventh of humanity, will always be a factor for peace and progress in the

world. It is this, I believe, that has prompted your friendship and co-operation with us. Our people have greatly benefitted from Soviet economic co-operation and assistance. They realise that Indo-Soviet co-operation is not merely an arrangement between two Governments. It is a coming together of two great and friendly countries. Apart from economic co-operation and mutual understanding on many international issues, our cultural bonds have been steadily growing. In no other country are Indian languages and literature so widely studied and Indian music, dance and drama so greatly appreciated as in the Soviet Union. Your literature, music and science which have vastly enriched man's heritage are now available to our people as never before.

Indian history will remember 1971 as an eventful year. We are certainly at a momentous juncture. From March until now, there have been many important developments. At the year's beginning, our economy had just regained its elan after eight troubled years. Our General Elections, held in March, brought greater clarity to the national scene and gave a firmer direction to our political life. We were all set to launch the second phase of our national development during which the promise of equality and freedom from want could come closer to reality. Our Parliament had been in session for just a week and the representatives of the nation were still shaking one another's hands when beyond our borders there occurred events which have created incalculable difficulties for us. In East Bengal, there is a grave confrontation between the people and the Government of Pakistan. and the actions of the Pakistan Army have compelled millions of people to leave their homes and to seek shelter in India. One cannot but be perturbed when fire breaks out in a neighbour's house. What has happened in East Bengal - or Bangla Desh, as the world has begun to call it can no longer be regarded as Pakistan's domestic affair. More than 9 million East Bengalis have come into our country. Do they not have the right to live and work in

their own homeland? We cannot be expected to absorb them. We have problems enough of our own and we certainly do not need to add to our vast population. In fact, much money and effort are going into plans to control population growth.

This is not an Indo-Pakistan dispute. The problem is an international one. But the weight of it has fallen on India, stretching our resources, financial and otherwise, to the limit. The international response has fallen short of the scale which a grim tragedy of this magnitude demands. It is surely the duty of the world not to delay in creating conditions in which these refugees irrespective of their religion can return without fear.

The growing agony of the people of East Bengal does not seem to have moved many Governments. Our restraint has been appreciated only in words. The basic issues involved, and the real threat to peace and stability in Asia are being largely ignored. We are glad that the leaders of the Soviet Union have counselled Pakistan to reach a political solution which will satisfy the aspirations of the people of Fast Bengal. We hope that these efforts will bear fruit.

The Soviet Union has initiated many moves for world peace. We welcome the understanding which has been reached with the Federal Republic of Germany, and we sincerely hope that further relaxation of other tensions will follow. While Europe is coming nearer to enduring peace, it is tragic that a new threat to peace has emerged in Asia, a Continent already tortured by prolonged conflicts in the Middle Fast and the South East. I will support the inalienable rights of all peoples, especially those of the brave Vietnamese people, to national independence and freedom.

The search for peace calls for determined effort. Peace cannot be attained by waiting and hoping, but through action and perserverance. Even for an individual, there cannot be a private quest for peace, nor for a nation can it be merely a national effort. It must be an international imperative. A day before he was assassinated,

Mahatma Gandhi said that the way to peace was to live amidst strife and to struggle with all one's might to overcome it. This applies to nations no less than it does to individuals. Dreams must be accompanied by endeavour. As Pushkin said:

I crave more life, more dreams, more agony

191

Midmost the care, the panic, the distress, I know that I shall taste of happiness.

I am glad to have had this opportunity of meeting and exchanging views with the leaders of the Soviet Union. Our discussions have been useful and them has been- a similarity of Views which reflects the closeness of our relationship. I am confident that our understanding will result in further strengthening peace, security and progress not only on the Indian Sub-Continent but in Asia and throughout the world.

I thank you for your gracious hospitality and the people of this great country for their friendship and understanding which we value so much. May it strengthen us and contribute to the peace and welfare of all peoples.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, May I request you to join me in drinking a toast to ever growing friendship between our two great countries and peoples and to peace and progress.

RUSSIA USA INDIA PAKISTAN GERMANY VIETNAM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner for Soviet Leaders

Following is the full text of the speech of the prime minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at the dinner given by her to Soviet leaders on September 28, 1971 in Moscow:

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

I am very happy to have come to your country and talked with Your leaders- I am especially happy that the General Secretary, Mr. Brezhnev, was able to join the talks. I believe that our talks have been useful and that they will certainly lead to better understanding between us.

The recently signed Indo-Soviet Treaty for peace, Friendship and Co-operation has been widely welcomed by the peoples of India and the U.S.S.R. We have had a long tradition of friendship between our two Governments and, If I may Say so, between the peoples of the Soviet Union and India, but this Treaty has certainly brought us closer and has improved the prospects of our co-operation.

As you remarked this morning, Mr. Prime Minister, our friendship is not based on a passing whim but on certain fundamental policies.

The close relationship between the Soviet Union and India has been a long and memorable one. Our friendship has grown with-each passing year. In the international field we have a close identity of views on major world problems. We have stood together in the councils of the world in the struggle against colonialism, imperialism and the exploitation of man by man. We share a common belief in peaceful coexistence and co-operation of States with differing social systems. We agree that the policy of non-alignment pursued by India is a dynamic force which can help to reduce tension in the world. We believe in the right of a people to shape their own destiny according to their own national genius. And both our countries have a deep abhorrence of war, and believe in general and complete disarmament.

Bilaterally the co-operation between the Soviet Union and India has been of immense mutual benefit- It has greatly strengthened the public sector of our economy in vital branches like steel, petroleum and other basic and heavy industries. Our trade turnover has increased phenomenally over the years, particularly after the agreement on the rupee payment system. What is perhaps of great significance than the increase in the volume of our trade has been its changing pattern. The Soviet Union is now supplying India with larger quantities of industrial raw materials, sophisticated machinery and technical know-how, while at the same time importing more of manu-

192

factured goods from India. There are also good possibilities of multilateral cooperation in many spheres. I regard all these as signs of a healthy and dynamic relationship, and I am confident that in the years to come our cooperation will grow stronger.

During our struggle for independence we thought that once we were free we would pursue uninterruptedly the path of progress. But from time to time thereafter we found that the freedom we had won was never secure, that one had to fight and struggle for it year after year. We have faced enormous difficulties on our path of securing for our people the rights which they should have.

Recently, the people of India gave their support to our policies in a very clear-cut manner. They turned the general elections from merely a party election to a "People's Election".

But before we could begin to fulfil the promises which we had made to them during the elections, events took place in a neighbouring country, which, for no fault of ours, placed a tremendous burden on our Government and on the people of India.

The burden is a financial one; it is a political one; it is one connected with security problems.

The events which were an "internal problem" of a neighbouring country have become very much "our problem", in fact "an international problem".

We have today in our country foreign nationals in numbers large enough to constitute the population of New Zealand and Sweden combined.

We are treating them as guests - but we have no doubt that these people must go back to their homes in peace and safety. Otherwise peace cannot be secured in our part of the world.

Even before this, our people have faced many difficulties with courage and unity and I have no doubt that they will face this situation also in that spirit.

I have been to Moscow and other parts of the Soviet Union several times, and on every occasion I have been received with great friendship and warmth. I should like to take this opportunity once more to thank you, and through you all the Soviet people for their friendship which I regard as the friendship for India and for Indian people.

We have had the pleasure and the privilege of having Chairman Kosygin and many other Soviet friends in India in the past. And now in the next few days. we will have the privilege of receiving President Podgorny in India for a short while.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Brezhnev will also pay us a visit one of these days.

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

May I request you to rise and drink a toast to the health of Chairman Kosygin and leaders of the Soviet Union, to the happiness of the people of the Soviet Union, to the friendship of our two countries and, if I may add, to the Indo-Soviet. Treaty for

193

RUSSIA USA INDIA NEW ZEALAND SWEDEN

Date: Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid for New Indian Ship Ord"

The following press release was issued in New Delhi on September 2, 1971 on British aid for new Indian Ship order:

Arrangements were concluded today in New Delhi for a British aid allocation of & 6,125,000 (Rs. 11 crores) to finance the building of a giant cargo ship for India by a Scottish firm.

A bulk carrier of 75,000 tons dead weight will be built for the Scindia. Steam Navigation Company of India by the Lower Clyde shipbuilding firm of Scott Lithgow. Due for delivery in 1976, the new ship will be 805 feet long, with a maximum breadth of 106 feet and a loaded draft of 45 feet. It will be powered by diesel machinery built by another Scottish firm, John G. Kincaid and Co. of Greenock.

This is the second Indian shipping order this year from Scott Lithgow to be financed by British aid loans. In March, letters were exchanged providing for aid loans totalling & 11.5 (Rs. 21 crores) million for two bulk carriers for the Shipping Corporation of India. Britain is the only country which has so far agreed to the Government of India's proposal that the purchase of complete ships should be

financed out of aid funds.

The Scindia ship will be used mainly for the carriage of iron ore exported by India to Japan. Its purchase will assist India's economic development by increasing the proportion of foreign trade carried in Indian vessels and thus saving foreign exchange.

INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA JAPAN

Date : Sep 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

New Loan Agreement

Following is the text of a press note issued in New Delhi On September 6, 1971 on the signing of a new Indo-British loan agreement:

Britain is to lend & 7.5 million (Rs. 13.5 crores) to India as debt relief aid under an agreement signed here today.

Mr. Peter Male, Acting British High Commissioner, signed on behalf of the British Government, and Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary in the Department of Economic Affairs of the Ministry of Finance for the Government of India.

The loan fulfils part of the pledge made by the British Government at this year's India Consortium meeting in Paris. Members then undertook to extend to a fourth year the Consortium's three-year scheme under which money was made available to India for debt relief purposes.

Under the terms of the agreement signed today, the loan is not tied to the

purchase of goods and services from Britain and is therefore a valuable supplement to India's foreign exchange resources.

The new aid loan - like all British loans to India since 1965 - is interest free and repayable over 25 years, with no repayments during the first seven years.

Debt relief aid as a form of quickly disbursable non-project aid to India was allocated by Britain in 1966-67 when she

194 made & 8.4 million available in an interest-free debt refinancing loan. A second similar British loan of & 11.6 million followed in 1967-68.

This British initiative was taken up by the Aid-India Consortium and broadened into a three-year scheme prepared by Mr. Guillaume Guindey for the Consortium meeting of March 1968. As originally planned the scheme provided India with \$ 300 million for debt relief purposes in the three years ended 1970-71. At its meeting last June the Consortium extended the scheme to a fourth year, with provision for \$ 90 million in 1971-72.

195

INDIA MALDIVES FRANCE

Date: Sep 01, 1971

October

Volume No

1995

Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII OCTOBER

No. 10

CONTENTS

PAGE

AUSTRALIA

Indo-Australian Cultural Agreement

197

200

BELGIUM

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner Given in Her Honour by Belgium Premier 197
Prime Minister's Speech at Brussels Royal Institute of International Affairs 198

Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Agreement on Co-operation in Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy and Space Research 201

FRANCE

Air Services Agreement 201

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's U.N. day Message 202

Address by Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh, on

U.N. Day 1971 203

Indian Delegate's Speech in U.N. General Assembly rejecting

bilateral negotiations With Pakistan on Bangla Desh 20

Shri Sen's Speech at Security Council on South Africa Apartheid 208

Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. General Assembly on Crisis in Pakistan 210

Shri Sen's Speech at Security Council on Situation in Mamibia 214

MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE

Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. Political Committee on Admission of People's Republic of China 216

Statement on World Security 217

Shri Rudra Pratap Singh's Speech at the Social and Eco Committee 227		
Shri Khan's Statement on Liberation Movements		234
Indian Delegate's Statement on Southern Rhodesia		236
Statement by Shri B. P. Das on Elimination of Racial I crimination 238		
TONGA		
President's Speech at Palam Airport welcoming King and Queen of Tonga 243		
King of Tonga's Reply	244	
President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of King and of Tonga 244	Queen	
King of Tonga's Reply	244	
President's Speech Bidding Farewell to King and Queen of Tonga 246		
King of Tonga's Reply	246	
UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS		
President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Podgorny 246		
Soviet President's Reply	248	
Text of Joint Press Statement on Indo-Soviet Consultation	ons	249
UNITED KINGDOM		
Prime Minister's Speech at Royal Institute of Internation Relations, London	nal 250	
YUGOSLAVIA		
President Giri's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Tito 253		
President Tito's Reply	254	
President Tito's Farewell Statement	256	
Joint Communique on Indo-Yugoslav Talks	2	256

AUSTRALIA USA BELGIUM GERMANY FRANCE INDIA PAKISTAN SOUTH AFRICA CHINA TONGA UNITED KINGDOM YUGOSLAVIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

AUSTRALIA

Indo-Australian Cultural Agreement

The following is the text of a joint Indo-Australian press statement issued in New Delhi October 21, 1971 after the signing of the Cultural Agreement between India and Australia:

The Fifth Consultative Meeting between officials of the Ministry of External Affairs of India and of the Department of Foreign Affairs of Australia was held at New Delhi on October 19th, 20th and 21st, 1971. The Australian Delegation consisted of Sir Keith Waller, CBE, Permanent Secretary, Department of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Patrick Shaw, CBE, High Commissioner for Australia in India and Mr. Peter Henderson, Assistant Secretary, Department of Foreign Affairs. They were assisted by Mr. I. E. Nicholson, Deputy High Commissioner and other officers of the Australian High Commission. The Indian delegation consisted of Shri T. N. Kaul, Foreign Secretary, Shri S. K. Banerji and Shri P. N. Menon, Secretaries in the Ministry of External Affairs. They were assisted by Shri S. Krishnamurti, High Commissioner for India in Australia and other officials of the Government of India.

The discussions took place with the customary frankness and cordiality. It was reaffirmed that these periodic discussions led to better understanding and hence to the

greater strengthening of the close and friendly relations between India and Australia. The two sides were able to exchange views on a wide range of international questions, special stress being laid on Asia, and also on bilateral relations, in the economic, educational, scientific, cultural and technical fields.

A cultural agreement between the two countries has also been signed. An increase in exchanges and further cooperation is expected to take place.

AUSTRALIA USA INDIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BELGIUM

Prime Minister's Speech at Dinner Given in Her Honour by Belgium Premier

Following is the text of the speech of Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at the dinner given in her honour by the Prime Minister of Belgium, Mr. G. Eyskens, on October 24, 1971:

It is a pleasure to be in Belgium and have the Opportunity of meeting its leaders. I thank you for your invitation and your gracious hospitality. My visit to Belgium has rekindled old memories. I was under ten when I first came here and experienced the thrill of my first flight from Ostend to Dover, and that was an exciting experience. My next visit was in connection with a Conference of the International union of Child Welfare. The city was in a festive mood then, for it was the time of the great Brussels Fair which was an example of the energy, the organisational ability, the meticulousness and the sense of purpose which

have made Belgium what it is. The history of Belgium is one of great achievements. The cathedrals and noble town halls of the middle ages are part of the world's heritage. In later years came the great tapestries, and those immortals of the art world Brueghel, Rubens, and Van Dyck. My own

197

discovery of Maurice Materlinck opened a new world for me, giving insight into the wonderful Organisation of the lives of insects and arousing my interest in nature, which is a continuing delight.

A few months ago, we welcomed their Majesties the King and Queen of Belgium. Their dignity, sincerity and sympathetic understanding made a deep impression on our people. Their visit was brief. But perhaps they had a glimpse of what we are trying to do against tremendous odds. To bring a better life to a country as vast and ancient as India, steeped in poverty and bound in tradition, in a system which is perhaps the freest in the world, can never be easy.

Many have criticised our ways and our endeavours. It was said that no people could win independence through non-violent means. Yet our leaders' faith in our people proved that their way was the right one for India. Doubts were then expressed whether India could remain united and whether democracy could take hold and survive in an undeveloped country where literacy was low. In the fifth elections to our Parliament this year, 152 million people went to the polls and exercised their right to vote even though in some places there was threat of violence. They showed maturity and discrimination. Similar doubts were expressed about the process of democratic planning. Our plans have had their ups and downs, but they have given us direction and we have moved steadily forward.

Just two or three years ago, foreign experts were prophesying that we would never be able to feed our growing population. It was in the very years of unprecedented and severe drought that we introduced our new agricultural strategy and today inspite of floods in the north and drought in the South, we have Produced 108 million tonnes of foodgrains, making India self-sufficient in this sphere. Our industrial production has trebled. In 1951, 23 million children went to school. Today their number' is 80 million. We have 21/2 million university students. Unchanging India is on the move. Although our achievement has not been insignificant, we are only too acutely aware that we have barely touched the fringe of the problem. Our people still live in several centuries and the poverty of ages cannot be removed in a few years. In our planning we are endeavouring to combine progress with social justice. Through our programmes we are attempting to help the weakest in any section, the small farmer, the small industrialist, the new entrepreneur, so that little by little inequality can be lessened.

It is ironic that just when we had at long last reached a point for rapid economic advance; suddenly and through no fault of ours, a tremendous burden fell upon us. India which is one of the poorest countries in the world, has the additional burden of looking after thirteen per cent of the population of East Bengal which is now on Indian soil. Thus, what was the Problem of another country has now been deliberately converted into a problem for India. This is not just an economic question. It has deep political and social overtones and is a real threat to our security and stability. It is the world's responsibility to create conditions in which there can be a lasting and acceptable solution.

I am grateful for the generous gesture which you have just announced. Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, I invite you to drink to the health and long life of their Majesties the King and Queen of Belgium, to the prosperity of Belgium, to the health of the Prime Minister and to friendship and cooperation between our two countries.

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BELGIUM

Prime Minister's Speech At Brussels Royal Institute of International Affairs

Following is the text of the speech delivered by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi at Royal Institute of International Affairs, Brussels, on October 25, 1971:

It is indeed a privilege to address the Royal Institute of International Affairs, and this gives me the opportunity to tell you something about my country and the thinking of the one-seventh of mankind who live there. Each country is so involved in its own problems that it can seldom keep up with trends and events thousands of miles away.

198

The world is one but each of us sees it from a different angle. There is the national position and its historical evolution. There is the personal point of view, largely determined by one's political philosophy and economic status. For two centuries or more, Europe dominated the world. In the present century, the United States and later the Soviet Union came to share this influence. Only after World War II did Asia become a factor in European thinking. Africa appeared on the world scene a little later.

Until the countries of Asia and Africa had struggled for and won their freedom, their problems and even their rich treasure of civilisation and culture were of concern to only a few scholars and specialists. Now there is better communication and little more knowledge, but developments in Asia are still measured by the standards and way of living of the affluent countries. It is 24 years since our Independence. Until then we could have no foreign or for that matter, any other policy since decisions were taken for us, not by us.

My father's interest in freedom and justice was not limited to our own struggle. He came to the meeting of the League against imperialism here in Brussels in 1926 and met the leaders of other Independence movements. Thus he had personal contacts with what was happening in other countries and he was a true citizen of the world. He gave our nationalistic movement clear ideas about the kind of political institutions we wanted in the future and the manner in which we would conduct our relations with our countries. It is this that enabled us to see our problems - not as exclusive Indian ones but in the perspective of the world's problems.

An organic world view unites our internal and external policies. Politically, we have established institutions which, in the words of our own Constitution, are formed by a passion "for political, economic and social justice'. Our democratic impulse owes its origin not so much to the legislative institutions, introduced during colonial rule as to the entire spirit of people's sovereignty which our nationalist movement had evoked. Economically, our endeavour is to overcome, as early as possible, our crippling poverty and to lessen the inequalities which were bred by colonialism, feudalism and the delay in adopting modem technology. We are modernising our agriculture, expanding and diversifying our industrial base so as to become self-reliant.

Since Independence the economic and social transformation of the country represents a vast qualitative advance during the first huff of this century. Under colonial subjugation, India's per capita income remained stagnant. The availability of goods and services per person in the middle 1940's was roughly the same as at the turn of the century. Our sustained efforts in the years after Independence have enabled the growth

of national income to be maintained at a rate of about 3.5 per cent per annum. In recent years the economy has tended to grow at an even faster pace. The country is now self-sufficient in food. With increasing expansion in irrigation facilities and fertiliser output, major breakthroughs are expected in other farm products as well. Starting from a flimsy base of consumer goods, industrial production has attained a range of depth and sophistication during the last two decades, the dramatic decline in the death rate and the Perceptible increase in the longevity of our people reflects the state of progress. Disparities do remain but the standard of living has risen substantially for all sections of the community even for those who continue to be under diverse social disabilities. The rigidity of traditional Indian society is weakening. Education and the political system have given confidence to our people. Women are participating actively ME all fields of life.

India lags behind the industrially advanced countries of the West in terms of material. comforts, but it has a pervasive social coherence which provides a firm foundation for accelerated economic growth in the coming years. During the nationalist movement our greatest emphasis was on non-violence, tolerance and on diversity within unity. The leadership of Mahatma Gandhi conditioned us to Choose the Path of settling disputes through Peaceful methods-This explains why, from the very moment of our freedom, we have stood for world peace, for non-alignment with military blocs, and for friendship with all nations, irrespective of their political systems.

199

We have never equated nonalignment with neutrality or unconcern or disassociation with countries belonging to power blocs. To us, the word has meant independence of judgement and action in international affairs, according to the merits of particular issues as they affect our own national interests and world peace. In the bipolar world of the early fifties, the very word non-alignment irritated some. But the

years have seen a blurring of the rigidity of alignment. Those who swore by alliances are making overtures to members of the opposite camp and the non-aligned. In the conditions of India, the principal problem of mankind is not the contest for power but the stark facts of poverty. The majority of the world's peoples are poor. They could be helped to a better life if their energy and resources which are today directed towards war were invested in their welfare. Problems on our own doorstep naturally tend to loom large.

A new crisis which has arisen surpasses in its magnitude all the earlier crises which have confronted us. Over nine million people of East Bengal - practically equal to the population of Belgium - have been terrorised and persecuted by the military rulers of Pakistan, and have been pushed inside our territory, jeopardising our normal life and our plans for the future. Should the world not take note of this new kind of aggression? This is not a civil war in the conventional sense. It is a genocidal pogrom of civilians merely because they voted democratically. It is cynical use of helpless human being as a weapon against a neighbour nation. We in India have shown the greatest self-restraint but there is no doubt that our stability and security are gravely threatened. Indeed, we feel the threat is to the peace of the entire region. The basic cause of this crisis must be remedied. A political solution must be found to this problem and to effective It must be acceptable to the elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh. To hold elections for seats which are not vacant in the present conditions of repression and chaos has no meaning or purpose. It is the responsibility of all those who are interested in peace to create conditions to stop the further influx of refugees and to enable those who are already in India to return to their homes in safety and dignity and without further delay.

Belgium has been the centre-piece of West European unity which is rightly the most cherished and urgent of your present objectives. Europe, so long rent by discord, is now pooling its resources for the solution of common problems. The European Economic Community is a great experiment in the voluntary coordination of national policies for larger regional purposes - not of war but of peace and development. An alliance for war provokes counter-action. But an alliance for peace has deeper ramifications. We welcome the relaxation of tensions in Europe and the treaties signed between the Federal Republic of Germany and USSR and Poland. We hope that steps to further reduce tension will be taken. We welcome European unity but we hope that it will not be aimed against any region, and that economic arrangements amongst advanced countries will not impose new hardships on those who like us, are making superhuman efforts to stand on their feet. Belgium has adopted enlightened Policies of International aid to developing countries. However, the terms of international trade have been steadily worsening for the suppliers of primary materials. A positive trade policy designed to help and not frustrate the efforts of developing countries would be worthy of the vision for which Belgium has been known.

BELGIUM USA INDIA LATVIA PAKISTAN GERMANY POLAND

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BELGIUM

Agreement on Avoidance of Double Taxation

Following press note was issued in New Delhi on October 8, 1971 at the conclusion of Indo-Belgium talks on avoidance of double taxation:

An Agreement for Avoidance of Double Taxation was concluded between India and

Belgium here today. It will come into force after approval and ratification by the Governments of the two countries.

The Belgium delegation to the talks was headed by Mr. Philippe Van Stevens, Inspector General, Central Administration, Direct

200

Taxes, and the Indian side by Shri R. D. Shah, Chairman, Central Board of Direct Taxes. The discussions, held between October 4 and 8, were conducted in an atmosphere of utmost cordiality and appreciation of each other's point of view.

The Agreement is aimed at facilitating the flow of investments from Belgium for India's economic development; it Will also promote increased trade and exchange of personnel between the two countries.

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Agreement on Co-operation in Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy and Space Research

Following is the text of a press note issued in New Delhi on October 8, 1971 On the signing of an Indo-F.R.G. agreement On co-operation regarding Peaceful uses of atomic energy and space re-search:

An Agreement was signed this morning between the Government of India and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on cooperation regarding peaceful uses of atomic energy and space research'. Dr. Vikram Sarabhai, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission and Secretary, Department of Atomic Energy signed on behalf of India and His Excellency Mr. Guenter Diehl, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany in India signed on behalf of the Federal Republic.

The Agreement is initially for a period of five years and the cooperation envisaged in the Agreement includes exchange of information regarding the peaceful uses of atomic energy and space research, the exchange of scientists and other research personnel and the execution of joint or coordinated research or development tasks. Details of the implementation of the Agreement will be discussed and decided upon through consultations from time to time between representatives of the two Governments.

GERMANY USA INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FRANCE

Air Services Agreement

Following press release was issued in New Delhi on October 14, 1971 on the conclusion of an air services agreement between India and France:

The national air carriers of India and France, Air India and Air France, have been authorised to operate Boeing 747 aircraft on their services through each other's territory, according to an air services agreement concluded last week in Paris.

The restriction on Air India that it could not excercise traffic rights between

Paris and New York, unless its service was routed via London, has been removed.

201

The agreement was signed in Paris by the leader of the Indian delegation Shri N. Sahgal, Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism. The French delegation to, the talks was led by Mr. M. R. Lathiere, Head of the Civil Aviation Administration in France.

Air France will continue with five services through India while Air India will have six services, according to the agreement. Air France will be entitled to six weekly services from April 1973 when Air India will be authorised a daily service through Paris.

FRANCE INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

President's UN. Day Message

Following is the text of the President Shri V. V. Giri's message issued on October 24, 1971 on the occasion of the U.N. Day:

Today is the 26th Anniversary of the establishment of United Nations which is observed as 'U.N. Day' by member-nations throughout the world. The Charter of the United Nations formulated immediately after the traumatic experience of the Second World War enshrines the hopes and aspirations as well as the collective will of mankind to strive in a common endeavour to save succeeding generations from the

scourge of war, to work for lasting peace and to make concerted efforts in political, social economic cultural, scientific, educational and other fields for the betterment of mankind.

The past 26 Years in the life of the U.N. have been a mixture of Successes and failures, hopes and disappointments and stresses and strains. The U.N. Charter has not been able to achieve all its goals in the short span of a generation. But this should be no cause for either despair or complacency. The United Nations is a unique Organisation in the annals of history and it is for the member nations and governments to make sincere and determined efforts to strengthen it so as to enable it to discharge its responsibilities in full measure. Although disappointments have been many, especially in the political field, the Organisation can be justly proud of some of its achievements in educational, scientific, cultural, technological and other spheres of human endeavour. The past year has seen significant developments for greater international co-operation through the U.N. and the adoption of various measures in the 25th session of the General Assembly are note-worthy; particularly, the Declaration of the Second U.N. Development Decade and the adoption of the Strategy for its implementation; the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security; the Declaration of Principles Governing Friendly Relations between States etc.

A measure of the involvement of U.N. in diverse fields and the commitment of the international community to it is the fact that today the Organisation enjoys the confidence of the governments and peoples the world over. From the original membership of 52 members in 1945 the U.N. is now composed of 131 members. We am glad that every year new members are being welcoined to take their place side by side with other nations in this world forum. We welcome the entry of Bhutan, Bahrain and Qatar in the U.N. this year. We hope that the efforts being made this year to restore its legitimate right to the Government of

the Peoples Republic of China in the U.N. will bear fruit.

The world is in the grip of powerful winds of change. The traditional resignation to fate of large sections of humanity is

202

giving way to the conviction that man's aspirations cannot be suppressed by outdated methods of colonialism, fascism and racism; nor can poverty be taken as a phenomenon beyond man's own endeavours to eradicate. Although the U.N. Charter strives towards the realisation of universal freedom, justice, liberty and economic and social progress, even today in the world we find that certain Powers are unwilling to grant fundamental rights and freedoms to the peoples of their colonies while others are denying to the majority of their population the democratic and legal rights and are trying to perpetuate rule by racist or bigoted minorities. The horrifying experience of the people of East Bengal who are suffering inhuman atrocities at the hands of the military regime of Pakistan has come as a great shock to the conscience of the civilised world. Over nine million men, women and children have fled Into our eastern States in search of security and shelter and thousands are coming in every day. This is a tragedy of historic dimension and the responsibility of assisting these refugees to return to their homeland in freedom and security and of helping the people of East Bengal to realise their legitimate democratic rights in their own homeland rests with the international community and the United Nations. This will surely be one of the severest tests that the U.N. has had to face and we hope that it can rise to the challenge and help restore freedom and peace to the brave people of Bangla Desh.

Although today man has made phenomenal strides in science and technology and is reaching for the stars, yet it is painful to see that the endeavours of man, on earth Itself have not succeeded in narrowing the gulf between the rich and the poor. Disease, poverty and ignorance still stalk half the

human race and efforts towards amelioration of vast masses of humanity need to be concerted on an international level. The role, the U.N. can play in this regard, will be crucial.

We in India have always striven for the establishment of universal peace and brotherhood not as a matter of political expediency but because we have been conditioned by our historical and cultural traditions and philosophical concepts to believe in the oneness of man and that peace and harmony are his natural condition. Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, reminded us of this great legacy through his concern for the dignity of Man, the uplift of the poor by collective and cooperative efforts and the principle of non-use of force. It is not surprising, therefore, that we have been steadfast in our support for the U.N. Charter and its activities.

We rededicate ourselves on this day to the United Nations and its ideals. We join with others in re-affirming our collective determination to strengthen the Organisation in order that it may serve as a more efficient tool for fashioning a better future for the world - a world in which there will be peace, progress and prosperity for all mankind and assurance of full freedom and fundamental rights to people everywhere."

INDIA USA BAHRAIN BHUTAN QATAR CHINA PAKISTAN

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Address by Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh, on U.N. Day 1971

Following is the text of the address by

the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh On October 24, 1971 at a function held in New Delhi to observe the 26th anniversary of the United Nations:

Today we are gathered here to observe the 26th Anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. AR of us will recall that the UN Charter signed in 1945 was conceived in the wake of the terrible devastation and untold human suffering caused during the Second World War. The establishment of this Organisation on a universal basis In a joint and common endeavour to strive for lasting peace on earth and to make earnest efforts towards achievement of freedom and progress for people all over the world was a landmark in the history of mankind. It constitutes an organised effort to tackle the problems of peace and progress in a comprehensive manner covering the entire spectrum of human activities.

During the past 26 years of its life, the United Nations has gone through many

203

trials and tribulations. It has seen some successes and perhaps many failures. It has few achievements to its credit in the political sphere and many grave issues, often of an explosive character, have remained unresolved. Yet, we can take comfort in the fact that in the economic, social and technical fields the United Nations has made a valuable contribution and developing as well as developed countries have derived much benefit.

However, a great deal remains to be done if the basis of tension and conflict in the world is to be removed for all times to come. Much more concerted and cooperative action is required if the ideal of betterment of the condition of man is to be achieved. But the strength of the United Nations and how far it can assist in realising the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter depend, in the ultimate, analysis, on the peoples and the Governments of the member States and their dedication and determination.

The ever increasing faith and trust reposed in the United Nations is evident from the fact that today the member-ship of the United Nations has increased to 131 from 52 in 1945. We were happy to welcome to our midst this year three new members -Bhutan, Bahrain and Qatar. However, universality of membership cannot be fully achieved until and unless other States which are not at present members are given their legitimate place in the Organisation. It has long been our conviction that the people's Republic of China should take its rightful place in the United Nations and we hope that this issue will be settled this year. It is also our belief that the entry of divided nations Into the United Nations would further contribute towards the achievement of the goals of the Organisation.

In the political field, the sceptics and critics will not fail to point out that the measures taken by the United Nations are more to salve the conscience of mankind than to solve the real problems with which it is confronted. War, threats of war and aggression, colonialism, racism and other forms of exploitation of man by man still continue to flourish in different parts of the world and the United Nations sometimes gives the impression of lacking the inherent strength to come to grips with these vexing problems. The minority racist regimes of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia continue to deny the legitimate rights of freedom and democracy to the majority population in these countries and in Namibia in total defiance of world opinion expressed through many U.N. resolutions. Portugal is still holding on to its colonies in Africa flouting flagrantly repeated U.N. declarations condemning continuance of any form of colonialism. The people of Vietnam have been denied peace since the end of Second World War and are still waiting for the day when U.S. and other foreign forces would be completely withdrawn and they can decide their own future, in accordance with their own wishes.

In West Asia, the continuing stalemate threatens to explode into another conflict if

an equitable solution is not found soon. It is a matter for serious concern that the unanimous decision of the Security Council embodied in its Resolution 242 of November 1967 has still not been implemented. It is imperative to ensure early compliance with its provisions.

Today a very serious and tense situation has arisen as a result of the repressive policies followed by the military regime in Pakistan which has been trying blatantly, and in total disregard of world opinion, to suppress the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of East Bengal. The atrocities committed by the military regime in East Bengal in trying to suppress the aspirations of the people have led to untold misery and suffering in that region and the influx of over 9 million men, women and children into India. The sudden and continuing inflow of millions has created grave economic, political and social stresses and placed a severe strain on our resources.

This disaster of historic dimension has stirred the conscience of mankind but failed to move the wheels of governments sufficiently. We in India have been deeply concerned and are naturally doing everything we can to look after these refugees. However, as the world has recognized and admitted, they are, in fact, the responsibility of the international community. India is looking after them as a trust, on behalf of

204

the international community, till safety and peace have been restored in East Bengal so that they can go back to their own homeland with honour, in freedom and security.

To cover up its own responsibility for the tragic happenings in East Bengal, Pakistan has been trying unsuccessfully to divert the attention of the world by aggressive posturing and a build-up of forces and tensions along our borders. However, the basic issue in East Bengal, as we all know, is a political one. To enable the refugees to go back to their homes and hearths, it is essential that a political solution acceptable

to the already elected representatives of the people of East Bengal is brought about. The international community must realize the urgency and gravity of the problem and the human suffering involved. A great responsibility devolves on the United Nations and it can discharge it only by acting in a concerted manner to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to change its policy of repression and to work out a political solution acceptable to the people of Bangla Desh.

The United Nations has been striving for the lessening of tension and conflict in the world and during the last year there have been many welcome signs of decrease in tension among great Powers. The efforts made in this regard recently inside the UN and outside are noteworthy especially the progress made in SALT Talks, the Treaties between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany and the Four-Power agreement on Berlin. These and others constitute important landmarks-

At the same time I must sound a note of caution. The concerns of the nations of the world are far wider than the pre-occupations of the great Powers. One of the basic concepts underlying the setting up of the United Nations was that in the solution of world problems and in the pursuit and the achievement of the objectives of peace and progress, which are the concern of the entire human race, all sovereign States should have a voice and a role to play. Life on our planet today is becoming increasingly inter-dependent and any development in one part of the world impinges on people the world over. It is necessary, therefore, that the point of view of all States no matter how big or small and particularly all the develop-Ing countries must not be Ignored. while arriving at solutions which have farreaching consequences for every one. In this context the non-aligned countries can make a significant and constructive contribution to the objectives of the United Nations.

Notwithstanding the spectacular ad-

vances which man has made in science and technology-in recent years, the gulf between the rich and poor nations of the world continues to widen and misery and poverty still prevail in the major part of the world. With its various specialized Agencies and organs, such as the WHO, ILO, UNESCO, FAO, UNICEF, UNHCR, UNDP, UNCTAD etc., the United Nations system offers to us a unique and efficient instrument for working together to fashion a new world order in which better standards of life would be available to all peoples of the world. The First Development Decade was an effort in this direction. But I fear that the hopes raised amongst the developing countries went largely unrealized. Per capita income on an average increased by only \$40 in the developing countries while the developed countries recorded an increase of \$ 600.

The declaration of the second development decade and the adoption by the General Assembly last year of the Strategy for Development during the 1970s gives us cause for new hope. However, the goals we have set for Ourselves will not be realized if the political will to implement the policy measures of the Strategy flags. The test of true international cooperation which is the essence of the Character will be the manner and extent to which the United Nations system will be able to meet the legitimate aspirations of the developing world. We welcome, in this context, the holding of the Third UNCTAD Conference in Santiago and look forward to substantial and tangible achievements.

It is clear that universal peace and security can be secured only if the basic causes of tensions and conflicts are removed. It is necessary for this purpose that not only should disputes be peacefully resolved but that the nations of the world should act in scrupulous adherence with the purposes and

205

Principles of the Charter. It is also essential that more concrete steps towards our declared objective of general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, under strict international control, be

taken. Even a small saving in the vast amount of resources now devoted by the great Powers to the building up of armaments, if diverted to assist developing countries, could make a tremendous impact on the world development picture and constitute a major contribution to peace.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us today recall our faith in the ideals enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirm our resolve to strengthen the United Nations system so as to enable it to play its rightful role in our united efforts to achieve the highly cherished goals mankind has set for itself.

INDIA USA BAHRAIN BHUTAN QATAR CHINA SOUTH AFRICA NAMIBIA PORTUGAL VIETNAM PAKISTAN POLAND GERMANY CHILE

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Delegate's Speech in U.N. General Assembly rejecting bilateral negotiations With Pakistan on Bangla Desh

Following is the text of India's Permanent Representative, Shri S. Sen's speech at the U.N. General Assembly on October 5, 1971 exercising India's right to reply to Pakistan Delegate:

On the last day of September when we could have exercised our right of reply we did not do so because Pakistan said nothing new except to make yet another attempt to involve India in a problem which is entirely of its own making. Today we are exercising our right of reply merely because that attempt has become desperate and has gone further, and issues with which this Assembly is fully familiar have been revived in order to divert attention from a problem which has

aroused international concern and opinion and affected the lives of millions of people. We do not believe that this kind of diversion in a tragic situation is either responsible or helpful.

The Pakistan delegation has blamed India for all of Pakistan's woes and difficulties. Let me assure the Assembly that very seldom has Pakistan displayed any candour or any honest desire to solve many of its own problems. I should like, however, to remind the Assembly of our position on two or three important problems to which reference has been made.

As regards Kashmir, we have repeatedly stated that the only problem is the question of withdrawal by Pakistan from the occupied part of Kashmir and we are always ready to enter into negotiations with Pakistan to bring this about,

As regards the Farakka barrage, not only have there been many negotiations and technical discussions, but when we are searching for some agreement, the tragic developments in East Bengal practically put a stop to these negotiations. However, it is now becoming clear that the whole hue and cry by Pakistan regarding the Farraka barrage was only to encourage anti-Indian feelings in Fast Bengal. This policy, too, has collapsed. We do not deny that we have law and order problems in our country. But, we do not try to solve them by committing genocide.

Many lurid details have been given about border incidents. This morning the Pakistan delegation went to the trouble of holding a press conference on the basis of an incident which is reported to have taken place on 29 September. At that time we did not have the facts regarding this alleged Incident, and I therefore took the precaution of asking Delhi to send me the facts, and the telegram I have just received reads as follows:

"No such incident has taken place on 29 September. In fact it is West Pakistan's armed forces that have been shelling our territory and killing and injuring people on our side over the last several weeks. The allegation made by Mahmud Ali..." - it should have read Mr. Mahmud Ali and I apologize, but we must realize that this is a telegram from the Ministry to me - "is obviously an attempt to justify Pakistan's shelling of her territory and an excuse to start an aggressive war against

206

India. India has been exercising the greatest restraint possible in the circumstances. This has been appreciated throughout the world. It is Pakistan that should be asked to exercise restraint and not to continue indiscriminate massacre of its people of East Bengal."

It is also interesting to note that in the details given it was said that exactly a thousand shells fell on Pakistan from our side. I wonder who counted them.

While this is the type of complaint and allegation made by Pakistan, India has, on the other hand, made move than 400 complaints to Pakistan concerning the violations of its eastern border.

It is also interesting to note that the Pakistan delegation did not care, or dare, to give the details of the activities of the resistance forces deep inside East Bengal. The fact is that it is not India that has had any doubt about the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Pakistan. It is the Pakistanis themselves who have not accepted Pakistan as it is constituted, or the policies they have been battling. It has failed to keep the many pledges made to its people and it is now facing the consequences. There is no use in blaming India for this.

We are always willing to co-operate with Pakistan in solving all bilateral problems. Last year, and many years in this forum, Pakistan brought up many bilateral issues; however, when bilateral negotiations are suggested, there is no response.

Today Pakistan asked for bilateral negotiations concerning a problem which is entirely of Pakistan's own making and which it rightly claims is a problem between East and West Pakistan. We do not wish to come into it; we cannot come into it; and we should not come into it. Those who believe that Indian co-operation in this sphere is necessary should realize that while cooperation with a neighbour country is always to be welcomed, no one can expect India to co-operate with Pakistan in a partnership to continue massacre, to tolerate the extinction of human rights, to make a mockery of self-determination - of which Pakistan never tires of speaking with regard to Kashmir - and to perpetuate massive brutalities. It is therefore not surprising that in late March or early April the Manchester Guardian stated that the next time Pakistan raised the question of Kashmir in this Assembly, the Assembly would collapse with laughter.

What has the Pakistan delegation said here today to encourage the refugees to return home or, more important, to stop the flow of the 3,000 refugees into India every day? Nothing. This is the degree of concern shown for its own citizens, over a million of which have been massacred in a most atrocious manner. This is in conformity with the concern shown for the people who died in the cyclone in East Pakistan last year. This callouseness with regard to human worth must be in the minds of many whom Pakistan has tried to dupe by loud proclamations of fundamental rights and valour.

The representative of the Pakistan delegation made some special claims simply because he happens to come from East Pakistan. I, too, was born and bred in East Pakistan. Not only I, but most of his countrymen in East Pakistan, would disagree with him both about facts and about his analysis. However, I should like to leave that to his conscience.

These are not matters for polemics or debate. We have no wish to enter into a controversy with Pakistan on these matters.

This is an international problem of vast magnitude and anguish. If Pakistan wishes to begin patriotic to seek a solution to the problem, the first step must be to begin negotiations with the elected representatives of the people of East Pakistan and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. In our view, any attempt to divide the elements in East Pakistan would not only be self-defeating, but would create many more difficult problems. The Pakistan delegation blames India for all the resistance of the Bengalis against their oppressors. The fact is, however, that the resistance is organized by the East Pakistanis themselves, that they are determined to fight for their survival and for their human rights. Nothing that the Government of India can or cannot do will change that position or that process. The only way it can be changed is by political agreement between the oppressor and the oppressed. I regret to say that I did not hear a single word in the Pakistan delegation's speech that would encourage hope for this endeavour.

207

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Sen's Speech at Security Council on South African Apartheid

Following is the text of Indian Permanent Delegate, Shri S. Sen's speech in the Security Council debate on October 11, 1971 on South African apartheid on Zambia's complaint:

May I first of all offer you, Mr. President, sincerest congratulations on your presidency

of the Security Council for this month. We are certain that this subject and the issues connected with it are so important and will require such sympathetic treatment that with yourself in the Chair the Council may hope to make some progress in this matter.

I am grateful for this opportunity to express our views on the nature of the complaints that have been coming before the Council with increasing frequency., Today it is Zambia against South Africa. A little while ago it was Senegal against Portugal, and some months ago it was Guinea against Portugal. The time has come, we think, when the Council should take a comprehensive view of these complaints in the perspective of what is happening between the Territories controlled by Portugal, South Africa and Mr. Ian Smith on the one hand and the independent African countries on the other.

It is common ground among all of us that we hate apartheid that we strongly resent the innumerable humiliations and the unjust and inhuman measures taken by the racist, colonial and minority regimes of Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon; but when it comes to taking action to remove or reduce the impact of those measures, to working out plans for United Nations action in order to ensure majority rule and to eliminate the' intolerable discriminatory measures, the United Nations as a whole, and the Security Council in particular, seem completely unable to move. The reasons for inaction are well known and I do not believe that we shall profit by going over them again and again, but we must realize that those inactions, this status quo established by the United Nations system, encourages the very evils which we have time and again vowed to do away with. It increases the threat to peace in the whole of southern Africa and makes it more and more difficult for the independent African countries to build their own social structure - economically, politically or by what might be called the social amelioration of their own people - in peace and freedom. Unfortunately, conditions outside their own borders do not allow them to do so.

The present complaint by Zambia is well founded. Indeed, even the Prime Minister of South Africa was not so categorical a few days ago about the intrusion of South African forces into Zambia on several occasions as was his Foreign Minister when he spoke before the Council on 8 October. Even when denying the facts, the Foreign Minister did not omit to utter a threat that should the South African authorities decide that any part of South West Africa, which South Africa illegally occupies, should be entered by any one from the neighbouring countries of Angola, Botswana, Zimbawe or Zambia, the South African forces would pursue them and take whatever measures might be necessary to teach the blacks a lesson. South Africa knows, of course, that with a war budget of nearly three million dollars and armed forces of all kinds, actual or potential of nearly 150,000 men, the independent African States on the border of South West Africa would have very little chance of defending themselves effectively against that massive military strength.

However, Zambia comes in for special attention for three good reasons, First, Zambia's opposition to apartheid in all its aspects is total, and, we are glad to say, allows no compromise. Zambia's President, Dr. Kaunda is a staunch supporter of nonalignment and a determined opponent of apartheid. He is therefore a special target for the Pretoria racist minority regime. Secondly, Zambia stands in the way of the South African policy of working out a system of dividing the African countries by various inducements. That policy implies that if some of the African countries would accept apartheid in South Africa and South-West Africa and the Portuguese colonial Territories they could enter into normal relations with those countries with some financial and economic benefit for themselves

208

Lastly, It is absolutely essential to South Africa that countries like Zambia be effectively undermined to create the socalled "third Africa". As the United Nations study on industrialization, foreign capital and forced labour in South Africa points out:

"It should be clear that what is at stake is the future of a large part of Africa, South Africa's basic purpose in putting forward its new programme is to protect itself. But in order to do so it must first undermine the independence of the black African States. So it is not simply a question of keeping the whole question of apartheid open. The consequences of South African policy within independent African countries will also be very serious."

I mention these facts only to show that Zambia has attracted and is likely to attract the special attention of the South African Government.

When these complaints come before the Security Council - from Zambia or Senegal or Guinea, or from anywhere else - the defence is either that the incidents complained of did not take place or that they were justified. The Security Council has recently investigated some of these denials and found them to be without substance. However, not enough attention has been paid to examining the pretexts. For South Africa, for instance, the justification is that this Territory of South West Africa (Namibia) is under its control. It forgets that whatever control it has in that area is illegally exercised and that it has no right to be there. That aspect of the matter is already before the Security Council in a different context, and we shall soon seriously have to discuss how South Africa's illegal control of this Territory can be quickly and effectively terminated. Meanwhile, that is no justification for a State to take aggressive actions against a sovereign State from the territory of a third country it is illegally occupying.

The General Assembly has already indicated that so long as the oppression by a minority Government of the majority of the population continues, or so long as the

colonial and racist form of domination is not brought to an end, it will be perfectly legitimate for freedom-fighters and liberation forces to continue their struggle by all available means. We believe the time has come when the Security Council can accept those two ideas in a formal decision. The Council can and should accept the legitimacy of the struggle for liberation from colonialism, which is right and lawful and can be waged by all means. It can and should accept that the struggle of peoples to put an end to the oppression of the vast majority of people of any country by a racist minority regime - as is taking place in various parts of southern Africa - is equally legitimate, and that the oppression should be brought to an end by all possible means. Secondly, it can and should be made clear by the Council, in a formal declaration, that South Africa has no justification whatever for being in South West Africa.

Once we had definitely and clearly stated those legal principles it would be simpler to deal with all the complaints by several independent sovereign States. We are Perfectly well aware of the difficulties that will be created in various quarters in defining those legal principles. But at the same time we believe that unless those legal principles are squarely faced and clearly stated this Council and- other United Nations bodies will not make much progress.

Any action. taken to suppress a liberation movement or the movement for equal rights of the people of a country would then be automatically unjustified, and those who perpetrated it could be treated as aggressors. Similarly, the South African presence in South West Africa would be that of an aggressor, and bath the international community and all States individually or collectively would be within their rights to end that aggression.

I know that that would not suit South Africa, for it has been established beyond doubt that South Africa has very little use for the United Nations and certainly has no desire to abide by any of its resolutions or decisions. It was as early as January 1953 that the then South African Prime Minister, the late Dr. Malan, said, "Personally I would rather be a member of NATO than a Member of the United Nations. It is a better safeguard for world peace". If South Africa continues to defy the United Nations and to confuse the cause of the freedom-fighters by

209

calling them communists and trying to punish them both inside and outside its territory by all means at its disposal, should we not ease South Africa's task by expelling it from an organization that is certainly not a safeguard for the type of world peace South Africa wishes?

We should like to make still another suggestion to the Council. These frequent complaints by African States and the effects of South Africa's policies and actions undertaken with the full co-operation of Lisbon and Salisbury persuade us that the Security Council would do well to keep these problems under periodic review. I know that several organizations of the United Nations system deal with apartheid, decolonization and United Nations administration - such as it is - of Namibia. While those efforts continue, to us it seems necessary that peace and security in that area, which is being constantly threatened by South Africa, should be kept under continuous review by the Council. Perhaps once in three months, or as frequently as the Council may decide, the Council could consider this problem its various aspects, decide what action could be taken to restore the rights of the people both of the colonial areas and also of such areas as South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe, and examine in detail, with as much publicity as possible, the effectiveness -- or lack of it - of the economic sanctions and other restrictions the Council may have from time to time decided on in respect of any territory or any Government.

We know only too well the inhibitions of various Governments about taking the forthright action permitted by the Charter in such situations. We believe that if some of the suggestions we have made are

followed we shall progress towards the elimination of colonialism and neo-colonialism, as also of the oppression by minority regimes of vast majorities. Simultaneously, we would then be prepared to remove all those evils, whatever they might be. In all their forms and manifestations, whatever the climes and conditions in which colonialism and neocolonialism may prevail.

The Council will no doubt take such specific action on the present Zambian complaint as it can, but we do not believe that efforts on specific issues will be fully effective unless we relate them to broader perspectives and ultimate goals. The alternative is to deal with those problems from day to day, and to hope for the best. We cannot build on hope unless it is backed by suitable plans and solid determination.

INDIA SOUTH AFRICA ZAMBIA PORTUGAL SENEGAL GUINEA USA ANGOLA BOTSWANA NAMIBIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. General Assembly on Crisis in Pakistan

Speaking in the U.N. General Assembly debate on October 13, 1971, India" Permanent delegate, Shri S. Ben, made the following speech on crisis in Pakistan:

I was prepared to exercise the right of reply last night, but the hour was late and there were 10 speakers who exercised a similar right

I spoke briefly on the evening of 5 October. It had taken Pakistan nearly seven days to conceive and deliver its reply.

Such a long period of gestation for a reply is unusual, if not unknown, in the plenary sessions of the General Assembly. But then it was not merely a reply but in many respects a full but stale statement, timed to coincide with what President Yahya Khan had to say yesterday and with various other publicity efforts. I was astonished that so much nervousness should be displayed about facts and so many bald assertions made without foundation. When on 5 October I spoke as a Bengali, I was simply sharing impressions on the basis of my experience. I am grateful to the representative of Afghanistan for having demolished some of Pakistan's bald assertions.

In his broadcast yesterday he gave some details of his plan, the substance of which he had announced on 21 June. That plan was described by informed opinion as a "pathetic sham".

If General Yahya Khan had any intentions of transferring power to the elected

210

representatives, he could have done so earlier this year and again he could have done so yesterday.

Air Marshal Asghar Khan of West Pakistan, a most distinguished soldier, has declared that the election results are already predetermined; and Mr. Nairaj Mohd. Khan, a leader of the People's Party led by Mr. Bhutto, has refused to go with his party's delegation to East Bengal for he found that the power there is shared by reactionaries, murderers and people without political support. Of course, given the press censorship, we cannot supply full texts of these statements, but we can draw some conclusions from the nature of government which has been established in East Pakistan. One gentleman of this Government, known as "Minister", lost the elections by 46,186 votes. His name is Mr. Abul Quasem. Another Minister, Nawazish Ahmad, lost his election by 96,007 votes. Still another, Mr. Akhataruddin Ahmad, lost by 39,681 votes. Yet another, Maulana A. K. M. Yusuf, lost by 44,590 votes. Need I go on?

The representative of Pakistan kindly agreed with me that these tragic problems are not fit for debate or polemics, yet his whole statement was nothing but a series of polemics. He says that the present problem is of recent origin, while the bilateral problems between India and Pakistan have existed for many years. I do not expect that the international community would be at all unhappy if India and Pakistan solved all their bilateral problems. We offered to do so time and again, but without response. It was nut we who brought up Kashmir in the Assembly, but the representative of Pakistan.

I have already commented on these diversionary tactics Pakistan uses. May I simply say that we should like the well-established principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of foreign territory by force to be applied to Kashmir as much as to any other place.

Pakistan accuses India of creating tension on the border and of supporting the freedom-fighters inside East Bengal. I would in this context read out what the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington had to say on 15 August 1971 on the ABC Television Network. Incidentally, the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington "is the brother of the representative of Pakistan here. He said:

"There were at least about 160,000 armed personnel who defected on account of Awami League propaganda. The army was asked on the 25th of March to go and deal with these 160,000 armed people."

Who are those people?

In the same interview the Pakistan Ambassador answered:

"There are not only East Bengal Rifles; there were East Pakistan Rifles; there was a border military force; there were armed police." From where did they get their arms?

The Ambassador said:

"These weapons came from looting of armouries and government stores and from the armouries of reserve police and so on, weapons that had been collected by force, by militant student bands who were going and knocking at the doors of the houses and asking People to deliver their guns and whatever sporting rifles - guns and rifles - they had. These were not collected from the East Pakistan Rifles. We wish we had taken the trouble to disarm them before."

That is the reality of resistance within East Pakistan - a resistance inspired by years of discrimination and exploitation, and which Was the direct result of ruthless and massive military action with unparalleled atrocities, total extinction of human rights, and a full-fledged campaign of genocide.

I repeat what I said before: we must not, shall not, and cannot interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. At the same time, Pakistan must not interfere in our internal affairs.

What has happened is that by Pakistan's brutal and preposterous actions, India has been faced with a refugee population of 9 million people, with consequences on the

211

social, political and economic structure which are well known to the Assembly.

I would have been more comforted if the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees had himself given a report on the plight of those refugees and on the alleged return of some of them to Pakistan. It is extraordinary that the Pakistani reported figure of 200,000 had remained steady for at least one month or more. We are, of course, not privileged to go inside Pakistan and collect statistics, but let not the representative of Pakistan have any grievances about such authoritative statements as are available to us.

Similarly, it should be easy for Pakistan to say what happened to the 471 complaints we made. We presume they should know. We have replied to all the complaints brought to our notice.

Yesterday Ambassador Shahi dismissed a Manchester Guardian comment as frivolous. That is his privilege, but I shall now supply some figures from the Christian Science Monitor given in its article, "The Agony and the Danger", of 31 July. It says:

"The estimates of people killed, not counting"- I repeat: not counting - "those who died of famine and cholera, have ranged up to a million."

International Press estimates of the number of people killed up to mid-August by the army varies between a minimum of a quarter million to a maximum of 2 million persons. Is it, therefore, an exaggeration to say that the armed action has resulted in at least a million deaths?

I have already referred to the type of election which is being worked out for bringing about normalcy in Pakistan. In this context a report has been received by Mr. Paul Marc Henri, the United Nations Administrator for Relief in East Pakistan prepared by United States Aid Mission experts. Parts of that report have been made available to the Sunday Times of London; and in its 10 October issue William Shawcross, describing the conditions in East Pakistan, says: "The infra-structure of the country has totally collapsed."

Mr. Victor Powell, of the Consortium of British Relief Charities, who returned from Dacca last week, has estimated that only 20 to 30 per cent of all industries in East Pakistan are working. "There are still reports from East Pakistan", says Mr. Shawcross, "of how the Government and army commandeer food trucks and boats and use hunger as a political weapon."

If all this is not enough, it has been made clear in the United Nations report that that Government will allow United Nations agencies to work only on post-cyclone relief projects that were begun before the spring civil war. Officially they are not allowed to give relief to those affected by the war rather than by the floods.

In the north there was no flooding, and it is there, as a result, that starvation is likely to increase; because, so far, the Pakistan Government has forbidden access, except to permanent missionary bodies.

In addition, the Assembly is aware of the large number of Pakistani diplomats, including several ambassadors, who have defected. The latest is the Pakistan ambassador to Argentina, Mr. Momin. Are these the kind of people who will be influenced by the bogey of Indian propaganda? No one can be more blind than the man who refuses to see.

Another development in Pakistan which is of intense international concern is the reported sentence of death on Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. It would be good to hear a denial of that report. If anyone has seen him during the last six months, we do not know him; all we know is that his British lawyers were not allowed to see him, and we are certain that Pakistan would not have allowed any outside judge - even of the International Court - to be present at the trial. Anyway, newspaper reports indicate that the trial is over.

Pakistan objects that any suggestion of political settlement with the elected leaders is an interference in Pakistan affairs. We in India have been burdened with over 9 million refugees as a direct consequence of Pakistan's military action. Is it, in these circumstances, unreasonable or illogical to suggest the kind of solution which in our view should be arrived at in order to persuade the refugees to go back home?

212

Is It unreasonable or Illogical to recom-

mend a political solution to bring about the kind of confidence that is a prerequisite for the return of the refugees? Is is illogical or unreasonable to suggest that, unless the refugees have a degree of security and hope for peaceful existence on their return home, they will be reluctant to go back? If these are illogical and unreasonable suggestions, I am glad to see myself in the company of a large number of delegations, foreign Governments and numerous official and non-official organizations. If a country resents this kind of suggestion, how can it in the same breath ask for co-operation in solving a problem which is essentially of its own making?

Besides, what relief can we promise to the East Bengalese when we did nothing when their friends, relatives and fellow citizens were being killed, their women raped, their houses smashed, property looted, children burnt, and their crops destroyed?

We have no intention of doing so, in spite of an invitation. All we can say is that this problem can be solved only between the rulers of Pakistan and its elected leaders, and we are disillusioned by the attempts to bring about a so-called normalization.

It was only the other day that two Members of Parliament of the Netherlands had their invitations withdrawn, simply because they would not accept Pakistani figures for refugees. Senator Kennedy's case is much too well known, and I do not wish to dilate on it.

The problem. has been created by the campaign of genocide, and Pakistan must settle it in consultation and co-operation with its own people. There is undoubtedly tension in the area, but that too is the direct consequence of Pakistan's actions. Tension will disappear and refugees will go back whenever Pakistan chooses the wise course towards a political settlement. Unless that is done, all this public agitation for Indian co-operation is nothing but more eye-wash.

In fact, in spite of Pakistan apologists, the President of Pakistan has made it quite clear that he would not meet the Indian Prime Minister. Even in these days of permassiveness, I cannot bring myself to repeat the words the President used about our Prime Minister. The curious will find it in Le Figaro of Paris. That particular article was reproduced in The New York Times about two weeks ago. Apart from insulting the person whom Pakistan would have us believe the General wishes to meet. he says bluntly: "I will not meet her". So much for seeking co-operation.

There are many instances in history when States have deliberately, and as acts of policy, promoted external tension in order to solve their domestic difficulties. Nothing is easier, and nothing is more dangerous. That is why what Pakistan is trying to do today.

A great crisis has overtaken Pakistan as a result of its own acts in using military force and repression against the people of East Pakistan in a situation which called for conciliation and compromise. To deflect the criticism of its own people and of the international community from this crisis, a campaign is being mounted against India. But that will not resolve the crisis.

The solution of the crisis lies between the Government in West Pakistan and the people of East Pakistan. If India advocates this, it is because what has happened in Pakistan is of extreme concern to the international community, and particularly to India. Because of its geographical location, India has to bear a heavy and continuous burden. While we speak of the return of the refugees, would it not be pertinent to ask why more and more of them are still coming? Because the house is on fire, and the fire cannot be put out by bullets. It is not a question of our leaving Pakistan alone; it is the people of Pakistan who are steadily coming towards India.

Before concluding. I should like to take this opportunity to thank the many delegations that have, spoken with sincerity and sympathy about the grave difficulties which we face. I should like to thank them publicly, and I should also like to state that we have appreciated the concern they have shown for a problem created by Pakistan but whose consequences affect us all.

213

INDIA PAKISTAN USA AFGHANISTAN UNITED KINGDOM ARGENTINA MALI THE NETHERLANDS FRANCE

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Sen's Speech at Security Council on Situation In Namibia

Following is the text of the speech by India's Permanent Delegate, Shri S. Sen, in the Security Council on the situation in Namibia an October 15, 1971:

Mr. President, I have already paid you my compliments and congratulations. I do not think they will increase or decrease by repetition, therefore I shall get straight down to the subject before us.

The Council is discussing a most important matter and we are grateful for this opportunity to express our views. There is no scope for levity or even humour.

After many years of detailed discussions and various arguments at the United Nations. an Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal aspects of the problem was requested. That opinion is now available and was arrived at by the Court by 13 votes to 2. All the legal problems which have now been raised in the debate in the Council were thoroughly discussed by the Court and there is not a single point - I repeat, not a single point - on which the Court did not come to a definite conclusion. The main feature of the Court's

decision is that whatever might be the rules, regulations and procedures:

"the mandatory Powers which, in so far as they may be appointed trustees by the League of Nations, will derive no benefit from such trusteeship.

(Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970) Advisory opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, paragraph 51)

This is not only a most vital concept of any trust but has been written into all mandates and trusteeship agreements.

South Africa having accepted the transfer of supervision and accountability to the United Nations, and after having recognized its obligation under the mandate after the dissolution of the League of Nations and after having also recognized the competence of the General Assembly, decided that the Mandate was no longer valid. It stated before the Court various arguments for continuing to occupy the Territory of Namibia. The Court rejected these arguments and said:

"These claims of title, which apart from other considerations are inadmissible in regard to a mandated territory lead by South Africa's own admission to a situation which vitiates the object and purpose of the Mandate. Their significance in the context of the sacred trust has best been revealed by a statement made by the representative of South Africa in the present proceedings on 15 March 1971: it is the view of the South African Government that no legal provision prevents its annexing South West Africa'."

(Ibid., paragraph 83)

We fully accept the Court's opinion in this respect.

Some comments have been made in the

Council on Whether the League of Nations had the power to terminate the Mandate unilaterally. This is hardly relevant in this context of today and we cannot accept the static concept of law which would ignore the well established doctrine of Cessante reationes legis res ipsa lex. Even in the days of conquests, imperial domination and distribution of spoils of war, it was clearly recognized that no advantage should accrue to a Mandatory Power as a consequence of the mandate. And it would follow therefore that it would be totally illegal to allow South Africa to annex this Territory on any grounds whatever.

Apart from these legal considerations, which as I said, had been thoroughly discussed and decided upon by the International Court of Justice, there are political considerations of great importance. The Ambassador of France has already indicated that self-determination of nations should be in the national context and this cannot be changed by equating nations with tribes, with South Africa denying the people of Namibia an inherent right of self-determination.

214

While we all agree that economic and social developments are necessary, indeed essential, for the progress of any nation, these considerations should not be allowed to stand in the way of any nation expressing its right of self-determination. I wonder, for instance, if we take the situation a few years ago, how many of the countries that are now Members of the United Nations and were then dependent could have justified their viability on grounds of economic and social advancement. The basic issue is that politically all nations should have the right of self-determination and that this right should be exercised as soon as possible. If a nation is held in bondage by another State without any legal justification, the presumption will be that its oppressor would not allow it to express its views through the process of self-determination. Hence, we entirely agree with the representative of France and many others that we can determine what Namibia wants only after we

have consulted the Namibians. Such consultation obviously cannot take place until South Africa has totally terminated its illegal occupation of Namibia.

I do not think it necessary for the Indian delegation to express once again its repugnance and total rejection of apartheid and all that it stands for. I would, however, add that no law or legal argument which would prepetuate any system or situation contrary to human civilization could be acceptable to the United Nations. Although the concept of civilization may have changed between the time Article 22 of the Mandate was written and today, it always been accepted that the principal purpose of any legal system must be to serve the human values and not to put them in distress or destroy them. Some 4000 years ago. before Christ, this prime consideration of humanism behind all laws was emphasized in a scriptural text of my country which reads as follows:

"The object of law and life is not merely the enjoyment of the pleasures of this world and those of the heavens beyond, but it is to relieve humanity in dire distress by removing human suffering, wherever it exists."

We consider that the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa is not only totally illegal but immoral. We consider also that the white regime of South Africa is wholly uncivilized, is unchristian and unfit to carry out its obligations under the Charter. After having disposed of these legal, political and moral considerations - very briefly, no doubt - the question arises what should the Council or the United Nations as a whole do now. In our view, the Council should first accept and endorse the Advisory Opinion of the Court and as a consequence call upon South Africa to terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia forthwith. Secondly, again as a consequence of the Court's decision, all States, be they Members of the United Nations or not, should recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of and concerning Namibia and take

all actions which follow from such recognition and invalidation. The question has been raised whether Chapter VII of the Charter can apply in the circumstances of the illegal occupation by South Africa. The heading of that Chapter speaks of "Action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression." Recent events - I have in mind the complaint the Council received a few days ago from Zambia - have proved that there is a constant threat to the peace, following South Africa's illegal occupation of Namibia. Secondly, let us recall what the South African delegation said before the General Assembly on 5 October 1966. It said: South Africa's right to administer the territory is not derived from Mandate but from military conquest-" Not only has the United Nations, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, time and again declared South Africa's occupation as illegal, this assertion of military conquest and continued occupation of Namibia places south Africa, in our view, in the status of a perpetual aggressor. Therefore we believe that as regards Namibia the provisions of chapter VII can and should be applied and that such application is mandatory for all states, including the permanent members of the Security Council, and also including States which are not Members of the United Nations.

We think it would be wrong to take political decisions first and then try to find legal justifications for them. It should be the other way round. We should take our political decisions in the light of law and

215

morality and in the interest of peace and security. We further believe that the arguments which have been given by the South African delegation for economic advancement are irrelevant and misleading. If we had the time to discuss these details, we could prove conclusively that most of the money that South Africa claims it has spent in improving the economic conditions of Namibia has been spent in order, first, to benefit the white settlers, secondly, to en-

courage further white immigration and, thirdly, for military purposes. Just to give one example, commenting on some figures of education, Dr. Muller claims that "the system in South West Africa is directly in line with the modem approach to schooling in Africa". The World Council of Churches, however, says in a report this month:

"these figures, moreover, conceal the fact that only two out of every ten African children of school-going age attend school, and very seldom for more than five years ... When South Africa states that there are 472 schools for nonwhites in Namibia, it must be understood that about half of these 'schools' meet under a tree without the most rudimentary tools of instruction like books, pencils and writing paper."

But we consider these claims irrelevant, because the Namibians are not in a zoo in their own country, where the zoo-keeper would simply take credit for having fed them and looked after them well. They are human beings with a right to live in their own way, and this is what South Africa, by its inhuman policies of apartheid and by its illegal occupation of Namibia. Is preventing, with the sole object of increasing its political power and its tribal privileges on behalf of the whites. I do not think that any country in the United Nations can tolerate this Namibia is neither a zoo nor a personal property of the South African Government or of the white tribes in that area.

In concrete terms, apart from the legal measures which we have suggested can be taken, the Security Council, by a formal declaration, should put the administration of Namibia under the Trusteeship Council to be administered through the Council for Namibia. If South Africa refuses to withdraw and hand over the administration, the provisions of Chapter VII will be attracted, and the Council could then take all necessary actions to ensure that South African withdrawal did take place and effectively. This will not solve the problem of apartheid and other repressions in South Africa itself, but at least South Africa will know that it

cannot continue intolerable acts of injustice not only to the people of Namibia but to the total membership of the United Nations, whose principles and purposes it is determined to violate and continues to violate with impunity and a measure of sneering sarcasm. Expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations may become inevitable, but civilizing its white tribes may prove much more difficult.

How pleasant and comforting it must have been for elderly gentlemen in 1919, brought up in the Victorian tradition, imperial charm, arrogance and ignorance, to think of civilizing the natives and the heathens. Today it is bad taste to speak of civilizing anyone, even the whites of South Africa, but I would rather be guilty of bad taste than of inhuman injustice, and I would not write anything like Article 22 of the Mandate in any United Nations document. This is how the times have changed; and so, must our laws and our attitudes.

INDIA NAMIBIA USA SOUTH AFRICA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA MALAYSIA SEYCHELLES GREECE

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. Political Committee on Admission of People's Republic of China

Following is the text of the speech by the Indian Permanent Delegate, Shri S. Sen, at the U.N. Political Committee on the admission of the People's Republic of China on October 22, 1971:

We are not discussing the admission of a State to the United Nations, for, if we were, we would have a recommendation of the Security Council under Article 4(2) of the Charter. We are not discussing the expulsion of a Member State for, in that event, we would also have the views of the Security -Council under Article 6 of the Charter. Inevitably, those who have, for whatever pur-

216

pose, chosen not to take full account of these two central facts have found themselves beset with contradictions, unconstitutional propositions, twisted procedure and false dogmas. Many speakers before me exposed and analysed these and I would not repeat their arguments.

We had hoped that after the recent trends that we welcome for greater understanding and co-operation with China by several countries, all thoughts of complicating the question of Chinese representation by various stratagems would be given up. Unfortunately, not only have they not been abandoned, but a gloomy danger of expulsion of Member States has been mentioned, when in fact no such danger exists. Refuge has been taken even behind the phrase "to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kaishek" as an endorsement of the view that expulsion is involved. The representative of the Netherlands, as indeed many others, have made short shift of this argument, if indeed it is an argument, by pointing out that this phrase in the draft resolution in document A/L.630 is merely a step which follows automatically from the restoration of the rights of the People's Republic of China, and has nothing to do with the expulsion of any Member State. The next is clear enough; it mentions expelling the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek, merely because their presence is illegal.

The simple issue before us is that there is only one China - that China is the People's Republic of China. There is only one Chinese seat in the United Nations, and the People's Republic of China alone is entitled to it. India has recognized' this straightforward truth ever since 1949 and has consistently supported the rights of the People's Republic of China to be the sole representative of China in the United

Nations. We shall, in accordance with this consistent attitude, vote for the draft resolution contained in document A/L.630 and vote against all other draft resolutions, amendments and procedural motions which may have the effect, either directly or indirectly, of delaying or confusing the simple issue I have stated. We look forward to the People's Republic of China taking its place among us - a place which it has by right - just as we look forward to better relations between India and China. The sooner these hopes are realized, the better.

Much has been said about realism. In our view, nothing could be more unrealistic than to delay any longer the full participation of China in the United Nations by its proper representatives, that is, the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China. There may be many ways of coming to realistic solutions, but surely they cannot be reached by discussing the nature and the character of different parts of the Chinese State or by attempting to decide what they should or should not do. Ours is an Organization of sovereign States, and our simple duty now is to decide that the People's Republic of China alone can represent China. All other arguments can only introduce confusion, and it is our hope that all delegations will concentrate on the one and only clear question before us.

INDIA CHINA USA THE NETHERLANDS

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement. on World Security

Following is the text of the statement

made by India's Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Shri S. Sen, at the 1808th meeting of the U.N. First Committee during debate on world security on October 27, 1971:

I should like to begin, Mr. Chairman, by offering you our good wishes and congratulations on your election as Chairman of our Committe. We all know and admire You and we are absolutely confident that with your guidance the Committee will get through its work with speed and decorum, and that our deliberations will bring us a step nearer to the principal objectives of our Organization: peace through peaceful means, progress through co-operation and security through negotiations. We are equally fortunate in having Mr. Ramphul as our Vice-Chairman and Mr. Migliuolo of Italy as our Rapporteur. Seldom has the First Committee had such a workmanlike team as its officers. and your combined experience, wisdom and

217

knowledge will be an invaluable asset for the success of our work.

An evident sign of your wisdom is to be found in the Committee's decision to discuss international security as the first item. That will render it possible to relate our subsequent discussion on other items to the broader framework with the smallest loss of time or logic. It will also encourage and enable us to decide, right at the beginning, in which directions we should move, and with what speed, to bring about the implementation of the important Declaration we adopted last year.

The preliminary views of the Government of India on these matters have been circulated recently in document A/8431/Add. 2, dated 18 October 1971. As indicated in that paper, I should like to elaborate on some of the points mentioned in it and also to comment at greater length on the facts, stated therein. My principal aim in all this will be to assess briefly how the Declaration has been implemented during the past year. I shall mention in particular developments

which, in our opinion, have helped or hindered the maintenance of peace and international security, so that any decision or resolution we may adopt this year could clearly indicate the areas in which more thought should be given or more determined action taken.

The threat to the security of my own country, which we have been facing recently, cannot but be uppermost in my mind; but here, too, I shall restrain and restrict myself to relating the developments to the wider considerations of peace and international security, as set out in the Declaration. I shall do so in spite of all the justifications - indeed, the provocations - that I have in discussing in depth and detail the tragic happenings which have placed intolerable burdens upon India through the action of another State, which now threatens us with open warfare. However, in view of the statement made by the representative of Pakistan, two days ago I may have to make one or two points. That should save time, inasmuch as I shall not have to reply separately to the statement of the Pakistan representative.

The last few years have seen a change in the distribution and relationship of Power equations in the world. Confrontations and military blocs have not disappeared, but their sharpness has been reduced. Instead of the competitive acquisition of more and better arms and always wishing to speak from "positions of strength", the great Powers have begun to appreciate each others interests and to find mutual accommodation. Unfortunately, such concepts as those of "balance of power", "spheres of influence" and "filling the power vacuum" still prevail. How refreshing it would be if some of our political commentators could analyse the problems without bringing in these and other outdated - and at times dangerous - concepts.

Unfortunately also, the developing countries have weaknesses - economic, social and political - which continue to invite external pressures and tempt outside interference. None the less we are gratified to see that

the growing economic power of some countries, not only countries of Asia and Europe, and the desire of still others, old and new, to follow policies not dictated by considerations of bloc interests, are having a weakening effect on ideological line-ups. Those changes have seemingly reduced the dangers of a nuclear war and helped to maintain an uneasy world peace. The United Nations, despite its good record in the fight against colonialism, finds itself unable to move forward in preventing local wars and conflicts. Our goal of peace, justice and progress seems at times to be both vain and distant.

In these circumstances the non-aligned countries have attached high and continuous importance both to the general problem of international security and to some of the specific situations which have been brought about in violations of the principles of the Charter to a point when international peace and security is breached or threatened. The process begun in Lusaka was reflected in large measure in the Declaration adopted last year and was taken a step further when the Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries met here in New York at the end of September this year and summarized their views in a communique which is readily available to all the delegations. This communique indicates clearly the areas and directions in which, in the opinion of the majority of the membership of the United

218

Nations, further action should be taken. But our purpose is and should be much wider. We wish to have the greatest, if not the unanimous, acceptance of our views and we are prepared to negotiate and modify our views in the wider interest of the world community but not to the extent of giving up any of the principles on which non-alignment is based.

It is in this context that we view with some scepticism the growing trend of what is coming increasingly to be known as "quiet diplomacy" and restricted negotiations between a smaller number of Powers in order to arrive at arrangements or solutions which concern all of us. Whether it is disarmament or the Middle East or South-East Asia or human rights or self-determination, we are all concerned, and we should all be able to participate and, if possible, contribute to the solution of all these problems. We fully realize, and indeed gladly accept, that at different stages restricted negotiations may be helpful, but before any final decision is taken an opportunity must be given for widest participation with full democratic freedom. Unless such a procedure is followed, our decisions would lack strength and would be more difficult to carry out. That is why we would, in principle, endorse the proposal for a world disarmament conference, even if we are aware that much advance preparation will be essential, that even then progress would at best be slow and that the problem of widest participation would not be easy to solve.

On the other hand, the debate on Chinese representation, which took place in plenary meetings, has shown a common concern for universality in the membership of the United Nations. The result of the vote is satisfactory to the Indian delegation, and we look forward to working in cooperation with China both inside and outside the United Nations. This year we welcomed the admission of four new Members-Bhutan, Bahrain, Oman and Qatar, and we hope this tendency of larger membership will continue to grow. In the near future the United Nations may be constituted in such a way as to reflect the various trends in world politics and be strengthened by the adherence of all those States which are still outside it and by a more rational adjustment in its various organs. These organs could then command the effective lovalty of the Member States themselves and at the same time have ready appeal to the peoples of the world - young and old, men and women, communists or capitalists, atheists or believers and of whatever colour, shape or background. We should like some thought to be given to such a strengthening of the United Nation as a whole so that the need for important problems affecting international security being discussed in separate forums will become less and less

Most speakers in the general debate, as well as those who have spoken here, have commented on the welcome developments in Europe, including those relating to Germany. The treaties between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany and between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany, as also the agreement of the four Powers on West Berlin, are consistent with the Declaration, especially with its important provisions that Member States shall refrain from the use of force in their international relations and that States shall respect the sovereignty of other States. The dialogue for the further strengthening of European security will, we hope, result. In bringing effective peace in Europe, and this without military alliances. The progress in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks could reduce mutual suspicion in the nuclear field and result in some limitations of nuclear arsenals. We welcome the proposed meeting at the highest level of the American and Soviet leaders, which has been suggested for the summer of next year. We would also support plans for a conference for European security; we believe that such a conference can do much good. We do not share the view that if it did not produce immediate and satisfactory results the present trends towards a better understanding might receive a setback.

In Asia too we see several new developments which should be in the interest of peace and of much greater security for Asian countries. Steps towards the normalization of relations between China and the United States, as well as the steady and remarkable economic growth of Japan, am significant events for us all. When China takes its rightful place in the United Nations and we think it should do so during this session - it can be expected to show greater flexibility Which will benefit the inter-

219

national community and will have a welcome effect on its bilateral relations not only with India but also with many other States. The lessening of bloc confrontation In Asia will put an end to such alliances as SEATO

and ANZUS, strengthen non-alignment and encourage regional co-operation. Meanwhile, the stability and strength of Indian democracy should continue to be an important factor in promoting peace and progress. Recent developments in several other countries of Asia also provide helpful signs for strengthening peace and security in this area.

Treaties such as the one India and the Soviet Union signed recently cannot but have a salutary effect by discouraging aggression and hostile designs and by encouraging mutual consultation and cooperation. This is essentially a treaty of peace and friendship, and no one who has no wish to disturb the peace or to harbour inimical intentions need have any misgivings about it. The concern of Pakistan about this treaty fortifies us in our belief in that country's intentions. Indeed, countries desiring peace should welcome that treaty, as in fact several countries have done. We should be glad to consider similar treaties with other countries in suitable circumstances and always provided that they are not directed towards any third country, that they strengthen non-alignment and that they promote peace. In the same spirit we welcome the initiative of Ceylon and Tanzania in seeking to declare the Indian Ocean as a Zone of peace. This subject was first raised at Lusaka last year, and the discussion suggested by Ceylon and Tanzania should contribute significantly to implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

While we note these welcome developments we are only too acutely aware of the many fields in which no progress for international security has been made in spite of the Declaration we solemnly adopted last year. Indeed, in some areas there have been significant failures, sometimes grievous failures

In the Middle East, all efforts to persuade Israel to agree to withdraw from the Arab territories have failed. Four-Power negotiations have come to a standstill and "quiet diplomacy" has remained so silent

that we do not know If any progress is being made at all. AU the indications are that nothing has been achieved all these months and years, that Mr. Jarring's mission has not had the co-operation from Israel needed for its work and that Israel is steadily going ahead with its plan for strengthening its hold over Arab territories and is indeed integrating them with Israel. Tension has increased and illicit occupation of territories is continuing under the cover of the ceasefire. All this is in violation of the Declaration and inadequate pressure is being brought on Israel to take up a reasonable and honourable attitude. On the other hand, the Arab States have done all that was reguired of them under resolution 242(1967) of the Security Council.

The four African Heads of State are about to make an attempt to solve this problem and we welcome their initiative, but should the problem and the tensions continue to threaten international peace, the Security Council should immediately be convened to ensure Israel's compliance with its resolution. The time for procrastination and sophistication is, in our view, long past.

In South-East Asia, progress has been slow but not insignificant. On the other hand, war has extended to Laos and Cambodia in a manner which has infringed practically all the important provisions of the Declaration and of the Geneva agreements. The talks in Paris have made no progress and the local. negotiations in Laos have not taken place. Cambodia continues to face many problems and, in terms of human suffering, all the people of the Indo-Chinese States are paying a heavy price. Once the bombing stops - and stops completely - and early withdrawal of foreign troops takes place according to an announced time-table, the negotiations can and will make progress. On Vietnam the sevenpoint proposal can provide the basis for a solution, in spite of the type of election South Vietnam recently had and local negotiations for national reconciliation can be undertaken and encouraged both in Laos and Cambodia.

In Africa, none of the provisions of the Declaration has been applied in relation to Namibia, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Zimbabwe. We see no solution

220

to their problems except on the basis of a more formal recognition of and support for the liberation struggle in these areas - as indeed has been accepted in the Declaration on friendly relations. A more effective sanction against Ian Smith's regime could also be considered but given the attitude of certain Powers, particularly of Portugal and South Africa, such sanctions will not succeed. We may, therefore, have to consider if South Africa, which has compounded its offence by its illegal hold on Namibia in spite of the cleat verdict of the International Court, has not been guilty of persistent violations of the principles of the Charter. Similar considerations may also apply to Portugal. What has been happening in Africa is a clear violation by several Member States of operative paragraphs 18, 22 and 23 of the Declaration.

Recent developments in the region to which India belongs cannot be ignored by us in any discussion on the implementation of the Declaration on International Security. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his report on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, has stated that:

"The situation in East Pakistan is a matter of deep concern, not only in the humanitarian sense, but also as a potential threat to peace and security".

What happens inside a State is properly Its own concern, but when these events materially and substantially affect another country, this must inevitably give rise to serious questions of that State's international responsibilities. These events are:

First, massive systematic violations, with utmost brutality, of human rights and fundamental freedoms resulting in, if not motivated by, a campaign of genocide; Secondly, inundation of the territories of a neighbouring State by millions of people so that the economic, social and political life is paralysed in the country of their refuge;

Thirdly, noisy and brutal threats of open warfare, with all the usual military boasts and demagoguery in the hope that India can be involved or at least some doubt created in the minds of the unwary.

Fourthly, repeated attempts to divert attention from its own problems. This is done by false accusation, by devious means to bring in India and at times by making meaningless offers and deceptive declarations in order to gain sympathy.

Fifthly, complete failure to achieve any political accommodation. The Secretary-General laments at the end of the section on East Pakistan in the introduction to his Annual report:

"But, as I have indicated, the basic problem can be solved only if a political solution based on reconciliation and the respect of humanitarian principles is achieved." (A/8401/Add. 1, paragraph 191).

I do not wish to dwell here on the plan of the Government of Pakistan to wipe out systematically the East Bengal intelligentsia and terrorize, through indiscriminate and massive killings, the Bengali masses into submission, as a final solution of the East Bengal problem. Nor do I wish to speak of selective dumping. The representatives assembled here are aware of these facts - and so is Mr. Andre Malraux. It is enough to say that in letting loose a reign of terror in East Pakistan, the Pakistan Government has completely violated operative paragraph 22 of the Declaration which states that:

"....universal respect for and full exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the elimination of the violation of those rights are urgent and essential to the strengthening of international security. . . "

(resolution 2734 (XXV), paragraph 22). operative paragraph 22 also "resolutely condemns" all forms of oppression, tyranny and discrimination. When it is considered that these inhumanities are being perpetrated by a minority regime over the majority of the people of the country, the enormity of these actions becomes a the clearer.

In the context of the unending stream of millions of East Pakistan nationals who are pouring into India, let me say that if the victim-State had been smaller and weaker than India, the economic and political integrity of that State could by now

221

have been destroyed. Very few States in the world could receive over nine million refugees, with more coming every day, and still survive for six months. If "aggression" means the infringement of the territorial boundary of a State, such aggression could be committed by military action as much as by driving millions upon millions of people into a foreign country: both threaten the very existence of the victim-State. The Declaration is particularly emphatic in asking respect for the sovereignty of other States and non-interference in their domestic affairs. Is not pushing millions across into a neighbour's territory an interference in their domestic affairs? The Government of Pakistan cannot escape the responsibility for the damage being done to India, unless it wishes to claim that it has lost sovereignty over East Pakistan.

But Pakistan's policies in East Bengal raise wider issues. The Secretary-General said:

"The conflict between the principles of the territorial integrity of States and self-determination has often before in history given rise to fratricidal strife and, in recent years, has provoked highly emotional reactions in the international community." We would not comment on the question of self-determination for Fast Pakistan at this stage. We are, however, clear that Pakistan is liable for the inhumanities perpetrated there and for interference in India's domestic affairs by forcing, and continuing to force, by its own action, into our territory millions of people and for creating conditions of insecurity and tension.

Pakistan has from the very beginning of its action against East Pakistan, been threatening constantly to use force against the territorial integrity of India - something totally prohibited by the Declaration. This is no doubt to divert attention from its own repressive measures and the civil strife in East Pakistan and to create the impression that India is behind the revolt in East Pakistan. As early as at the end of July, General Yahya Khan threatened total war against India. This threat has been repeated several times by him and was given out in detail and forcefully as recently as 12 October. All this constitutes a total repudiation of the obligations assumed by Pakistan to respect the Declaration and the Charter and thus to refrain from the threat or use of force. President Yahva Khan's threats have been accompanied by military movements towards our frontier on the West Pakistan - India border, a thousand miles away from East Pakistan.

I should in this context like to read from a statement by the Honourable Mr. Cornelius E. Gallagher, member of the United States House of Representatives, made on 11 July in the House. He said-

"The response of the Indian Government to the crisis created by the action of the Government of Pakistan has been magnificent. They have demonstrated most unbelievable restraint in view of the provocative effects of the army's brutal sweep and they have shown inspiring compassion to the refugees. If it can ever be said that any Government is truly moral and humanitarian, the Government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi has earned that distinction in the weeks since the first

refugees crossed her border. The sheer number of refugees is irrefutable evidence of the brutal policies pursued by the Government of Pakistan to crush the People who won the elections. Based on interviews I conducted with a cross-section of the refugees, I now believe that a calculated attempt to crush the intellectual life of the Bengali community occurred because of mass killings of professors, students and everyone of any distinction by the army. This in my judgement gives credence to the charge of genocide".

I have quoted that statement chiefly because the representative of Pakistan made a vituperative attack on India in his speech the day before yesterday. Of course, I reject firmly and categorically all his allegations. I also know that the purpose of his tirade, which took most of his time, was simply to divert attention and to give an appearance that India is involved in this problem between West Pakistan and East Bengal. I will not give him an opportunity to escape from the consequences of what he himself describes as "the kind of ordeal which has seldom befallen any other country

222

in the world." Many of the arguments he has used, many of the baseless statements he has made, have been disposed of in the general debate, and a full record will be found in documents A/PV.1940, A/PV.1941, A/PV.1943, A/PV.1945, A/PV.1953, A/PV. 1663 and A/PV.1965.

However, I owe the Committee - but not Pakistan - some further information on the so-called offer of President Yahya Khan to withdraw troops from the border. Ever since Pakistan carried out its vicious attack on the people of East Bengal it has decided to employ a jargon which it was hoped would mislead foreign opinion and assuage those few in West Pakistan who might somehow begin to feel that all was not well. So, all those Bengalis who had stood for their rights were described as miscreants; all those who had decided to fight for their

survival were dubbed "anti-state" elements. But that was not enough; India had to be brought in, and now all the mukti bahini, or freedom fighters, have become Indian infiltrators.

But let us examine this a little more. At the end of July, President Yahya Khan said, "I shall declare a general war, and let the world take note of it." Those strident war cries have been repeated throughout the last few months, and were accompanied by a campaign of "hate India", "crush India", Jehad or holy war. By the fourteenth of this month Pakistan had completed its massive movement of troops to the frontier, and in response and in self-defence we moved ours also. Those moves must be seen in the context of the deliberate building-up of tension by Pakistan over a long period. Then came the so-called offer that Pakistan forces would withdraw from along the borders "if India withdraws its forces, ceases infiltration and other hostile acts". The Committee will no doubt note the conditions: Pakistan must decide whether India has ceased infiltration and other hostile acts before it withdraws, if withdrawal was the main objective, why did Pakistan move its troops to the frontier in the first instance - quite apart from the fact that ours is a large frontier and we face many serious logistic problems. Anyway, these are matters of the utmost gravity and cannot be treated as a chess game for schoolchildren,

The second point I should like to mention to the Committee is the assertion of the Pakistan delegation that conditions In Pakistan are normal and that the refugees can return now. I should have preferred to hear about the conditions of East Pakistan from a large number of distinguished international civil servants who have visited those areas. Let them come and tell us what is happening. Their reports, as also reports from many other authoritative sources, are available to support everything we have said and to contradict everything Pakistan has said. When Pakistan claims to have given facts, all we find are statements of intentions. They keep on saying what they have done, but no one else confirms their claims. If

President Yahya Khan had visited East Pakistan even once during the last seven months he might have found out, if he wished, how his declarations were working in practice.

In a Press Conference held by our Prime Minister in New Delhi on 19 October, she was asked why India was not accepting additional men from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. She explained, and I quote part of her answer:

"Border and all refugee camps are perfectly open for Press people, for Members of Parliament who have come from many different countries, ranging from Japan on one side through Europe, on to Canada, the USA, Latin America, New Zealand and the Middle East. All these people have visited, and are visiting, the camps and the border. Therefore, obviously, there is nothing that we want to hide or we can hide in the sort of society which we have in India.

"Therefore, it is a valid question why we object to the United Nations formally sending observers. Well, because we see no need for them, What is the purpose of their coming here? It is said that they will come and see why the refugees are not returning. Now, it seems to me rather a ridiculous question when every day 35,000, 40,000, 42,000 are coming. This is the reason why they are not returning. Quite honestly, if you put yourself in a situation where you have escaped to avoid atrocity, to gave your life, and sought shelter and are living in most difficult conditions,

223

not at all in comfort of any kind, well, you can only go back if you are convinced that the situation has changed. But when more people are coming with the same sort of atrocity stories, you cannot possibly go back.

"So the first thing for the United

Nations, if it wants to do anything, is to see that conditions are created in Bangla Desh, within Bangla Desh, which will guarantee the return of refugees in safety and dignity."

Curiously, Pakistan never replies as to why refugees, whose number now exceeds 9.4 million, are still coming. Incidentally, I have just come across a report on the meeting of the Consortium in Paris, and with your permission and indulgence I should like to read out this short report, which appeared in The New York Times. I believe that the actual text of the Consortium discussion is not yet a public document, but what The New York Times has written today is, I think, adequate to prove how vapid and irresponsible are some of the statements made by the Pakistan delegation. The report is datelined Paris, 26 October. It states:

"Thirteen nations and five international organizations agreed here today to a world-wide effort to meet the cost of the growing refugee problem in India. The expenditure needed to care for the East Pakistanis who have fled into India was put at \$ 700 million until the end of next March."

When we gave that figure in the General Assembly, someone from the Pakistan delegation said it amounted to practically a quarter of India's total budget. It does, and that is what the Bank Consortium has confirmed. The report adds:

"It was agreed that such costs were creating an intolerable burden on India. The delegates meeting here at the European headquarters of the World Bank are involved financially in India's development. Reports given by Dr. Patel, of the Indian Ministry of Finance, by Charles Mace, United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Refugees, and by the World Bank officials put the number of refugees at more than 9.5 millions."

Now, a Government - If It can be called a Government - that can count absent people and come up with fabulous figures on a basis

that is undisclosed and with dates that are undisclosed can challenge anything it likes, but here is the authoritative statement of the Bank officials, who put the number of refugees at more than 9.5 million. But lest there be some feeling that only officials accept that figure, let me read the next paragraph of that same report from Paris:

"Representatives of Austria, Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United States attended the meeting with the delegates of India, the International Monetary Fund, the United Nations Childrens Fund, the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development."

Now, how long are we going to put up with childish accusations of this kind made only to confuse the issue?

The magnitude of the burden being borne by India and the dangers to peace and tranquillity in the region consequent on Pakistan's - military action against East Pakistan have been recognized by the international community. It remains, however, the urgent task to tackle the root cause of the problem and persuade the Pakistan Government to come to a political solution with the popular leaders of East Bengal and particularly with Sheikh MuJibur Rahman. If it can do it otherwise, let it do ft. We are giving our views on how it should be done. It is no interference in Pakistan's internal affairs. If it is interference, we should be kept out and not invited to become involved in it.

Apart from the specific problems which are of concern to the Committee, I should like to put forward certain general considerations. These might help us to move forward in implementing the Declaration.

India has consistently and systematically called for the creation of effective barriers against war, aggression, attack, coercion, subversion and political and ecocontext we have placed special emphasis on the principle of non-use of force in international relations.

The basic concept of the non-use of force - written into paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the Declaration - needs to be further elaborated. Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter clearly states that the threat or use of force shall not be used against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. These purposes are contained in Article 1 of the Charter, and include the following:

- (a) "To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace";
- (b) "To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion".

Implicit here is the belief that disputes between States in the classical sense are not the only situations which threaten international peace and security. The problem is wider in scope and content. It could be suggested that any deliberate, serious and systematic violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter and of the obligations the Charter imposes could be regarded as threats to the peace and, where appropriate, as breaches of the peace. An examination of the history of the apartheid question in the United Nations is particularly illuminating. First, the world community has recognized that gross and systematic violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms cannot legitimately be shielded by Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter: from scrutiny and action at the international level. Secondly, it has been forcefully acknowledged that by their very nature and in terms of their broadest implications such violations endanger and threaten international peace.

Since the United Nations cannot achieve a secure and lasting peace unless it can raise effective barriers against aggression, it is absolutely necessary to agree on a definition of aggression. Acceptance of high abstract principles will be valueless if responsibility for aggression cannot be determined in all specific instances. How is it possible to settle disputes justly without being able to identify the culprit? Last year we warned that the emphasis on a mechanism for the peaceful settlement of disputes should not bring about the result that the United Nations, either directly or indirectly, would give encouragement to situations in which the aggressor, after having secured what he wanted, would acquire sympathy and goodwill by offering negotiation, mediation and arbitration on the basis of trading his ill-gotten gains. We should like to reiterate that proposition.

The world Organization has to develop and acquire the skill and strength required for dealing effectively with problems with far-reaching consequences. As I have pointed out earlier, peace may be imperilled by actions which amount to a systematic violation of the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter. Perhaps this can be done by making clear once again that the commitment to international action aimed at the observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms has the same and equal validity as the commitment to the eradication of apartheid and racial discrimination, the completion of the process of decolonization and the economic and social development of the developing countries.

At the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, a number of delegations emphasized procedures and techniques for the pacific settlement of disputes. That concern has found its place in the Declaration. Operative paragraph 6 of the Declaration recognizes the principle that the obligation to settle international disputes by pacific means does not mean that a given dispute should be settled by a particular means or that the States are to be guided by any specific order of priorities in the choice of methods. This principle of free choice is to be found in Article 2, paragraph 3, of the Charter. It is also stated in Article 33, under which the Security Council, in calling

225

Upon the parties to any dispute to seek a solution through peaceful means, may not call upon them to proceed in accordance with a particular procedure.

I might recall Article 1, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which states clearly that adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations is to be undertaken "in conformity with the principles of justice and, international law". Article 2, paragraph 3, calls upon all Member States to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered". This specific concept has not been given enough attention in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. We think that action in this area might be discussed further in pursuance of operative paragraph 17 of the Declaration. The Assembly has a particular responsibility, since Article 13 of the Charter foresees studies and recommendations for the purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification. Major political changes have taken place in the international community over the past twenty Years, and new States are reluctant to accept obligations and apply laws for whose formulation they were not responsible and some of which may not be based on equity and justice.

The Declaration recognizes the need to take effective, dynamic and flexible measures to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. While the international community has developed a vast array of procedures and techniques for peaceful settlement of disputes, there has been, regrettably, no comparable progress in the suppression of organized violence by States. Little has been achieved in the way of concluding agreements under Article 43 to develop the United Nations capacity for enforcement action. The whole series of constitutional issues of Articles 39, 40 and 41 remains at best confused and unexplored. We believe that the development of a system for determining aggression and consequent obligation for effective economic and other sanctions could compensate to some extent for the lack of agreement under Article 43.

My delegation hopes that whatever subsidiary organ the Security Council may consider worth setting up should be concerned with identifying the aggressor. Secondly, we would emphasize that the procedure of the Council should be strictly adhered to, and private negotiation, however useful, must not be used to the detriment of any Member States. All Member States should have their rights fully protected under the present rules of procedure and the relevant sections of the Charter.

Paragraph 12 of the Declaration, which asks Member States to do their utmost to enhance the authority and effectiveness of the Security Council, could best be implemented through emphasis on concrete, effective and comprehensive measures aimed at the implementation of the decisions of the Security Council. For example, the authority of the Security Council has seriously suffered because its decisions on the situation in South Africa, Namibia, Southern Rhodesia and elsewhere have remained unimplemented.

The adoption of the Declaration has also underlined the need for an early agreement on guidelines for more effective peace-keeping operations. Accordingly, it would be appropriate if the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations were again urged to make special efforts with a view to reach-

ing an early agreement.

The totality of the environement for international security will continue to be determined, in large part, by progress in the crucial area of disarmament. operative paragraph 19 of the Declaration establishes, a close connexion between the strengthening of international security and disarmament and the economic development of countries. My delegation would make fuller comments on disarmament and economic development in other appropriate forums.

We are anxious to have a general and complete disarmament, including nuclear disarmament under effective international control, and to make determined efforts in preparing and implementing a programme for the Disarmament Decade. We would also wish to ensure that the benefits of technology for peaceful uses of nuclear energy be made available to all States,

226

without discrimination. We hope that the forthcoming report of the groups of, international experts, commissioned by the Secretary-General, on the economic and social consequences of the arms race and of military expenditures will provide a good basis for significant progress in the field of disarmament.

This is the first year since the adoption of the Declaration that we are discussing this important subject. It is the hope of our delegation that as a result of this discussion we shall come up with a resolution not repeating the Declaration, not attempting to arrive at another declaration, but indicating clearly the areas where progress can be made and where the emphasis should be placed. We have in mind that certain general statements in the Declaration would require emphasis if we are to make progress in this important field of international security.

Similarly, we would wish to see full and faithful implementation of the Strategy for the Second Development Decade, and we hope that the forthcoming Conference at Lima will bring forward a concerted and practical plan of action.

If I have spoken at some length, it is because we believe that the subject has assumed added importance since we adopted the Declaration. It is our hope that some progress - and we are realistic enough not to expect full progress - will bee made this year in pursuing some of the ideas we have mentioned. We look forward to fruitful cooperation with all other delegations to achieve that end.

INDIA USA ITALY PAKISTAN ZAMBIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA BAHRAIN BHUTAN OMAN QATAR GERMANY POLAND JAPAN TANZANIA ISRAEL LAOS SWITZERLAND FRANCE CAMBODIA VIETNAM ANGOLA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE NAMIBIA GUINEA-BISSAU ZIMBABWE PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA UNITED KINGDOM CANADA NEW ZEALAND AUSTRIA DENMARK THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY SWEDEN PERU

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Rudra Pratap Singh's speech at the Social and Economic Committee

Following is the text of the statement made by Shri Rudra Pratap Singh, Member of Parliament, in the General Debate in the Second Committee on 7th October 1971:

Mr. Chairman,

When we adopted the International Development Strategy last year, we thought we were initiating a new era in the economic history of the 20th century. But we have been overtaken by events. and an international monetary crisis, unprecedented in the life of the United Nations, has suddenly caught up with us. The result is that the strategy has been pushed into the background even before a modest beginning

could be made towards its implementation.

As the distinguished Minister for Finance and Economy of France pointed out in Washington last week, the problem before us is more economic than monetary and more political than technical. It is in this perspective that we will have to look at and resolve the grave issues with which we are confronted.

When, at its last session, ECOSOC adopted a resolution on the international monetary situation, we were aware of our being on the door step of a serious crisis. But we did not expect that a unilateral decision within a fortnight of the adoption of the ECOSOC resolution would result in the crisis breaking over our heads. Since 15th August 1971, exchange rates have been fluctuating with no certain indication of the direction in which a realignment of parities will take place. All the arrangements we have carefully worked out over the years - whether it is in regard to monetary cooperation, the ground rules for the conduct of international trade, uninterrupted and augmented flows of development finance, the smooth transfer of technology from the developed to the developing world on reasonable terms, properly organised world markets for commodities and manufactures. or international transport systems - all these arrangements stand in danger of collapsing because one important country has taken the first step towards disregarding the rules of conduct of the International Monetary Fund, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs, the UNCTAD's Standstill Agreement on Tariffs, - and, as we in the Second Committee are particularly aware, the spirit of the International Development Strategy so solemnly adopted only a year ago.

227

My delegation cannot emphasise too strongly that the developing countries have not contributed in any way to the present crisis. Almost all of us in the developing world are running large balance of payment deficits and are finding these deficits a serious constraint on our possibilities of growth. Our needs are more pressing than those of the developed countries. Foreign exchange shortages hamper us more than they do the developed countries. Nevertheless, the countries of the third world have consistently, conscientiously and dutifully accepted the international discipline enjoined upon them.

Yet, we of the developing world are being penalised for sins which are not of our commission. An import surcharge of 10 per cent has been levied on a wide range of goods by one of the most important developed importing countries. Although representatives of the developing countries have emphasised in various forums the serious difficulties into which this action of the United States has placed them, we are still to receive an authoritative confirmation that our views are being taken into consideration seriously and that this surcharge, at least in respect of the developing countries, will be removed forthwith.

The developing countries are also deeply distressed by the disruption in the flow of development finance. Development is essentially a continuous process: a cumulative decelerating of the rate of growth is inevitable if there are disruptions in the availability of investible resources. The third replenishment of IDA resources, scheduled for June this year, is still to come Into effect. We are glad that in spite of this some countries have announced their advance contributions. but, as in many other things, the action taken by the United States will be crucial. unless the IDA can be assured of timely and adequate replenishments, as envisaged in the International Development Strategy. pi-ogress towards widening the criteria for IDA loans will necessarily be halting.

Insofar as international monetary reform is concerned, my delegation would wish to place on record that we of the developing world have been compelled to play the part of mute witnesses to a deliberate flouting of some of the most carefully negotiated international agreements in recent economic history. Mr. Chairman, I use the word "mute" deliberately because there is a manifest tendency on the part of the deve-

loped countries to discuss matters, settle issues and arrive at conclusions among themselves without taking the developing countries fully into confidence and without ensuring that not, only are their interests protected but also that their voice is heard.

Therefore, it is the view of my delegation that the developing countries must be intimately associated from the start in the process of decision-making leading to the evolution of a new international monetary order. The essential elements of this new order must include the following:

- (1) A return to the cardinal principle of the Bretton Woods system namely, fixed exchange rates through multilaterally negotiated realignment of parities.
- (2) Wider margins of fluctuation around parities in order to combine flexibility with a reasonable degree of stability.
- (3) The progressive evolution of the Special Drawing Rights of the IMF as the primary international reserve asset.
- (4) Larger and more equitable allocations of SDR's to the developing countries.
- (5) The establishment of a link between SDR's and development finance as an integral part of the proposed monetary reform.
- (6) The maintenance of the value of the reserve assets of the developing countries in the proem of monetary reform and the insulation of the value of these assets from the vagaries of exchange rate fluctuations.

Given the urgency of the situation and the imperative necessity of resolving the crisis with all deliberate speed, my delegation wishes to express the hope that the distinguished experts assembled here in this Committee will formulate concrete recommendations regarding the action which must be taken. My delegation is prepared to work in close co-operation with all other dele-

gations towards this end. Procrastination or hesitation will only worsen the inauspicious beginning which the Second Development Decade has made.

And that brings me to the further action we need to take during the course of this session on the International Strategy of Development for the Second Development Decade. As members of this Committee are only too aware, although the Strategy was adopted unanimously, unanimity was achieved by the procedural technique of allowing individual delegations to state their reservations in their country statements. The developing countries agreed to this procedure not only in the interests of obtaining unanimity but, more importantly, in the expectation that over the years the developed countries would progressively withdraw their reservations. Yet, in the year that has elapsed since the adoption of the Strategy, none of the developed countries has indicated a time-bound programme for the withdrawal of their respective reservations. Both in order that this session of the General Assembly might show concrete progress in this regard, and in order to prevent at Santiago a repetition of the kind of sterile confrontation which characterised the first few weeks of UNCTAD II, it is essential that the developed countries should seize this opportunity to state straightaway the steps their Governments propose to take to bring their actions more in line with the provisions of the International Development Strategy.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation notes with profound disquiet that it is not clear whether the target dates stipulated in the Strategy will, in fact, be respected. Paragraph 32 of the Strategy specifies that every effort will be made to implement the General scheme of Preferences - -and I quote - " as early as possible in 1971" - unquote. We are entering the last quarter of 1971 but, apart from the European Economic Com-

munity, no other preference giving country has indicated any firm date by which the GSP will go into operation.

Similarly, my delegation would like ask the developed countries whether they in tend to adhere to the target dates given paragraphs 42 and 44 of the Strategy in respect of the quantity and quality of development finance. The decision taken by the United States to reduce its aid flow by 10 per cent has vitiated the atmosphere and we stand in serious danger of hearing the old, tired arguments about burden-sharing once again.

A firm statement of intention by all developed countries in this regard will help restore the confidence of the international community in the earnestness with which the provisions of the Strategy are to be implemented. To the extent that any particular developed country finds itself unable to adhere to any particular target date, the least we can expect is a solemn pledge to work towards these targets on a "best endeavour" basis.

I now turn to the question of review and appraisal of the Strategy for the Second Development Decade.

Although the ECOSOC has considered this matter in two successive sessions, the substantive aspects of review and appraisal were not dealt with exhaustively at their any of these sessions. The ECOSOC resolution containing the package deal concerns itself only with certain institutional aspects of review and appraisal. ECOSOC resolution 1625 (LI) on the Committee for Development Planning makes only a glancing reference to the substantive questions. Similarly, the ECOSOC Decision contained in document E/L.1457 provides but a general indication of the manner in which the General Assembly might deal with this issue. Hence, this Committee will be considering the question of review and appraisal virtually on a clean slate except, of course, insofar as paragraphs 79 to 83 of the Strategy specifically lay down the lines along which our thinking should proceed.

First, we shall have to spell out clearly and unambiguously the purpose of review and appraisal. Paragraph 79 of the Strategy states that the fundamental purpose should be --and I quote - "to keep under systematic scrutiny the progress made towards achieving the goals and objectives of the Decade - to identify shortfalls in their achievement and the factors which account for them and to recommend positive measures, including new goals and policies as needed." - unquote. Clearly, the General Assembly should elaborate on this formula-

229

tion so that the review bodies will know exactly what is required of them.

Mr. Chairman, it is not Individual country performance which should be subjected to review and appraisal. The common purpose of review at all levels national, regional, sectoral and global should be to assess the manner in which the operation of the Strategy has affected the process of economic growth -and social progress so that shortfall in the achievement of the goals and objectives of the Decade and the factors that account for them can be identified and recommendations formulated regarding the new goals and policies which are needed. In this connection, my delegation would wish to commend for the consideration of this Committee the statement made by the Government of Argentina in its reply to the Secretary-General's note verbale that - and I quote - "the policies 'adopted' should be compared with the policies that were 'recommended' and the specific results achieved for the economy should be compared with the goals that were 'set'." - unquote. My delegation also endorses the general approach to the purpose of review adopted by the Governments of Sweden and the Netherlands as set out in document E/5000 and Addendum I thereto.

Our deliberations on review and appraisal should also go into the question of the scope of the exercise. We have got the impression that review and appraisal is sometimes conceived of as applying exclusively

to the developing countries. Obviously, the manner in which the operation of the Strategy has affected economic development in the developing world would be of primary concern. But, equally, the contribution which the developed countries, jointly and severally, have made to the process of economic development should be the subject of examination.

The third aspect of this question which we must decide upon is the integration of review machineries at the national, regional and sectoral levels with the global review mechanism. The International Development Strategy, in paragraph 79, specifically charges us with the task of "avoiding unnecessary duplication or proliferation of review activities". There will be unnecessary duplication and proliferation if each review agency at each level operates independently without regard to the manner in which the Committee for Development Planning would wish to gather the information and data it requires to formulate conclusions and recommendations for consideration at the intergovernmental level.

In the view of my delegation, the Committee for Development Planning would function as the fulcrum of the review mechanism. It would decide what kind of information and data it requires and review agencies at the sectoral, regional and national levels would largely concentrate on supplying the CDP with such information and statistical data as the CDP calls for.

If we accept the data monitoring scheme given in the Secretary-General's note (E/5040) the elaborate tier system he has recommended, the large number of indicators of growth, and suggested detailed action on every point of the Development Strategy, then we would be confronted with such a huge mass of indigestible, non-comparable information that we would inevitably miss the wood for the trees. The appraisal at all levels must be fully integrated and made simple, specific and pointedly geared to an assessment of the impact of the operation of the Strategy on world economic development through international co-

operation.

Mr. Chairman, before leaving the subject I would like to have your permission to say just a word about the role of the Specialised Agencies. It must be made clear to the Specialised Agencies that the normal review activities which they have undertaken since their inception should be distinguished from the activities they undertake' in the context of review and appraisal of the implementation of the International Development Strategy. The detailed reviews which they have always undertaken cannot be metamorphized into their contribution to the review of the Strategy. The one must be distinguished from the other. In this specific context, the role of the Specialised Agencies should be circumscribed to providing the CDP with such factual information as it requires and to assessing the manner in which the operation of the Strategy has affected growth in their respective sectors.

230

Mr. Chairman, having expressed in some detail our views on the substantive aspects of review and appraisal, may I now turn to its institutional aspects? The institutional aspects of review and appraisal should not become artificially linked with institutional arrangements in other fields. To this extent, my delegation is not entirely happy with ECOSOC resolution 1621 (LI), generally referred to as the package deal. But we do appreciate the need for setting up a separate Committee for Review and Appraisal comprising 54 members. Our preference would be to locate this Committee directly under the General Assembly and not make it a subsidiary body of the ECOSOC. This preference is expressed in view of the fact that wherever the review Committee might be located, its views, in terms of paragraph 83 of the Strategy, can be transmitted to the General Assembly only through the Economic and Social Council. At the same time, by placing the review Committee under the General Assembly we would not be interfering in any way with the prestige, autonomy and effectiveness of U.N. organisations directly under the General Assembly such as the UNCTAD and the UNIDO. It seems to us that this is the essential consideration which would help to resolve the bitter controversy over the package deal which characterised the 51st session of the ECOSOC. In this connection, my delegation would wish to welcome the proposal to eventually double the membership of the ECOSOC. We have long believed that one of the main reasons for which the Economic and Social Council has not been able to effectively discharge its Charter responsibilities is its limited membership and, therefore, its unrepresentative character,

Mr. Chairman, for the last one and a half years the Economic and Social Council has been engaged in determining how to improve its methods of work. My delegation reaffirms that the ECOSOC is one of the principal organs of the U.N. system for the consideration of economic and social issues. We, therefore, welcome attempts to improve its effectiveness. But we cannot support any move which would result in a diminution of the role of the General Assembly as the primary organ of the U.N. system. My delegation, therefore, expresses the hope that improvements in the work of the ECOSOC will improve its effectiveness. but not expand its functions beyond those envisaged in the Charter.

Mr. Chairman, with all the emphasis at its command my delegation wishes to urge that immediate and constructive consideration be given to the problems of the least developed among the developing countries.

There were two essential considerations which went into the formulation of UNCTAD resolution 24 (II): first, that special measures must not result in discriminatory arrangements being set up among developing countries and, second, that the purpose of special measures should be to ensure that all developing countries derive equitable benefit from measures taken by the international community to promote growth in the developing countries as a whole.

The early attempts to identify the least

developed countries were not successful precisely because both the procedures used and the listing arrived at were contrary to the provisions of resolution 24 (II). However, the report of the Committee for Development Planning on its 7th session has broken the back of the problem. The UNCTAD's Second Ad-Hoc Group of Experts, who have adopted the CDP's recommendations in regard to identification, have also made an important contribution in this regard. My delegation believes that the question of identification has now been settled and we must proceed to the more important problem of devising and implementing specific special measures in favour of the least developed among the developing countries. The Trade and Development Board at its 11th session adopted it resolution endorsing the list of countries Initially identified as constituting the hard core of the least developed countries. It also established an Inter-Governmental Group to continue work on criteria for further identification of those countries relatively disadvantaged in the context of specific policy measures in a sector of economic activity or a particular geographical region, and to formulate policy measures in favour of the latter." India was one of the co-sponsors of this resolution and my delegation avails of this opportunity to reiterate before the Second Committee its endorsement of the categorisation of least developed countries recommended in the report of the Committee for Development Planning.

231

The UNCTAD Group of Experts have, in the view of my Government, expressed the fundamental objective of all special measures in a very accurate manner when they have urged that this objective should be - I quote - "the establishment and expansion of production capacity" -- unquote - in the least developed countries. So far, special measures have been conceived in an ad hoc manner and without any well defined perspective. We believe that before any special measure is taken up for consideration, it should be subjected to the litmus test of whether or not the measure in

question would contribute to the establishment and expansion of production capacity in the least developed countries.

It is the view of my delegation - a view which, incidentally, is shared by the Committee for Development Planning -- that the first requirement of the least developed countries would be an intensive programme of technical assistance. Mr. Chairman, India is already extending technical assistance to various countries through participation in multilateral programmes such as the Colombo Plan and the SCAAP as also through a bilateral scheme which goes under the name of the Indian Technical and Economic Co-operation Programme (ITEC). The Government of India is fully prepared to participate in programmes of technical assistance which will be implemented in favour of the least developed countries. We are also sure that other developing countries, not readily classifiable as least developed, would wish to join in this cooperative endeavour. However, these efforts on the part of the developing countries to promote co-operation among themselves cannot achieve full fruition unless the international community offers its whole-hearted support.

Thus, wherever possible, technical experts for work in the least developed countries ought to be recruited from other developing countries. In the establishment of basic development institutions as also infrastructure, equipment and personnel from other developing countries is likely to result in the least developed countries getting what they require from others who have had a recent and intimate association with the developmental process, thus making future growth in the least developed countries rapid, cheap and efficient. Similarly, in the establishment of infra-structural facilities and development projects, wherever possible procurements should be made from other developing countries. As regards increased financial assistance to the least developed countries on soft terms, the untying of development assistance in the direction of other developing countries would enable the aid dollar to perform a double task: that of

providing direct financial assistance to the least developed countries and that of enabling the more advanced developing countries to expand the volume of their exports and diversify the pattern of their trade.

In concluding my remarks on this important subject I must emphasise that, in the view of my delegation, there is no conflict of interest between the so-called more advanced developing countries and the countries which will be identified as the least developed among them. Whether we are relatively more advanced or relatively less fortunate, the basic fact remains that we are all developing countries. Our aspirations are common and our interests are similar.

Mr. Chairman, the eleventh session of the Governing Council of the UNDP was presented with a whole series of proposals relating to the implementation of the consensus, the provisions of which had been approved by the General Assembly in Resolution 2688(XXV). It will be recalled that Governments had accepted the target of doubling the resources of the Programme during the next five years. The Administrator in document DP/L.157 stated that doubling of the Programme by 1975 is a realistic goal. Accordingly, we were disturbed when a growth rate of resources of only 9.6 per cent per annum over the next five years was suggested and accepted by the Governing Council. This indeed will mean that even the present capacity of the United Nations development system will remain unused and will result in the stagnation of the Programme at its present level, in real terms. We were even more concerned that in the first year after the adoption of the consensus, the pledges made were lower than even the unfortunate and unacceptably low percentage of 9.6 per cent. We can only conclude that the developed countries, with

232

laudable exceptions, have not only failed to make even the minimum required efforts but have provided valid ground for seriously doubting their intentions. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we hope that the Governing Council would very soon review the rate of growth of resources on which the indicative planning figures, as established at the, 11th session were based. The failure to do this would only confirm our doubts and in the long term will be self-defeating for the interests of the developed countries themselves.

Before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, may I have your permission to say a few words about the performance of the Indian economy during the past year?

The Green Revolution continues to sweep the country and food production in the fiscal year 1970-71 reached the record figure of 108 million tonnes. We are fairly confident of attaining the target of 120 million tonnes set for the Fourth Five Year Plan which ends in March 1974. The breakthrough in wheat production has been accom-Plished but we are still searching for the rice strain which will enable us to finally conquer the vagaries of the monsoon. In any case, we have taken a firm decision to end all concessionary food imports from the end of this year and a modest beginning in the export of cereals - particularly the Basmati variety of rice - has been made.

The most significant feature of industrial growth in 1970-71 was the 13 per cent increase in production recorded in the small scale sector. A survey recently carried out has shown that nearly a third of the output of the small sector is being exported. This has established beyond doubt the viability, in terms of quality and timely deliveries, of small industrial sector.

Exports have also been satisfactory, the increase over the previous year being about 9 per cent. Non-traditional exports such as machine tools, electrical equipment and a range of chemical products, have displayed an encouraging buoyancy.

However, there has been one extremely disquieting development of late which I cannot help but make a reference to. As members of the Committee are aware, since the last week of March this year, India has been subjected to the largest, influx of refugees ever known in the history of mankind. More

than nine million refugees have already entered India from East Pakistan and the present rate of influx runs to about 33,000 per day. We are doing all that we can to look after the need of these distressed people. But, I must stress that our resources are severely limited and this ha-, thrown an unbearable burden on our economy. Present estimates are that the Government of India would have to spend about 800 million dollars during the year ending 31st March 1972 in order to care for the refugees. This would incidentally be more than the net total annual foreign aid inflow into India. If there is no reduction in the inflow of refugees, and there is no sign yet of this, the estimate of expenditure will need continuous upward revision. International assistance pledged so far, though generous and spontaneous, amounts to a small fraction of the total minimum requirements. Another way of looking at the but-den which the refugees are imposing on the Indian economy is that expenditure on the refugees is about a sixth of the total development expenditure envisaged in the Central and State budgets combined.

I am sure this Committee will readily Appreciate that we cannot continue to bear this burden indefinitely. For the moment, we still hope to attain the development goals listed in the Fourth Five-Year Plan. But this is a hope based on the expectation that the refugees will soon be able to return to their homeland through creation of necessary conditions there. While the humanitarian and other aspects of this problem are receiving attention in other appropriate forums, its serious negative impact on the process of economic development of India needs to be fully realised and rectified.

233

INDIA USA FRANCE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC RUSSIA CHILE ARGENTINA SWEDEN THE NETHERLANDS SRI LANKA PAKISTAN

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Khan's Statement on Liberation Movements

Speaking during the debate at the U.N. Trusteeship Committee on October 20, 1971 on Liberation movements, Indian Delegate, Shri Zulfiqar Ali Khan, said:

Mr. Chairman,

May I first of all take this opportunity of congratulating you on your election as the Chairman of our Committee? Your long association with the United Nations and specially questions of decolonisation and human rights is certainly an asset for this Committee. Our congratulations also go to our Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. Mrs. Skottsberg-Ahman's first-hand expe-Hence of the working of the Special Committee on Decolonisation will be of immense value. The Rapporteur of the Committee, Mr. Tadesse brings with him not only a tradition of Ethiopian association with this Committee, but also his charm and detailed knowledge of the problems with which this Committee will be dealing.

As my delegation indicated earlier, we shall separately discuss the question of Rhodesia. My present statement relates to the question of Territories under Portuguese Administration. Portuguese colonialism is the oldest and the most intransigent of colonial administrations in Africa and at present forms with South Africa and the minority regime of Southern Rhodesia the axis of an unholy alliance created for the purpose of dominating directly or indirectly the whole of the Southern African subcontinent.

The year 1970-71 was a period of increasing collaboration between Portugal and its major allies, specially South Africa and

Rhodesia.

In February this year the Security chiefs of Portugal, South Africa and Southern Rhodesia met in Salisbury.

In June the Portuguese Minister for Foreign Affairs visited South Africa where he is reported to have discussed with the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs maintenance of security in the region south of the 10th parallel, as well as the sea route around the Cape, with special reference to the Indian Ocean coast and the Mozambique Canal.

A number of statements made during the visit underline the close relationship between Portugal and South Africa. In one speech, the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Hilgard Muller said that the strategic positions of Portugal and South Africa were important factors for the defence of western civilisation by both countries, especially because they shared common ideas of peace and pi-ogress, were subjected to the same threats and were exposed to the same dangers.

This unholy alliance also has important economic dimensions. The intention, which is central to the expansion of the economic base of a Southern African regional bloc, is to hook the countries of the south into an integrated power-using area spanned by the giant hydroelectric Cabora Bassa Dam on the middle of Zambesi. The Dam is being built in Mozambique's Tete province, which is the centre of the most crucial battles of the war between Portuguese troops and FRELIMO, and it will stand at the strategic conjunction of Zambia, Malawi and Rhodesia. This project, devised by South Africa and financed by a giant international consortium of South African, and other foreign interests, is interested to provide for the economic centralisation of a vast region across the boundaries of a dozen different states - but on South African and Portuguese terms, and in such a way that the economic needs and strength of the white minority regimes will prevail over the needs of the smaller African states searching for a genuine economic independence. Western financiers seem to have adopted the Portuguese propaganda line that Cabora Bassa, project is of benefit, essentially to the Africans. But as Lord Brockway has pointed out and I quote:

"This project is not similar to Volta: this is not similar to the Aswan dam; it is the exploitation by a Colonial Power in the interests of its own financiers ... at the expense of the Africans who are living there."

234

The Portuguese "Journal do Commercio" of 24th May reported that South Africa will consume 80% of the 18,500 million KW per year which the giant dam will produce. Cabora Bassa is to be the centre not only of hydroelectric power but also of white power in Southern Africa. Portugal has announced a scheme to settle one million white immigrants along the Zambesi to strengthen the man-power resources of the white-minority states of the South. One of South Africa's most influential economic planners has stated that Cabora Bassa is viewed not only as a source of cheap power for South Africa's growing needs but as the focus for "a closely knit Southern Africa... which implies a signal contribution of an outward looking South African Republic to all the African countries clustered in the South." In other words, this is seen as an expansion of apartheid power in Africa, a means of strengthening Portugal fighting her desperate rearguard action' in her colonies and a profitable investment for European financiers. Neither the Cabora Bassa scheme nor its partner on the west Side- of the continent, the Kunene project between Angola and South West Africa, (likewise a joint South-African-Portuguese project) could be planned or constructed were it not for the active participation and support of Western business and finance groupings and their governments.

Cabora Bassa is designed to help make South Africa and Portugal the economic power house of Africa south of the Equator, while the white settlers flowing into the area will be an attempt to create fresh reserves of white opposition to African freedom and thus to hold the line against the African freedom movements.

Inspite of this military and economic alliance the liberation movements in Angola, Guinea-Bisau and Mozambique have continued to operate with great success. The liberation movements have widened and improved their political and social structures within these colonies for the benefit of the populations which support and form the national liberation movements; and in line with this advance have enlarged their military capability both to protect these populations from Portuguese raids and ravages, and to attack the occupation forces of the Portuguese regime. They have also won a far wider recognition than any they had managed to achieve before.

Portugal has increased its military effort and has now added to it the chemical warfare. Though Portugal still denies the use of herbicides and defoliants in Angola, Dutch and German journalists, who visited Angola recently have reported definite evidence of Portuguese use of Napalm and defoliants. The Dutch journalists have brought back fragments of napalm bombs and of crops withered by defoliants from Eastern Angola to Lusaka.

But the liberation movements working against all these dangers and obstacles were able to achieve not only an enlargement of the new institutions in the zones where their military units have an overall military superiority against the Portuguese, but they have also enlarged the size of these zones.

These successes, achieved in the face of great difficulties and dangers, have begun to win for the national liberation movements a wider international recognition: this now ranges over a very broad spectrum of political and religious opinion in a large number of countries. Its broadening nature was shown dramatically in May 1971 when an important Catholic missionary organisation, the White Fathers, decided to stop all its work in Mozambique, and pull out its thirty-five missionaries there because, as its General Council roundly stated, it had

found that its missionaries were being used by the colonialist regime as a cover for colonialist brutality and oppression.

But Mr. Chairman, the liberation movements are winning these battles at the cost of great suffering and sacrifices imposed upon them by the Portuguese colonialists, In all these colonies many fighters lack proper clothing; they lack protection against the bitter cold of the dry season, and they are often desperately short of medical supplies, notably of the anti-biotic and anti-malarial drugs; they need aid to maintain and extend their schools, their clinics, their economic networks in , their liberated zones. Their need is great. In this connection, I would like to invite your attention to resolutions 2671 (XXV), 2704 (XXV), 2705 (XXV),

235 2706 (XXV) and 2707 (XXV) of the General Assembly.

There is no doubt that if the people of the Territories under Portuguese administration are to be liberated, sterner action will have to be taken, particularly by the major trading partners of South Africa and the NATO allies of Portugal. But at the same time concerted action should be taken to provide meaningful assistance to the colonial peoples in their struggle.

Mr. Chairman, as in others parts of the world throughout southern Africa the violence of oppression has sparked the struggle of liberation. Four hundred fifty-five thousand Portuguese now rule more than twelve million Africans. Here lingers a fearful balance between liberation and the remorseless intensification of colonial repression. A minority is maintaining a monopoly of political and economic power to aporopriate the fruits of social and economic development through the exploitation of those who lack such power. The General Assembly has already indicated that as long as the oppression by a minority government over the majority of the population continues, or so long as the colonial form of domination is not brought to an end, it is perfectly legitimate for freedom-fighters and for liberation

forces to continue their struggle by all available means. Never in history has violence been initiated by the oppressed. How can they be the initiators if they themselves are the result of violent oppression. There would be no oppressed had there been no prior situation of violence to establish their subjugation. Oppressed people can have only one of the two alternatives: the continuing and intensifying violence of oppression or the struggle which seeks to destroy oppression. Since the legitimacy of the struggle for liberation from colonialism has already been accepted by the General Assembly, it should now make a formal declaration that any action taken to suppress liberation movements or movements for equal rights of the people in a country would be automatically considered as unjustified and those who perpetrated it, could be treated as aggressors.

INDIA USA ETHIOPIA SOUTH AFRICA PORTUGAL MOZAMBIQUE MALAWI ZAMBIA ANGOLA GUINEA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Delegate's Statement on Southern Rhodesia

Following is the text of statement by Hon. Nawabzada Zulfiquar Ali Khan, M.P., Representative of India on the Fourth Committee, on October 21, 1971:

Last year the General Assembly basing itself on the report of the Special Committee on colonialism, adopted Resolution 2652 (XXV) on the question of Southern Rhodesia. This resolution had several salient features: it declared illegal all measures taken by the racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia, including the purported

assumption of republican status; it affirmed that negotiations with the illegal regime would be contrary to the provisions of Resolution 1514 (XV), it condemned the failure and refusal of the administering Power to take effective measures to bring down the illegal racist minority regime; and it called for "moral and material assistance to the national liberation movements of Zimbabwe", and drew the attention of the Security Council to the necessity of imposing sanctions against South Africa and Portugal, whose governments had thus far refused to carry out the mandatory decisions of the Security Council.

The Security Council has also considered the question of Southern Rhodesia twice during 1970. The first occasion followed the illegal proclamation of republican status for Southern Rhodesia by the racist minority regime. Resolution 277 (1970), which was adopted by the Security Council on 18 March 1970, outlined several measures to be taken by States against Southern Rhodesia including the severance of all consular relations and the immediate interruption of any existing means of transportation to and from Southern Rhodesia. It also asked the specialised agencies to render aid and assistance to those who were suffering from oppression by the illegal regime. In particular, it called upon "those with primary responsibility under the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, to assist effectively in the implementation of

236 the measures called for by the present resolution."

The second occasion was in November 1970. At that time, the Security Council once again called upon the United Kingdom as the administering Power to take urgent and effective measures to bring to an end the illegal rebellion in Southern Rhodesia, and to enable the people to exercise their right to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and in conformity with the objectives of the General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV).

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined above some of the important features of the decisions taken by the Special Committee, the General Assembly, and the Security Council in 1970 with regard to the question of Southern Rhodesia. These are all a matter of record, and are well-known to the distinguished delegates on this Committee. I have mentioned them only to bring out graphically the contrast between the U.N. decisions and recommendations on the one hand, and performance by interested States on the other.

To take a well known example, following the unilateral declaration of independence by the regime of Mr. Ian Smith, the U. K. Government suggested economic sanctions against illegal regime, as opposed to the use of force. These sanctions were later expanded by the Security Council, and even a Sanctions Committee was set up to review their day-to-day functioning. It was a hopeless task from the start, South Africa and Portugal having blatantly refused to apply any sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The Committee now has the infructuous task of plugging the little loop-holes in the sanctions network, while the major ones, such as trade with South Africa and Portugal, remain unchecked.

The reports of the Sanctions Committee are revealing in many respects. The Committee has admitted that, despite the sanctions, mineral exports from Southern Rhodesia have increased. It is also reported that the number of cases of suspected sanctionsbreaking has increased considerably. A point of even greater concern reported by the Committee is that, despite Paragraph 8 of Security Council Resolution 253 (1968), European immigration into Southern Rhodesia remains substantial. This is serious not only because it has resulted from a lack of effective action on the part of several countries, contrary to the resolution of the Security Council, but because it is indicative of the continuing confidence of the average European immigrant that Southern Rhodesia in its present racist form will continue to be a viable entity in the foreseeable future. It is also a measure of the confidence, or lack of it, in the effectiveness of United Nations

decisions.

To take another example, the United Nations has, always emphasised the primary responsibility of the British Government in regard to Southern Rhodesia and the imperative necessity for the administering Power to take effective action, including the use of force to bring to an end the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia. It is unfortunate that no effective action whatsoever to this end has as yet been taken.

The administering Power has continued to emphasise that it seeks the path of negotiations. To all appearances, this is a reasonable course. But negotiations with whom? Any negotiations undertaken by the administering Power should be with the true representatives of the people of Zimbabwe, and not with the illegal racist minority regime which has shown no intention of instituting majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. It is not with Mr. Smith, but with political parties representing the vast majority of the people of Zimbabwe that negotiations should be undertaken for bringing about majority rule in the Territory.

It is in this context that one notes with concern the reports of a projected compromise between the illegal minority regime and the administering Power. According to a report in the London Times of 9 October, Mr. Ian Smith said that a settlement of the dispute with Britain over independence was closer than it had ever been, but there were still "basic and major" differences between the two countries. Mr. Smith also added that if there was an agreement the terms would be better than those offered by the British Government at previous summit meetings. "The history of this affair shows that with the passage of time Rhodesia's position has improved and strengthened."

This concern is all the greater at a time when the administering Power has decided

237

to withdraw from the Special Committee on the Situation With Regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and declined invitation to attend its discussions pertaining to Southern Rhodesia. We feel that the continued participation of the administering Power in these discussions would have contributed to the work of the Special Committee, and obviated the need for the kind of concern to which I have referred

We hope that it will be possible for this concern to be dispelled during our present deliberations, and we will look forward with interest to the comments of the distinguished delegate of the United Kingdom in this connection.

The Security Council has been receiving complaints from southern African States with increasing frequency. Only the, other day Zambia complained against South Africa. A little while ago it was Senegal against Portugal, and some months ago it was Guinea against Portugal. We should take a comprehensive view of what is happening between the territories controlled by Portugal, South Africa and Mr. Ian Smith on the one hand and the independent African countries on the other.

Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of this Committee to emphasise at every opportunity the responsibility of the administering Power, lest it be forgotten by default. If negotiations take place, they are welcome, so long as they are with the true representatives of the people of Southern Rhodesia, and not with the illegal racist minority regime.

There is little doubt that the sanctions against Southern Rhodesia, so long as they are not complied with by South Africa and Portugal, will not have any appreciable effect on the illegal regime. It is, therefore, incumbent on the Security Council to consider serious action to force these countries to honour their obligations under the UN Charter.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is of the utmost importance that all moral and material assistance be rendered to the brave patriots of Zimbabwe, it is estimated that 130

African nationalists are detained, without trial, in Southern Rhodesia. Amnesty Inter. national, in an urgent call to the British Government, has drawn its attention to their plight. One-third of these men have been held for more than six years, and some since 1959. Some Rhodesian prisoners recently released from jail, says Amnesty, were transferred immediately to detention. One of these was Mr. Abel Siwela, who served seven years in Khami prison. It is not enough to render assistance to refugees from Zimbabwe - although here, as elsewhere, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees is doing everything in his power to assist them. It is important for the world at large to recognise that it is only just to assist the liberation movements directly in their struggle for liberation. Even the Security Council, in paragraph 14 of its resolution 277 (1970) has recognised the necessity of increasing "moral and material assistance to the people of Southern Rhodesia in their legitimate struggle to achieve freedom and independence." It is now incumbent particularly on the permanent members of the Security Council to ensure that there is no gap between theory and practice.

INDIA USA ZIMBABWE PORTUGAL SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM ZAMBIA SENEGAL GUINEA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Statement by Shri B. P. Das on Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Following is the text of the statement by Shri B. P. Das, Member of Parliament Representative of India, in the Third Committee, on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination (Agenda item 54), on

October 29, 1971:

On behalf of my delegation I would like to thank the Secretary-General on his report on the work of the Organization ending 15th June, 1971, pertaining to the item under discussion. I would also thank the Director of the Human Rights Division for his introductory statement on the subject. While his statement was comprehensive and analytical and contained many suggestions for practical measures towards achieving the objective of eliminating discrimination both

238

on the national and international levels, it also indicated that the road to total elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination is long and strewn with many hazards and obstacles.

My delegation is indeed very happy to note in this connection that an excellent, valuable and monumental study has been prepared by His Excellency Ambassador Herman Santa Cruz on Racial Discrimination in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres. It is understood that this Report would be printed and circulated to all Member-States and other Institutions. We would take this opportunity to request the distinguished delegate from Chile to convey our hearty congratulations to His Excellency Mr. H. Santa Cruz for his thorough, industrious and painstaking collection of material and sound analysis in the preparation of this Magnum Opus.

It needs no reiteration that any form of racial discrimination is most loathsome and reprehensible. The discriminatory treatment meted out to fellow human beings because of the pigment of the skin is nothing but a manifestation of a perverted mind. The repressive measures practised on racial grounds are not only inhuman and criminal, but are also against all canons of a civilised society in the true sense of the term. Apartheid, the most heinous form of racial discrimination, is a blot on the conscience of mankind and a crime against humanity. Madam Chairman, I feel honoured to refer to what Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Indian

Nation, did and how he fought and suffered for the cause of the Black in South Africa and for the elimination of racial discrimination as a whole. Indeed, it would not perhaps be an exaggeration to say that Mahatma Gandhi was the first to raise the banner of revolt, albeit by peaceful and nonviolent means, against racism and apartheid which he started in South Africa in the early years of this century. Addressing the General Assembly on October 14, 1968, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, reiterated the stand consistently taken by India in the matter in the following words, and I quote: "Equally explosive is the continued denial of basic human rights on grounds of race. The conscience of the world community must be aroused not only against South Africa where racial discrimination has been elevated to the level of State policy but against the emergence of racism in any form in other areas. We must also firmly resist the last vestiges of colonialism. Our freedom and independence will not be complete so long as the people of Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea are denied theirs." The attitude of my delegation and my country on the question of racism and racial discrimination, therefore, needs no further emphasis.

For the past 25 years the entire international community has been making tireless efforts to bring apartheid and other, forms of racial discrimination to an end. Last year the General Assembly declared the year 1971 as the International Year for Action to combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, and called upon Member-States, Specialised Agencies, Institutions, both official and nonofficial, to celebrate the Year in a befitting manner. The Secretary-General hoped that the manifold activities during this Year "will move Governments and peoples to strike a final blow at what is one of the greatest ills of our times."

It is gratifying to note that Cameroon, Central African Republic, France, Jamaica, Malta, Nepal and Peru have meanwhile ratified and acceded to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination. My delegation trusts that this example will be followed by not only the four new members who have joined this world body this year, but also by other States who have signed the Convention but not yet ratified or acceded to it. My delegation is happy to note the measures undertaken by the Governments in this International Year for Action as listed in Document A/8367 of 24th September, 1971, and A/8367/Corr. 1 of 25th October, 1971, as well as by the United Nations, its Specialised Agencies, regional Inter-Governmental Organizations and by national and international Non-Governmental Organizations. We hope that apart from 41 Member-States and one Observer, more Member-States would still avail themselves of the opportunity to celebrate the Year in a manner befitting the occasion and the noble objective and give their reports in the following year. A cursory glance of the reports indicate the extent of awareness shown by Member-States in regard to the International Year for Action and we add our

239

voice to that of all those who call for a rapid and final end to the intolerable, inhuman and uncivilised practice of racism and racial discrimination.

So far as India is concerned, our Prime Minister issued a message on 21st March, 1971, which has been reproduced on page 25 of Document A 8367, and I do not think I should take the time of this Committee by quoting the message. With your permission, Madam Chairman, I may, however, briefly enumerate the activities undertaken by my country in celebrating the International Year. A very comprehensive programme for the observance of the Year in India has been drawn up both by the educational authorities and the mass media. Some of the highlights are as follows:

- 1. Our Prime Minister issued a message which has been referred to above.
- 2. All-India Radio has drawn up a national programme of discussion on the subject.

- 3 The Films Division of the All-India Radio would cover major events in India relating to celebrations for use in the Indian News Review.
- 4. The Ministry of Information and Broadcasting has issued a paper "Background to the News" series documenting the action taken by the UN against apartheid and Racial Discrimination and evils of apartheid and other Forms of Racial Discrimination.
- 5. The Directorate of Advertising and Visual Publicity will bring out a small folder/document in English and Hindi wherein special stress will be laid on India's contribution to the solution of the problem of Racial Discrimination for distribution throughout the country.
- 6. The Indian Federation of UNESCO Clubs organised a joint function to mark the inauguration of UNESCO Workshop and the observance of the Year on 21st March 1971.
- 7. The United Schools Organization, New Delhi, which is an institutional member of the Indian National Commission for UNESCO organized an All-India Seminar on the theme "International Year for Action to comb-at Racism etc., in May 1971."
- 8. In addition, the Year will be celebrated in the Universities and other educational institutions all over the country and, last but not the least, Women's Organizations all over the country also arranged special meetings for the purpose.

As regards the General Assembly Resolution 2446 (XXIII) which appealed to all States to continue to give political, moral and material assistance to peoples struggling against all forms of Racial Discrimination, I may point, out that India has been in the forefront of the struggle against apartheid and other manifestations of Racial Discri-

mination ever since the days of Mahatma Gandhi.

In fact our entire struggle for independence was not only guided by our determination to achieve our inalienable rights for freedom but was also inspired by the ideals of universal brotherhood, respect for human rights and dignity and the pursuit of friendship and understanding among human beings all over the world on an equal basis regardless of any distinction of colour or creed.

The Indian Constitution confers equal rights on all its citizens irrespective of their race, sex, colour and religion. The Constitution also provides adequate safeguards for the minorities, whether religious or linguistic or of ethnic origin. The Constitutional provisions regarding citizenship and fundamental rights as well as the election laws of the country have guarded against any scope for practising Racial Discrimination in any form in the civic and political life of the country. The Preamble of our Constitution says that the people of India have solemnly resolved to secure to all citizens of the Republic:

JUSTICE, social, economic and political; LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

EQUALITY of, status and of opportunity; and to promote among them all

240

FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the Nation.

Moreover, one whole part of the Constitution has been devoted to the fundamental rights of the citizens which are justiciable, and I take the liberty of quoting at least two articles of our Constitution. While Article 15(1) says: "The State shall not discriminate against any citizen on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, place of birth or any of them," Article 16(2) provides: "No citizen shall, on grounds only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence or any

of them, be ineligible for, or discriminated against in respect of, any employment or office under the State." There are several other articles guaranteeing equal rights to all citizens without any discrimination whatsoever. I may also add that judiciary in India is absolutely independent of the executive and it is already proved in several cases to be ever-vigilant in upholding and defending the fundamental rights of the citizens.

In pursuance of these principles laid down in our Constitution, the Government of India have taken series of measures to translate them into practice and particularly for the eradication of the social and economic backwardness of certain sections of the society so as to bring them up to the level of the rest of the society as fast as possible.

Madam Chairman, you and the distinguished delegates in this Committee are aware that the population of India consists of a number of communities and the largest minority community, i.e., the Muslims alone are 60 million today. But all communities, irrespective of size, are equal before the law and the Indian State is not identified with any particular religion. It is secular in character and makes no distinction whatsoever on grounds of religion, caste, creed, colour or sex. Promotion and incitement to Racial Discrimination is prohibited under Section 153 A of the Indian Penal Code. In fact, synthesis has been the chief characteristic of the Indian civilisation and India's historical development and there are no racial barriers at all in India. Active efforts have been made at all times to promote national integration among various communities in India. These efforts have also been accompanied by India s active contribution on the international plane in the direction of protection and furtherance of Human Rights and fundamental freedoms and elimination of all kinds of discrimination.

India participated in the Symposium on the Evils of Racial Discrimination held in Yaounde from 16th to 29th June, 1971, as part of the celebration of the International Year. The Symposium, in the opinion of our delegation, served a very useful put-pose. India also sent an observer to the Seminar on the Dangers of Recrudescence of Intolerance in all its forms and the search for ways for preventing and combating it held in Nice from 24th August to 6th September, 1971. As the document has not been made available, my delegation would reserve its right to comment on the Seminar later on under the appropriate item of the agenda.

Madam Chairman, I would not speak at length on the evils of apartheid which is being tackled-by the Special Committee on Apartheid and other forums of the United Nations where our representative would make suitable intervention. We would only add here that the continuation of apartheid is a shame and a disgrace to human civilisation and poses a threat to international peace, harmony and security.

Before I turn to the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, I would like to record with appreciation the role and the activities of the Non-Governmental Organizations in the field of human rights, particularly the part played by them in accelerating the process of elimination of various forms of racial discrimination. My delegation hopes that the Non-Governmental Organizations would not relax their efforts in assisting the United Nations and in taking the message to the peoples with whom their representatives are in constant touch.

Turning to the report of the Third and Fourth meetings of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, my delegation would like to make a few comments. Following the International Year of Human Rights in 1968, the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination came into force on 4th January, 1969. India signed the Con-

241

vention on 2nd March, 1967, and ratified it on 3rd December, 1968. My delegation feels that the Reports of the Third and Fourth sessions are quite encouraging in so far as the Experts have carried out their tasks in

an able manner by examining the initial reports so far submitted by the States Parties. The Committee's comments have been quite frank and, we are sure, will prove to be very useful to all concerned. We are glad to note that the Report submitted by India was found by the Committee to be quite satisfactory and that the Committee did not consider it necessary to ask for any further information.

After the Third session of the Committee held in April, 1971, the Secretary-General had drawn the attention of the 17 States Parties to the fact that the Expert Committee had found their reports "Incomplete" or "unsatisfactory" in the sense that significant categories of information were either totally lacking or insufficiently furnished in them and requested them to furnish the Committee with all the pertinent information by 15th July, 1971. At the Fourth session of the Committee held in August-September. 1971, six of these submitted their reports. Several experts expressed a sense of concern and anxiety at Pakistan not having furnished the required information so far, particularly when in recent months East Pakistan had been the scene of a human tragedy of immeasurable proportions.

The Government of Pakistan was requested to furnish information to the extent to which the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination was being implemented by them. Madam Chairman, I should like to draw the attention of the Committee, particularly to Article 5 of this Convention, which guarantees to every citizen of the States Party without distinction of race, colour, national or ethnic origin, certain inalienable political rights, right to freedom, of opinion or expression, right to security of person and protection by the State against violence and bodily harm, whether inflicted by Government officials or by any individual, group or institutions. Article 1 of the Convention makes it clear that racial discrimination shall mean "any distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, Which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the

recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedom in the political, economic, social, cultural, or any other field of public life.

It is common knowledge now that all these rights guaranteed under the Convention have been denied to the 75 million people of East Pakistan who have been victims of massive violation of human rights and suppression of their legitimate aspirations through brutal military force.

People of East Pakistan are ethnically and linguistically different from those of West Pakistan. For years ever since the creation of Pakistan they have been discriminated against in matters of employment, economic development, budgetary provision and indeed in different sphere of social, cultural and political life by the deliberate administrative policies and measures of the Government dominated by West Pakistan.

A study made by a Harvard University group of American economists who had been closely associated with development plans of Pakistan, makes it amply clear that, and I quote: "Pakistan Government policies have at the very least exacerbated the inequalities that arise from an uneven distribution of natural resources between the two regions and a disproportionate share of the benefits of economic development have accrued to West Pakistan With 60 per cent of the population, East Pakistan's share of central government development expenditure has been as low as 20 per cent during 1950-51 - 1954-55, attaining a peak of 36 per cent during the Third Five-Year Plan period 1965-66 - 1969-70. I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee by quoting several other writings on the subject by distinguished observers from abroad as to how the people of East Pakistan have been systematically discriminated against in different spheres of life.

The tragedy which is being enacted in East Pakistan for the past seven months and which has been described by the Secretary-General himself as one of the tragic episodes of human history has many facets which have attracted world-wide attraction and concern, It is not for me to mention all

242

those aspects here on this item of the agenda. But it is only relevant and appropriate to mention the injustice inflicted upon the people of East Pakistan, which constitute about 60 per cent of the total population of Pakistan as a whole. How can you expect India to be silent when she has consistently campaigned against racial discrimination and denial of human rights and fundamental freedom whenever and wherever they have taken place and when such gross violation of the Convention is going on just across our borders. Furthermore, India has been directly and most adversely affected by the tragic events in terms of a massive and continuing influx of refugees which is about to reach a figure of 9.5 million.

In the light of the above, non-compliance by Pakistan of the repeated reminders by the Committee on Racial Discrimination cannot be dismissed as just a routine affair when some delay may have been unwittingly caused. Serious note needs to be taken of this, as was indeed done by several experts during the Fourth session of the Committee on Racial Discrimination. Where fate of millions is involved, our Committee, which is concerned with social and humanitarian affairs, and is indeed now considering the question of elimination of racial discrimination in all forms, should urge upon the Government of Pakistan to put an immediate stop to the continuing violation of the Convention to which they are a party.

Madam Chairman, all that I have said above would show that the international community faces a challenging task in the matter of elimination of racial discrimination in all its forms whenever and wherever it is practised and propagated. It is therefore necessary to examine in this Committee all the reports received from various expert bodies in greater depth and with a view to suggesting concrete and practical measures for putting an end to any form of violation of the Convention anywhere in

INDIA USA CHILE SOUTH AFRICA ANGOLA NAMIBIA GUINEA MOZAMBIQUE CAMEROON CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE JAMAICA MALTA NEPAL PERU PAKISTAN

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TONGA

President's Speech at Palam Airport welcoming King and queen of Tongs

Welcoming Their Majesties the King and Queen of Tonga, the President, Shri V. V. Giri, made the following speech on their arrival at Palam Airport on October 2, 1971:

On behalf of the Government and the people of India and on my own behalf, I have great pleasure in welcoming Your Majesty and Her Majesty the Queen to India.

We, in India, have been following with deep interest the efforts made by the people of Tonga to maintain and build up their nation with its own distinct personality and identity. Your Majesty's able guidance an leadership as a Prime Minister from 1949 to 1965 and, thereafter, as a sovereign monarch have been instrumental in bringing Tonga back into the comity of nations. Now as a free, sovereign, and peace-loving people, you are engaged in the task of transforming an age old society into a prosperous nation. Sharing as we do the same goals for ourselves, we in India, will be only too happy to be able to share our experience with you for our mutual benefit.

May I, once again, bid Your Majesties and other members of your party a hearty welcome to this home of friends."

Volume No

1995

TONGA

King of Tonga's Reply

In his reply, His Majesty Taufa'ahau Tupou IV, King of Tonga, said:

I would like to thank you, Sir, for your, extremely kind words on the occasion of this first State visit to India. I must say that we have also been following the happenings in India over the past years and, like, you, we admire the progress made by this ancient nation into a position which it has now reached.

We feel, as you have remarked, that countries like ours, who are sister nations in the comity of nations, should indeed share our experiences and offer whatever we can. This is one of the reasons why we are so happy to be in India, not only for the sake of visiting India and meeting its people but also for seeing what has been done and perhaps gaining from the experiences of India.

We are a small group of islands and compared to India, the most populous country in the Commonwealth, our country is one of the smallest in population. However, as you have remarked, whether countries are large or small, their objectives are the same, in that they try to work for orderly conditions in which ordinary citizens may find a good life and have hopes for themselves and their children. I think these objectives are universal and we sincerely share them with you.

I am very much looking forward to seeing parts of India that have programmes for the future. Thank you very much."

TONGA RUSSIA INDIA USA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TONGA

President's Speech at Banquet in Honour of King and Queen of Tonga

Following is the text of the speech made by the President, Shri V. V. Giri at a banquet given in honour of Their Majesties the King and Queen of Tonga, at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 2, 1971:

It is my great pleasure this evening to welcome amidst us Their Majesties the King and Queen of Tonga who have honoured us by visiting our country.

The Pacific Ocean- and its lands and peoples are somewhat distant from us. But since the attainment of our independence, we in India have always had a deep interest in that region, since we share many common values and interests. We are deeply gratifled that this desire for closer relations is reciprocated by our friends in the Pacific region. Your Majesty will perhaps be glad to know that earlier this year the Prime Minister of Fiji and the President of Nauru have been our guests. May I express the hope that time will see a broadening and deepening of exchanges at all levels between our two countries.

I am confident that the exchange of views during Your Majesty's stay in New Delhi will prove fruitful, and will pave the way for strengthening the existing relations between our countries in the economic, cultural, scientific and technological fields. May I assure Your Majesty that my Government is always ready to extend the fullest cooperation in this regard.

And, now, Ladies and Gentlemen, may I request you to join me in drinking a toast to the good health and prosperity of Their Majesties, the King and Queen of Tonga, and to the growing bonds of friendship between the people of Tonga and India."

TONGA USA INDIA FIJI NAURU

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TONGA

King of Tonga's Reply

Replying the King of Tonga said:

The Queen and I wish to say first of all how very pleased we are to pay this visit to India. In my own case, I have paid very short visits to Bombay and spent a few hours in Calcutta but other than these incidental visits, I have not spent much time In this country. However, I have always been interested in India for very many

244

reasons. So I entirely endorse your remarks, Mr. President, that it would be proper and fitting that we should see how help can be offered to us by India which is a fast developing country.

It is true that you had visits from two leaders of South Pacific. But I think it is entirely legitimate that India should be interested in the Pacific because the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean are neighbouring Oceans and not only so there is also Indian community in Fiji which is now in majority there. And many of the countries in the Pacific like Nauru, Fiji and ourselves are sister nations of India in the Commonwealth and, therefore, we share many traditions with India. These are the reasons for our visit as King and Queen of Tonga.

However, I have some very personal reasons Why I am particularly happy to have made this visit and those reasons would have been unchanged had I not held the office that I do. I have been extremely interested in many contributions of India to civilisation and I have always thought that the Indian contribution in the invention and development of, what is now referred to by scholars as, the Indo-Arabic numerals, is surely one of the most significant contribution to human civilisation because if you divide a human learning into approximately two divisions, you have the sciences and the humanities. Well, the sciences very largely depend upon measurement and measurement depends upon mathematics and formerly under the Greek and Roman civilization, scientific progress was very seriously handicapped because the ancient forms of numerals were extremely hard to use. Most of the mathematics in those days involved process of geometry and some other practical physics, but owing to the absence of easy type of numerals with which you could calculate, those cultures were basically handicapped and the whole culture of mankind would have continued with that handicap if it had not been for the introduction of the Indo-Arabic numerals. Many people, of course, simply call these numerals as Arabic numerals but it is more just to call them Indo-Arabic numerals because though Arabs transmitted these numerals, there is ample evidence that they were invented in India. This is first of my personal reasons for having always wished to be in India.

There are many other historical reasons, India is a very ancient country and is the origin of many religions but particularly of the religion that has now flourished very greatly outside the borders of India - Buddhism. It was an Indian prince who became the Light of Asia, as the scholars say.

Apart from that, there is historical importance that India has played in the world, as we know it. Even as Indian Empire before Independence, India did play a significant part in the history of the world. Again the way in which India did ultimately win Independence was a way that fitted a nation with a very ancient culture, a nation with patience and restraint and high regard for others. In other words, India won Independence in a very highly civilised manner and this we cannot say for all countries that have won independence. In many of them it has been won by violence involving hatred and bitterness and all the feelings that accompany these.

These are only some of the reasons why. I personally very much appreciated your invitation, Mr. President, to visit your great and ancient country. I am certain that getting to know one another will help in increasing better, closer relations and cooperation and so on.

I must say that some of these personal reasons have been satisfied by visiting India and we shall always treasure the memories of what we have seen and friendship of the people of India in future. I hope, of course, that India will continue to develop, prosper and take her place in the affairs of the world in such a worthy manner as she has always taken in the past.

- I, therefore, join your wish, Mr. President, that goodwill may flourish between your country and mine and between your country and many of the countries of the Pacific.
- I, therefore, propose that we drink to the health of the President of India and to friendship between India and Tonga.

245

TONGA INDIA USA FIJI NAURU OMAN

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TONGA

President's Speech Bidding Farewell to King and Queen of Tonga

Following is the text of the speech by the President Shri V. V. Giri at the airport on October 5, 1971 bidding farewell to their Majesty King Taufa'ahu Tupou IV and Queen Halaevalu Mata'aho of Tonga:

"Your Majesties, as you depart from Delhi, may I say that the friendly exchanges we have had in the last few days have endeared Your Majesty to the people of India. You have still to visit some parts of our vast land. I trust that the remaining part of your stay will be equally pleasant and that you will carry many happy memories of your visit to our country.

I would like to take this opportunity to request you to convey to the people of Tonga the good wishes of the people of India and the assurance of my Government for strengthening the existing bonds of friendship for further cooperation in future.

And, finally, may I wish Your Majesties Bon Voyage!"

TONGA RUSSIA INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

TONGA

King of Tonga's Reply

Replying the King said:

This morning, time has come for us to continue our tour of India, going to other parts of this great country-

I must say, in the last few days that we have been here, it has been a heart-warming experience to be amongst you in this part of India and the capital city of India, partly for the reason that we have been in the midst of Indian history and Indian culture and partly because we were able to see this most populous of all democracies operating. And I feel sure that you, Mr. President, Madam Prime Minister, Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament of India, all realise how very important for the cause of freedom is the success of this great democracy. So, we all freedom-loving people will continue to wish you well and hope that your country will prosper and flourish in the future.

Thank you very much.

TONGA USA INDIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Presidents Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Podgorny

The President, Shri V. V. Giri, made the following speech at the banquet given in New Delhi in honour of Mr. N.V. Podgorny, president of the U.S.S.R. On October 1, 1971:

On behalf of the Government and people of India, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you, Mr. President and members of your Delegation, to this capital city of New Delhi.

It was only two days ago that our Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, returned from Moscow after having had most fruitful discussions with Your Excellency and other top Soviet leaders. Your stop-over in our country at the present time is, therefore, all the more symbolic of the friendship which. has developed over the years between India and the Soviet Union. This is a friendship not dictated by considerations of the moment,

246

but firmly rooted in the long-standing vital interests of our two peoples. This friendship has stood the test of time and we may be justifiably proud of it.

The signing of the Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation on August 9 this year has been a historic event of outstanding importance for both our countries. The Treaty provides a firm political and legal basis for the further strengthening of our cooperation in all fields, for achieving economic and social progress and for safeguarding peace and security.

The decision taken to establish an Inter-Governmental Joint Commission for economic, scientific and technical cooperation, during the recent visit of our Prime Minister to the Soviet Union is an important step, in the context of the treaty, for consolidating relations in an area which is of special significance to a developing country like ours.

The gap between the developed countries and those which are developing has shown no tendency to decrease, despite the efforts made in this direction over the last twenty years. Our practical way of tackling this problem is by transfer of technology in relevant fields, thereby helping developing countries to accelerate the rate of growth of their economies.

We live today in a world full of contradictions and constant change. While adapting ourselves to the needs of the times, we must ensure that our state policies are based on certain fundamental principles which are of value not only for securing our own respective national interests but also the interests of the world as a whole.

You, Mr. President, are aware of the difficulties that India has had to face during recent months in looking after over 9 million refugees who have come into India across our Eastern borders. As pointed out by the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, Mr. A. N. Kosygin, this unprecedented influx of refugees from East Bengal, equalling in numbers the population of a mediumsized European country, "can be explained only by the intolerable living conditions created for them there". This mass inflow of dispossessed people has imposed serious social and political strains upon us and has caused a set-back to the socio-economic programme, which had been started under our 4th Five Year Plan, for providing a better living standard of our People.

We are thankful to the Soviet Government for showing Proper understanding of the situation. The Joint Statement Issued on September 29 on the conclusion of our Prime Minister's visit to the USSR has reaffirmed that "the Preservation of peace demands that urgent measures should be taken to reach a Political solution of the problems which have arisen there, paying regard to the wishes, the inalienable rights and lawful interests of the people of East Bengal as well as for the speediest return of the refugees to their homeland in conditions safeguarding their honour and dignity". It is imperative that the further flow of refugees into India must stop, and that those refugees already in India should be enabled to return to their homeland without delay. In our view, such a political solution which can restore confidence must be in accordance with the wishes of the chosen representatives of the people, who were given a massive mandate both in the elections to the Provincial Assembly and the National Assembly in December 1970. Any substitute arrangements aimed at bypassing the existence and authority of the freely elected representatives of East Bengal can only aggravate the situation further.

Your stay in our country, Mr. president, is all too short and tomorrow you will be leaving for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Our two countries share a profound concern over the situation in South East Asia. We both remain convinced of the necessity for the withdrawal of foreign troops from Indo-China. so as to enable the peoples of that region to realise their legitimate interests and to shape their own future without outside interference. It is in this spirit that we have endorsed the recent 7-point proposals of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam as an Important step towards a peaceful political settlement.

Before I conclude, I would like to say, Mr. President, that we consider your present visit only as being half-completed due to its exceedingly short duration. Therefore, while wishing you and members of your party a pleasant and successful journey and a safe return home, we look forward to another visit by you, in the not too distant future, when you can see something more of

247

our country. I can assure you that wherever you go in our land you will find convincing proof of the warm feelings of friendship that the people of India have for the people of the Soviet Union, in much the same measure as I had found these feelings reflected amongst the people of the Soviet Union during my visit to your great country in 1970.

May I request you, Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen to rise and drink a toast to the health of the President of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR; to the prosperity and happiness of the people of the Soviet Union; to the further strengthening of Soviet-Indian Friendship; and to the consolidation of Peace and Security in the world.

INDIA USA RUSSIA CHINA VIETNAM

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Soviet President's Reply

Following is the text of the translated speech of His Excellency N. V. Podgorny, President of the U.S.S.R. at the banquet:

"Esteemed Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen and dear friends: I would wish to thank you, Mr. President for the kind words addressed to the Soviet Union, to the people and Government of our country and to say how much we appreciate the generous hospitality accorded to us in India. Availing myself of this favourable oportunity of making a short stay in India we are very gratified to convey to President Giri, to Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, to the Government of India and to the entire friendly Indian people sincere greetings and best wishes from Leonid Brezhnev, Alexei Kosygin and other leaders of the Soviet Union as well as from the Soviet Party and Government delegation which is present here.

A few days ago Prime Minister of India, Madam Indira Gandhi, visited the Soviet Union. The results of her visit are highly estimated in our country as an important contribution to the development of friendly Soviet-Indian relations. We welcome now an opportunity of picking up, as it were, the thread of this friendly exchange and to continue contacts (with the Indian leaders this time on their native soil.

We are witnessing at present the events of truly historic significance in the relations between our two countries. The recent Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of India based on the rich experience of our past relationship maps further prospects for the development of sincere friendship and fruitful cooperation between our two States totalling eight hundred million people. The Soviet-Indian Treaty is yet another convincing evidence of the profound desire of the peoples of the Soviet Union and India to expand and strengthen their friendly relations and to consolidate security in Asia and throughout the world. It is noteworthy that the Treaty confirms the confidence of our two countries in each other's foreign policy and in particular the respect of the Soviet Union for the policy of non-alignment pursued by the Indian Government. It is not directed against any other States and the further consolidation of friendly Soviet-Indian relations is not to be gained at the expense of deteriorating relations with third countries. There is no doubt that the Treaty strengthens positions of peaceful forces and is a major contribution to the struggle of nations for peace and security which is particularly important in the obtaining international situation. The Imperialist forces of aggression and suppression are responsible for the flames of war and hostility in various regions of the earth. In some of the areas there have been created acute situations of conflict fraught with very grave consequences. All this runs counter to the basic interests of peoples and hampers the fulfilment of their aspiration for national liberty and social progress, for peace and better living conditions. That is why the Soviet Union, in common with its friends and allies, with all peaceful forces, is work-Ing actively for the relaxation of tensions and for the just settlement of the international conflicts.

Our Leninist foreign policy has been further confirmed in the decisions of the 24th Congress of the CPSU in its comprehensive and constructive programme and

248

struggle for peace and friendship among nations, for strengthening International security and cooperation. Against this background, the Soviet people watch closely the difficult and dangerous situation on the Hindustan sub-continent. We consider that the further sliding down towards a military conflict must be prevented and that the tension there should be removed by means of an equitable political settlement with due account for the legitimate rights and interests of the peoples in that region. On its part, the Soviet Union seeks to render all possible assistance to such a settlement in the spirit of the existing friendly relations with India.

The Soviet people feel profound sympathy and respect for the Indian people and for India. The whole world is well aware of the love the Indian people have for their country, of the persistent struggle for its freedom, independence and prosperity, of their industriousness and patience. These are the qualities of your people which have left a deep imprint on the world civilisation.

Our brief visit to your country has coincided with the celebrations devoted to the 102-anniversary of the outstanding leader of the Indian national liberation movement, the humanitarian thinker, Mahatma Gandhi. The Soviet people know Mahatma Gandhi as a great fighter for India's freedom who upheld the concepts of justice, equality and friendship among nations, and they pay the highest tribute to his memory.

Here in Delhi, Soviet delegation extends to the people of India most sincere wishes for well-being and further success in fulfilling big and complicated tasks in the construction of new India, in the development of its national economy and culture and strengthening its independence. I would wish also to express the firm conviction that the relations of strong friendship and comprehensive cooperation between the Soviet Union and India will continue to develop to the benefit of the peoples of our two countries.

May I ask you to join me in the toast to the very good health of President Giri, to the very good health of the Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, to the health of all those present here, to friendship between the Soviet and Indian peoples, to success and prosperity of the friendly Indian people."

USA INDIA

Date : Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Text of Joint Press Statement on Indo-Soviet Consultations

Following is the text of a joint press release issued in New Delhi on October 27, 1971 on the conclusion at Indo-Soviet consultations:

Consultations between representatives of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs headed by the Deputy Minister, Mr. N. P.-Firyubin, and representatives of the External Affairs Ministry of India headed by Shri T. N. Kaul, Foreign Secretary, and Shri S. K. Banerji, Secretary (East), were held in Delhi from October 22 to October 25, 1971.

The leader of the Soviet Delegation, Mr. N. P. Firyubin, called on the President of India, the Prime Minister, the Minister of External Affairs and the Chairman, Policy Planning Committee. In the course of talks there was an exchange of views on questions of bilateral relations as well as international questions of mutual interest.

The consultations took place in accordance with the existing practice of annual bilateral consultations and also under Article IX of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. These consultations were held in connection with the

present tense situation in the Indian subcontinent which threatens the cause of peace in this region. The two sides were in full agreement in their assessment of the situation.

The consultations were held in an atmosphere of sincere friendship, mutual confidence and understanding and manifested an identity of views on the subjects discussed

249

INDIA USA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNWED KINGDOM

Prime Minister's Speech at Royal institute of International Relations, London

Following is the text of speech delivered by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at the Royal Institute of International Relations, London, on October 29, 1971?

"I am glad at this opportunity of addressing such a distinguished gathering which includes many specialists on India. I am confining my remarks to one theme Democracy in India. The period which is to follow will presumably range over other matters.

During our struggle for independence, it seemed that freedom itself would be ful-filment. But when we achieved it, we knew that every completion is a beginning. For us, this was the start of a great experiment in the creation of democracy in an ancient, complex and vast country.

The story of Indian development is not without significance for the rest of the world. How could it be otherwise when it encompasses the aspirations and struggles of over five hundred and fifty million human beings? Political theorists with their neatly labelled indices have sometimes spoken of democracy in India as a futile quest. To them democracy could only be a two-party system worked by those who were educated in a particular way. Perhaps as advanced people of the West, of a generation ago had protested that the colonial countries were not ready for freedom, so it was said that the under-developed societies of Asia and Africa were not ready for democracy and could achieve order only under dictatorship of some kind or at most a controlled or guided democracy. Can democracy be guided any more than freedom? is not a guided democracy a contradiction? perhaps these questions are irrelevant. For it now seems that in countries the word Democracy, was used as a shield for reaction and the subversion of freedom. But we did take democracy seriously. To us it conveyed the equality of all people to participate at every level-functioning of Government.

In the choice of political institutions, it is not inevitably the past that is decisive, but the changing conditions of the lives and attitudes of people and the capacity of those who are in positions of leadership to involve the largest number of people in the political process.

The British ruled over us for two hundred years. Little did those early colonizers realise that along with their flag they brought the seeds which would destroy their rule. Macaulay, who pleaded so passionately for western education, did not quite foresee that he was undermining the edifice he was so anxious to perpetuate. The nineteenth and 20th centuries brought ancient India face to face with the imperatives of the contemporary world. And we quickly absorbed all that was relevant and significant in Bentham and Mill, in Rousseau and Voltaire, down to Marx and Weber. An this was grafted on to the Indian ethos.

We then had Tagore, Gandhi and Nehru, to mention only a few.

PLANNED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Our democracy is dedicated to Planned economic development, the peaceful transformation of an old social order and the uplifting of millions of people from conditions of social, economic and technological under development. Thus, what we are attempting in India is not mere imitation of the West minister system but a creative application of meaningful democracy to the vastly different economic and social problems of India.

Democracy was not entirely new to India, for its roots could be found also in our old panchayat system. This system probably came into being because the village and the people were too distant from the centres of political power. Today this ancient institution has been transformed into a new organ of self-government at district and, what we call, block levels as a link

250 between the Government's programmes an the people.

The concept of the rule of law and the British pattern of administration may have helped to keep order in the country, but much in these institutions has remained static, and without changes. They are becoming stumbling blocks to democracy and to progress.

There are forces in our society, as in others, which pull in opposite directions. The competitiveness of democracy and of contemporary living seems superficially sometimes to have strengthened the hold of caste, religion and region, and these are now exploited for social and economic gain. But this is a passing phase and these differences cannot weaken India's fundamental unity or the basic sense of Indianness which is powerful binding factor. Paradoxical though it may sound, we believe that the functioning of democracy itself can remove these obstacles on the democratic path.

EDUCATION

Education has expanded tremendously and today there are million students in colleges, the number of children in school has gone up from 23.4 million in 1951 to 83 million, but I am sorry to say that we have not done as well as we should have in our Programmes for adult literacy. Without being able to read, a person's world is a limited one, for he cannot share the knowledge and companionship that come with books- We must, and we are, doing more for primary education, to strengthen secondary education and for adult literacy programmes. At the same time, I cannot agree with the common belief in the West that literacy by itself gives greater wisdom or understanding. Our people, illiterate though they may sometimes be, are the inheritors of an ancient culture and philosophy, which have sustained them through the vicissitudes of their long history. Indian voters have shown extraordinary insight and understanding of what goes on around them. If some are misled by false propaganda or diverted by irrelevant factors their number is not larger than those of their literate even educated - counterparts in other countries. The Indian voter knows where his interests lie and has exercised his right to vote with great political sophistication in spite of the competitive political platforms of numerous parties. even in the face of threat and violence. It is because of this basic soundness of our people that democracy has taken root in India.

Since long before Independence, the-Congress Party had committed itself to certain programmes. Indeed our leaders had made it clear that we were fighting not only against foreign rule but against all that was evil in our society, against injustice and poverty and social inequality. Our system must therefore cater to the genuine needs of ordinary people without neglecting the long-term development of the country. Development adds a new dimension to the challenge of democracy.

APPROACH To DEMOCRACY

Three distinct streams of thought have combined to produce what might vaguely be called the Indian approach to democracy. There is a stream of liberalism and parliamentary democracy, which emerged out of the British system - parliamentary institutions, political parties, free elections, fundamental rights and freedom, the rule of law etc., which formed the political core of our democratic system. Parliament is the commanding centre of our political system, and Government's responsibility to the legislature at the Centre and in the States is beyond dispute.

In modern society, freedom cannot be the unrestricted play of individualism nor the apotheosis of private interests and private enterprise as against social interest and the public good. Freedom lies in a delicate and continuous balancing of the rights of the individual with the rights of society. Our Constitution and our actual political practice provide a larger degree of freedom than is obtained anywhere else in the world. We stand for the freedom of the Press, but we do not accept the proposition that the freedom of the Press means the freedom of industrialists to own the Press, or that the right to property should also stand in the way of progressive and necessary social legislation to lessen glaring inequalities of wealth and bring the reality of economic freedom to larger sections of the. population. We have taken action to eliminate these anomalies. We

251 have sought to amend the Constitution in order to give substance to democracy.

The second major stream is that of socialist thought with emphasis on social democracy and economic planning and development. Our nationalist movement had interpreted political independence and democracy in terms of the welfare of the common man. After Independence, this interpretation became the predominant content of our democratic system. Indeed, the entire apparatus of democracy is geared to social and economic development. In

Europe, democracy as we know it, followed the industrial revolution. In India democracy with its freedom and pressing popular demands came first, and the process of industrialisation, economic development and major welfare schemes have to be operated in the face of diverse and contradictory pressures.

This baffling combination makes our task more difficult and because of the absence of organised propaganda, our achievement appears less spectacular than the accomplishment of others by different methods. But we think that we have gained something in the longer run not so much in glittering material terms and material, but in terms of human values gained, in terms of human sufferings avoided, and in terms of the enduring and harmonious development of the individual and society. I do believe that real and lasting social transformation, encompassing attitudes of mind and ways of living of millions of People, can be effected only by peaceful means-

The third stream has emanated from Mahatma Gandhi and his philosophy of nonviolent revolution. The Impact of Gandhian thought and method on democracy in India is indirect and impalpable, yet subtly pervasive. It has supported and enriched India. This whole experiment, this endeavour 16 combine freedom, socialism and the methods of peace in an immensely complex situation is taking place in India, not in isolation from the rest of the world, but in the midst of international cooperation and in the glare of world wide publicity. International cooperation is a constituent element of India's effort in building a progressive economy and a democratic society. This is why ever since our Independence we have put forward the idea of world peace and world cooperation as an enlightened national interest of India.

We believe in, and we have strictly adhered to, the principle of non-interference. But can this be one-sided? Today there is interference in our affairs, and the stability, progress and security of our country are gravely threatened. As a result of the tragic

events in East Bengal, nine million people have poured into our territory, creating a situation which seems to surpass the convulsions of Partition. The crisis in Pakistan is a deep one and the spectre which haunts that unhappy country cannot be exercised by the usual recourse to blaming India. Two questions arise. First whether religion by itself can form the basis of a nation state in our times, especially when the state machinery is impervious to the ordinary laws of political development and cultural aspirations, and secondly whether some action other than that of the bayonet is not necessary to win loyalty. We in India are restrained and calm in the face of threat and provocation, but we are bound to protect the interests of our country.

No country, least of all one as vast and varied as India, can be classified under one label or another. It seems to me that even those who claim expert knowledge of India are often wide off the mark in their assessment of Indian events.

Many specialists tend to fit facts into a Preconceived framework of theory about caste and models of development which have, little relevance to reality. Even in Britain which has such close historical ties with us, there is a wide gap in the under-standing of the forces which have shaped our recent history and which are influencing us today. To have a worthwhile dialogue such an understanding is vital. Britain and India must both replace the old myths by a more rational approach. Given the necessary intellectual efforts on both sides, I am confident that India and Britain can have creative and purposeful relations. It is the hope of bringing about such relations that brings me to London and to this Institute." 252

UNITED KINGDOM INDIA USA MALI PAKISTAN

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

YUGOSLAVIA

President Girl's Speech at Banquet in Honour of President Tito

Following is the text of the speech made by the President, Shri V. V. Giri, at a banquet given in honour of the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Josip Broz Tito and Madam Jovanka Broz at Rashtrapati Bhavan on October 17, 1971:

On behalf of the Government and the people of India, I am very happy to welcome you Mr. President, Madam Broz and members of your Delegation to our country. May I also on behalf of the people of India extend to you and your party our Diwali Greetings.

The three years that have elapsed since Your Excellency's last visit have been eventful. Some of these events have been positive and some negative. But our friendship has been growing steadily and your visit at the Present time is a significant manifestation of this.

Our friendship is neither transient nor based on expediency. It is firmly rooted in similar experiences, in shared beliefs and in common aspirations for peace based on the independence and equality of nations.

Although distance separates our countries, mutuality of interests and a common approach to many issues have brought us very close. In the political field, our relations are very close and together we have tried both in the U.N. and in the Group of non-aligned countries to reduce tension and Preserve Peace in this thoubled world. The principle of non-alignment which sprang from our independence and imbues and serves our foreign policies now enjoys the support of many nations throughout the world. The last conference of non-aligned

countries at Lusaka reaffirmed the validity and importance of non-alignment in the Present-day world. Unfortunately, the non-aligned group of States have not stood together on all issues concerning violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and this may weaken their strength and importance. We must reverse this trend.

In the economic field, our two countries have expanded mutual cooperation in economic relations and trade. Both countries realise the need to discover new areas of cooperation in each other's economic development. We shall shortly be changing the system of our trading. In response to the request of your Government, we have agreed to change the clearing system to payment in convertible currency from January, 1973. Thereafter, through our collective efforts, we must safeguard that our trade does not decline and that its further growth is facilitated.

The gap between developed countries and those less fortunately placed has continued to widen, and this is of considerable concern to the future of world stability and peace. Non-aligned countries, through unity of action, can influence this situation in a more positive direction.

We in India have achieved substantial improvement in our standards of living and industrial and agricultural production. We have witnessed a green revolution in recent years and today we are on the threshold of self-sufficiency in foodgrains. The general elections held early this year resulted in a massive mandate to the Government to remove Poverty and to usher in a socialist and egalitarian society.

Unfortunately, shortly after our elections, we were faced with the consequences of a most brutal repression of the people's democratic rights and fundamental freedoms in East Bengal. Millions of refugees began to pour into India and today we are obliged to provide food and shelter to more than 9 million refugees. This situation in its magnitude and pathos is unprecedented in human history, and it surely calls for the

utmost international aid and sympathy. But what we have actually received so far in the form of aid is entirely disproportionate to the sympathy expressed by the nations of the world.

253

You, Mr. President, are aware of the complexity of the difficulties facing us at this moment. We do appreciate your own personal efforts to alleviate these difficulties. We believe that a peaceful political solution should be found which is acceptable to the people and their elected leaders. We have, therefore, exercised the greatest possible restraint in the face of very grave provocations. However, our resources are strained to the maximum and we cannot maintain the refugees much longer. The Government of India are determined that the refugees must go back to their homeland in conditions of safety and dignity. We are convinced that the only lasting and practical solution lies in restoration of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the people of East Bengal. These rights are inalienable and legitimate and their restoration should be through the freely elected representatives of the people. Continuation of the present intolerable conditions serves only to aggravate the situation further and cannot lead to a peaceful or enduring solution.

Your stay in India this time, Mr. President, is short, and it is therefore not possible to show you some of the recent achievements of our people. You will spend your time mainly in talks with our leaders, and we have no doubt that the talks will contribute to greater mutual understanding and further strengthening of our relations in all fields.

May I request Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, to rise and drink a toast to the health of the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; to the prosperity and happiness of its brave people; to the further consolidation of Yugoslav-Indian friendship; and to peace and security in the world."

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

President Tito's Reply

Replying President Tito said:

It gives us genuine pleasure to be with you again, Mr. President, and we thank you wholeheartedly for the magnificient reception and for your friendly words. We interpret the honours that have been shown us, and the kind attention with which we have once again been surrounded, as an expression of traditional Yugoslav-Indian friendship, the depth and steadfastness of which are stemming from the rich experience of our long years of cooperation and our common dedication to the Ideals of peace, freedom and equality among nations.

I have already visited your great and beautiful country several times and each time have enjoyed your cordial hospitality. I have therefore had an opportunity not only to see the marvels of India and to become acquainted with Its historical and cultural heritage, but also to follow continually your socioeconomic development and to be a witness to the enormous achievements of your gifted people over the past two decades.

Almost three years have passed since my last visit to India. I know that significant results have since been achieved in agriculture and industry, in the application of modern technology, as well as in other spheres, in spite of the great obstacles and difficulties you have met in your way. But these results would be even greater were it not for the fact that you have confronted a number of specific problems with which we, too, are very well acquainted from our own experience. Most of these problems are also characteristic for the other developing countries. Stability, not only of economic but of international relations in their entirety, as well as the prospects for peace and security in the world, depend in substantial part on how these extremely serious problems will be solved in the future. Joint efforts in this sphere also bring us closer.

Mr. President, at this very moment, your country faces the particularly grave problem of caring for millions of refugees from East Pakistan. This is an enormous and unexpected burden for India which it cannot And should not have to bear alone. The entire international community must

254

engage itself urgently, and to a much greater extent than has hitherto been the case, in solving this problem. Greater and more effective assistance must be rendered to the refugees in India and, on a parallel basis, measures should be undertaken and political conditions created in East Pakistan ensuring the refugees a safe and quick return to their abandoned homes. This is, as we see it, the only possible lasting solution to, this problem which, apart from causing millions of people suffering, has broader political implications. For the persistence of deterioration of the present situation could jeopardize peace and stability in the entire subcontinent, and even beyond. India truly has the full moral and political right to ask the international community for assistance in resolving this deeply moving human drama.

Mr. President, the existence of positive tendencies and the achievement of certain results, in terms of peaceful settlement of controversies and acceptance of present world realities, are encouraging signs. The progress that has been made in that spirit in Europe may serve as an example. But the state of affairs in the world is still such as to give cause for grave concern. I am thinking above all of the procrastination in

solving the Middle East Crisis and of the continuing foreign military intervention in Indo-China. The just struggle of these peoples for freedom and independence, for their legitimate right to decide their destiny themselves without interference from the outside, has always enjoyed the sincere support and assistance of our two countries.

The non-aligned countries have always been engaged in the defence of the principles of freedom, independence, sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. The present international situation, characterized by significant changes and perturbations and requiring intensified efforts by all peaceminded forces -- makes the role and activity of the nonaligned more indispensable than ever before. The non-aligned countries are now in a position to make an even greater contribution and to strive even more determinedly for overcoming the divisions in the world and removing everything that might provoke fresh antagonisms and divisions. This assumes endeavours, on their part for the long term improvement of international relations on the basis of full equality, mutual respect and opposition to all forms of the application of force and pressures. This is the essence of the decisions of the Third Conference of Non-aligned Countries held in Lusaka. The recent consultations of non-aligned countries in New York confirmed their common agreement on the need for continuity and even closer cooperation, in the United Nations, and generally.

This, of course, involves extremely complex tasks, the discharge of which will as well depend on the understanding of how interdependent are the interests of nonaligned and all other countries. A grasp of this interdependence should lead to full solidarity and the most active possible cooperation for surmounting the present difficulties in the world. For, what our world will be like tomorrow hinges in great measure on the courage with which we perceive its realities today, on the efforts we invest to make it better. Through long years of friendship and fruitful cooperation, Yugoslavia and India have demonstrated in practice the soundness and usefulness of such an orientation.

Mr. President, we in Yugoslavia are investing great efforts in the development of our country, in the further revolutionary transformation of society on the basis of self-management, strengthening of socialist democracy and full assertion of the equality of all the peoples and nationalities comprising our country. This is Also the objective of the constitutional amendments we adopted recently. It was Our Paramount Purpose to release to an even greater extent the creative initiative of our working people, to augment their role and position in society. In this respect we take a steadily critical view of all we do. From our own experience we draw lessons for the future, ever mindful that history does not excuse unwanted haste but even less fearful faltering.

Dear friends, it gives me great pleasure to be able to note that the relations between our two countries are developing successfully in the political, economic, cultural and other spheres, in the spirit of friendship and mutual benefit. I am certain that this visit and the talks with YOU will also promote the further strengthening and deepening of fruitful cooperation between Our two countries.

255

May I raise this glass to the health of His Excellency the President of the Republic, Mr. Giri; to the health of the Prime Minister, Madame Indira Gandhi; to the comprehensive advancement of the Republic of India; to continued close and friendly relations between the peoples of Yugoslavia and India."

YUGOSLAVIA USA INDIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC PAKISTAN CHINA ZAMBIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

YUGOSLAVIA

President Tito's Farewell Statement

In a farewell statement at the airport on the conclusion of his visit to India on October 20, 1971, President Tito Said:

"I am particularly happy to have this opportunity, thanks to the kind invitation of President Giri and the Indian Government, to visit once again friendly India. This visit, as any previous visit, to your country enabled me to learn more about the efforts which the Indian people and its Government are investing in the construction of the country and the overcoming of the heritage of economic under-development. I admire very much the great energy and creative enthusiasm by which the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, approaches the problems and their solution on which depends a better future of the people of this great country.

At this moment, India is faced with a particularly serious problem - the presence on her soil of millions of refugees from East Pakistan. It requires naturally enormous resources to take care of them. I wish to pay full tribute to the Indian Government which even beyond Its real possibility did everything which war, in her might to give refuge and shelter to these people. I take this opportunity to stress once again that it is the duty not only of India but of the whole international community to help in securing the most elementary conditions for the life of these people and their safe return to their homes.

Our visit to India has been this time short but very useful. We had the possibility to have talks with the Indian leaders on bilateral relations and international questions of mutual interest. We share the views on the role of non-aligned countries under Present international conditions. We share the common conviction that non, aligned countries should even more determinedly work for the fulfilment of the principles which have been once again confirmed at the conference in Lusaka last year. We leave India richer with a new proof, a further proof of friendship between our two countries.

I take this opportunity to thank once again the President of the Republic of India, Mr. Giri, the Prime Minister, Madam Indira Gandhi, the Government and people of India for the warm welcome and cordial hospitality. I wish the Indian people and its leaders every success in their further creative endeavours. Thank you.

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA

Date: Oct 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

YUGOSLAVIA

Joint Communique on Indo-Yugoslav Talks

Following is the text of the Joint Communique issued in New Delhi on October 20, 1971 at the end of the visit of His Excellency Mr. Josip Broz Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia:

At the invitation of the President of India, Shri V. V. Giri, the President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Marshal Josip Broz Tito, accompanied by Madame Broz, paid a friendly State visit to India from October 16 to 20, 1971. The visit provided an occasion for the manifestation of traditional Indian-Yugoslav friendship and a powerful and fresh incentive for continued close relations and common dedication to the ideals of peace, freedom, independence and international co-operation based on equality of rights.

The President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the President of India and the Prime Minister of India, held talks on important current international issues and on bilateral relations.

Participating in the talks on the Yugoslav side were:

Mr. Rato Dugonjic, Member of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Mr. Ilija Rajacic, Chairman of the Assembly of the Autonomous Province of Vojvodina and Member of the Presidency of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Mr. Anton Vratusa, Member of the Federal Executive Council of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Mr. Marko Vrhunec, Acting Chief of Cabinet of the President of the Republic;

Mr. Milos Melovski, Counsellor for Foreign Affairs in the Cabinet of the President of the Republic;

Mr. Eduard Kljun, Head of the Department for Asia in the Federal Secretariat for Foreign Affairs; and

Mr. Andjelko Blazevic, Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in New Delhi.

On the Indian side were:

Sardar Swaran Singh, Minister for External Affairs;

Dr. Karan Singh, Minister for Civil Aviation and Tourism;

Shri Surendra Pal Singh, Deputy Minister of External Affairs; Shri T. N. Kaul, Foreign Secretary; Shri S. K. Banerji, Secretary (East); Shri P. N. Menon, Secretary (West); Shri H. Lal, Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade; Shri R. Jaipal, Ambassador of India to Yugoslavia; Shri K. P. S. Menon, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs and Shri A. P. Venkateswaran, Joint Secretary, Ministry of External Affairs.

Both sides discussed the changing configuration of the international situation and agreed to intensify and coordinate their efforts further in the international arena in the interests of world peace and the struggle for freedom, national liberation and independence.

Identity or closeness of views on many important questions of interest to the two countries was manifested during the talks, which were held in an atmosphere of sincere friendship and in a spirit of mutual confidence and understanding.

Both sides noted with satisfaction that co-operation between the two countries had been further strengthened and consolidated over the years. It was acknowledged that there exist great possibilities for the further expansion and intensification of mutual co-operation in all spheres on a long-term basis. To that end they agreed to continue the practice of regular bilateral consultations.

The two sides stressed the necessity for the appropriate economic authorities of the two countries to undertake, through the Joint Committees and other bodies, all measures designed to promote the further successful development of economic co-operation, including joint projects in either country or in third countries and the sharing of scientific and technological expertise on a mutually advantageous basis.

The grave situation created as a result of the recent events in East Bengal was discussed. The Yugoslav side shared India's deep concern over the serious social and political tensions engendered in India, and the strains placed on India's economy, by

the presence in India of many millions of refugees, whose number is daily increasing by many thousands. Both sides agreed that the problem could only be solved by a political solution acceptable to the representatives who had been elected by the people. This would enable the normalisation of the situation in East Bengal, put an end to the exodus, and enable the refugees to return to their homeland in safety and honour, irrespective of their race or religion.

257

Both sides called for urgent measures to achieve this objective in accordance with the wishes, inalienable rights and lawful interests of the people of East Bengal. It was agreed that any attempt to bypass the so clearly expressed wishes of the people would further aggravate the problem.

Both sides agreed that any postponement of the solution of the problem, which is in itself a source of instability and tension, is likely to lead to a serious aggravation of the situation.

The Yugoslav side expressed its concern over the fate of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and manifold adverse consequences that the present treatment of this prominent public figure might have. President Tito expressed the conviction that a human approach to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman would be in the interest of the peaceful political solution and in the interest of peace and stability in the sub-continent, as he had laid down in his appeal to the President of Pakistan Mr. Yahya Khan on August 14, 1971. The Prime Minister of India reiterated that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the elected leader of East Bengal, should be released unconditionally as an essential pre-requisite to a peaceful solution.

The Prime Minister of India stated that the Government of India are determined that the refugees must go back to their homeland without delay and that urgent measures need to be taken to that end. The Yugoslav side agreed with this. Pending the speedy return of the refugees, both

sides agreed that the care of these millions of refugees must be the concern of the entire world community, and effective and prompt international action needed to be undertaken to that end.

The two sides noted that in Europe, although still divided and burdened by the vestiges of the last war, conditions have improved, creating an atmosphere for strengthening security and peace and for constructive co-operation among the European countries on a basis of equality.

It was felt during the talks that - in spite of certain positive trends and serious attempts to solve some major world problems by negotiation - the policy of force, aggression and Interference in intern affairs continued in international relations, constituting a danger to the independence and security of countries and an obstacle to their independent development.

Both sides were firmly of the view that their policy of non-alignment was an important bond between them. Yugoslavia and India, dedicated to the principles and objectives of non-alignment and considering that the present international situation calls for intensified activities by the non-aligned countries, agreed to take resolute steps for the implementation of the programme adopted at the Conference in Lusaka.

Both sides considered the disquietening international monetary crisis and economic situation. They noted that no progress had been achieved in reducing the gap between the developed and the developing countries and in removing the discriminatory measures negatively affecting the developing countries.

They re-affirmed that the developing countries, which are most affected by the present world economic crisis, should take more energetic steps collectively to improve the situation.

Both sides agreed that the concrete programmes for development, co-operation and integration amongst developing countries at inter-regional, regional and subregional levels for accelerating economic growth agreed to at the Lusaka Conference of non-aligned States should be implemented for more rapid development of the developing countries. In this context, they stressed the importance of the Conference of Asian Foreign Trade Ministers at Bangkok and the Ministerial Conference of the Group of 77 which will be held in Lima later this month.

They agreed that the developing countries should ensure a consensus of opinion at Lima so that a common platform is formulated for UNCTAD III and the U.N. Development Strategy for the Second Development Decade is successfully implemented.

Both sides stressed the need for urgent measures for the purpose of promoting

258

agreement on general and complete disarmament, including in particular nuclear disarmament, under strict and effective international control

The two sides discussed the activities and the role of the United Nations, and underlined the need for scrupulous respect for and observance of the provisions of the Charter by all Member-States of the United Nations. They agreed to the necessity for ensuring universality of its membership. They welcomed the admission of Bhutan, Bahrein and Qatar to the U.N. They attached particular importance to the immediate restoration of the legitimate rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. They also considered that divided and other countries outside the U.N. should be enabled to take pail in the activities of the U.N. and its agencies.

Both sides declared their support for national liberation movements and the struggle against colonial domination and demanded the complete elimination of the vestiges of colonialism in accordance with the U.N. Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples.

They condemned racist policies and practices as a gross violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The two sides expressed their concern over the continuation of the war and foreign intervention in Indo-China. Stress was laid on the indispensability of the rapid withdrawal of all foreign troops from Indo-China, in order to enable the people of that region to live in peace and security and to decide freely their future destiny without any interference from outside. In this connection they noted that the seven-point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam constituted an important basis for a peaceful political solution of the question of Vietnam. They expressed the hope that a peaceful political solution of the Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia questions would be found within the broad framework of the Geneva Agreements.

The two sides expressed their serious concern over the tense situation in West Asia and the absence of concrete results in solving the crisis. They agreed that any further postponement of a peaceful solution in conformity with the Security Council Resolution of 22nd November, 1967 would pose a grave danger to international peace and security. They re-affirmed the need for urgent measures to achieve a lasting, stable and just peace on the basis of implementation of the above-mentioned Resolution, including the withdrawal of Israel from Arab territories and respect for the legitimate rights of the people of Palestine.

The President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia invited the President of the Republic of India, His Excellency Shri V. V. Giri, and the Prime Minister, Madame Indira Gandhi, to visit Yugoslavia. The invitations were accepted with great pleasure.

259

YUGOSLAVIA INDIA USA MALI PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ZAMBIA PERU BHUTAN QATAR CHINA VIETNAM CAMBODIA LAOS SWITZERLAND ISRAEL

Date: Oct 01, 1971

November

Volume No 1995 Content Foreign Affairs Record 1971 Vol. XVII NO. 11 **NOVEMBER CONTENTS PAGE BULGARIA** 261 Indo-Bulgarian Trade Protocol **CEYLON** Indian Line of Credit to Ceylon 261 FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY West German Aid to Madras I.I.T. 262 GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC Exchange of Technical Co-operation in Veterinary Sciences 263 Indo-GDR "Protocol for Co-operation" in Broadcasting 263 HUNGARY 264 Indo-Hungarian Joint Committee INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS Prime Minister's Letter the U.N. Secretary General U Thant on Situation in East Bengal Shri Mohammad Usman Arif's Statement on the Policies of Apartheid 266 Dr. Nagendra Singh's Statement on Definition of Aggression at

Sixth Committee	271
Dr . Nagendra Singh's Statement in the Sixt	th Committee in Reply
to Statement of Pakistan Delegate	275
Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. General Assen	nbly Welcoming the
Chinese People's Republic to U.N.	276
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS	S : EXTERNAL PUBL
COVEDNMENT OF INDI	٨

LICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(Continued Overleaf)

PAGE

Shri Samar Sen's Speech at Tl	hird Committee on Refugees	from	
East Bengal	277		
Shri B. P. Das's Statement in	Third Committee	281	
Shri P. K. Banerjee's Statement on World Disarmament Conference		284	
Indian Delegate's Statement on	Palestine Refugees	286	
Indian Delegate Shri Banerjee's Address on Disarmament at U.N.			
First Committee	288		

LIMA MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE OF "GROUP OF 77"

Shri L. N. Mishra's Address at Ministerial Meeting of "Group of 77" 292 Foreign Trade Minister's Statement in Parliament on Lima Conference 296

PERU

Indo-Peru Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreement 297

PRIME MINISTER SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI'S TOUR ABROAD Prime Minister's Statement on Her Foreign Tour Prime Minister's Reply to Discussion in Rajya Sabha 300

SINGAPORE

Prime Minister Shrimati Gandhi's Speech at Dinner to Singapore Prime Minister 304 Reply by Singapore Prime Minister 305

UNITED KINGDOM

Agreement For Two New British Loans 306 Shri Surendrapal Singh's Statement on Detention of Indians at **British Airports** 307 Shri Surendrapal Singh's Statement on Anglo-Rhodesian Agreement

307

UNITED STATE OF AMERICA

Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Reply to President Nixon's Welcome Address Prime Minister's Address to Indian Student's Association of Washington Prime Minister's Speech at Columbia university 314

BULGARIA INDIA GERMANY HUNGARY USA PAKISTAN PERU REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

BULGARIA

Indo-Bulgarian Trade Protocol

Following is the text of a press release issued in Neu) Delhi on November 29, 1971 on the Indo-Bulgarian Trade Protocol for 1972 signed between the two countries:

Talks between the Indian and Bulgarian Trade Delegations concluded here today with the signing of a Trade Protocol for 1972. The Indian Delegation was led by Shri V. S. Misra, Joint Secretary, Foreign Trade, and the Bulgarian Delegation by Mr. V. Grantcharov, Deputy Foreign Trade Minister of Bulgaria.

The Protocol envisages trade turnover between the two countries of the order of Rs. 65 crores in 1972.

The principal items of India's exports to Bulgaria will be steel wire ropes, steel pipes, iron and steel castings, machine tools, textile machinery, industrial machinery, engineering goods such as hand tools, sewing and knitting machines, bicycles, components and spare parts, various chemicals, drugs and pharmaceuticals, paints and pigments, in addition to traditional goods and new items like sports canvas shoes, consumer items like pins, needles, scissors, etc, silk fabrics, readymade garments and handicrafts.

The principal items of import from

Bulgaria will be urea, rolled steel products, caprolactum, chemicals and pharmaceuticals. The new items of imports will be polyster fibre and yam, photographic base paper, ships, soda ash and straw and viscose cellulose.

Bulgaria has shown interest in new and non-traditional items and the Protocol accordingly provides for increased scope for exports of non-traditional goods from India to Bulgaria and less exports of traditional goods.

Both Governments have noted with satisfaction the steady growth of mutual trade between India and Bulgaria. It has been agreed that in order to bring about further expansion and diversification in the two-way trade exchanges, possibilities of commercial, industrial and technical cooperation should be fully explored by identifying spheres where bilateral collaboration can be usefully undertaken.

BULGARIA INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CEYLON

Indian Line of Credit to Ceylon

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on November 26,1971 on the agreement between India and Ceylon on the provision of an Indian line of credit to Ceylon for purchase of Indian goods:

India has provided to Ceylon a line of credit of Rs. 5 crores under an agreement signed here today. The credit is for the purchase In India of certain goods like com-

mercial vehicles, industrial construction and general purpose machinery, electrical equipment, railway equipment, tractors and implements, paper and pulp machinery and sugar mill machinery for small-scale units.

261

The agreement was signed by Dr. H. A. de Gunasekera, Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Planning and Employment, on behalf of Ceylon and by Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of India.

The two delegations also discussed closer cooperation in matters relating to trade and industrial collaboration. India has agreed to import from Ceylon increased quantities of a variety of commodities. It was recognised on both sides that there was considerable scope for further expansion of trade and industrial collaboration.

The discussions which led to the signing of the agreement today were in continuation of the talks initiated in Colombo in September this year when the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh, visited Ceylon. Economic matters of mutual interest to both countries were then discussed.

INDIA USA SRI LANKA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

West German Aid to Madras I.I.T.

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on November 26, 1971 on the Indo-F.R.G. agreement on provision

of further assistance to IIT Madras by the Federal Republic of Germany:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) will give further assistance to the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras during the next three years for development of specialised technical laboratories and establishment of a major computer centre at the Institute.

According to an agreement signed here today by Mr. T. P. Singh, Secretary, Union Ministry of Education and Social welfare and His Excellency Mr. Guenter Diehl, Ambassador, FRG, the Institute will receive technical books for Its library and scientific instruments and engineering equipment for Its new laboratories and workshops valued at over Rs. 1 crore at the current exchange rate. In addition, West Germany will provide fellowships for the advanced training of 30 teachers of the Institute in German technical universities and the services of German Professors and specialists in selected fields.

The proposed computer centre at the Institute, estimated to cost about Rs. 140 lakhs will be one of the largest in India. It will function as a regional facility and cater to the needs of educational institutions, research laboratories and industry in Madras. A major part of the cost of the computer, about Rs. 1 crore will be met out of the West German Food Aid Funds in India.

The Madras Institute was set up by the Central Government in 1959 with West German aid as the third in the chain of five higher technological institutes. The present agreement represents the third phase of West German aid and will complete the development of the Institute as a centre of advanced engineering education and research. The important fields for which-the Institute provides facilities include: turbomachines, process engineering, electronics, fine technics, machine tool engineering, chemical engineering, metallurgy, electrical machines and hydraulic engineering. The Institute has about 700 post-graduate Students and research scholars studying for the Masters and Doctorate Degrees in engineering.

Detailed negotiations for the present phase of German aid to the Institute were held in Bonn in August 1971 by an Indian mission consisting of Dr. L. S. Chandrakant, Educational Adviser (Technical), Union Ministry of Education and Social Welfare and Dr. A. Ramachandran, Director, Indian Institute of Technology, Madras.

262

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Exchange of Technical Co-operation in Veterinary Sciences

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on November 1, 1971 on the signing of an Indo-GDR Supplementary protocol between India and GDR providing for Scholarships for training and exchange of technical co-operation in Veterinary Sciences:

A supplementary protocol providing for scholarships for training in the field of veterinary sciences during the years 1972 and 1973 was signed today between the Governments of India and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) under a protocol on scientific and technical cooperation between the two Governments initialled on February 2, 1971. Mr. K. Mueller, Director-General of External Economic Relations, signed the supplementary protocol on behalf of the GDR and Shri J. C. Mathur, Additional Secretary, Agriculture, for India.

Under the supplementary protocol 20 scholarships will be offered to Indian veterinarians and two to GDR experts. The scholarships are for a duration of about three months each.

Ten scholarships are related to the Organisation and functioning of animal health services. There are, two scholarships each, for advanced training of veterinarians in the fields of (i) physiopathology of reproduction and artificial insemination of cattle, (ii) pig health, (iii) poultry health, (iv) sheep health and (v) meat hygiene, supervision of meat processing plants and meat shops.

Another 10 scholarships per year offered by GDR to India are for the advanced training of managerial staff of veterinary and animal husbandry services at the Agricultural College of Zschortau, near Leipzig, for three months intensive courses.

Under the protocol India offers to GDR two scholarships each of three months foradvanced practical training of veterinarians in prevention, control and diagnosis of rinderpest.

Both countries will also exchange officialreports on communicable diseases of animals, periodicals on veterinary medicines, legalregulations and provisions in the field of veterinary medicine and bacteria I virus. strains and antigens of mutual interest

INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Indo-GDR "Protocol for Co-operation" in Broadcasting

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi on November 24, 1971 on the signing on an "Indo-GDR Protocol for Co-operation" in the fields of radio and television between the broadcasting organssations of the two countries:

A "Protocol for Cooperation" in the fields of radio and television between the broadcasting Organisation of German Democratic Republic and All India Radio was signed here today.

The plan which comes under the framework of Indo-GDR Cultural Exchange Programme was signed by Mr. Rolf Weissbach, Deputy Chairman of the State Committee for-Broadcasting of the GDR and Mr. A. K. Sen, Director General, All India Radio, New Delhi.

The Agreement provides for a continuous exchange of radio materials and of contemporary radio plays in order to give a real picture of the developments in the two.

263

countries. The exchange of programmes will be made in the form of tape recordings and scripts and will comprise music programmes, mixed spoken and music programmes and pure spoken programmes.

As per the agreement, the two organisations will assist the work of each other's correspondents and reporting teams. The GDR will also provide facilities for the training of the members of staff of AIR.

While the GDR radio will place at the disposal of the All India Radio every two months tape recordings of classical music, music performed by orchestras of the GDR, German folk music, dance, and light music and youth songs, AIR will make available every two months tape recordings of Indian folk songs and other taped material.

The two organisations will exchange quarterly broadcasts of a duration of upto 15 minutes. These broadcasts made in the

form of reportages will inform on the social and cultural life in the respective country.

On the occasion of National Days and National memorial days of both countries, there will be exchange of special programmes.

The exchange of all materials will be made free of charge. The copy right fees and the fees for the copy right protection of artistic works for all broadcasts will be paid by the party broadcasting the work.

The agreement will come into force with immediate effect.

INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

HUNGARY

Indo-Hungarian Joint Committee

Following is the text of a Press Note issued in New Delhi on November 18, 1971 on the conclusion of the Indo-Hungarian Joint Committee meeting on the Cultural Exchange Programme:

The Indo-Hungarian Joint Committee which met in New Delhi from 15th to 18th November, 1971 finalized the Indo-Hungarian Cultural Exchange Programme covering the years 1971-72 and 1972-73. The Programme was signed today at a ceremony by Shri T. P. Singh; Secretary, Ministry of Education and Social Welfare, on behalf of the Government of India and Mr. Miklos Nagy, Deputy Chairman of the Institute of Cultural Relations, Hungary, on behalf of the Government of the Peoples Republic of

Hungary.

The Programme contains 85 projects envisaging co-operation in the fields of education, science and technology, medic ine, agriculture, art and culture, radio, television, film and press and sports, through visits of professors, lecturers, artists, writers, scholars, journalists, medical and agricultural experts, dance and music ensembles; organisation of film festivals, art exhibitions; and exchange of scientific and technical information, books and publications, and radio and television programmes.

In terms of personnel exchanges about 66 Indians would visit Hungary, and 60 Hungarians would visit India.

This is the Fifth Programme of Cultural Exchange between India and Hungary drawn up in pursuance of the Indo-Hungarian Cultural Agreement signed in 1962.

264

HUNGARY INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Prime Minister's Letter to U.N. Secretary General U Thant on Situation in East Bengal

Following is the text of the letter dated November 16, 1971 front the Indian Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi to the U.N. Secretary General U. Thant in reply to the latter's communication on situation in East Bengal:

Your letter of the 20th October was received two days before my departure on a long tour abroad. It was not possible to reply

until my return to Delhi. My trip gave me the opportunity of discussing the crisis in Pakistan with a number of leaders in different countries.

We have avoided any hasty reaction to the recent events in Pakistan which have naturally caused you and us great concern. I am sure you will appreciate our anxiety as the military authorities in Pakistan continue to pursue a deliberate policy of suppressing the fundamental freedom and human rights of the people in East Bengal and driving out millions of their citizens into India, thus placing intolerable political, social and economic burdens on us. Inspite of the repeated declarations of "amnesty" and "invitations" for the return of the refugees and claims regarding the return of "normal" conditions in East Bengal made by the military regime of Pakistan, the flight of the people of East Bengal into India has not stopped and provides tragic testimony to the continuing military repression and denial of basic human rights in Fast Bengal. The consequences of activities of the military regime of Pakistan threaten and distort the entire fabric of our national life and pose a serious threat to our security.

Consistent attempts have been made by the Government of Pakistan to divert attention from the prevailing situation inside East Bengal and its own refusal to reach a settlement with the people of East Bengal and their representatives, who were elected in a fair and free election held by the present Government of Pakistan, by projecting the issue as an Indo-Pakistan dispute. The most recent manifestation of this policy is the movement of Pakistani troops and armour to our borders, threatening India with total war, and simultaneously launching a vicious "Crush and Conquer India" campaign. These steps confirm our belief that Pakistan is seriously preparing to launch a large-scale armed conflict with India and that we have therefore to take all necessary defensive measures.

I should like to assure you, Excellency, that we have no desire to provoke an armed conflict with Pakistan. Such measures as

we have taken are entirely defensive. We have been constrained to take them because of the movement and positioning for offensive combat of the Pakistani military machine. We have had to bear in mind that Pakistan has moved her forces right up top the border although the cantonments where they are normally based are only a few hours distance from the border while the bases of our own troops are located at several days distance. Indeed, we waited long enough before we moved our troops to the frontiers.

The root of the problem is the fate of the seventy five million people of East Bengal and their inalienable rights. This is what must be kept in mind, instead of the present attempt to save the military regime-To side track this main problem and to convert it into an Indo-Pakistan dispute can only aggravate tensions.

During these difficult months, we have taken every opportunity to advocate strongly that the problem of East Bengal can be solved only by peaceful negotiations between the military rulers of West Pakistan and the elected and accepted leaders of East Bengal. A first step towards the opening of such negotiations is the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, as demanded by the people of East Bengal and their elected representatives. Instead, there is an attempt to establish phantom governments and legislatures. Indeed, I learn that fifty-five persons have been declared elected "unopposed" Such. undemocratic and entirely indefensible action can-

265 not but increase bitterness. This farcical reelection should be stopped.

If the military regime in Pakistan persists in its policies, the situation in Fast Bengal is bound to deteriorate. Yet there is no evidence of the wisdom or the desire necessary to seek a political solution of the problem. I believe that statesman of goodwill all over the world are convinced that only such a solution could bring normalcy to that tormented region, stop the further influx of refugees and enable those now in

India to return. You yourself have made several statements emphasising the need for such a settlement. It is tragic that the Pakistan Government have turned a deaf ear to all such appeals. Your offer of good offices could play a significant role in this situation.

It is always a pleasure to meet you and to exchange views. Whatever efforts you can make to bring about a political settlement in East Bengal which meets the declared wishes of the people there, will be welcome, and if you are prepared to view the problem in perspective, you will have our support in your initiatives.

I have stated my views frankly. It would not be fair to you not to do so, for I know how anxious you are to prevent the aggravation of the grim tragedy of East Bengal. I had hoped to discuss these matters with you in New York but was very sorry to learn of your illness. I hope that you are quite well again.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Mohammad Usman Arif's Statement on The Policies of Apartheid

Following is the text of the Statement by Shri Mohammad Usman Arif, M.P., Representative of India on the U.N. Special Political Committee on November 2, 1.971:

India's association with the people of South Africa is long and historic. As you all know, the Father of Indian nation, Mahatma Gandhi, spent 22 years of his political life in South Africa fighting against oppression, racial discrimination and inhuman laws. It was India which first brought the question of Apartheid to the attention of the United Nations and at the first session of the General Assembly introduced resolution 44(I) on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the history of South Africa is a history of conflict It began with the conquest of African people when a settler-dominated agricultural economy was established and resource-industries based on cheap and abundent labour of Africans was developed. The conflict involves physical separation of races, the assignment to each of a permanent political status and the restructuring of the economy to provide the white settlers with the maximum benefits and security and to keep the African nonwhites in a permanent state of under-development. This is apartheid. It is both an operative system and a rigid structure of social, political and economic stratification.

The strict division of the society into economic classes and social status groups is maintained on the basis of race and colour. But apartheid is not simply a system of racial discrimination alone, nor can it be explained in terms of economic exploitation. It is both and something more. It integrates both of these factors in a rigidly defined political culture whose principle source of energy is perpetual and pervasive conflict.

Mr. Chairman, this political system is maintained by a process which can be described in psychological terms as internalization. Cultural adaptation by oppressive laws is the basis of this process. The non-white African should be made to act inferior and the system will work only if they start feeling inferior. By the same process of internalization the white man's humanity is repressed so that he may oppress other men. This political schizophrenia present in varying degrees in all situations in South Africa is bound to manifest Itself through violence.

In order to maintain this system, a cruel regime has been established, supported by a

police state and the most vicious machinery of repressive laws imaginable.

South Africa is the only country in the world that proclaims the inequality of its 266

citizens in its laws. The South Africa Act 1961 declared that only white persons may become members of the all-powerful parliament. The Native Land Act, 1972, provides that Africans may not own land in 87 per cent of the country's territory. The Group Areas Act, 1956, empowers the Government to proclaim ghettos for ownership and occupation by people of mixed descent and origin. The Native Urban Areas Act, 1945, restricts the entry of Africans into the towns and compels Africans in the cities to live in locations subject to the control of white superintendents. The Native Abolition of Passes Act, 1952, makes it compulsory for every African man or woman over sixteen to carry and produce on demand to any policeman a book containing his photograph, number, and the various permissions he needs in connexion with residence, movement and work. The Population Registration Act, 1950, obliges every South African to have himself racially classified, and creates special race courts for investigation of borderline cases. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, 1953, expressly authorizes separate but unequal facilities in public places for persons of different races.

To enforce these inhuman laws, the South African government has established a cruel and efficient machinery. of the Law Courts, the Department of Justice and the Police force. Justice is placed by law firmly in the hands of the whites. Judges, juries and magistrates are always whites, as are also the prosecution. Apart from cleaners, court orderlies, interpreters and junior clerks, the membership of the Department of Justice is confined to whites, most of who are enthusiastic supporters of apartheid.

The power and importance of the Police force has grown so much in recent years that it Jhas become the most important organ of Government, making the country a veritable police state. It plays an important role not only in the execution of policy but in shaping and determining it. Its 30,000 members are divided roughly half and half, into whites and non-whites. But there are no non-whites commissioned officers.

With this machinery working at its full capacity it is natural that prisons should be full. The average daily prison population is over 70,000. The great majority of prisoners are Africans sentenced for contravention of apartheid regulations.

The net result of this inhuman policy during the last 10 years is a tale of unparallel misery. It is estimated that 50 percent of the Indian population in Natal live below the poverty datum line as do 68 per cent of the families in Soweto. Average non-White income is 7 rand while that of Whites is 95 rand per head, per month. The earnings of Whites are thus 485 per cent of those of non-Whites and the disproportion increases annually. A Coloured child dies of malnutrition every 35 minutes and two African children die during the same period. Half the children in a typical African reserve (homeland) die before they are five years old. And in the Transkei reserve 40 per cent of the children die before they reach the age of 10.

Expenditure on African education is less than one eighth of that on White education and the gap is growing. 0.1 per cent of the African population have matriculation or school leaving certificates and the State and provinces in 1969 spent R238 million on White education and only R14.5 million on non-white education. In 1968 there was only one qualified non-white engineer, and there was not one registered African apprentice in the whole South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, the General Assembly in its 25th session passed a comprehensive resolution 2671 (XXV) to deal with the various aspects of this tragedy.

Once again this resolution drew the attention of the Security Council to the grave situation in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole, recommended

that the Council resume urgently the consideration of effective measures, in the light of relevant General Assembly resolutions, including those under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations and urged all States:

Firstly, to terminate diplomatic, consular and other official relations with the South African Government;

Secondly, to terminate all military, economic, technical and other co-operation with South Africa;

267

Thirdly, to end tariff and other preferences to South African exports and facilities for investment in South Africa; and

Fourthly, to ensure that companies registered in their countries and their nationals comply with the United Nations resolutions on this question.

I shall give first of all what we have done in response to the General Assembly resolutions.

In regard to operative paragraph 2 of part B of this resolution the Government of India have been extending assistance to the African National Congress which maintains an office in New Delhi. As regards operative paragraphs 2 and 6 of Part C, the Government of India have been undertaking appropriate information activities through publicity media in India. In implementation of operative paragraph 5 or Part D of the resolution, action is being taken to observe the International Year for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination in a suitable manner. The Indian Council for Africa is organising pictorial exhibitions in various Indian universities with a view to depicting "Life under Apartheid". The Indian National Commission for Cooperation with UNESCO is arranging an All-India Teachers Seminar to discuss ways and means of combating racism and racial discrimination. This theme will also act as a focal point for the information activities of the Commission.

Inspite of her own pressing demands India has continued to make contributions to the UN Trust Fund.

The High Commissioner. for India in South Africa was recalled in 1946. The Mission itself was withdrawn in 1954.

Action was taken in 1963 to close Indian ports to south African ships and to prohibit Indian ships from calling at South African ports.

In the same year the International Civil Aviation organisation was informed that the Government of India would not permit aircraft belonging to the Government of South Africa and to companies registered under South African laws to over-fly India while operating scheduled International air services, and to make non-scheduled flights to through or over India.

India was the first country to sever trade relations with South Africa in protest at its racial policies. The decision to Impose economic sanctions was taken in principle as early as November 1944. When towards the end of 1945, the Government of South Africa announced that fresh legislation would be enacted for carrying out and extending its policy of racial discrimination, Government of India took immediate action. All exports to, and imports from, South Africa were therefore prohibited from July 1946, and this boycott has continued ever since.

Mr. Chairman, India took this decision, inspite of the fact that it had a favourable balance of trade with South Africa. India had increased substantially its trade with South Africa in the course of war. For a time it even ranked as South Africa's third most important source of imports. We lost South African market in which we had earlier established ourselves and in which the demand of our products had been continuously growing.

This, Mr. Chairman, India has done with

considerable sacrifice; for some of the measures severely affected our own economic development. But we did it with no regret. This much we owed to humanity, to our African brothers in bondage. Unfortunately this cannot be said of many other countries and specially the major trading partners of South Africa. The main trading partners of South Africa continue to increase their trade with South Africa. The figures for the 10 most important trading partners of South Africa, from South African statistics, are illustrative. In 1960 South African imports from its 10 major trading partners were to the value of 828 million rands. In 1970, they reached almost 2,000 million rands. In the corresponding ten years exports have gone up from 462 million rands to more than a thousand million rands. New capital inflow to South Africa has also reached a record level of over \$ 1.000 million in the financial year 1970-71. This Investment is almost wholly from the main trading partners of South Africa.

Mr. Chairman, the details of cooperation between South Africa and its major trading partners, the measures of racial separation and discrimination taken by the South African government and above all the repressive measures taken by the Pretoria regime

268

against the opponents of apartheid during the year have all been chronicled by the Report of the Special Committee on Apartheid, document A/8422. I shall not, therefore, go into those details. It is a comprehensive report. My delegation would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the Rapporteur, Mr. Uddhav Deo Bhatt, for a very useful document and incidentally a dossier of South African misdeeds. I would also like to pay a tribute to the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid, Ambassador Abdulrahim Abby Farah whose dedication to the cause has been a moving force behind the Special Committee's work.

Having said that Mr. Chairman, I would invite the attention of the Committee to the recommendations made by the Special Committee on Apartheid to the General Assembly.

The Committee has recommended the adoption of two declarations; one on the Elimination of Apartheid and the other endorsing the Olympic Principles to Combat Racial discrimination in short. My delegation considers both these declarations very important. It is important that the world body should reiterate its grave concern over the situation in South Africa and restate the essential elements of a solution in accordance with the United Nations Charter. It should also declare "the grave deterioration of the situation in South Africa as a result of the imposition of racial discrimination as a state policy; the rejection by the South African regime of policies of United Nations organs for a peaceful and just solution; and the growing that to the peace in South Africa and in southern Africa as a whole." In this connection, I shall refer to the message my Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi gave on the International Day for Elimination of Racial Discrimination. She said and I quote:

"Equality is the dominant urge of man. Peace and Justice can be achieved only when dignity of man without distinction of race or colour comes to be honoured. Racialism is a crime against humanity and all forms of racial discrimination must end. Millions of non-whites in South Africa and elsewhere still live under tyranny of racial arrogance and prejudice.

"On this day we pay homage to those who have fought and those who have made the supreme sacrifice for world of equal human brings.

"People of India will always raise their voice for racial equality and peace until the goal is reached."

The second declaration on racialism in sport must be viewed within the much wider context of the whole repressive mechanism of apartheid. The virtual absence of public parks and playgrounds in non-white areas and lack of leisure, low incomes and debilitating health standards has restricted the growth of sporting skills among the non-

white youths, physical development among children and the moral uplift which the competitive sport brings. As the Australian Labour Leader, Mr. Whitlam said and I quote:

"Totalitarian racist regimes from Sparta to Hitler's Germany and Vorster's South Africa have made sport central to, and symbolic of, their supremacist fantasies."

The Special Committee has also urged the Security Council to declare the arms embargo against South Africa as mandatory. Mr. Chairman, it is no secret that the Pretoria racist regime has adopted a military posture to maintain the white man's supremacy over South Africa by sheer force. It has made preparations to strike against the independent countries in the north in terms of the doctrine of "anticipatory counter attack." South Africa's military presence in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Angola is to maintain that military posture.

South Africa now possesses military equipment worth more than 2,000 million rand (\$ 2,800 million). Its budget estimates for defence increased from 40 million rand In 1959-1960 to 271,600,000 rand in 1969-70. The strength of South Africa's Defence Force, including members of the Citizen Force who are under military training, is estimated at 39,700. When fully mobilized, South Africa's armed forces (including men who have completed Citizen Force training) would total 85,500. In addition, there are about 58,000 commandos or part-time militia.

This heavy defence expenditure is certainly not incurred to maintain law and

269 order within its own boundaries. It is a means of aggression against its neighbours.

Only recently the Security Council considered a complaint from Zambia against South Africa and adopted a resolution on the subject. Before that Senegal had complained against Portugal and some months ago it was Guinea who had complained

against Portugal. It is absolutely essential that the supply of arms to South Africa should be completely stopped as a measure of maintaining peace within that region.

The Special Committee has also called for contributions to the OAU Assistance Fund for the struggle against colonialism and apartheid. Mr. Chairman, my delegation feels that the OAU Fund concerns not only South Africa but also southern Africa and we have welcomed the establishment of the Fund as one of the means to facilitate the implementation of the resolution 2671B (XXV). We hope that all governments, organisations and individuals will respond to the appeal of the OAU for contributions to the Assistance Fund. We hope shortly to announce our own contribution to it.

On the 5th of November 1969 a representative of the African National Congress Mr. Robert Resha made a statement at this Committee. Concluding this statement Mr. Resha said:

"Finally, in asking for help, we want to make it very clear, that we are not asking the United Nations, nor any Member State for that matter, to go to South Africa and fight for us.

"We are convinced that the struggle for the emancipation of African people will be fought and won by the political and moral support we may get from the United Nations as well as the material assistance we may get from Member States will no doubt bring nearer the day of victory."

Sir, the least that we can, or rather the best we can do in the present circumstances is to support the African people themselves to carry on their struggle.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Committee has recommended that the United Nations should greatly increase its information activity on apartheid. South Africa is probably the only country among the smaller nations of the world which spends huge sums on overseas propaganda. In Western Europe,

the Great Britain and the United States, the South African propaganda far exceeds anything currently being, attempted by any nation except, perhaps, the super powers. The image of a generous, pious nation of white people, uncomplainingly struggling under the dual burden of non-white backwardness and world misunderstanding is being disseminated. The case is being made that South Africa with its 3 1/2 million whites and 11 million Africans, is a Western Christian democratic state. This involves the use of books, booklets, brochures, pamphlets, and leaflets distributed throughout the world to prospective immigrants and above all to investors. It is estimated that in 1967 the South African Government spent over 7 million dollars on propaganda and it is not only the industrialists, pressmen and political figures but also United Nations itself which is subject to this propaganda. John Lawrence in his book "The Seeds of Disaster" has exhaustively reported on the propaganda policies of the South African regime. Here, I would quote a passage from that book. He said and I quote:

"The New York Office concentrates on lobbying of more than 1,000 accredited pressmen gathered around the United Nations during the General Assembly session. This is undoubtedly the most important aspect of public relations activities in the United Nations."

In this connection, my delegation would like to express its appreciation of the work done by the Unit on Apartheid. The list of "Studies" and "Notes and Documents" published by the Unit in 1971 is Indeed impressive and provides effective means of rebutting South African propaganda.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier the history of South Africa is a history of conflict, a conflict which is bound to manifest itself through violence. It is time that we realise that the racist policies followed by the South African Government are a danger to the world peace and steps should be taken before the course of events bring the world to the brink of disaster.

Mr. Chairman, repressive regimes ha a common screen to hide their crimes when ever human rights are violated and peoples, aspirations for freedom and Independence are crushed by brutal force. Article 2, para. graph 7 of the United Nations Charter is used as a protection and it is claimed that these brutalities fall essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the state and, therefore, United Nations cannot take any action. True to the pattern, the Government of South Africa has taken shelter under Article 2, paragraph 7. This argument has been effectively demolished by the United Nations Commission on the Racial Situation in the Union of South Africa (documents A/2505 and A/2505/Add.1). The Commission said and I quote:

"A general study of the provisions relating to the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and the powers, and limitations of principal organs of the United Nations in carrying them out leaves no room, for doubt that, under the Charter. the Assembly is empowered to undertake any investigations and make any recommendations to Member States that it deems desirable concerning the application and enforcement of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter, among which the respect of human right's and fundamental freedoms is outstanding. The exercise of the Powers and functions devolving on the Assembly in such matters does not constitute an intervention within the meaning of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter."

When People are uprooted from their homes, villages are destroyed, women and children die of starvation, when education is restricted and economic exploitation becomes an established Policy of the Government, the human conscience cannot be satisfied by expressing mere sympathy. While elements of genocide are clearly proved by impartial sources and we see that the whole people are culturally, socially, economically and politically stranged, United Nations can-

not just watch and pass recommendatory resolutions. For the restoration of human dignity and safety of human lives, it is essential that we start considering in terms of mandatory steps to control a situation which any day may spark unprecedented violence and destruction of life.

INDIA USA SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC OMAN AUSTRALIA GERMANY ANGOLA MOZAMBIQUE ZIMBABWE ZAMBIA SENEGAL PORTUGAL GUINEA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Nagendra Singh's Statement on definition of Aggression at Sixth Committee

Following is the text of the statement by Dr. Nagendra Singh, Representative of India, in the Sixth Committee, on the Definition of Aggression, on November 3, 1971:

While thanking you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me the floor, may I at the very outset express the deep appreciation of the Indian Delegation for the valuable guidance given by Dr. Augusto Legnani of Uruguay, as Chairman of the Special Committee on the question of defining aggression. In addition we would like to pay a warm tribute to the distinguished Rapporteur Dr. Riyadh Ay Qaysi of Iraq for his skillful, comprehensive and enlightening presentation of the Special Committee's report.

The Indian Delegation has always been of the considered view that aggression has to be defined most urgently for considerations of international security and world peace. When this Committee was constituted four years back, we entertained the sanguione hope that the adoption of a proper definition of aggression would not only have

restraining influence On the Potential aggressor but in the event of aggression determine the cause of aggression as well as locate the culprit With that comprehensive, object In mind, we would urge the Special Committee to give the highest priority to this topic and to Present to the U.N. a definition on an immediate basis. The Indian Delegation would be second to none in emphasising the necessity for the completion of this task in the over-all interests of maintenance of world public order.

In regard to the problem Presented by the question of defining aggression, the Indian Delegation has three submissions to

271

make. The first consideration, in the view of the Indian Delegation, is that aggression must be comprehensively defined. Though precision may be the first virtue of a good definition, we would not like to sacrifice the requirement of a comprehensive definition of aggression at any cost. There are many reasons for holding this view. Aggression can be of several kinds such as direct or indirect, armed in nature or even without the use of any arms whatsoever. There can be even direct aggression without arms. As far as one could appreciate, the Special Committee has been concentrating on precision and in relation to armed aggression alone. This is certainly one aspect but there are other several aspects which should not be neglected. We would not, therefore, subscribe to the view expressed by some of the delegates that the other forms of aggression namely by methods other than armed force, could be omitted or postponed to be defined at a later stage. We would accordingly support the categorical view expressed by the distinguished delegate of Burma, the U.K. and others that a definition of aggression excluding indirect methods would be incomplete and therefore dangerous. The Indian Delegation is somewhat impatient because four years have lapsed and even the definition of armed aggression has not been completed. If an attempt were to be made by the Committee to define non-armed aggression later, it is not known how much time would be further required in this exercise.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the different draft proposals of some powers listed in Annex. I and II of the Report present a difficult problem to the Special Committee. If efforts were to be made to reconcile the different viewpoints expressed in these three different drafts, it may quite easily take several years of the work of the Special Committee. When the question is one of immediate importance and urgency, the problem of reconciling different viewpoints let alone the problem of a precise definition, may have to be given up in favour of formulating an all inclusive concept of aggression which would recite the constituent factors or the ingredients of aggression and have an inbuilt condition for determining and locating the culprit and fixing responsibility of the State concerned. In the interests of expediting the conclusion of the work of the Special Committee, the Indian Delegation would submit for the consideration of the Sixth Committee the well-known legal maxim of Manu formulated several centuries ago that what cannot be precisely defined should be comprehensively described to achieve a complete whole. Thus, all the aspects of aggression that have been mentioned by different members of the Committee could be brought together to present a comprehensive and complete report on the subject of aggression. The Indian Delegation would, therefore, repeat that precision may have to be sacrificed for a comprehensive and complete concept and there are several valid reasons for doing so. We feel that if a narrow precise definition were to be formulated, the would-be or potential-aggressor would always take those precautions necessary to escape from the clutches of the definition so formulated. A comprehensive formulation, therefore, which would cover all kinds of aggression, whether direct or indirect, whether lethal or without resort to arms, would perhaps answer the question posed before the Special Committee both expeditiously as well as effectively. Taking into consideration the latest inventions which science may offer for commission of aggression, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that a narrow precise definition on armed aggression alone may not prove fruitful.

The second submission of the Indian Delegation relates, to the very interesting exercise undertaken by the Committee on the multifarious motives which constitute "the aggressive intent". Unfathomable and unpredictable are the ways of human ingenuity and a comprehensive list of what motives constitute "aggressive intent" would be difficult to imagine. We fully appreciate the validity of the list given in the draft proposals submitted by several members of the Committee. It is, submitted, however, that no list of this type could be exhaustive as it could not cover all future eventualities and every circumstances of the case. Moreover, it is not clear why it is necessary to prepare such a list enumerating the different motives behind the "aggressive intent". The Indian Delegation is inclined to agree that what was stated by the distinguished delegates of Jordan, Sudan, El Salvador and the United Kingdom namely that a description of various kinds of motives is not strictly

2.72

necessary as it could not be included to be a part of the definition of aggression. It is true such motives are helpful to bring out the circumstantial evidence proving the "aggressive intent". We agree of course that there must be "aggressive intent" for the commission of the offence of aggression on the same analogy as in municipal law "criminal intent" to commit murder or arson is necessary for the completion of the offence of homicide or arson but the innumerable motives which go behind that intent to murder such as hate, love, money are not stated in the definition of homicide or arson. Lord Elden has rightly said that even God himself has not been able to delve in the mind of Devil to find the exact kind of motive working him. The exercise giving a list of "aggressive intents" may, therefore, be helpful, but not essential. We would urge, therefore, in the interest of expeditious finalisation of the definition of aggression that the Special Committee concentrates on all the essentials. What we are after is speedy conclusion of this Committee's work and towards that objective, we would be prepared to co-operate and work in every way possible.

The third submission which the Indian Delegation would like to submit for the consideration of the Committee relates to the need for examining when exactly the use of force may be said to take place for the Purpose of completion of the offence of aggression. In Annex. III of the report (Page 30), aggression is defined as "the use or armed force by a State against another State. When does this use of armed force take place is a crucial question. Does it take place when the territorial integrity of the victim State is violated by the weapons of the aggressor State? Or does It take place when an aggressor state has taken the last irrevocable step in firing the weapons of destruction, even though such weapons have not transgressed the territorial boundary of the victim State? This question is indeed vital in the context of supersonic weapons, and particularly in relation to determining the victim's right of self-defence. According to article 51 of the UN Charter, the right of self-defence, accrues "when an armed attack has taken place". In the context of supersonic weapons, the victim state has no chance to defend itself if the "use of armed force" or resort to armed attack is defined to take place only when the territorial boundary of victim state is transgressed. The exact import of the words of the Charter, "when an armed attack has taken place" have to be examined very carefully. This is essential because aggression has to be defined within the overall concept of the Charter and the right of self-defence is so interwoven with aggression that the Committee could not neglect that aspect also particularly because of the existence of supersonic weapons and the need to state in the definition when actually the use of force takes place for completing the offence of aggression. It could perhaps be argued that if a victim state is to survive a supersonic nuclear attack to exercise its right of self-defence, aggression must be deemed to have taken place when the aggressor state has fired irrevocably its weapons of destruction which it cannot withdraw even though such weapons were still within its own territory or in the space of neutral territory aimed at destroying the victim state.

The Special Committee may like to examine this aspect as well because it comes within the topic of "Priority" listed by the Committee. If the first use of nuclear weapons is always illegal, what is the position of the victim state? Would the victim of nuclear attack have the right to use nuclear devices in self-defence? Would the victim state in such circumstances be regarded as an aggressor state if it used nuclear devices before the nuclear weapons of the aggressor state had violated its own territory? The concept of priority must necessarily therefore, take into account this vital question to pin-point when an armed attack, within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter, and for the specific purpose of our definition of aggression, may be said to have taken place. Though there is considerable strength in the contention of the view-point expressed by the distinguished delegate from the United Kingdom that in. defining aggression we need not get involved with considerations of selfdefence, we would submit, Mr. Chair-man, that definition of aggression would not be complete unless the Committee also deals with the precise point in time and place when the act of aggression may be said to have taken place. This would require a proper appraisal of both the ingredients for the commission of a criminal offence, namely Actusrea and Mensrea as well as the full inter play of the doctrine of Locus

273

Pueniten'stiae. For example, for the commission of arson, there must be the necessary Mensrea or intent to burn a building for some motive such as greed or defeating an insurance policy, etc. Motives behind the intent, strengthen the existence of Mensrea, but without Actusrea there would be no commission of the offence of arson. Again even if there is presence of Actusrea, the point to determine is when does the act of the culprit complete the offence. For example, the accused may purchase petrol, inflammable and igniting material but such a purchase alone would be enough to complete the Actusrea and hence the commission of offence of arson. In such cases, the law gives the advantage of Locus Pueniten stiae advantage, namely the accused may change

his mind even after purchasing the inflammable and igniting material and not use it at all. It is only when the accused goes to the building and places the inflammable material in the proper position, and throws the igniting substance, thus committing the last irrevocable proxim act that the offence or arson may be said to be completed. This aspect of the matter has to be examined in the light of aggression in inter-state affairs. Any definition of aggression to be really useful must specify through the stage at which an act of aggression may be said to be completed and committed irrevocably.

My fourth submission, Mr. Chairman, is that an ad-interim declaration on definition of aggression, as suggested by some delegates, would do more harm, than good. By its very nature, the "ad-interim" definition would be an incomplete effort. An incomplete definition would naturally leave room for acts of aggression to be committed in the undefined field and this would indeed be a calamity. A half baked definition would in fact encourage aggression rather than act as a deterrent. I am glad to state that several delegates including Great Powers have opposed the formulation of an incomplete definition.

While, therefore, opposing the suggestion of interim declaration on definition of aggression, the Indian Delegation would like to emphasise that taking into consideration the cases and incidents, relevant for our purpose, a comprehensive approach Presents the only solution. As stated earlier, all kinds and types of aggression must be covered by our definition. The Indian Delegation fully supports in this regard the view point expressed by a delegation that there is a clear "need for ensuring that we so draft the Definition as to defeat the ingenuity of any aggressor state in appearing to abide by the letter of the law even when it is clearly violating the spirit and true purpose of the law. The definition, therefore, should be so framed as to be capable of application to those situations where an act of aggression has taken place, however, carefully the aggressor state appears or tries to appear to be a law-abiding member of the

international community". For example, there could be a unique type of bloodless aggression resulting from a vast and incessant flow of millions of human beings forced to flee into another State. If this invasion of unarmed men in totally unmanageable proportion were to not only impair the economic and political well-being of the receiving victim state but to threaten its very existence, I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, it would have to be categorised as aggression. In such a case, there may not be use of armed force across the frontier since the use of force may be totally confined within ones territorial boundary, but if this results in inundating the neighbouring state by millions of fleeing citizens of the offending state, there could be an aggression of a worst order. If as a distinguished delegate has pointed out the spirit of the law should be invoked such would be the inevitable conclusion. Again, Mr. Chairman, what would be the concept of self-defence in Such an eventuality. The unarmed human beings could hardly be destroyed by arms in the name of humanity and again what would be the position of the victim state if this vast human. exodus were to persist despite bilateral protests to the aggressor and multilateral appeals to the international community. In such circumstances when, how and where could the right of self-defence be, exercised? What I wish to convey, Mr. Chairman, is the complexity of the problem which does not permit of a four-line definition of aggression much less an ad-interim declaration on it

After making these suggestions for what they are worth, the Indian Delegation would like to give full latitude to the Special Committee to undertake this task in a manner in which they feel it could be best completed in the shortest possible time but not leaving

274

behind any of the vital aspects which inevitably enter Into the concept of aggression. While concluding my statement, I would like to reiterate that an incomplete definition would do incalculable harm by way of promoting the cause of the aggressor. and indefeating the very ends of justice and in the process destroying the true raison d'ente of the Special Committee itself.

INDIA USA URUGUAY SAUDI ARABIA IRAQ BURMA UNITED KINGDOM EL SALVADOR JORDAN SUDAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Dr. Nagendra Singh's Statement in the Sixth Committee in Reply to Statement of Pakistan Delegate

Following is the text of the Statement by Dr. Nagendra Singh, Representative of India, in the Sixth Committee, on November 3, 1971, in reply to the statement of the Representative of Pakistan:

I would speak only on a point of clarification because the Legal Committee should not be dragged into the political field, particularly when there are other U.N. forums for discussion of political matters. The points raised by the distinguished delegate of Pakistan regarding refugees and Bangla Desh have been discussed in the General Assembly and the First Committee and I need not burden the Sixth Committee with details in regard to the problem which has a political aspect. My statement to the Sixth Committee this morning was purely a legal approach to the problem of defining aggression. What I had submitted, Mr. Chairman, was that aggression should be defined in a comprehensive manner to cover all aspects of aggression, direct, indirect with areas and otherwise. In this connection, I had quoted the statement made by the distinguished delegate of Pakistan with which the Indian Delegation had wholeheartedly agreed. In continuation of that statement, I merely gave an illustration of what an unarmed aggression could be. To make myself clear,

let me quote again the statement of the distinguished delegate of Pakistan: "There is a clear need for ensuring that we so draft the definition as to defeat the ingenuity of any aggressor State in appearing to abide by the letter of the law even if it is clearly violating the spirit and true purpose of the law. The definition, therefore, should be so framed as to be capable of application to those situations where an act of aggression has taken place, however, carefully the aggressor State appears or tries to appear to be law-abiding member of the international community". I illustrated this proposition of the Pakistan delegation by giving an example of an invasion of millions unarmed civilians. I made no insinuations, but a legal approach to the same is necessary. Secondly, in regard to the point raised by Pakistan that there should be an ad-interim declaration on aggression, I would reiterate that the view of the Indian delegation is that you cannot both have a comprehensive definition as well as an ad-interim declaration. The two in the same breath would be contradictory. The statement of Pakistan which is quoted by me asks for a comprehensive definition. Yet the Pakistani delegation wants an ad-interim declaration. You can have one or the other. You cannot have both because the ad-interim declaration would be an incomplete effort covering aggression by armed force only. This incomplete approach would give a wrong impression to the whole world. I have already pointed out in my statement that a partial definition would be dangerous, as it would encourage aggression in the undefined field. I need hardly repeat these arguments over and over again. However, the distinguished friend from Pakistan is entitled to his viewpoint and I am entitled to hold my views on the subject It is for the Sixth Committee to consider bath these view-points. There is nothing more to be stated further in this regard. Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I thank profusely the delegate from Pakistan for the sympathy which he has expressed on humanitarian grounds for the victims of the cyclone in Orissa, on the east coast of India. Humanity is of paramount importance in human relations and must be of the same importance in inter-state relations also. We

appreciate what Pakistan has said and I would hope that human considerations will always weigh with human beings. In this connection, I may add, Mr. Chairman, that the whole world knows in the context of

275

world events today where humanity lies and the world public opinion is the judge in this regard.

I thank you, Sir, for giving the opportunity to explain the view of the Indian Delegation.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri S. Sen's Speech at U.N. General Assembly Welcoming the Chinese Peoples Republic to U.N.

Following is the text of the speech by the Indian Permanent Representative Shri Samar Sen On November 15, 1971 at the 1983rd meeting of the 26th session of the U.N. General Assembly welcoming the delegation of the People's Republic of China:

In 1949 the People's Republic of China came to power in the great and ancient land of China after a long and sustained revolution. In 1950 India was the first country to propose that, as a result of this change in China, the Chinese seat in the United Nations should be occupied by the representatives of the People's Republic of China. In spite of consistent efforts by India and an increasingly larger number of States, it has taken the United Nations 21 years to correct a perverse mistake. The fact that we find that today China is fully restored to its law-

ful rights in the United Nations is therefore a matter of great satisfaction to India.

The United Nations will undoubtedly be more realistic by the participation of the true representatives of China in our dell-berations and discussions. We would continue to believe that the major problems of the United Nations and the fulfilment of the Principles and Purposes of the Charter will be easier to handle with fuller membership.

When China was not properly represented there was always the possibility that the Government of nearly 800 million people, as well as the rest of the world, looked at the problems from their own perspectives and not through the full mutual appreciation of each other's point of view. This deficiency will now be removed and it is a great pity that our Secretary-General could not be present here with us to see the opening of a new era of open agreements through open diplomacy through this great forum. We are certain, however, as we wish him the speediest of recovery, that he would be greatly pleased at the warm welcome that we are giving today to the delegation of the People's Republic of China.

The two neighbouring countries, China and India, with the largest populations in the world, are bound by thousands of years of civilization and achievement. Since we both became masters of our destiny, we worked together at Bandung to formulate the principles of peaceful coexistence; we devised together Panchshila or the five principles of international conduct; and we have established many bonds of friendship and understanding, Admittedly, clouds have gathered in the development and strengthening of our bilateral relations; it is our hope that these clouds can soon be dispersed and that China and India will perform their common task with fullest co-operation and mutual confidence. It is in this context that we were pleased to receive a message from Premier Chou En-lai to our Prime Minister, which concluded with the words:

"May friendship between the peoples of China and India grow and develop

daily."

May I, in sharing, on behalf of India, these words of hope and good cheer, say that we look forward to working in close cooperation with the delegation of China to the United Nations. I extend to them our warmest welcome and our sincerest good wishes. A most exciting and hopeful future lies ahead of us and let us hope that all of us, all 131 delegations present, will have the ability and wisdom to work for it.

276

INDIA CHINA USA INDONESIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Sen's Speech at Third Committee on Refugees from East Bengal

Following is the text of the statement by Shri S. Sen, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations, in the Third Committee, on the report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, on November 18, 1971:

We have followed with great interest the statement of the distinguished High Commissioner for Refugees on the latest situation of the East Pakistani refugees in India. It is particularly gratifying to us that the High Commissioner has, in spite of his remarkable diplomatic sweep and skill, confirmed in every important particular the account we have been giving of all aspects to this formidable problem. He has just returned from India where he visited some refugee camps of his choice and was given all facilities to put his understandably limited time to the best use. On several occasions

we have expressed our appreciation for the work being done by Prince Sadruddin Agha Khan. His statement here has confirmed once again the full cooperation that he and his representatives in India have been receiving from the Government of India in carrying out their duties. We should not like to recall the tragic course of events in East Bengal which forced the massive number of Pakistani citizens to leave their homes and come and live in India in most difficult conditions. Nor is it our wish to speak about the efforts made by India to deal with the intolerable burdens imposed on us by the actions of Pakistani military junta. A detailed account of these efforts was placed before the recent meeting of UNHCR's Executive Committee in Geneva. At present we shall focus our attention mainly On steps to be taken to relieve the misery of the refugees, to the extent possible through the United Nations.

The tragedy and the immensity of the problem can be described in the High Commissioner's words. At the ECOSOC meeting in July this year he said:

"There is no doubt, therefore, that we are confronted with one of the major population movements of modem history, with all the tragic aspects of human misery and sufferings that such movements entail."

Reporting to his Executive Committee three months later in October he described it as a "challenge of unprecedented magnitude". And this month he said in a broadcast message over All India Radio:

"I have no doubt that the influx of refugees from East Pakistan into India, since six months, in terms of its magnitude is the worst problem of uprooted people that the world has ever faced."

It should be clear to all who have any feelings or objectivity that never before have so many people fled across an international frontier in such a short period or in such distressing conditions. When we first approached the United Nations on the 23rd

April 1971, for assistance to meet the needs of the refugees, they already totalled half a million. This number continued to increase as Pakistani military regime carried on with murder, loot, rape and other unspeakable atrocities. On 26th October the Special Consortium of the World Bank meeting in Paris announced that "more than 9.5 million refugees have entered India by now and the influx is continuing." The latest figure is 9,608,901 on 5th November; the daily average influx in September was 27,000 and in October 17,000.

This meeting in Paris was held to discuss the impact on the Indian economy of this large and continuing influx of refugees from East Pakistan. With your permission, I should like to read the text of the communique issued. It is not long-

"A special meeting of the consortium of governments and institutions interested in India's economic development was held in Paris on 26 October 1971 under the chairmanship of the World Bank. It discussed the impact on the Indian economy of the recent large and continuing influx of refugees from East Pakistan and assessed the cost of relief at \$ 700 million in the financial year ending March 1972.

277

The meeting was attended by representatives of the Governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, India, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, and by representatives of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Representatives of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand attended the meeting as observers.

The meeting heard statements by I. G. Patel, Secretary, Department of Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance, Government of India, and by Charles Mace, Deputy United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and considered a report on the cost of refugee relief prepared by the World Bank. More than 9.5 million refugees have entered India by now and the influx is continuing.

Delegates expressed deep concern about the situation and its serious consequences for the economic development of India and unanimously recognised the need for special assistance to offset the burden of refugee relief. Members emphasised that assistance for refugee relief should be additional to normal development assistance., Considering the nature of the problem this assistance should preferably be in the form of grants. To prevent drastic cutbacks of development expenditures in India, commitments of special assistance are required urgently and should be in a form which would provide immediate support to the budget of the Indian Government and the Indian economy generally.

It was the sense of the meeting that the problem of refugees in India was an international responsibility. The meeting noted that world-wide contributions pledged to date came to over \$ 200 million. Delegations urged the UNHCR as the focal point of the whole United Nations system to continue his efforts to seek contributions from the international community to cover the cost of relief-estimated at \$700 million. The countries represented at the meeting agreed, because of their special interest in India, that they would make efforts to meet a substantial part of the total need "

We in India deeply appreciate the offers of help from wherever they come and I should like to thank all Governments, international agencies, non-governmental organizations, voluntary agencies and private individuals - all of whom have done so much to help. But this response, generous as it is, takes care of only a small part of our needs. Between the requirements as assessed by the World Bank and the pledges so far made, the difference is nearly \$500 million. The actual gap is even wider since all the promises of help have not yet been fully kept.

The presence of millions of refugees has brought grievous impact on the economic, social and political life in India and is a continuing threat to India's stability and security. We wonder how many states in the world can receive nearly ten million refugees with more coming every day and still survive for six months. The driving of millions over millions of people into a neighbouring country in a manner and in such conditions as would endanger the existence of the receiving state is nothing but a civil invasion and an intolerable interference in its domestic affairs.

That is what we are facing today and India has become a victim of a new kind of aggression by the military regime of Pakistan. The High Commissioner has spoken of two principal fields of action; first, urgent relief measures for refugees in India, and secondly, the promotion of their voluntary repatriation. The action so far taken, for relief measures has been described fully in the statement of the High Commissioner himself. Voluntary repatriation is the only lasting solution to the problem. We emphasise that this is not only the best but an imperative solution. And that it must come soon. The international community as a whole is responsible for caring for the refugees and If today India is looking after the massive millions of Pakistani refugees, she-

278

is doing so as a trustee on behalf of the international community and strictly for the shortest time possible. Conditions which will persuade them to return home must be created without further delay. We cannot and do not accept their indefinite presence in India. We agree with the High Commissioner that the relief operation should not become yet another permanent political and econo-

mic burden on the international community. Since most of the burden has to be borne by India, what the High Commissioner has said is much more true for India herself.

In the Introduction to his Annual Report the Secretary-General stated that efforts to bring about the repatriation of refugees have so far been unavailing. Since President Yahya Khan announced his agreement to allow the East Pakistan refugees to return on 25th May, the total number of refugees in India has steadily increased. The crux of the matter is that international and government efforts in East Pakistan are increasingly hampered by the lack of substantial progress towards a political reconciliation."

To this reason for the lack of progress in repatriation must be added another and more basic explanation of why the influx has continued over these last six months. It has been described indeed as a haemorrhage. Unless we can diagnose the disease, we cannot provide any effective cure. Volumes of reports from impartial international observers which explain the causes exist but we do not have time to discuss all the details-, chiefly, the basic cause of this unprecedented movement of people is to be found in the massive, systematic and continued violation of the most fundamental human rights, Including the right to life itself. It amounts to a genocidal punishment to 75 million people. Seldom before, and certainly never after the UN Charter was promulgated, have human rights and fundamental freedoms been violated on such a vast scale and with so many brutalities and with such cynicism as has taken place this year in East Pakistan. This latter half of the 20th century when man is striving to conquer space and time, we have had the misfortune to see a gigantic operation of medieval butchery. There has been an attempt to crush and humiliate a people simply in an attempt to suppress their freely and democratically expressed will. I do not wish to recount the events that led to this grim drama staged East Pakistan since the mid-night of March 25th, although we can easily and readily place before this Committee unassailable facts of

the entire situation as it unfolded from day to day. But we must emphasise that no solution to the problem of East Pakistan refugees in India can be found without discussing the nature and extent of massive violation of human rights in East Pakistan.

Ever since the tragedy started there have been attempts to mislead and confuse the basic and root cause of this unprecedented movement of population. We understand these attempts by desperate and unwise men and we cannot and will not sympathise with them. At first, all was sought to be hidden and protested by citing domestic jurisdiction and internal affairs. Subsequently, persistent efforts have been made to present the problem inside East Pakistan as an India-Pakistan dispute. Yet another argument is that India is preventing the return of the refugees, as if India could afford, under any circumstances, to feed or look after nearly ten million refugees for any length of time; and now established facts are perversely challenged in the hope that impact of public condemnation will be diffused, and so, reduced. But truth is hard to conceal: Pakistan's propaganda figures for refugees have been contradicted by President Yahya Khan himself, who the other day, when discussing the question, said: "Two or three million, there may even be four million." The President is obviously in doubt and is aware of the canard whose only purpose is to involve India in a process which has never been followed in any refugee problem and yet his delegation continues to give figures as if they are based on anything except political imagination. It would indeed be a remarkable feat to count absent people. It is also noteworthy that Pakistan's figure of 200,000 refugees having returned to their homes has remained unchanged over the last three months. And then the figure is nicely divided and rounded upto 1,40,000 Muslims and 60,000 Hindus, at the same time, as the High Commissioner has been informed that 64,000 passed through reception centres and 1,36,000 came back on their own. Here again is another instance of counting people who no one knows how they came.

But then people, who first described all the refugees as "criminals, who define all free voters as "anti-state" elements, who call all freedom fighters as "miscreants" or now "Indian infiltrators", cannot be expected to be too scrupulous about facts.

To discuss the mechanics of repatriation before creating the basic conditions for making repatriation possible and practicable is unrealistic and ineffective. For facilitating the repatriation of the refugees, the High Commissioner made a pertinent comment to his Executive Committee in Geneva last month. He repeated the same comment today when he said: "In our past experience, if and when a settlement had occurred in the country of origin, a system of mutual cooperation and help was established with the active participation of UNHCR which facilitated a repatriation. Until this stage is reached, substantial and well organised repatriation cannot make any sense and the trend is difficult to reverse."

We return once again, therefore, to the fundamental cause of the crisis in Fast Pakistan and the ceaseless flow of refugees. "The basic problem," writes the Secretary-General, "can be solved only if a political solution based on the reconciliation and the respect of humanitarian principles is achieved." The international community is entitled to ask if any solution to the basic issues which accompanied this man-made disaster, is being worked for. We see no effective attempt being made in that direction; on the contrary, much evidence is available that sophistry and confusion between great right and great wrong are being encouraged to conceal a lack of courage and to justify inaction. Events of the past months, with the understandable popular resistance to the discredited regime and its methods is increasing steadily inside East Pakistan, should now make it clear that a climate of confidence can be created in East Pakistan only through reconciliation with the already elected and accepted leaders of the people of East Bengal. It is less than a year back the East Pakistanis voted almost to a man for a certain leadership and a well defined programme and they are 75 million

of them - the majority of the population of the whole of Pakistan.

Regrettably, the only attempts which have been made by the Government of Pakistan in this direction are propaganda measures to beguile increased international concern for a political solution. This concern was widely unmistakably expressed during the general debate of the Assembly. At the same time, military repression continues with the burning of whole villages as reprisals, and on wrong information, even in areas next to the capital of East Pakistan, and other brutalities are periodically and frequently reported in the foreign press.

Diverting attention from this main cause of the trouble will not solve the problem before us. To hurl accusations against India and deliberately to create tension through military concentration on the Indian borders, are totally negative and dangerous policies. We deplore these as much as the violation of human rights in East Pakistan.

We agree with every word of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Denmark when he said on 16th November 1971 before the First Committee: "The Danish Government appeals, as others have done, to the Government of Pakistan for moderation and restraint, with a view to bringing to an end the violence in East Pakistan. Only a Political settlement based on respect for human rights and the freely expressed will of the People can solve the problem of East Pakistan." Can such an expression of view in the larger interests of the subcontinent and the world be termed as an act of noncooperation or of political motivation? No Propaganda can change a problem which is wholly and essentially a problem between the Government of Pakistan and the people of East Pakistan into one of a dispute between India and Pakistan. The basic problem lies inside Fast Pakistan and must be solved there itself so that the refugees can go back under credible guarantees for safety of life, property and honour.

However, such reports as we have Indicate that the conditions in East Pakistan are

distressing and that relief efforts are not making much headway. We shall comment more fully after we have heard Mr. Paul Marc Henri.

To sum up, Madam Chairman, the burden on India imposed by the political refugees from East Pakistan continues to grow and is becoming intolerable. We all know the reasons for this most massive movement of population in human history in such a

280

short time. And judging from the statements made by the numerous delegations in the General Assembly during its 26th session, it would appear that our organization as a whole is clear on the steps that should be taken by the Government of Pakistan to reverse the present trends. There is however deep disappointment that neither the United Nations nor individual states have yet been able to persuade that Government to take steps towards a solution. We, in India, who are facing the most vicious impact of the problem created by another country, have tried to deal with it as humanely as possible, and at a great cost to ourselves. It is not by skirting round the problem, not by expressing sympathies alone, not by rendering financial or other assistance, however urgent such assistance certainly is, and not by evading the responsibility for taking forthright decisions, that the international community can act justly towards 10 million helpless and unfortunate refugees taking temporary shelter in India. It is by clear reasoning, a clear grasp of the basic causes of the problem and by a determined effort to make the Government of Pakistan see reason and act in conformity with the acknowledged principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms, that this Committee or for that matter the UN can truly discharge their responsibility towards suffering millions of East Pakistanis. Before I conclude, I repeat that all the causes of the crisis lie in East Pakistan and it can be solved only in co-operation with the elected and accepted leaders of the people of East Pakistan and in accordance with their freely expressed will. Meanwhile, as long as we eat, the refugees will eat also.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND FRANCE AUSTRALIA BELGIUM CANADA DENMARK GERMANY ITALY JAPAN THE NETHERLANDS NORWAY SWEDEN NEW ZEALAND PERU

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri B. P. Das's Statement in Third Committee

Following is the text of the Statement by Shri B. P. Das, Member of Parliament, Representative of India, in the Third Committee, on the report of the Assistant Under-Secretary General of the United Nations East Pakistan Belief operation (UNEPRO), on November 19, 1971:

Speaking in this Committee yesterday, Ambassador Sen welcomed the statement of the distinguished High Commissioner for Refugees and paid a tribute to his work as the focal point of assistance to the refugees coming from East Pakistan into India. I should like to express once again our admiration for this work. The statement of UNHCR, after dealing comprehensively with the relief measures being undertaken for the refugees, emphasised that their voluntary repatriation was the only solution. It also brought out forcefully that unless, and I quote: "There is a settlement in the country of origin", there can be no significant progress in the voluntary repatriation of the refugees. The High Commissioner also said that the refugees would only repatriate in significant number when they were convinced that real peace and security prevails.

Today it is my duty to pay tribute to the lucid and bold statement by the distinguished Assistant Under-Secretary General on the relief operation inside East Pakistan. The statement corroborates the conclusion reached by the distinguished High Commissioner for Refugees. While Prince Sadruddin said that voluntary repatriation required real peace and security, Monsier Paul Marc Henri has also said that security and peaceful conditions inside East Pakistan were indispensable for the progress of the relief operation inside that area.

The suffering caused by te man-made disaster in East Pakistan is the same, whether for its victims in their own homeland or for the victims who have fled for shelter in a foreign land. We support all efforts that might bring relief to the people of East Pakistan, and we hope sincerely that the activities of UNEPRO will succeed in bringing relief to those for whom it is intended.

What, however, struck us in the statement of the Assistant Under-Secretary General was his note of warning and concern regarding the operation of UNEPRO. He

281

said that while there was hardly any shortage of supplies at present, the main difficulty lay in their reaching the people. Among these difficulties he mentioned, were, firstly, freedom of access to certain areas in East Pakistan because of military activities; secondly, the problem of augmenting purchasing power of the population in circumstances of economic dislocation; and thirdly, the question of non-discriminatory distribution in view of allegation that at the distribution level, the local authorities were using supplies for political ends. Monsier Paul Marc Henri warned that the whole operation was reaching the cross roads. Though he did not amplify, obviously one course is to insist on an even more powerful and extensive UN operation in East Pakistan with all its implications to surmount the difficulties mentioned by Monsier Henri.

It is obvious that neither the Secretary-General nor the donor countries envisaged such steps when the UNEPRO was launched nor is this a feasible proposition. The second

alternative is the intensification of efforts to create normal conditions inside East Pakistan in cooperation with the people of the land. So far as we are concerned, there can be no doubt which is the preferable alternative. Among its other defects, the first alternative would be totally impracticable. it is not possible for the United Nations or any other relief organization to function in any area without the active and the willing cooperation of the local people. The second alternative is the one which coincides with the general wish of the international community.

I would like to pay a tribute to the field staff of the UNEPRO who are working in east Pakistan under most difficult conditions. We have no doubt as to their being motivated solely by the humanitarian course set for them by the Secretary-General. To the extent that they have been able to bring succour to the needy, they deserve full support. Since, however, certain important questions have been raised about the success of the UNEPRO and it does appear to be reaching a critical stage, it is necessary to be watchful and keep the operation under constant review.

There is yet another point regarding the UNEPRO that I should like to place before the Committee. The Secretary-General launched UNEPRO as a humanitarian operation and this was never intended to be, nor can it ever be a substitute for the political solution inside East Pakistan. Should the donor countries come to consider that the UNEPRO is a way of solving the refugee problem in India, it would be wholly an unrealistic proposition. This Committee will, I am sure, avoid such an impression. Even if East Pakistan was over-flowing with rice and other foods, people will continue to take refuge outside it and refuse to return to their homeland as long as political persecution continues. People have fled to India because they have been terrorised and are full of fear of being killed and maimed and humiliated and not because there is shortage of food or other amenities.

Madam Chairman, if we again and

again reiterate the necessity of a political solution as opposed to a military one inside East Pakistan, this does not mean that we intend to dictate terms to Pakistan as we are sometimes accused of doing. After all, India is not alone in suggesting such a solution of the root cause that has triggered off the two operations we are discussing in this Committee. Several delegations speaking here have referred to the necessity of a political solution with the already elected representatives of East Pakistan. Nor does the suggestion that unless there is political solution inside East Pakistan conditions are likely to get worse, amount to a threat. Several countries have said exactly the same thing and it is quite unfair to single out India for such accusations. After all, we have to remember that India is the principal victim, of the events inside- Fast Pakistan and is naturally concerned about the situation.

Yesterday, Ambassador Sen ignored the usual allegations made by Pakistan against India. I have absolutely no intention to refer to these today. But the distinguished representative of Pakistan made a very serious allegation that the Prime Minister of India in a reported statement supported disintegration of Pakistan. I want to state categorically that it was absolutely false and baseless and the Prime Minister herself categorically denied having at any time made such a remark. I think one should take a little care to ascertain truth while

282 quoting statements by Heads of Governments.

I shall quote from the Prime Minister's statement in the Parliament which she made on her return from her tour, on November 15. She said and I quote:

"Mr. Deputy Speaker, I conclude this statement with the reminder that in the community of nations our country symbolises the urge for peace, freedom and justice. There was a time when ours was the lone voice in the world which was in the grip of cold war. Even in

the midst of grave crises which the military rulers of Pakistan have created for us, our people, our country and this great Parliament of the largest democracy in the world, have maintained the spirit of peace and of self-restraint. We have refused to be excited by threat or provocation from across our borders. Let us then continue to conduct ourselves with quiet confidence in ourselves so that the world should see and know that India cannot be browbeaten nor lulled into a false sense of security. Calmness of spirit and strength go together. India is calm and we are capable of taking decisions in defence of our security and our stability."

Let me make it clear here that we have never advocated the secession of Fast Pakistan or the break-up of that country-If the territorial integrity of Pakistan today is in jeopardy it is entirely because of the actions of the Government of Pakistan and there is no use blaming others for the situation that now exists inside East Pakistan.

In conclusion, Madam Chairman, my delegation would like to offer its comments on the two proposals which were placed before this Committee yesterday. We would like to make our position clear on this matter. First of all, there can be no question of our being equated with Pakistan so far as this problem is concerned. The problem arose inside East Pakistan to which we were never a party and it can be solved only inside East Pakistan. We are concerned primarily because we are the victims of the consequences of what happened Inside East Pakistan which is an intolerable burden on us. Secondly, unless the root cause of the refugee influx as well as the dislocation in East Pakistan is clearly recognised, we shall not be able to suggest correct remedies. If the UN shies away from recognising the fact that there has been a massive violation of human rights inside East Pakistan and that the situation can only be ameliorated through a reconciliation between the Government of Pakistan and the people of East

Pakistan on the basis of the freely expressedwill of the people of East Pakistan, it cannot contribute to the solution of the problem. We are encouraged by the fact that many delegations who spoke yesterday and today have recognised in varying degrees the above propositions. It is clear therefore that any outcome of our deliberations should properly reflect those considerations.

We are grateful to the representatives of Netherlands and New Zealand on the one hand and Tunisia on the other, who have suggested a resolution and a formulation, respectively, for the Committee's consideration. We appreciate their serious concern for the problem and sincere desire to see an end to this problem. But we regret that neither of these formulations fully meets with the needs of the situation. To take the Tunisian formula, its very premise is unacceptable to us. How can cooperation between Governments alone solve a problem, the root of which lies in a dispute between a Government and its own citizens? How can India and Pakistan be expected to cooperate in solving this problem unless there is a settlement between the Government of Pakistan and the people of East Bengal

As regards the draft resolution tabled by Netherlands and New Zealand,. my delegation feels that it is not comprehensive enough and does not refer to the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms at all. We hope it will be possible for the three delegations - Sweden having also cosponsored it now - to take these comments into account. I have already outlined these essential ingredients.

The Indian delegation has not taken any initiative in proposing a draft resolution. Even though the situation is of particular

283

concern to India because of the unbearable burden imposed on us, we feel that the purely humanitarian question of the refugees is an international responsibility and not exclusively of India. We continue to look to the wisdom and concern of the international community to find a way out of what the

High Commissioner described yesterday as a cruel and gigantic problem. But at the same time, I should like to make it clear that India cannot be a party to any conclusion arising from our deliberations which is either inadequate to meet the situation or which suggests the wrong path. It is a matter of regret and we cannot help saying this, that the United Nations have so far proved to be impotent either in preventing the massive violation of human rights in East Pakistan or stemming the civil invasion committed by Pakistan against India by throwing out millions of their citizens Into our country.

If the United Nations still refuse to recognise the reality and come to grips with the root cause of the problem I do not know how the UN and particularly this Humanitarian Committee can justify their existence and can inspire confidence in the common people all over the world about its capacity and willingness to defend human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Let me still hope that something positive and useful will emerge out of the deliberations of this Committee which will do justice to the cause of the unfortunate millions who had to run away from their homeland under most tragic and inhuman conditions.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC NEW ZEALAND TUNISIA SWEDEN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri P. K. Banerjee's Statement on World Disarmament Conference

Following is the text of the statement

by Indian Delegate Shri P. K. Banerjee, in the U.N. General Assembly, on World Disarmament Conference, On November 19, 1971:

On behalf of the delegation of India, I should like to welcome the participation of the delegation of the People's Republic of China in our work in the General Assembly and, in particular, in our discussions on the question of disarmament.

The problem of disarmament is the most vital and urgent problem that faces mankind in this nuclear age. The ever-mounting arms race Poses the supreme question of the survival of mankind; it causes International tensions, threatens world peace and diverts valuable resources from the much needed economic and social development to unproductive and destructive purposes.

However, mankind has never known disarmament before. The achievement of disarmament is also made difficult by the existence of deep-seated mistrust and deep-rooted suspicion among nations. Besides any efforts that Governments might make, there is an imperative need to mobilize world public opinion in favour of disarmament.

A question that is particularly relevant at the present moment is the future of the organization of disarmament discussions so that the best possible results can be obtained. Our experience of the long history of disarmament discussions has taught us that it is essential to have such discussions on two planes: a deliberative plane and a negotiating plane.

A deliberative plane is needed so that all States of the world should have the opportunity of taking part in disarmament discussions and should be enabled to express their views on the various disarmament questions. Furthermore, the international community could give guidelines for concrete negotiations on various measures in the field of disarmament. The need for the attainment of world security through disarmament demands the universality of participation of all States in a deliberative forum.

A negotiating plane is also essential so

284

be conducted in a business-like manner with a view to reaching agreements on treaties and other internationally binding instruments. Disarmament questions and the various steps to be taken to deal with them are highly complicated matters requiring a great deal of detailed, if not dedicated, work. It is not possible to negotiate in large gatherings. Detailed and hard negotiations can only be undertaken in a small body, preferably away from the glare of publicity and the pressure of propaganda.

In recent years disarmament discussions have borne some fruit, and this has in no small measure been due to the fact that disarmament discussions have been conducted on two planes, namely, the deliberative plane and the negotiating plane.

The General Assembly has held discussions every year on disarmament questions, and the United Nations Disarmament Commission has also met on a few occasions. Their deliberations have provided a direction and a sense of purpose, and have also established guidelines for concrete negotiations. But the actual negotiations have been conducted in a small body, the Committee on Disarmament. The link between the deliberative forum and the negotiating body has been maintained, since the Committee on Disarmament has taken the guidelines for its work from the General Assembly and, in its turn, the General Assembly has reviewed the work of the Committee on Disarmament and has charted the path for further work.

It has now been suggested that a world disarmament conference be convened so that disarmament discussions can be speeded up. India has, together with all the other non-aligned States, supported the idea of convening a world disarmament conference in such meetings as the summit conference of the non-aligned countries held in Belgrade, Cairo and Lusaka. The ministerial consultative meeting of non-aligned countries held only recently in New York made similar recom-

mendations. The General Assembly of the United Nations, in Its resolution 2D30 (XX) of 1965 endorsed that proposal of the non-aligned States. However, such a conference could not be convened, although various informal discussions took place from time to time during 1965 and 1966 especially.

The delegation of India is in favour of further efforts being made with a view to reaching agreement on the convening of a world disarmament conference. The delegation of India, therefore, fully supports that draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union in document A/L.631, of 28 September 1971. The universality of participation of all States, whether or not they are Members of the United Nations, and the need for careful preparation are the two essential conditions for the success of a world disarmament conference, particularly in order to ensure that the results of such a conference would provide a real impetus and a guideline to negotiations on meaningful measures of actual disarmament.

In keeping with its basic approach to the question of organization of disarmament discussion, the delegation of India remains firmly convinced that while every effort should be made to convene a world disarmament conference nothing should be done which might in any way retard or hamper the work of the existing negotiating body on disarmament, namely the Committee on Disarmament. In fact, every effort should be made to strengthen that negotiating body by securing the participation of France and the Peoples Republic of China in its work and through an improvement in its procedure of work. The committee on Disarmament is doing useful work, though progress has been slow, there is need for maximum co-operation and assistance in the work of that Committee.

The delegation of India accords its support to the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation and it is our hope that the decade of the seventies will be a decade of disarmament, continued progress and stable peace.

INDIA CHINA USA EGYPT YUGOSLAVIA ZAMBIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Delegate's Statement on Palestine Refugees

Following is the text of the statement made by Shri I. J. Bahadur Singh, Representative of India on the Special Political Committee, on November 26, 1971:

Mr. Chairman,

My delegation has listened with great interest to the various aspects of the problem of the Palestine refugees - which have been dealt with by the preceding speakers. This is a matter which has been of great concern to us over the years. We do not think it is either desirable or possible to divide the problem into two water-tight financial and political compartments. An emergency by its very nature requires an immediate remedy. A 21-year old problem. however, cannot be dealt with on the basis of an emergency or solved by ad hoc measures. In fact any attempt to deal with such a problem on an ad hoc year to year basis delays and prevents a permanent solution.

Each year we discuss the chronic problem of UNRWA finances, find temporary solutions to save the agency from restricting its already restricted relief work, issue a few more appeals, collect some more money and regretfully witness some more trimming down of its services.

Mr. Chairman, once people are forced to leave their homes and country, an are

obliged to take refuge in another country, the first Problem of course is to provide them with food and shelter. But this problem, though essential and immediate, must remain temporary. Food and shelter are not a solution. The basic problem and the only problem is the return of the refugees to their homes. Initial assistance provided in an emergency cannot replace appropriate long-range treatment.

We are dealing with this problem since 1947 on an emergency basis and continue to Ignore the only solution which is permanent and just, the restoration of the inalienable rights of the refugees. Article 13(2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states:

"Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The General Assembly's resolution 194(III) adopted on December 11, 1948 said:

"that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours shall be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date. . ."

During the last 21 years various United Nations bodies have adopted 220 resolutions on the Palestine question and its ramifications. What has been the result of these resolutions? I can do no better than quote what the Commissioner General of UNRWA has highlighted in his report (A/8413)

"Despite more frequent public recognition of the need to take account of the legitimate right of the Palestine refugees in any political settlement and the adoption of resolution 2672(XXV) by which the General Assembly recognised the entitlement of the people of Palestine to equal rights and self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and declared that full respect of the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensible element in the establish-

ment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East; there was by the end of the year little to lessen the frustrations of the refugees."

My delegation has listened to the debate on the financial aspects of the problem with misgivings. We feel that more attention is being paid to interim arrangements than to final solutions. The very fact that a section of a population is obliged to take refuge in a neighbouring state or states is indicative of the gross violations of human rights. The international community cannot absolve itself from its duty by paying conscience money for the pitiful maintenance of refugees in camps.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 1949-50 the total population of refugees registered with UNRWA was 960,021, by June 71, It was 1,468,166 - a distressing increase of more than 500,000 refugees. But a much more disconcerting increase is that among babies

286

and children. In 1950-51, 2,174 babies and children were registered with UNRWA. By June this year the number has increased to 352,143. A whole new generation is born in the refugee camps with no home, no hope - acceptable neither in their own country nor in the host countries. More than a million and half people have been displaced, some of them for the third time within a span of the last 21 years. And the process is still going on. This summer the Israelis bull-dozed part of a refugee camp in Gaza and removed some of the Palestinians to settlements in the Sinai desert. Another 50 Arab families were compulsorily expelled from the region.

For more than 20 years this gross violation of human rights remains unresolved while this Committee finds itself in the tragic and ridiculous situation of considering penny-pinching alternatives. If sugar is eliminated from the basic ration, we are told, a Certain amount of money is saved, as would also be done if we cut down on soap, milk, hot meals for children and so on. Perhaps never in the history of the world such

a tragic situation has been dealt with so little concern. Mr. Chairman, if I speak with feelings on the subject, it is because we feel the full impact of this tragedy. We ourselves at this very moment are burdened with nearly 10 million refugees. The Palestine refugee pose the longest unsolved problem whereas the East Bengal refugees confront us by their numbers and suffering with the most unprecedented tragedy of modern times.

The only solution to the problem of refugees is that they go back to their hearths and homes. The distinguished delegate of Kuwait in a well reasoned intervention earlier in the debate has said that the return of the refugees cannot be made contingent on peace between Israel and its Arab neighbours. We fully subscribe to that view. Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Egypt by virtue of becoming hosts to these unfortunate refugees cannot be coerced into signing a peace treaty with Israel so that the future of the Palestine refugees is settled. Refugees are a direct responsibility of the state which has forced them to flee and not of the State who has come forward to their succour.

Israel has disrupted the economy of Jordan, Lebanon and Syria by forcing refugees on their territory. The influx of these refugees has created political pressures. social problems and economic difficulties for these countries. To hold these countries to ransom for the ultimate solution of the fate of the refugees is unjust and inhuman. My delegation rejects the argument that the solution of refugee problem "must be developed and implemented within the framework of an agreement between the parties on the terms of a final overall peace settlement." There are no other parties only one party which has forced innocent people to take refuge in foreign territory. We maintain that Israeli responsibility towards its refugees is independent of her relations with her neighbours. Arab neighbours of Israel are not bound either legally, or morally to negotiate, cooperate, or discuss the subject of refugees with Israel. Israel must take back its refugees. It is her duty to create a climate of confidence in which these refugees go back to their homes in safety with dignity and honour enjoying full right of self-determination,

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the plight of the refugees is a humanitarian problem, but it cannot be solved without a political settlement. It is inextricably mixed up with the basic human rights of people and no humanitarian argument should deflect us from its political ramifications.

Inspite of our own burden to which I have already referred my government has decided to increase its 1972 contribution to UNRWA by 20% of the level of its 1971 contribution. It is a small increase, but we hope this symbolic gesture would be matched by those governments which in previous years have given substantial contributions.

Before concluding my statement I would like to associate my delegation with the tributes of appreciation earlier expressed to Sir John Rennie, the Commissioner General of UNRWA, his predecessor Dr. Lawrence Michelmore and the staff of UNRWA for their thankless but courageous task which they have carried out in spite of financial difficulties. We would also like to thank the Working Group and its distinguished Chairman, Ambassador Nuri Eren for the Commendable way in which the group has worked to solve the immediate financial difficulties of UNRWA.

287

INDIA USA ISRAEL KUWAIT EGYPT JORDAN LEBANON SYRIA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Indian Delegate Shri Banerjee's Address on Disarmament at U.N. First Committee

The following is the text of address by the Indian Delegate, Shri P. K. Banerjee to the First Committee an November 29, 1971, outlining India's position on Disarmament:

On behalf of the delegation of India, I should like to welcome the delegation of the People's Republic of China. We look forward to our co-operation in the field of disarmament.

The delegation of India had, in its statement before the First Committee last year, drawn the attention of this august body to the two main disquieting features in the present situation concerning disarmament: first, an ever-mounting arms race and, second, a growing disappointment in regard to any genuine progress on disarmament,

The crux of the problem of curbing the arms race and of making progress on disarmament lies in the field of nuclear weapons. That is why the international community has repeatedly called for the highest priority to be given to measures in the field of nuclear disarmament. If this supreme purpose is not kept in mind and meaningful steps are not taken towards that end, the problem of disarmament will not be resolved and every effort will be in vain.

As regards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, the delegation of India would stress that speedier progress could be achieved if the following four specific suggestions could be adopted:

First, the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control can only be achieved through a step-by-step approach, whereby a series of partial measures should be negotiated. However, it is essential to always bear in mind that any partial measure or measures should only be conceived of as steps leading towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. Partial measures could be broadly classified into

three categories: measures to prevent armament, measures to limit armament and measures of disarmament, It is imperative that an appropriate balance should be maintained among these various categories of partial measures, with particular stress being laid on measures of actual disarmament.

Secondly, it would be useful if the Soviet Union and the United States were to submit revised versions of their respective draft treaties on general and complete disarmament, which they had presented in 1962, in the light of the various developments which have since taken place and the many suggestions which have been put forward.

Thirdly, the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations drawn up by the Soviet Union and the United States on 20 September 1961 and commended by the General Assembly should be the main basis for concrete work.

Fourthly, the general order of priorities to be followed in disarmament discussions should be as suggested in the Declaration on Disarmament, which was issued by the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned States held in Lusaka in September 1970. The general order of priorities recommended by that large assembly of, nations is as follows:

(a) measures in the field of nuclear disarmament; (b) other measures of priority in the disarmament field; and (c) non-armament or confidence-building measures.

The question of the elimination of chemical and bacteriological (biological), weapons has been in the forefront of discussions in the field of disarmament in recent years. This has been rightly so, because bacteriological and chemical weapons are weapons of mass destruction. The international community has been increasingly concerned about the continued development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological and chemical weapons. The approach which received the largest support in the international community was that both bacteriological and chemical weapons should be eli-

minated jointly or simultaneously, because there existed an inseparable link between the two categories of weapons. The Geneva Protocol of 1925 is based on that principal and fundamental approach.

288

However, it has now been generally recognized that the situation as It has recently developed in regard to discussions concerning bacteriological and chemical weapons makes It possible to reach agreement at the present moment on a convention on the elimination of biological and toxin weapons only and that further, negotiations would have to be undertaken on the elimination of chemical weapons.

In the discussions that have taken place in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament on the formulations of a draft convention on biological and toxin weapons, which would enjoy the general support not only of members of that Committee but would subsequently be acceptable to the wide membership of the United Nations, the delegation of India has stressed that five propositions should be borne in mind. Let me enumerate:

Firstly, the Geneva Protocol of 1925 should be safeguarded and nothing should be done which might either adversely affect the Protocol or cause doubts on its continuing validity.

Secondly, the inseparable link between bacteriological (biological) and chemical weapons, on which the Geneva Protocol of 1925 rests, should be fully reflected and respected in the new convention on biological and toxin weapons.

Thirdly, negotiations should be continued actively with a view to reaching agreement on the elimination of chemical weapons also.

Fourthly, the field of biology and chemistry should remain peaceful and international co-operation should develop therein.

Fifthly, there should be a clear recognition and implementation of the twin principles that the resources released by disarmament should be used for peaceful purposes and that a substantial portion of such savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament should be devoted to promoting the economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries.

A revised draft convention on chemical and toxin weapons has now been jointly cosponsored and submitted by the Soviet Union and the United States, together with the socialist States and the NATO allies members of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament. The delegations of the Soviet Union and the United States, have, in their respective statements before the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament and before the First Committee of the General Assembly, made remarks and comments in regard to the various provisions of their revised draft convention on biological and toxin weapons. The delegation of India has carefully noted these explanations and comments, In particular, it is reassuring to know that the exemption in regard to biological agents or toxins, which would be permitted for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes, would not in any way create a loophole in regard to the production or retention of biological and toxin weapons. There is, however, an inconsistency between the last two preambular paragraphs of the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons, which need to be clarified. The penultimate preambular paragraph mentions the objective of excluding completely - and I am underlining "excluding completely" - the possibility of the use of such weapons, whereas the last preambular paragraph only talks of minimizing - and I am underlining "minimizing" the risk of their use. Now, this inconsistency appears to us perhaps as a drafting error, which has been made inadvertently-The delegation of India would therefore Propose that the last preambular paragraph of the draft convention should be reformulated as follows:

"Convinced that such use would be repugnant to the conscience of mankind and that no effort should be spared to remove this risk".

It is reassuring that, in the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons, the link between bacteriological weapons and chemical weapons has been clearly recognized, and the need to conclude a convention on chemical weapons as soon as possible has been accepted as a binding commitment.

It would have been most appropriate if the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons had contained an affirmation of the principle that a substantial portion of the

289

savings derived from measures in the field of disarmament would be devoted to promoting economic and social development, particularly in the developing countries. The joint working paper (CCD/341), submitted by eleven members of the Group of Twelve and supported by Argentina, made this suggestion, which was not accepted by the main co-authors of the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons. In the view of the delegation of India, the minimum that should be done is to affirm that principle in any resolution that the General Assembly might adopt in regard to the draft convention on biological and toxin weapons. The delegation of India has therefore cosponsored this suggestion in document A/C.1/L.582.

In keeping with its basic approach in the field of biological and chemical weapons, the delegation of India, together with the members of the Group of Twelve, has cosponsored in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament a joint working paper on possible elements of future agreement on the elimination of chemical weapons. The delegation of India remains firmly of the opinion that negotiations on chemical weapons should be actively Pursued. The joint working paper provides an excellent basis for developing guidelines for further negotiations on chemical weapons. It is the hope of the delegation of India that the

General Assembly will commend the basic approach contained in that joint working paper. it is with this Purpose in view that the delegation of India has co-sponsored the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.581 regarding future negotiations on the elimination of chemical weapons.

The fundamental problem in regard to a comprehensive test ban is that nuclear weapon tests are continuing because the development and production of nuclear weapons is going on- A rationale behind the continued production and testing of nuclear weapon systems is the so-called theory of the balance of deterrence and the supposed belief that International security rested on such a balance. The international community has never accepted such a rationale, for international security can be based only on disarmament The continued development and production of nuclear weapons poses a threat to International peace and security.

it should be clearly recognized that even the problem of a ban on nuclear weapon testing in the three environments, namely, the atmosphere, outer space and under water, has not been fully resolved and that there should not be any doubt in that regard. The partial test ban Treaty of 1963 has remained doubly partial, for not only are underground nuclear weapon tests beyond its purview, but the Treaty has not been adhered to by all the nuclear-weapon States. It is, therefore, a fragile Treaty. Furthermore, the Treaty is being eroded through venting from underground nuclear weapon tests. The joint memorandum of the group of eight non-aligned countries in document ENDC/235 in 1968 drew attention to the infringements of the partial test ban Treaty from venting of underground nuclear weapon tests and expressed apprehension that the very existence of the Treaty might be endangered.

India's dedication to the cause of a comprehensive ban on all nuclear weapon tests is a matter of record. Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru was the first world statesman to draw attention to that problem as early as 1954. It was at the initiative of

the Government of India that an item on the "urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermonuclear tests" was included in the agenda of the General Assembly in 1959 and has been discussed each year ever since.

Year after year, the General Assembly has since called upon all nuclear-weapon States to suspend nuclear weapon tests in all environments. In 1962, the General Assembly, by its resolution 1762 A(XVII), condemned all nuclear weapon tests. From 1963 onwards, the General Assembly has urged all States that have not yet done so to adhere without further delay to the partial test ban Treaty and has called for a treaty banning underground nuclear weapon tests. However, there has been no movement in the respective attitudes and positions of the nuclear-weapon Powers.

A stage has now been reached when the issues in the field of a comprehensive test ban should be clearly defined and the lines of action delineated without any further delay or equivocation, The delegation of India would like to submit four main con-

290

siderations in this regard. Firstly, the provisions of the partial test ban Treaty should be fully observed, and those nuclear-weapon States which have not yet adhered to that Treaty should do so without any further delay. Secondly, whatever be the differences on the issues of verification of a ban on underground nuclear weapon tests and notwithstanding any other considerations, all testing of nuclear weapons in all environments must be immediately suspended. A continued testing of nuclear weapons contains serious health hazards and encourages and enhances the arms race. Only an immediate suspension of all nuclear weapon tests can facilitate the solution of the problem of a comprehensive test ban. Half-hearted measures and palliatives, including the socalled restraining or transitional or confidence-building measures, are not the answer to the problem, and might even contribute to a legitimization of certain categories of nuclear weapon testing. Thirdly, the meaning of a comprehensive test ban should be

clearly understood. A comprehensive test ban has two aspects: (a) all nuclear weapon tests in all environments should be prohibited; (b) all nuclear-weapon States should be parties to it. Fourthly, negotiations should be undertaken for a separate treaty to prohibit all nuclear weapon tests in the underground environment. Attention, however, should simultaneously be focused on the need to conclude an agreement on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

India has constantly been in favour of a comprehensive nuclear weapon test ban, and has supported efforts to put a complete end to the testing of nuclear weapons in an environments. India-Intends to abide by that policy. At the same time, India has been aware of the tremendous contribution which the technology of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, including peaceful nuclear explosions, can make to the economy of the developing world. The benefits of this technology should be available to all States without discrimination. This view was forcefully endorsed by the non-aligned countries at the Lusaka Conference. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) should provide service for nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes to all its members without discrimination in accordance with its Statute.

The delegation of India welcomes the report on the economic and social consequences of the arms race (A/8469), which has been prepared by the Secretary-General with the assistance of consultant experts. The report should prove useful in our work in the field of disarmament. We are in agreement with the unanimous conclusions of the expert consultants. The delegation of India earnestly hopes that the General Assembly would accept the carefully-worded recommendation contained in the Report that:

"In order to draw the attention of the Governments and peoples of the world to the direction the arms race is taking, the Secretary-General should keep the facts-under periodic review." (A/8469, P. 44). India, together with all the non-aligned countries, has subscribed to the concept of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace. This concept means that the area of the Indian Ocean be kept free from great Power rivalries and confrontations. we therefore congratulate and welcome the initiative of Ceylon in inscribing an item at the current session of the General Assembly, SO that serious discussions could take place on how our objective could be achieved. There is need for intensive consultations in order that a consensus could be reached on a declaration by the General Assembly regarding the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

It is our firm belief that no matter how long and difficult the road, the international community hag to persevere in Its noble task of achieving global security through disarmament. The delegation of India would continue to support all efforts which are aimed at bringing about genuine, balanced and effective disarmament.

291

INDIA CHINA USA ZAMBIA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC ARGENTINA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

LIMA MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE OF "GROUP OF 77"

Shri L. N. Mishra's Address at Ministerial Meeting of "Group of 77"

Following is the text of the Foreign Trade Minister, Shri Mishra's, speech at the Ministerial meeting of the "Group of 77" in Lime (Peru) on November 2,1971:

"May I begin by expressing our gratitude of His Excellency the President of the Republic of Peru for inaugurating our Conference. His inaugural address has been a source of inspiration in our deliberations. I also offer to you, Mr. President, my heartiest congratulations on your unanimous election as the President of this Conference. We have no doubt that under your able stewardship, this meeting will review the progress since Algiers and would establish firm guideposts for our march from Lima to Santiago.

Mr. President, before leaving for Lima, when I met our Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, she was nostalgic about her visit to your great continent, which reinforced the bonds of friendship and understanding which have existed between India and Latin America. While stepping on the Peruvian soil, I was reminded the similarities between Peru and India, both of whom have had a long and glorious history and have shared a common misfortune that their wealth and prosperity attracted the covetous eyes of the colonial powers. Even a common name associates us to the original inhabitants of your soil.

This Continent which has been struggling for an economic break-through for the past few decades and in the normal circumstances should have been way ahead in the path of development, is now reasserting itself with new vigour and determination. It is endeavouring to break away from the shackles of its economic relationship and to chart out a course of development based on self-reliance and mutual cooperation among the countries of this region. Many countries of Latin America and particularly this country of Peru have demonstrated beyond doubt that they are firmly resolved to exercise paramount sovereignty over their natural resources and to become complete masters of their economic destiny.

As you are aware, Latin America has played an important role in the establishment and evolution of UNCTAD. It is, therefore, in the fitness of things that this meeting of the "Group of 77" as well as the next session of UNCTAD should take place in this Continent.

This meeting takes place at a historic moment when international relations are

undergoing radical transformations. Old animosties are yielding place to new understandings. The call made by India 22 years ago for opening the doors of International organisations to the representatives of the 800 million people of China has at last found the general acceptance of the international community. The frontiers of colonialism are receding and we are happy that our family is growing in numbers.

We also welcome the new members of Bahrain, Bhutan, Cuba and Qatar to the "Group of 77".

Mr. President, as you would no doubt be aware that we in India, under the inspiring leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, have Pledged ourselves to pursuing a policy of growth with social justice. Our determination to achieve self-reliance has been greatly reinforced by the massive support given by the people of India only a few months back to the policies of our Prime Minister.

Mr. President, It is useful to ask ourselves the questions: What compulsions led to the establishment of the "Group of 77"? What achievements and aspirations have sustained us since? The "Group of 77" was born out of the common adversity that confronted all of us. The unity of the "Group of 77" has helped to articulate the needs of

292

developing countries as weft as to outline their possible solutions.

Since then, as a result of participation in the work of the "Group of 77", our understanding of each other's problems has increased and we have now a much greater perception of how mutually beneficial relationships can be forged among developing countries as well as between the developing and the developed countries.

Let us remember that singly or in small group we cannot achieve meaningful solution to our respective problems, it is only through common endeavour and joint effort of the "Group of 77" as a whole that the vast problems of trade and development can be successfully tackled. There is no fundamental divergence in our economic interests and all of us assembled here have a common stake in the restructuring of the world economic order. Let us, therefore, pledge anew to further strengthen the unity of the "Group of 77", for the conditions of common adversity, which prevailed in 1964, still continue to plague our own efforts to promote the well-being of our peoples.

Whatever little we have achieved has been the result of the united efforts of the "Group of 77". But a lot still remains to be achieved. Time has now come for us to ask ourselves the question whether the "Group of 77" is fully equipped to meet this challenge. In this connection, my delegation has heard, with great interest, the suggestions made by His Excellency the President of Peru and other distinguished speakers, for institutionalising the "Group of 77". These suggestions deserve our most serious and urgent consideration. We should, therefore, establish a small group of representatives and charge it with going into this matter in detail and make concrete recommendations for our consideration.

Mr. President, it is a true measure of our confidence in our own self-help efforts that while we have asked for effective international action to facilitate a fuller mobilisation and more effective utilisation of our domestic resources, we have never failed to reiterate that the primary responsibility for our development rests upon us. We have also declared our determination to contribute to one another's development. The fallacy that there is no complementarity between our economies has so far made It difficult to realise the undoubted potential of mutual cooperation. There is greater complementarity amongst our economies than between the economies of developed nations. While advanced nations continue to forge and enlarge areas of co-operation among themselves, our own efforts in this direction have been sporadic, with the result that the full potential of trade and economic co-operation

among us has not yet been fully exploited. Should we agree to institutionalise the "group of 77" and establish a permanent organ, we can charge it to continuously explore all avenues of stimulating trade exchanges among us.

Seven years have elapsed since the establishment of UNCTAD and yet the goal of promoting higher rates of economic growth throughout the world and the evolution of a new and more rational pattern of international trade remains a distant hope even today.

We have been extremely fortunate in having had two very dedicated persons as Secretary-Generals of UNCTAD. Despite their relentless efforts, the record of UNCTAD in the field of implementation of its recommendations has been disappointing. Unless we succeed in stimulating the political will of the Governments of developed countries to implement the agreements already reached in UNCTAD and to embark on serious negotiations for new agreements, we will fail in making UNCTAD truly responsible to the needs and aspirations of the developing countries. For solving their mutual problems the developed countries frequently meet among themselves at a Political level. On the other hand, the UNCTAD has met at a political level only once in four years. If, therefore, the re. cords of achievements in the UNCTAD is to be improved, it is necessary that the frequency of contacts between the representatives of developed and developing countries at a political level must be increased. It is, therefore, important for us to press for the Trade and Development Board to meet at a political level.

The charter that we adopt at Lima should not seek the charity of affluent

293

nations but must derive itself from the basic principles of constructive partnership in development which the international community has carefully endeavoured to build over these years. For instance, we know it only too well that development assistance based on national Interest of rich nations makes it uncertain and their national considerations can fail us in the most crucial moments. One of the main issues to which this Conference should address itself is how to build a system of accountability within the framework of UNCTAD or in the wider framework of the UN system which can impart greater realism to the agreements on principles and policies reached within the framework of UNCTAD. How exactly this can be done would have to be carefully considered.

But I am clear that we would have to resort to a more organised system of purposeful consultations with a view to accelerating the implementation of the recommendations of UNCTAD. This is particularly so because of the role which UNCTAD has to play in the review and implementation of the international development strategy within its field of competence and the importance which the Santiago Meeting would have to assign to the implementation of measures already agreed upon, as well as the efforts that would be necessary to widen and deepen the areas of agreement in a dynamic context.

In the field of development finance while the adherence to target dates both in respect of volume and the terms of financial assistance in accordance with the obligations of the international development strategy is Important, a stage has been reached when we need to look afresh on the very concept of aid. Can finance flows in the form of supplies and Commercial credit on term which impose heavy burdens be regarded consistent with the concept of aid, which is meant to assist the developing countries in their process of economic development? Do we not, Mr. President, need to distinguish financial flows emanating from commercial considerations from flows designed to supplement and accelerate the process of development of the developing countries?

The international monetary scene in recent years has been characterised by highly disturbed conditions. It is well known

that the smooth functioning of the international monetary system is an important condition for the orderly expansion of world trade and international capital flows. There can, therefore, be hardly any doubt that the uncertainties and instabilities prevail in the international environment for the economic development of developing countries. We must emphasise that any reform of the international monetary system must fully take into account the aspirations of the developing countries. More generally any new framework of trade and payments must provide explicitly for carrying out of the obligations freely assumed by the member States of the U.N. in the course of the elaboration of the international development strategy. In particular, any reform for the world monetary system must include the incorporation of the link between the creation of new liquidity and provision of additional development finance as an essential element of the international monetary mechanism. The stake of the developing countries in an orderly solution of the monetary Problems that have arisen and the smooth functioning of the international monetary system is in no way less than that of the developed countries. It goes without saying that these are matters which cannot be settled by limited number of countries. It is a matter of deep regret to my delegation that vital decisions about future of the International Monetary System, which are of equal concern to the entire world community, are sought to be taken by limited group of countries. It is our firm view that it is on a world-wide scale that decisions about the future of the International Monetary System must be negotiated and adopted, if they are to be, as indeed they must be, truly responsive to the needs of the international community as a whole.

While we were happy at the conclusion of the deliberations of the Special Committee on Preferences leading to the adoption of the Generalised Scheme of Preferences, we are distressed at the attempts being made by certain countries to indefinitely postpone its implementation. While it is a matter of satisfaction that countries of the European Economic Community and Japan have

decided to implement the scheme, the United States and the U.K. have adopted retrograde steps. Further, till the general scheme of preferences covers all products of interest to

294

developing countries, the use of the word 'General' would remain a misnomer.

In the disappointing record of the progress achieved so far, we cannot fail to express our satisfaction at the positive contribution rendered by some countries like Japan, France and the centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe under the leadership of the Soviet Union.

The progress in the field of commodity arrangements has been extremely slow. It is a matter of concern to my delegation that even the agreement on cocoa has not yet been negotiated. We consider the conclusion of the International Cocoa Agreement as an important task before the Santiago Meeting and, if necessary, this "group of 77" might charge a special Ministerial Commission for impressing upon the concerned nations for the early conclusion of the Cocoa Agreement.

Mr. President, we the developing countries possess the bulk of the vital raw materials of this world. Yet the prices which we fetch for our raw materials are unfavourable as compared to the prices of the manufactured products. While we do expect the rich nations to join us in a constructive partnership to accelerate the rate of our economic development we cannot wait indefinitely, it is obligatory upon us to evolve an alternative commodity strategy. One method could be an evolution of joint collaborative action among ourselves to improve our terms of trade and to ensure that we secure just, remunerative and equitable prices for our primary products.

The Problems of the least developed among the developing countries deserve our urgent attention. Several delegations have correctly emphasised the need to adopt special and immediate steps for the least developed countries and the distinguished

delegation from Nepal yesterday drew our attention to some of the measures which need to be quickly taken. We on our part are anxious to support and reinforce the efforts being made to find adequate solutions to the problems of the least developed countries.

We in India are familiar with the difficult problems of the land-locked developing countries. We have special relationship with Afghanistan and we sympathise with their needs and aspirations.,, With Nepal, with whom we have age-old historical ties, we have only recently concluded a Treaty of Trade and Transit to the full satisfaction of both the countries. This treaty marks a significant step towards strengthening the ties between India and Nepal. We recognise that problems of the land-locked countries deserve our special attention.

One of the disturbing developments in the field of international trade has been the neglect of the interest of a large number of developing countries in the growth and intensification of regional economic groupings among developed countries, particularly in Europe. While we hope that the regional economic grouping, particularly the European economic community, will adopt outward looking policies, it is necessary to ensure that they adopt a time bound programme for providing increased access to products from all developing countries and urgently solve the problems of those countries whose interests have been adversely affected in the intensification of their regional groupings.

Mr. President, there are several developments taking place which threaten to destroy the principles which the international community has sought to evolve through its untiring efforts over these years. The dwindling aid flows, the hardening of the terms of assistance, the international monetary crisis, the growing climate of protectionism in the rich countries and a threat of a possible trade war among affluent nations threaten to destroy the very foundations of international economic co-operation. A large part of world economic system rests on the ability and the functioning of

the U. N. system to render adequate support for the efforts of the international community. However, the action of some nations has led to a stagnation in the ability of the U.N. system to render adequate support to the global development effort. This development threatens to destroy the foundations of the system itself. My delegation is clear that the system of international economic co-operation, that we have painstakingly built, should not be a prey to the whims of any individual nation. This may call for a restructuring of the financial

295

responsibility for retailing the world development system, so that the system does not come to rely on disproportionate authority. It may call for a more rational restructuring of the system in consonance with the changes which are taking place in the distribution of world economic power. We have to suggest, in no uncertain terms, measures in those directions which are courageous enough and which can mark a distinct move in that direction.

Mr, President, before I end, I cannot help recalling what the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, had said while inaugurating the second session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development in New Delhi in February, 1968, and I quote:

"The wealth of the prosperous grows in isolation and does not provide support to those who need it. The world economy has no built-in corrective. Economic processes must, therefore, be guided by a moral purpose and directed towards desirable ends by the political will of the international community."

It is this political will of the international community that we will have to stimulate at the third UNCTAD."

PERU USA ALGERIA CHILE INDIA CHINA BAHRAIN BHUTAN CUBA QATAR CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC JAPAN UNITED KINGDOM FRANCE RUSSIA NEPAL AFGHANISTAN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

LIMA MINISTERIAL CONFERENCE OF "GROUP OF 77"

Foreign Trade Minister's Statement in Parliament on Lima Conference

Following is the text of the statement of the Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra laid on the table of the two Houses of Parliament on November 13, 1971 on the Lima Meeting of the Group of '77':

I returned about 10 days ago after attending the Ministerial Meeting of the Group of `77' at Lima in which 96 develop-Ing countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America participated. I thought it useful to convey to this House my general impressions about the Lima meeting and the results we were able to achieve during our deliberations lasting nearly 10 days. Members would possibly be aware that the Lima meeting of the developing countries was preceded by the regional meetings of the Asians at Bangkok, Africans at Addis Ababa and of the Latin Americans at Lima Our task at Lima was to coordinate and harmonise these regional positions so as to adopt a common philosophy and programme of development of the Group of 77, prior to the Third Session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development being held in Santiago (Chile) in April, 1972. I might mention that the First Ministerial Meeting of the Group of `77' was held in Algiers prior to the Second UNCTAD which was held in Delhi.

I cannot hide from the Members the difficulties we experienced at Lima in reaching a common consensus on a Programme of Action subscribed by all the developing countries spread over three continents. Over the years differences had crept within the rank of the developing countries and the

Lima meeting was an attempt at a high political level to cement these differences and to forge a united front in our dialogue with the developed countries. Hon'ble Members will appreciate that the 96 developing countries spread over the three continents and in different stages of economic development are bound to have differences in the fixation of priorities and in any action programme which is adopted. These differences, however, do not detract from a basic identity of the interest of all developing countries in their dialogue with the developed countries and in the grim struggle against poverty.

In the end the Lima deliberations were successful. We were able to overcome our differences. The developing countries subscribed to a common Declaration and Principles of the Lima Programme of Action, whose copy I place before this House. Members will find from the document that the Lima Programme of Action covers a wide spectrum of policy measures ranging from a satisfactory solution to the prevalent international monetary crises, export promotion measures in the field of manufactures

and semi-manufactures, commodity policies, action in the field of shipping and measures in the field of transfer of technology.

The path from Lima to Santiago will be even more difficult. I must confess that the present climate for international cooperation is a source of anxiety to all of us. The dwindling flow of external resources, the hardening of the terms of assistance, the growing climate of protectionism, the possibility of a trade war among the developed countries, and a growing unconcern to the problems of developing countries threatens to destroy some of the positive results painstakingly achieved through international economic cooperation over the years. That is why the Group of `77' while reaffirming their faith in international cooperation for development have reiterated that the primary responsibility for their development rests upon themselves. The third UNCTAD provides a unique opportunity for the

developed countries to effectively create and reverse the adverse situation facing the developing countries. It is my hope that the Governments of the developed countries would respond in a positive spirit to the measures outlined in the Lima document which confirms our faith in the value of international cooperation for assisting the development of the Third World.

PERU USA ETHIOPIA CHILE ALGERIA RUSSIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PERU

Indo-Peru Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreement

Following is the text of a press release issued in Lima (Peru) on November 4, 1971 On the Signing of the first Trade and Economic Cooperation agreement between India and Peru:

India and Peru signed here today the first Trade and Economic Cooperation Agreement Providing for doubling of trade between their countries every year in the next three years and immediate extension of Most-favoured Nation Treatment to each other.

Both the Foreign Minister of Peru, Lt. Gen. Edgardo Mercado Jarrin, who signed on behalf of Peru and Shri L. N. Mishra, Union Foreign Trade Minister, who signed for India hailed the Agreement as unique and as opening a new chapter for expansion of India-Peru trade and economic relations.

Under the Agreement, India will be able to secure sizable quantities of non-ferrous

metals of strategic importance, significant in the present context. Long staple cotton is another item for import from Peru.

In respect of India's exports, the Agreement envisages breaking of new ground by providing for export from India and Peru of a whole range of engineering goods, complete plant equipment and machinery steel products, chemicals, besides traditional items like jute manufactures, tea etc.

At present Indo-Peruvian trade is limited and irregular. Today's Agreement puts for the first time Indo-Peruvian trade on a sound footing providing for steady growth and expansion.

Article one of the Agreement has en. joined both parties to ensure maximum facilities and Most-favoured-Nation Treatment to increase trade between India and Peru.

Both countries have agreed to grant each other maximum facilities for import into their countries of products originating in the other. Maximum facilities will be

297

accorded by both countries to each other in matters relating to customs duties, foreign exchange, transportation and distribution.

Ships of either country will enjoy maximum facilities in regard to entry into ports of contracting parties.

The Agreement which will remain for a period of three years also envisages immediate high level consultations for setting up, joint ventures in fields of manufacture of machinery, chemicals, woollen goods etc.

The Agreement was signed in the presence of a distinguished gathering of Ministers, diplomats, senior officials of the two countries and a large number of delegates presently attending the Lima Conference of developing nations. It was signed in the hall of the imposing Foreign Office building of Peru.

Speaking immediately after signing the

Agreement, Shri Mishra said it was a happy augury that the negotiations, which had commenced four days ago. on his arrival in Lima, have been concluded successfully. He was confident that today's Agreement would lead to positive results and help in a big way in expanding trade between the two countries.

Shri Mishra noted this is the second trade agreement which India has concluded in the Latin American region, the first being with Colombia signed last year.

The Foreign Trade Minister announced that today's Agreement would be the forerunner of similar agreements India proposes to sign with other Latin American countries, between now and UNCTAD III.

In his speech, General Mercado shared the views of the Foreign Trade Minister and said his Government would do everything possible to expand trade with India to the maximum extent.

Peru, he said, is interested in a large number of Indian manufactures and Indian expertise and technology. Similarly, India can also take advantage of Peru's experience in certain fields. For a country like Peru, Indian expertise and technology is of special relevance. He suggested that experts of both countries set up joint teams to take maximum advantage of today's Agreement to promote economic development and trade expansion in both countries

PERU INDIA USA RUSSIA COLOMBIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PRIME MINISTER SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI'S, TOUR ABROAD

Prime Minister's Statement on Her Foreign Tour

Following is the text of the Statement made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, on November 15, 1971 in both the Houses of Parliament on her foreign tour:

I have just returned from a tour of Belgium, Austria, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany.

The decision to pay official visits to these countries was taken much earlier in response to repeated Invitations and in consonance with the practice of reciprocity. The House will remember that President Nixon and Prime Minister Heath had visited our country in 1970, Chancellor Kiesinger in 1969 and President Pompidou when he was-Prime Minister. But owing to our General Elections, my visit had to be postponed.

In spite of the grave situation in Bangla Desh and along our borders in West Pakistan, I undertook this visit as an earnest of our desire to leave nothing unexplored which might lead to an easing of the burdens imposed upon us and to discourage those who am bent upon finding excuses to threat-298

en our security. It is the complete selfassurance of our people and the unity of all our parties which gave me the confidence to undertake the visit at a time of national danger.

My visit enabled me to exchange ideas with the Heads of governments and leaders of public opinion at a point of time when important changes were taking place in the world and to put across to them our point of view on matters of world interest, bilateral relations, and more specially on the situation in Bangla Desh and the threat it is posing to our social, political and economic structure and to peace in this region. Our discussions helped to remove certain misgivings and to focus attention on the root cause of the problem, that is the refusal of the Pakistan military regime to respect the verdict of their own people, the reign of

terror let loose by them in Bangla Desh and the consequent influx of refugees into India. I think that these countries as well as others realise that it will not help to deal with peripheral problems without finding a political solution in Bangla Desh through negotiations with the already elected leaders of the people of Bangla Desh and in accordance with their legitimate wishes. Most countries also realise that the release of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman is essential and intend to impress this upon the military regime of Pakistan.

After a long period of tragic indifference and sheltering behind the thinly disguised legalistic formulation that it was merely. an internal affair of Pakistan, there is now a growing sense of urgency in seeking a solution.

Pakistan's efforts to side-track and cloud the basic issue by seeking to involve the United Nations and to transform the struggle of the people of Bangla Desh into an Indo-Paldstan confrontation and conflict have been exposed. It is now well understood that India will not be misled by Pakistan's moves and that the military regime in Pakistan must come to terms with the people whom they have treated with such injustice and cruelty. It is also widely appreciated that no, country has any right to impose a solution on the people of Bangla Desh and that force can not suppress the spirit of freedom and nationalism with which they are inspired.

During my visit to the United States, I was informed that a decision had been taken to stop further shipments of arms to Pakistan. A formal announcement has since been made. I was given to understand that no arms are being supplied from the United Kingdom, France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

It is my earnest hope that joint or several efforts of the statesmen whom I met will make the military regime in Pakistan realise that no good can come of sabrerattling or by forcing a military conflict on India. I hope it is not too late for sane counsel to prevail for one cannot go on ig-

noring hard facts. The just and legitimate aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh, indeed of West Pakistan also, cannot be ignored and trampled upon.

There was general sympathy for the manner in which we are bearing the heavy burden of looking after over nine million refugees. There have been indications of additions to the funds for giving relief to the refugees. All these countries agree, that conditions must be created inside Bangla Desh to stop the further influx of refugees and to facilitate the return to their homeland in safety and human dignity of those now in India.

Having said this I must make it clear that we cannot depend on the international community, or even the countries which I visited, to solve our problems for us. We appreciate their sympathy and moral and political support, but the brunt of the burden has to be borne by us and by the people of Bangla Desh who have our fullest sympathy and support.

So far as the threat to our security is concerned, we must be prepared - and we are prepared - to the last man and woman, to safeguard our freedom and territorial integrity. Obviously we cannot take risks such as the withdrawal of our forces from the border unless the situation in Bangla Desh is resolved satisfactorily as it poses a serious threat to our security.

Solutions have been found or initiated even to seemingly insoluble problems, as for

299

instance in Europe and between the United States and China, by a wise impulse in men of wisdom and vision. But these developments should not lull us into complacency or wishful thinking.

In Europe these is a welcome spirit of detente, which we hope will soon lead to stable security in that continent. This should have a stabilising influence in Asia and other parts of the world. There was a realisation that political detente should be combined

with outward-looking economic policies, especially in regard to the needs of the developing world.

Bilateral economic relations were also discussed with those countries. There was a sympathetic response. Belgium, France and the Federal Republic of Germany have shown understanding that there should be a broad outlook in approaching the relations between India and European Economic Community. There are new possibilities of our collaboration in the industrial, technological and scientific fields.

In brief, these are the impressions which I should like to share with honourable Members. I am deliberately not mentioning the leaders of individual countries by name because they were all full of sympathy and friendship for India.

I think my visit also helped to restore our relations with Britain which had suffered a serious setback in 1965.

I Should like also to express, on behalf of the Government and the people of India, my sincere thanks to the Governments and peoples of the countries I visited for the warm and friendly reception I received everywhere. I should further like to record my appreciation of the world press, which, by and large, has given a fair and objective account of the events in Bangla Desh, of the inexpressible horror let loose upon the people there, of the heroic struggle which they are waging in defence of the most elementary democratic right and liberties.

May I take this opportunity of thanking my people and all the political parties who have shown wisdom and restraint and kept the nation united against any external threat?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I conclude this statement with a reminder that in the community of nations our country symbolises the urge for peace, freedom and justice. There was a time when ours was a lone voice in the world which was in the grip of the cold war. Even in the midst of the grave

crisis which the military rulers of Pakistan have created for us, our people, our country and this great Parliament of the largest democracy in the world have maintained the spirit of peace and of self-restraint. We have refused to be excited by threat or Provocation from across our borders. Let us then continue to conduct our-selves with quiet confidence in ourselves so that the world should see and know that India cannot be browbeaten nor lulled into a false sense of security. Calmness of spirit and strength go together. India is calm and we are capable of taking decisions in defence of our security and our stability."

USA AUSTRIA BELGIUM FRANCE GERMANY PAKISTAN INDIA OMAN CHINA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PRIME MINISTER SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI'S, TOUR ABROAD

Prime Minister's Reply to Discussion in Rajya Sabha

Following is the text of the statement by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in reply to the discussion on her statement about her tour to Belgium, Austria, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, France and the Federal Republic of Germany in the Rajya Sabha on November 30, 1971:

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am not talking about my statement although that is the main matter under consideration, but most of the Members who spoke, very rightly spoke about the question which is uppermost in our minds and which was uppermost in my mind when I went abroad. Whatever I have to say about my tour, I have already stated in my statement and I do not think any new questions have arisen on that

account. But here in the House I see a basic unity of outlook on this issue and I think there is a general support also. I should like

300

to thank them for the manner in which they have spoken. I should specially like to thank my old friend, Shri Babubhai Chinai and Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee who spoke just now with such understanding of the situation. Professor Ruthnaswamy was kind but of course he expressed the typical Swatantra point of view. Shri Mani also of course I must not forget to mention...

Dr. Bhai Mahavir not unexpectedly made some rather carping remarks which were typical of him. I seem to irritate him and his Party as much as I irritate President Yahya Khan and who does not even - I am not talking of Dr. Mahavir but the other gentleman - like to take my name when he refers to me. Dr. Bhai Mahavir spoke about my projecting a personal image. Now, when one goes only as a Prime Minister, of course one goes as a representative of the people - any honour that is done to any Indian is an honour to the country and usually another country can only honour a country through somebody, whether he may be a scientist or even if he is an ordinary citizen. So, I do not think that if an honour is done to me or if I have been able to project an image, it is certainly not to a person isolated from a country, but I think, as I have said on a previous occasion, it is an honour to the country and what they think the country stands for. So, from that point of view that is as important as speaking about a country direct.

Another point which Bhai Mahavir made wag something about our showing restraint at the wrong time. I think some Members were not listening to him as quietly as they should have and he said that they were not being Patient when they should be Patient and the Government was patient when it should not be patient. I agree with him that hon. Members could occasionally show greater patience but I think the Government should always show restraint and patience especially a Government which

is sure of itself and sure of its people. I do not think that our friends from across the border have gained much by their lack of patience and by the tone of their statements, their threats and provocations and I think we have gained a great deal by putting all these threats, all these abusive words, if I can put it that way, in their proper perspective; that is, they do not ruffle us, they do not divert us from what we are going to do, what we think is right for our country and they do not rouse our anger in that sense. of course one is angry, not because of words used; one is angry at what is happening in Bangla Desh; one is angry because it seems to us such an unnecessary tragedy. It has taken the lives of millions of people and have uprooted millions of people from their homes. It is not only those who have come to our refugee camps who are uprooted but from what one hears from foreign correspondents and those who have been to Dacca and other parts of Bangla Desh, the entire country is like a refugee camp; that is, vast masses of the population are moving from village to village, nobody knows who belongs to which village. When they are harassed in one area and when they see an empty village or part of an empty village they may settle down there or they may find that they cannot live there and they move on. So the conditions there are quite chaotic but I would only like to say that the Jana Sangh has its own manner of functioning. They are welcome to it. They have seen I think in the past whether it has brought them honour or success. We have a different way of functioning and we are going to stick to our way which I think is certainly more dignified and gets us better results also.

Now there was one point. I think it was Prof. Ruthnaswamy who said something about the Indo-Soviet Treaty being a handicap in the Prime Minister's baggage. I do not know who is handicapped, it certainly did not handicap me. No foreign official or head of State or head of Government whom I met even mentioned the Treaty. The question was asked at press conferences. Nobody else was at all concerned. I think they understood the situation; people may use these phrases but I do not think anybody

really thinks that India has changed her Policy or is going to change her policy. In fact my own guess is Part of the reason why we irritate other people so much is just this that they find It irritating that there is a Government and people who are not willing to change at their request or at their hint or whatever it is.

Mr. Chatterjee spoke of my concentrating on seeking financial aid for the refugees. This also I explained everywhere. I have never asked for financial aid. It was again in reply to questions at press conferences

301

that I had said that die help from the international community has been negligible which it has been and I can hardly not answer a simple question like that. I have never asked for help of this kind or another. Neither have I given any advice to foreign Governments. I have said, it is for you to decide what is in your national interests; we cannot expect you to do something which is not in your national interests but we think what is happening here on the sub-continent and its likely consequences will affect peace in Asia and therefore peace in the world. I think all the countries will be affected by it in the long run and it is better they realised the situation and faced up to it now rather than make changes in their policy later on.

Something else Mr. Chatterjee said. I do not know whether I misunderstood him. Did he say that I had said either the Mukti Bahini or those who are fighting were seeking a solution within Pakistan?

My point has been that it is only the people of Bangla Desh who have the authority to say what they want; I mean they know what they want. I do not think I have the authority to say on their behalf that this is what should be the solution. So far as I am Concerned I can give my view as I did give my view that they would not now settle for anything less than liberation. I told them very clearly that if any talks am to be held, it should be with the people who have been elected by the Public of Bangla Desh. By

that I did not mean these new people who have come in unopposed by any means. So, we have all along stressed the main and the basic issues involved and tried to draw Peoples attention to it. Now, it has been Pakistan's consistent effort to try to internationalise the issue and to try to turn it into an Indo-Pak dispute. This is what I had to face everywhere. Everywhere they said: If only you win agree to talk to General Yahya Khan, if only your Foreign Minister can go or your representative can go, then things will be solved. It is in answer to them that I had to say that they will not be solved because this is not our country and it is only the people of that country who can solve their problems or who can state it. Naturally I had to say that Sheikh Mujibur Rehman is their undisputed leader and he is the person who is the most authorised to speak on their behalf, but I did add that in order to voice the opinion of the people of Bangla Desh, he must be free. He must be able to know what is happening in Bangla Desh. He cannot express an opinion if he has had no knowledge of what has happened and what is happening, as is to be the case. So, this attempt to bring the whole matter to the Security Council, I think is part of the same game, that is, to confuse the realities of the situation and those who are moving in this direction cannot but be suspect in the eyes of the Indian people.

Kashmir, of course, is as much a part of India as Gujarat or Maharashtra or any other part of the country and any attack there, as any attack anywhere else, will be repulsed and fought with all the strength at our command. The hon. Member, who spoke just before me, has given you, in brief, an account of what happened in the earlier periods, that in both the wars which we have had on the borders of Kashmir in 1947 and in 1965 we did not have adequate forces there, for good reasons. The people, the common people, the Gujjars, the nomadic tribes, the peasants or the other people stood so solidly with us. They brought the first news that the people were coming and doing propaganda against us. They gave all this news. They were the first in the line of resistance and we were able to stand up to those invasions which in the beginning were not obvious invasions. They were hidden because they were infiltrations. Today also aggression is committed on India. As I said in my speeches, there was a new kind of aggression. The Pakistani armies may not have massed on our soil, but it was an invasion, when we have such a large proportion of the population of another country coming on to our soil It is a kind of invasion Now, many of them are genuine refugees in difficulties. Nevertheless, the problem that their coming has created does threaten the security of our country and the stability of our country. Amongst them are people are not genuine refugees. So, from all these points of view, they are threatening our security and, therefore, it is a kind of aggression. Now we have remained restrained-But we have silenced some Pakistani guns, we have dealt with their tanks and we have brought down some of their intruding aircrafts. But we have not poised a counter-

302

threat in any sense of the ward. But we cannot allow the annihilation of the people next door to us. I mean, this is what has to be very clearly understood by the world and which I did speak to them. It is not like two equal armies fighting there, the Mukti Bahini and the West Pakistani troops. It is a fully equipped army fighting with the people, some of whom have been trained in the East Pakistani Rifles and the East Bengalee Regiment, some of whom have been trained very quickly in the various camps run by the leaders of these two paramilitary forces. But nevertheless, they are not equal in that way to the army. And it is not in our national interest that an entire people, not just the Mukti Bahini, but the entire unarmed population of Bangla Desh should be annihilated. Although the threat is already great, anything like this happening or even happening partially would increase the threat to our security immediately and also for the future.

On the western side, our armed forces were deployed sometime after the Pakistani troops moved up to our borders. We have not taken any initiative there. But, as I said,

we shall meet any threat to our freedom or our security and, of course, we feel that the present threat just is not merely a threat but a threat to the very foundation on which India is built and on which India is surviving.

Now there are suggestions you have heard about the withdrawal of troops. I have already explained in the other forum why we cannot withdraw our troops in the West because our lines of communication, the cantonments and so on are so placed that Pakistan has a very great advantage, and having twice been taken unawares by Pakistan in this very area, in Kashmir and so on, we cannot afford that risk. But I would certainly welcome the withdrawal of troops, and I think the troops that should be withdrawn straightaway are the Pakistani troops in Bangla Desh. They are far from their homes, they are also suffering and I think that they should be taken back to rejoin their-families and friends in West Pakistan. And this would be a positive response from Pakistan to show that they do want a solution in Bangla Desh. It would be a gesture for peace. And I do feel that in today's circumstances, the very presence of Pakistani troops in Bangla Desh, as I said earlier, is a threat to our own security.

I think that I have answered most of the points. So far as the present situation is concerned, as you know, the Mukti Bahini is facing very courageously - it is a very difficult fight - they are fighting very bravely, and they have our good wishes, and they have our support also. Nobody can predict what the future will bring but as I have said on an earlier occasion, nothing is going to ease the situation immediately. No matter what happens, what steps we take, the next month, will be of very great difficulty to us and also to the people of Bangla Desh. I mean - we have to know - there is no solution, which is a magic solution, which will end the suffering of the refugees or end the burdens on us. This just cannot happen with the best will in the world. I am glad that this unity has been shown. Shri Chatteriee spoke something about our singling out his party and so on. I can assure him that it is not at all our intention.

But certain things had happened in West Bengal. I am glad that the situation has improved greatly and once there is peace there will be no course for anybody to be poised against anybody else, and this is the time when all parties should unite, because, as I said, the burden on the Indian people is very great and the challenge and the difficulties we face are extremely difficult, and they will need all the strength we have, all the resources we have and all the unity and determination which we can bring to beat upon.

I have full confidence that all parties will respond to this challenge and together we will be able to come out of what is a dark period for us and for the people of Bangla Desh. We will come out of it and they will be able to make a new life for themselves. Thank you.

303

USA AUSTRIA BELGIUM FRANCE GERMANY CHINA UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA PAKISTAN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Prime Minister Shrimati Gandhi's Speech at Dinner to Singapore Prime Minister

Following is the text of the speech by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at a dinner at Rashtrapati Bhavan, New Delhi given by her on November 22, 1971 in honour of the Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr. Lee Kuan Yew:

Mr. Prime Minister, May I welcome you, and Madam Lee, here. It is a great pleasure to have you with us, a dynamic young leader of a dynamic young nation which has made tremendous progress. May I also say that we are specially delighted to have your charming daughter with us.

President Giri was your guest recently and he came back full of admiration for what he saw and what he heard about your work and your country. We have taken keen interest in the progress - not only progress of the economy and industry but also what you have done in other spheres, health and education. I had a very interesting talk with the Prime Minister about what they am doing in education and I think there is something we can learn from the experiment being carried out in Singapore. Most of our visitors who returned from there are specially impressed by your housing scheme, some of which I saw myself when I was there. All these things are admirable and notable achievements. But I think perhaps the most important is the manner in which you have integrated the various People who live there. I think the world can be divided today into two thoughts or two ways of living. There are people who think that everybody should be put in the same mould and be uniform, and the others who think that diversity itself can lead to unity and indeed can be a source of strength. Both our countries, I think, be. long to this latter. It is because our people have the opportunity of expressing them. selves, should we say, in different languages, or different religions, different cultures. It seems paradoxic but that is, I think, what holds them together in the same way. If we try to force them into a pattern, I have no doubt that they would wish to break away.

Having a great visitor is always an occasion for discussing many things and our talks have ranged over many subjects - politics, naturally, international affairs. You were kind enough to tell me what was happening in your country and I was specially interested in your assessment of what was happening in Asia. You have been an astute observer of the Asian scene and today this scene is changing. So it is interesting and valuable for us to know what you thought of the present situation and also how you thought it might develop and what influence it will have on the different countries.

Asia is changing. So is Europe and in a different way. In both, there is some attempt at breaking down of barriers - even long-standing hostilities and hatred. That is why I said when I was on my trip recently that it was ironic that Europe which had been the scene of so many big world wars and so on should now be moving towards Peace, whereas in Asia two areas of conflict remain and a third is threatening. And it is this threat from across our borders which also points to this idea, which I mentioned earlier, that every country has to consider the different cultural streams which exist within its frontiers and perhaps it was a negligence of this which is at the base of the present conflict across our borders. It also shows that you cannot make religion the basis of a nation. We had felt this from the beginning, but now the world has proof of it.

India, as you know, is too large not to have problems and I think our problems are commensurate with our size. But perhaps we also have the strength - at least we certainly think we have - to deal with these problems. Our experience shows that you deal with one kind and another kind crops up and I think it is not very much different for other countries. They have different types of problems perhaps; they nevertheless exist and will continue to exist so long as the world remains.

304

In this matter of fact world. Ideals are often ridiculed. But we have felt here that ideals and commonness of purpose are bonds which keep a people together and which give coherence to a country and give it direction and therefore strengthen it. Of course, being human beings, we do not always live up to our ideals. But it is, I think, nice to have them to look up to and as a guiding star. We believe also that every country has something to learn from the others, even though conditions may be different. We can adapt and India, throughout its long history, has been able to absorb much from other civilisations and cultures and this is what has given richness to our heritage.

So we welcome you here. There is friendship between our countries. Our talks have shown that there is similarity in outlook on many matters and we share some problems in common; we share some ideals in common and I hope that our friendship will grow in strength and I am sure it will be beneficial to our peoples. So, once again, I would like to welcome you and your party and hope that you will have a pleasant stay with us and that we shall be partners - or shall I say good companions in the journey towards these ideas about which I spoke earlier. May I ask you all to drink to the health of the Prime Minister, Mrs. Lee, to the prosperity of Singapore and to friendship between our two countries."

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC INDIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

SINGAPORE

Reply by Singapore Prime Minister

Replying Mr. Lee Kuan Yew said:

This is not the first occasion that my wife and I have been your guests and received the hospitality of your table, and before you that of your father. We have been old friends and I hope, on our part, we tried to be good friends.

Earlier this year, when you had your decisive electoral victory, we thought to ourselves that now was the chance to get a break-through, both economically and in many Other fields. Then came the terrible tragedy in your Eastern neighbour and we watched in horror the horrendous massive

folly of man to man, man's inhumanity to his own fellowmen. I have said this on a previous occasion to a different audience recently in London that many of us admire the great restraint and great patience with which your Government and you personally have handled this very difficult situation.

You have said that we can learn from what goes on around us, and perhaps it is because we did learn some of these lessons of those who were independent earlier than we became independent that we have so far mercifully avoided the pitfalls of a prejudiced bigotry and a desire for homogeneity which none of us, not even India divided in 1947, inherited. Those of us who have been in political life know now that there are strange things happening in a world which is growing into monolithic economic blocs, the American economy passing its problems on to the West Europeans, to the Japanese, to the Australians and to all others in the non-Communist world, Western Europe trying to get together. Perhaps it may not be never that we will learn this lesson in Asia. However much we disagree with each other, it is best if we do not settle disagreements by force. But Europe went through two horrendous world wars to discover that many of her problems could not be resolved by force of arms. So once we admire the achievements of the advanced countries, perhaps there are orthodox, conventional, oriental values which may provide the framework on which we can re-build a modem industrial society, keeping our identities and not perhaps become poor imitation of the West. I have no doubt India has the capacity, the Indian people have the capacity to do this. we have many Indians as Singaporians. We have no doubt that they have got it in them, given the opportunities, and perhaps an indirect compliment was paid to the Indian people recently when a British Member of Parliament, who is wellknown for his very strong views on the nonwhite population in Britain, pointed out that

305

It was not the West Indians that he was worried about; It was the Indians who were fast climbing up the economic ladder in his country. We know of your glorious past. We know of your present problems. We also know of your great successes in overcoming so many of the past problems and I would hope that in the next few years, problems which look so insuperable with such a difficult task within your frontiers would be resolved peacefully and without the use of force.

Getting honorary degrees is always a hazard in these days and the British Prime Minister went back to Oxford and got a very boisterous time at the hands of his own students. Other Prime Ministers in the Commonwealth also went to Oxford and had difficult and rowdy audiences. To you was the big compliment paid of a demonstration in your honour and in support of the patience, restraint and strength that you have shown.

I would like my wife and I and my colleagues to drink to your health and to ask all of you to join me in wishing progress, prosperity for India and the Indian peoples."

REPUBLIC OF SINGAPORE USA UNITED KINGDOM INDIA JAPAN AUSTRALIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Agreement For Two New British Loans

Following is the text of a press Note issued in New Delhi on November 18, 1971 on the signing of two new loan agreements between the Government of India and the U.K.:

Two loan agreements allocating a total of æ35 million (Rs. 63 crores) British aid

to India were signed here today. The British Minister for Overseas Development, Mr. Richard Wood, who is visiting India, signed on behalf of the British Government, and Shri K. R. Ganesh, Minister of State in the Minis" of Finance, signed for the Government of India.

The first agreement, the UK / India Maintenance Loan 1971, is a loan of & 27 million (Rs. 48.6 crores) covering the import from Britain of non-project goods. Amongst these are raw materials, spare parts and components required to service India's agricultural and industrial production. Of the &27 million, &3 million (Rs. 5.4 crores) is reserved for the needs of British oriented firms,

The second agreement, the UK / India Mixed Project Loan No. 2 1971, is for & 8 million (Rs. 14.4 crores). It will finance the import from the United Kingdom of goods and services required for certain large projects agreed by the two Governments. The loan counts towards the total of & 72 million project aid which the British Government indicated that they would commit to India in the four financial years from 1970-71 to 1973-74.

Projects which have already been agreed by the British and Indian Governments include a fertiliser complex now being built for the Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative at Kandla and Kalol in Gujarat, and the construction in the United Kingdom of three cargo ships for the Shipping Corporation of India and the Scindia Steam Navigation Company. Other projects are under discussion.

The loans transform into firm aid commitments the major part of the pledge made by the British Government at the India Consortium earlier this year to allocate $\infty 54.5$ Million (Rs. 98.1 crores) fresh aid to

306

India in the financial year 1971-12. A debt refinancing loan of ∞ 7.5 million (Rs. 13.5 crores) has already been signed; an agreement for the remaining ∞ 12 million (Rs. 21.6

crores) of the pledge will be signed shortly.

All these loans are made on the terms common to earlier British loans: they are interest free, the capital being repayable over 25 years including an Initial grace period of 7 years.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Shri Surendrapal Singh's Statement on Detention of Indians at British Airports

Following is the text of the Statement made by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shri Surendrapal Singh in the Rajya Sabha on 25th November, 1971 regarding a reported detention and harassment of Indian nationals at the Airports in U.K. in spite of the fact that they possessed valid passports and entry permits:

Government are naturally concerned about any cases of harassment of Indian nationals at British airports and points of entry into Britain. As the House knows, all such instances brought to the Governments notice are taken up immediately with the British High Commission in New Delhi and With the British Government through our High Commissioner in London. The British Government have assured us that instructions have been issued to Immigration Officers to avoid any harassment to Indian visitors. They have also assured us that all complaints of harassment are examined by them with a view to avoiding their recurrence.

Under British regulations, a Common-

wealth citizen, including citizens of India, who enter Britain for limited periods, do not require visa or a special entry permit. However, the British High Commission has been advising intending visitors to apply for an entry certificate before leaving India "in their own interests."

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

Shri Surendrapal Singh's Statement on Anglo-Rhodesian Agreement

Following is the text of the Statement by the Deputy Minister of External Affairs Shri Surendrapal Singh in Rajya Sabha on 29th November, 1971 regarding the reported agreement reached recently between the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of Rhodesia under Mr. Ian Smith, aiming at the preservation of the white minority rule in Rhodesia and the reaction of the Government of India thereto:

Government have seen reports on an Agreement signed on the 24th November, 1971, between the British Foreign Secretary and Mr. Ian Smith. According to these reports, the Agreement envisages the establishment of a Special Commission to be appointed by the United Kingdom to assess the views of all racial groups in Rhodesia on the proposals agreed to in the recent discussions at Salisbury. The proposals are to be submitted for-the approval of the British Parliament. After parliamentary approval, the British Government is to introduce a Bill in Parliament on the subject.

We are ascertaining the details of the proposals from the British Government. Government of India's views will be made known after they have received the details and examined them.

307

INDIA USA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Reply to President Nixon's Welcome Address

Following is the text of Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's speech in reply to President Nixon's welcome address in Washington on November 4, 1971:

Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, Ladies and gentlemen: It is a pleasure to be in Washington and to meet you and Mrs. Nixon once again. I am grateful for your invitation which had made this visit possible.

It has not been easy to get away at a time when India is beleaguered. To the natural calamities of drought, flood and cyclone has been added a man-made tragedy of vast proportions. I am haunted by the tormented faces in our over-crowded refugee camps reflecting the grim events which have compelled the exodus of these millions from East Bengal.

I have come here looking for a deeper understanding of the situation in our part of the world in search of some wise impulse which, as history tells us, has sometimes worked to save humanity from despair.

I look forward to our discussions. I have

no doubt that they will lead to strengthening of friendship and understanding between our two nations and to a lighting of our path as we work together for peace in Asia and the world.

We share a community of ideals and there is no real conflict of interests between us. Our people value your friendship. They have great admiration for the spirit of quest of the, American people for their desire to reach beyond the immediate. I bring the greetings of India to you and to the warmhearted people of the United States.

And I fully and sincerely reciprocate the desire which you expressed that the Sun may always shine on our friendship and that we may always work for those ideals which our people and countries have cherished through these years.

USA INDIA

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Address to Indian Students' Association of Washington

Following is the text of the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi's speech delivered at a function organised in Washington Cathedral, by the Indian Students' Association of Washington on November 5, 1971:

"This is a very awe inspiring moment for me because I have never spoken in a Cathedral before. And the audience is so mixed that it is difficult to know just what to tell you about India. Obviously those who have come from India and have some basic knowledge about what is happening there would like one kind of speech and

those perhaps who are not so closely in touch would like another kind. But even those who are from India may have been in touch with what has been happening there since last year.

You all know that India is a very ancient country. Although since our Independence we are trying desperately hard to modernise our society, we still live in several centuries and there are many different levels of development in different parts of the country. We have highly developed society such as those of our scientists, those who work in the fields of atomic energy and along side we have tribal societies who still live in another age. But all these and many different people in between are what go up to make the Indian Nation. Sometime people who live far away-whether in the United States,

308

in Europe or other parts of the world think that merely because we have several religions or sixteen languages or other points of difference between us our unity is threatened or there is some danger to it.

But this is not true. We have great diversity but we have equally great unity. In fact we feel that it is the very diversity of the country which is strength to its unity and there is, I would say, that although there always has been a basic unity there has been a basic feeling of Indianness which joins together Indians of different religions and different languages and even different races.

Today the unity is stronger than ever before. Because today's unity is caused by our democratic function. In India democracy does not mean merely giving a vote once in five years or whenever there are more elections in between. It means trying to participate in what is happening in the Country. I do not claim that everybody is participating today but it is our effort that our society should be such that all sections of the people would have the opportunity to Participate. How obviously this. can Only take place when some of the basic problems, the basic difficulties which face the people

are solved and India's major problem which has been for centuries, and remains today, is the problem of poverty and of economic inequality. We feel that democracy cannot be real for our people unless poverty is lessened and that is why we say that we are a secular socialist democracy. The word 'Secular' does not mean that we are antireligion. On the contrary it means that the State has equal respect for all the religions of the country and that a citizen has equal rights regardless of his religion. The State as such does not have a religion of its own. Obviously it could not. If State has a religion then those who did not belong to that religion would not feel that they were equal. Similarly in economic field we believe that it is only through socialism that we can bring about sort of equality that is essential for a real democracy.

Today under our constitution all citizens are equal. But we know that, in fact, it is not so. A person who is poor although he has the same rights, in practice he cannot enjoy those rights. He does not have the same rights; he does not have the same education; he does not have the same nutrition; he does nut have the same employment opportunities and he does not even have the same rights legally because the, other person can employ far better lawyer and so on. Now whereever there is such great inequality there is bound to be tension in society and that is why in order to make our democracy meaningful to the people, in order that there should be a sort of peace which will allow fast economic progress, we have to fight with poverty. But our way has been a democratic way and a peaceful way. We think that the changes which must come and which will come whether we want them or not should come peacefully. Either we help to give direction to the changes or the changes will come in spite of us and therefore they may come violently and they may cause a great deal of disruption. Now any kind of change does create difficulties for somebody or another, even the smallest change. It is for society to have the strength to get over these difficulties in a friendly way and in cooperation with each other. Our way of bringing socialism is not to have a uniform pattern,

it is certainly not to compel people to do anything. It is not even to take away things from those who have but we do have rules and regulations to see that those who have do nut increase their economic power at the cost of others.

Now perhaps you heard of the violence we had in some parts of the country. You may also have heard of the word naxalite which is what we use for some of our extreme elements. How did this grow? Because in many parts of the country there have not been proper land legislation and where there is legislation it had not always been implemented. So in one part of the country certain extremist political elements who are able to exploit the feeling of the People and in this area there happen to be rather backward tribal people so these tribal people with bows and arrows and spears attack the landlords of that area, kill them and occupy their land. Now either that is one way of doing things. The other way is that you see that there is injustice and therefore we have such laws to say that each person can own not more than a certain area of land or urban property or whatever it is. And so certainly a person suffers a little bit but he does not really. suffer that because even within that limit he is very well off. And

309

this is the price we pay for peace and economic development and we all know the experience of this country and of other countries is that it is only when opportunities are spread out amongst people that society itself can be strengthened and these tensions are lessened.

FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY

We speak of freedom and of democracy but these words today do not mean just what they meant some years ago. For instance when the word democracy first came into being it did not mean that everybody had the right. It meant that they were a few privileged people who had the right and the vast majority of people did not. But through the ages the meaning of the word changed and nobody today will accept that limited mean-

ing and today all the protest movements in the world are because some group or the other feel that those people whether they are black or brown whether they are women or young people feel that they are not enjoying their rights which should be theirs under democracy. This is why these protest movement begin and gather strength. So in India we are trying to evolve a way in which we can change the society so that little by little those who have been under privileged through the ages are able to be equal citizens. Firstly I think this is necessary for human dignity, for democracy, for freedom. But apart from that from the very practical point of view it is equally necessary. Because if it does not happen then there will be tension and nobody will be able to Prosper and we will not have the kind of stable society in which there can be economic progress.

PROGRESS

India has in the last years progressed a great deal. From Independence right upto 1962 our progress was quite spectacular. In 1962 we had a conflict on our borders with China and our attention was diverted from development to defence and a lot of money which should have been used for very essential roads, schools and other items, was used to strengthen our army because uptil then we had just not given a single thought to the defence of the country.

In 1965 we had another conflict - this time with Pakistan and we had barely covered from this heavy expenditure when we had terrible drought. For three years It hardly rained and suddenly we were faced with near-famine conditions. But it speaks of the courage and endurance of the people and their will to cooperate that even though the situation was so dark we were able to pi-event death through famine. Of course, the United States helped a great deal, other countries helped, other voluntary organisations helped and this is the period in which we were able to initiate our new strategy for agriculture. In those days - I came to the US in 1966 and the main question asked was: Can democracy survive in India? Can

you possibly feed this growing population? Afterwards we even saw headlines can India survive? You all see that India has survived, democracy has strengthened greatly and today our production of cereals like wheat and rice is fully adequate to feed our entire population as well as to have buffer stock in case of future needs.

But of course the situation is never so simple and we now have a new set of security. Our agricultural product as I said, is very good. Formerly we were paying attention merely to what people would eat. Now we are able to do research in other farm projects which are called cash crops.

In industry also our production has trebled, the number of people going to school is now very much greater - about 80 million children. Our experience has been that every problem solved means a set of new problems. Some time the same in different shape and some time quite different one. Now because education has expanded and industry has not kept pace we have a very, serious problem of what we call the educated unemployed young people with degrees -and not enough jobs for them. Some of the fault is of our education because it is of such a general nature that our young People are not really prepared to face the challenges of the contemporary world. And also most of them would like to have a secure job whereas gradually they must be much more resourceful, take initiative and try and find, make opportunities and openings for themselves.

Today we sometimes have many areas where there is shortage of teachers, of doctors and even of engineers and at the same

310

time there are engineers, doctors and teachers who are unemployed because many of our young people do not want to go to the villages or to the mountains or to the forest areas. So many conflicting situations have existed but I have no doubt that this is a part of the phase of develpoment through which we have to go and just as we have been able to solve other problems these prob-

lems will also be solved. So far as employment is concerned we have what we call crash programmes - that is we give top priority to certain schemes. They are not going to employ everybody but even if it makes a small dent in the number of unemployed we feel something has been achieved. So India is going ahead in every direction.

Our last elections have given the country a new sense of unity, a new sense of cohesion and a new direction. What was extraordinary about these elections was not that a political party won a big majority but that the ordinary people - People who had never bothered about Politics - people who had not voted sometime in earlier elections, took this as their campaign. We had many young people who worked all day in factory or in office or somewhere else and who gave us their might. They would come straight from work and come to the party office, work till one o'clock, two o'clock at night. We had many people like taxi drivers, truck drivers, scooter drivers who either gave free service to our workers or helped in some other way. So in a way the whole population became involved and this shows that at a time when there was tremendous propaganda against - they were enormous - because some of the biggest money powers were against us. So a lot of money was used against. But people in India made up their own mind what they thought was right direction and they were not-put off by threats or even in some places by violence. So this is what shows that democracy is strong and people have faith in their own capacity to do things and to solve problems.

Now today's crisis is quite a different one. It is not a usual economic crisis or a political crisis or even a social crisis. It is a crisis for which we are not at all to blame. We have no hand in it. We had no warning that such a situation is going to arise. Across our borders just as we had elections, elections took place and just like in our country the majority voted for one particular party, there also in Pakistan the majority and not only in East Bengal but in the whole of Pakistan - both parts of Pakistan the

majority voted for one party, the Awami League and one leader who is Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. But whereas in our country democracy took the normal course and our party came into power there they were not allowed to do so. And under the guise of negotiations troops came from the other side and on 25th of March a reign of terror was let loose as a result of which vast number of refugees have poured into India and a part of India which was a most complex from social point of view because there are many different tribals, there are many small States, there are many tribal people. Politically it is an area from which our extremist parties have been born and are active and there is a great deal of violence and in this area have come, as I said some where, that it is as if the entire population of Michigan State was to suddenly come to New York State. You can imagine the difficulty of coping with it and this is in India which is one of the poorest of the countries of the world.

GRAVE THREAT

So the financial burden is immense. But we are not really worried about the financial burden. When you have been poor and you learnt to endure, drought famine and all these conditions. You have the strength to bear an extra burden. It is not going to be easy, it is going to delay our programmes and our progress but it is something that ultimately can bear. What worries us is that our social and political tensions which have Come and most of all the fact that for the first time after independence there is a very grave threat to our security, our stability and even to our integrity. Now this is a situation which no country can tolerate. We want well being for our people, we want, higher standard of living but we cannot have it at the cost of any part of our freedom. So this is a difficult problem we face. At this moment I do not know what is going to happen. We have done everything possible in the past and we shall continue to do everything possible to avoid a conflict - or a greater confrontation. But in a way there

is a conflicted way. There may not be war in the accepted sense of the word but we feel there is an aggression on our country by the manner in which refugees are coming. The problem which has been deliberately created and it seems that one country, a neighbour country has very conveniently solved its own problem and just pushed all those people whom they did not like, who did not vote for them in elections on to another country. So thereby they solved some of their problem by removing these people bodily and secondly making us much weaker because of enormous burden which has come on us.

Now in this situation naturally any country would like understanding and support. But India is big enough, India is strong enough, India is united enough to face its problem on her own.

I have not come on this trip to ask for help. In fact even when I came in the time of drought I never said that we wanted help. I have come firstly because in response to a very kind invitation given a year ago and also because vast changes are taking place in Europe and in Asia and it is important to know what the leaders of Government and leaders of important Nations are thinking and what their assessment of various situations is and also I would like them to know MY assessment of the situations, in my area. I just said that we think that whatever the hardships we have been through tremendous sacrifices before and we can sacrifice today. But what we would like the world to know is that what happens to India is not merely of importance to India, it is not merely of importance to Asia. We think It is important to Europe and to the rest of the world. it is too large a country to be ignored. Today what is happening is that in most countries people are still working or thinking along the old Me of balance of power. When the country India was partitioned into India and Pakistan it was an unnatural partition. We knew it was bound to create problems but we accepted it because it seemed to be the price for freedom and we thought that even if there were problems and difficulties at least we will be able to go ahead and do something for the part that is ours. And in spite of grave provocation we have never interfered In what is happening on the other side. Our tribals have been armed and trained in China and in Pakistan. They have been encouraged to fight and to disturb the peace in our country. We did not complain to any other Nation. We dealt with these problems on our own and we have solved them one by one by talking with our people, by trying to find an answer to their difficulties, not by suppressing them.

In 1965 how did the war start? We did not start it. It started because thousands of infiltrators were sent into Kashmir thinking, they believe, their own propaganda that the people of Kashmir were not with India and therefore if people came from Pakistan the local people would help them. But it was not true and so it did not happen. The people, the ordinary people whether they were peasants or the nomadic tribes, they immediately faced the situation and because of their help and support that we were able to control the situation because in the first week we had no Army there at all. Having had the Chinese aggression in 1962 all our forces were at that time concentrated on Eastern borders. So I am giving this only as an example. They are trying to do the same thing this time. We have news from Kashmir that there has been some infiltration and we are perfectly capable of dealing with it. So the war does not necessarily mean that the two armies stand opposite and shoot. It is just as much aggression when you send people across to disturb. There is a situation in Fast Bengal and we have been told that if we do not give support at all and we do not show our sympathy to the people of East Bengal the question will be solved. What is the reality? The reality is that here are a people - 75 million people whom we did not encourage at any time, with whom we had no contact at all before this trouble but today who are strongly imbued with the spirit of nationalism because of the difficulties which they have gone through because the proposed various solutions but all these were brushed aside and the military regime of West Pakistan thought that they could suppress them by

sending their army over. Their Army has been active many months but they have not been able to suppress the movement because the guerillas and the base of the guerillas are the paramilitary forces of East Bengal. They are not Indians. They are the people who were there before in East Bengal and perhaps you all know this is the only time in

312

history when the Nation is to a man united. We boast of our unity in India but we do not have that kind of unity yet. To a man from the Chief Justice down to the smallest man they are united.

And today the guerillas are functioning there. They may sometimes come on Indian soil and I have no doubt that they do because we have no control over the border - it is far too big a border. If we could have sealed it we would have sealed it off and not allowed all these refugees to come. But when I took up this question with our military people they said even if we put the whole army there we will not be able to only where you can stop them coming is to shoot on the first sight and obviously this is not something which we do. So this is the situation there. The guerillas are supported by the entire population inside. Most of the action is not taking place near the Indian border, it is taking place in the centre in the most heavily fortified area, where there are most concentration of West Pakistani forces. That is where the guerilla action is taking place - that is where the local people are giving full support although they know that every time there is guerilla action the whole villages are razed to the ground. Even then they give that help. So there must be something which is moving them. And when a man is moved by this sort of spirit there is nothing on earth that can crush it. We all know through history that men have been Wiled, men have been wounded, crushed, suppressed but the spirit of man and the ideas of freedom, of human dignity have never been crushed in the history of man. We have been through this in India and every country which sought for freedom has been through. It is this spirit of man which has helped man to progress and to

rise to new heights. India certainly cannot be a party to the suppression of this spirit of freedom and human dignity. Nor we believe that peace can be bought by such suppression. Perhaps you can delay freedom but you cannot prevent it. India believes in facing the reality of any situation. These many- years we stood for the admission of China to the United Nations. china was not friendly to us -- China attacked us but we kept to this position because we felt that facing the reality that China exists a very large area, a very large population it was unreal to say that it should be ignored. And now we find that the Nations - many Nations --- who were opposed and who blamed us for this policy have today changed their mind. So this is a situation where we all must see a reality. And only by facing it can we then try to seek a solution which will be lasting and durable. We feel that no solution can be durable unless the people of East Bengal themselves accept it and that means their elected representatives. It is not a solution to say that so many people who were legitimately elected are no longer members and we will elect new ones. And I believe that 55 or 58 (some such number) have already been declared elected unopposed in the place of members who are alive, whose seats are not vacant. Some people may call this as a civilian Government but we do not accept and I do not think any one in the world who really wants to face the truth can accept it as a true Government which will be accepted by the people and which can deliver the goods. So this is a very difficult complex situation in our part of the world. We feel that if anything happens which threatens stability of India it will affect peace in the whole world.

You have given me a very patient hearing and I have great pleasure to have this opportunity of saying a few words. I bring to you the greetings and good wishes of the people of India. They have very great friendship for the people of America and I would say that we have no animosity even to the People of Pakistan or even of West Pakistan. Because we feel that by taking a wrong part they are jeopardising their own future not

just what happens in East Bengal but even what happens in West Pakistan. It can only remain strong if there is some contact between the Government and the people and if the people of the different provinces feel that they also are a part of development, they have a say in what is happening in the country which they do not so far have.

One more thing I would like to say. When we achieved freedom the struggle was all over the subcontinent. But in India those who fought for the freedom won the elections and formed the Government. But in Pakistan those who had fought for freedom remained in prison and it was those who had worked for the British whether as

313

bureaucrat or in the Army or in other form, they and who had opposed the freedom movement, formed the Government. And it is in this that the seeds of conflict and the seeds of future weaknessess were sown from the very day of the birth of the country. Once more I thank you very much and all wishes."

USA INDIA CHINA PAKISTAN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Speech at Columbia University

Following is the text of the speech of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, delivered at the School of International Affairs, Columbia University, on November 6, 1971:

I am deeply touched by your words and

by your asking me to come here this afternoon. People of America have always shown
an understanding of our problems. During
our independence struggle which has influenced my generation very profoundly and
which has shaped our present India, we took
inspiration from the words of some of your
own great men. India has strived to stand
for freedom and democracy in our own
country and in other places because we believe that these qualities, these ideals, are
indivisible. We believe that what happens
in one part of world does affect other people
and other countries.

Now it is very difficult to know what to say about India even to a distinguished audience such as this who are well informed because the country is so diverse, so full of contradictions, that anything you say about it is true of some parts and equally untrue of other parts. It is a country of great poverty, but one which is fighting poverty with all its strength. I think that if I were to select just one Indian quality, I would say it is that of tolerance, and I think this is a quality which is so essential for any working real democracy.

The other day in England, I was asked something about the high ideals of India and whether India was a country of high Ideals. My reply was that It is true that we have very high ideals, but like other countries, India is also inhabited by human beings and not all human beings are able to live up to high ideals. But nevertheless I think it is important if some of us aim at them and try to work our way by difficult, painful steps towards them.

Democracy can have many meanings. The meaning most often given to it in the West is that there should be a two-party system and that people should vote for one party or another. In fact, we were told that because we had many parties, perhaps there was something wanting in our democracy and we should aim at a two-party system. Now frankly to us it seems very strange because the two parties may not be able to contain all the opinions in a country at a time though I must admit that sometimes

the multiplicity of parties which we have in India is not a very great help to the public. But It is a phase of development, and I do not think it basically affects democracy. We have been able to have democracy, and democracy has been strengthened because of this quality of tolerance, which is an old quality in Indian philosophy and in our way of life.

We have many differences among ourselves. We have differences even within my party, but our method has been to try and talk things over and see how we can minimise the difference or points of dispute, how we can talk and arrive at some kind of work-Ing compromise. That is why through the years, even though the people of India are not educated and many of them, I am sorry to say, are still Illiterate, it would not be true to say that therefore they do not understand the problems which affect them. We have seen in our elections that every election has been an occasion for the education of people and that they have voted with maturity and understanding. I do not mean to say that many of them are not misled, or diverted by irrelevant factors, sometimes by misleading propaganda, but if you will forgive me, I will say that their number is no larger than similar cases in the more educated countries.

314

The basic problem in India is one poverty. We feel, therefore, that democracy cannot be real for the people unless it is accompanied by a system which gives greater equality. You all know that the word freedom, the word democracy, did not always mean what they mean today. In periods of history they applied only to a limited group. A few people were privilege people and were known as citizens, the rest may have been slaves or not entitled to the rights of freedom or democracy. But today no one will accept that situation. Today democracy means that every single person living in a country as a citizen should have full and equal rights.

Now this is our attempt in India. Under the Constitution it is so, but in reality it is

not really yet. The policy of the Governmerit aims at enabling our people to take advantage of the rights which are theirs under the Constitution. We do not have any dogmatic stand nor do we like to be labelled. Roughly we say we are a secular, socialist democracy. And secular India does not mean anti-religion; it merely means that there is no state religion but that all the religions of the different people living there will be equally honoured and equally respected. Socialism, we think, is the only way through which we can lessen the disparities between the different sections and, therefore, make democracy more meaningful.

When we were fighting for freedom, we thought freedom was the end, the ultimate aim. But, of course, when we got there, we found it was not. It was merely the opening of a door, the door of opportunity. And the door led to a tremendously difficult path, which was not merely the responsibility of the Government or the party. If we had to go on this Journey, we would need the participation and help of all the people of India. Now this is what we are trying to do. We have many Parties, parties who are against our basic policies and parties who are not - or at least they say they are not - but Say we are not implementing our Policies in the manner in which this should be done. We have found room for all these different paths and ideas. And our vision of the future is that it is through cooperation and not conflict that we can go ahead.

Although we have great diversity of language, of religion, even of races, of customs, we do not think it is a weakening factor. In fact, it is a surprise to me when I come abroad and at almost every place I am asked this question, "Will Indian unity hold? How do you manage these different languages?" Well, we have no difficulties at all. Because each State has its language and the people there study in that language. But it does not prevent their working in other States, travelling in other States. It does not upset the basic feeling of Indianness which binds us all together.

Indian unity is an established fact. It

is not dependent on a political party or a person. It is something which just exists in India and I do not think that it can easily be diminished or weakened. But there are many tendencies which could weaken unity. In fact, I think in the whole world there is always constant conflict between things that divide and weaken and others which cement together. It is for us to work towards the cementing unity, strengthening factors rather than the others.

In the last years since I was in the United States before, India has changed a great deal. We have been through an extremely dark Period, a period when the question was asked, "Can democracy survive, can unity survive, can you feed your growing population " Now we have answered all those questions. Democracy has been strengthened. The last election has proved this if proof were needed. Of course we did not doubt it for an instant. Unity is stronger than even before, and we are fully selfsufficient in the main cereals which the people eat, that is, wheat and rice. We are now trying to extend our agricultural programme to other farm products. We have improved in industry. But there is no doubt that with all this advance we have merely touched the fringe of the problems which we face. But we face the future with confidence

Had I come here just a few months ago and you had asked me what are the difficulties, I would have said there are no difficulties now? We are united. We are sure of our direction. And we are going ahead solving our problems one after another. But just a week after our new Parliament met and we were still, in the ways of all demo-

315

cratic societies, congratulating one another on our victory, a terrific new burden fell on us. All of you are aware what it is. So I do not want to dwell on It. But I would like to point to some questions which arise and which we think are very basic questions. We are told today that because our forces and those of West Pakistan are facing each other on the borders, there is a threat of

war. And this is true. But the real problem is not because these forces are face to face. The real problem is because of what has happened in East Bengal. If today there is peace in East Bengal it would not matter if our forces are face to face in the West or in the East. There would be no war. But there is this very serious problem there. And how did it arise? it did not arise because there was insurrection or because there was a desire of one part of Pakistan to separate, to secede, to become independent. No such voice was raised. There was an election held, a free election under the present military leadership of Pakistan. The programme for the election was put frankly and openly before the people. If the Government of West Pakistan objected to that programme, that was the moment to say, "we will not allow the elections, we cannot allow your six points, we do not approve of them." Nothing was said. The elections were held and the people of both parts of Pakistan overwhelmingly voted for one party - the Awami League.

I am congratulated on my great majority. But it was nothing compared to the majority which Sheikh Mujib Rahman gained in the election in Pakistan. It was a tremendous victory for him. And he is not extremist. He was a moderate person. In fact, if I may use the term, he used to be called by some others an American stooge at one time. But- once the elections were won, apparently this came as surprise to the Government of West Pakistan and they wanted to find out ways of getting around these results.

Negotiations were begun. We were not in touch with either Sheikh Mujib or his party or East Bengal. We did not know what was happening. We read in the papers that there were negotiations. Later, much later, in fact only about a week before I started on this trip I happened to meet somebody who said he was present at the negotiations. And on the 24th of March they thought that they were coming to a settlement, may be not a satisfactory settlement but still something, that could be worked out. But this period was in fact used to

bring troops from West Pakistan and on the 25th of March a reign of terror was let loose. Perhaps you have beard that the biggest concentration, the biggest attack was on the University of Dacca, where a large number of faculty and students were killed on the very first night. Now the entire East Bengali population - the civilians, the paramilitary forces, the East Bengal Regiment and the East Pakistani Rifles changed their allegiance, that is, they decided to fight the Pakistani army and that is the base today of the fight of the people of East Bengal. They are the people who are training the guerillas, young people who are coming across.

Now we are asked the question why is India hesitating to allow United Nations Observers? We are not really hesitating because we have some observers already - we have been there since many years and we have about. 10 people from the United Nations High Commission for relief of refugees on the Eastern border. Ours is a very Open society - anybody who comes, any of you, any of the diplomats who are there, the press, parliamentary delegations from Europe, from Latin America, from Asia, from New Zealand, the Arab countries, the Scandinavian countries, all these people have been to our camps. They have been to the border, and many, of them have crossed over and been to East Bengal. Every one of them, without exception, has given one story, Which is of the very great misery and the utterly chaotic conditions which exist there. Now in these conditions we are told that there is an attempt to have a civilian Government by declaring some seats vacant which are not vacant The people who were legally, constitutionally elected are still there, but their seats have been declared vacant and I am told that 55 people have been declared elected unopposed. Now in the present conditions they can have the whole Parliament declared unopposed because it is surely not possible for anybody to vote.

316

Now if United Nations observers go,

what do they hope to achieve? If they go with the intention of really bringing about peace in East Bengal, they are very welcome on our side: on any side they want to go, we will facilitate their going there. But this is not what they want to do. They want to say what is happening in East Bengal is an internal problem of Pakistan - "we will only want to see what is happening at the border". Now what is happening at the border cannot be divorced from what is happening inside East Bengal. You cannot say, "we will go and try and, well, prevent the guerillas but not prevent the army killing the people". Well, I cannot even say what is happening to some of the women there. They are not going to interfere with those things, but they do want to interfere with what the freedom fighters are doing.

You may ask, "Is India interfering in this by giving some support?- Well, I can tell you that the people of East Bengal are not very happy with what we are doing for them. They think, and I agree with them, we are doing far too little. And what we are doing is something that we cannot help doing- We cannot stop people going across the border either from the other side to our side or from our side across back to East Pakistan. Had we been able to do this, we would certainly have taken measures to stop these millions of refugees from coming. Because initially the reaction was, well, they are in great trouble, let us allow them in. But very soon the problems that grew for us are really beyond our control and are creating an extremely difficult situation.

The people of America have shown generosity. As I came here, I was given a cheque. I have been given cheques by school children in different countries, by poor people, all kinds of people and we are grateful for that help. But the major problem is nut financial one. We are poor, we cannot afford these millions of people. But because we have known how to live without food, without necessities, we can put up with any difficulty. We can look after any number of people, of course with great discomfort to them and to us and may be some people will die also. But nevertheless, we can survive this prob-

lem. What is difficult to survive are the political consequences, the social tensions, the difficulty of the administration, and last, but most important the real threat to our independence, to our stability to our integrity. Because with the refugees are coming people who, may be are not genuine refugees, we are having sabotage, our trains have been blown up and all kinds of other things.

So India today is facing a real threat. Wherever we have reached in economic growth, in social stability of the people, it has't been an easy task; it has been a tremendously difficult task against very great odds. We had help from many countries including the United States, but it has been a very very small part of the major endeavour. The major brunt of the problems - whether it is the refugees today or whether it is the problems of our own people, It has been borne by the Indian people themselves. If there is progress, it is because the Indian people have put in the effort, put in the sacrifice that was needed to go ahead.

So just when we come to a stage where we think we can go ahead much more easily, much faster, we suddenly have the problems of another country. They are not our problems and another country which has pushed across the border those people who did not vote for their Government, for the regime they wanted. There is no other crime which these people have committed because the cry for Independence arose after Sheikh Mujib was arrested and not before. He himself, so far as I know, has not asked for Independence, even now But after he was arrested. after there was this tremendous massacre, it was only perhaps understandable that the rest of the people said, Well, after this how can we live together? We have to separate".

So this is the situation. We have no animosity towards Pakistan even though they have campaigns --"Crush India, Conquer India". I do not know whether the pictures appeared here But these were the stickers which the population was having. They observed a day or a week and they had these things on their cars. We never had anything like this, and we never shall We

have not had anything against even China. China has attacked us, Pakistan has attacked us. On our side we have always said we want friendship. On our side we have always taken unilateral steps which we

317

thought would lead to a normalisation of relations. But there has been no response forthcoming.

Well. we do not mind if there is no response. But we do think that the limit of our endurance has been reached when they think they can just put their troubles on to us.

Here was the problem they were facing, - that their people had voted against the Government. So what do you do, you send them across the frontier. At one stroke you get rid of your enemies, you get rid of population and you weaken India which you want to weaken. It is something which India just cannot tolerate. Not me, may be I could tolerate. But with all my majority in Parliament, it is not a dictatorship. I have to carry not only my party, I have to carry in a serious situation all the other parties of India. And we feel that it is not just the question of India because we believe that if peace is threatened in India, if stability is threatened in India, there cannot be peace and stability in any part of Pakistan. They can have all the armies of the world, whether they have from China or the U.S.A. or any other country. They cannot bring peace if there is instability in the major part of the sub-continent.

Today by some countries wanting to support the prestige of one man, they are threatening peace in the entire sub-continent. I do not personally think that they can save Pakistan or keep it united or keep it strong by, supporting a person who is not an elected person. who is a military dictator. So this is what we are concerned about - not really today's problems but the basic values for which we have fought, for which so many of our people have given their lives. These are the values which are being attacked.

And if they are attacked next door to us, well, what guarantee have we that they can survive in our country and they cannot be attacked there. This is what bothers us. It is not important who is to blame, though I think Pakistan is to blame, but I do not want to score a point in a debate. What is important, how can we now have peace? You cannot have peace just by saying that the troops should move. You can only have peace if the basic problem which has arisen is solved. And the basic problem is not in the West where the troops are facing each other, but in the east. Since I have mentioned troops, I would like to say one word more, and that is that Pakistan moved its troops about a week or ten days before we did anything. And the United Nations observer, who was there took up this question with them. They said, "Well, this is nothing serious, this is just ordinary training exercise". If that reason is accepted, it is very strange indeed that you have these exercises and you keep your troops posted not for a day or two days but over a week. And ten days passed without any action from the United Nations or anybody else. Then we said, well these people may attack, and in order to defend ourselves we must move up our troops. Already twice, or rather three times, if you include China, we have been invaded and found unprepared. No Government can last in a country if the people feel that this Government is not going to defend our country or defend our security.

We waited patiently, hoping that something would be done, some ways would be found. But nobody bothered. Not a word was said while these troops were on our borders facing us. It was only when our troops went that suddenly the world's concern came up. "Oh, the two troops are facing each other.

It is true that war is a dreadful thing. I have lived through the last war in London, the worst part of the blitz. And I know that now wars are much worse. I know what happens to the civilian population. Never would anybody want war for their people. And certainly India will do nothing to provoke a war or conflict. But India is deter-

mined to safeguard her interests. India is determined to keep her freedom intact India is united as never before, and India feels so strongly about these basic things,

whether it is freedom, whether it is democracy. It is a whole way of life with us. It is not a dogma, It is not an ism' that we follow. It is a way of life which has kept, our nation alive for thirty centuries. And we are not going to have it attacked because it suits somebody or other or does not suit somebody or other. We want help, we want support, we welcome sympathy. But basically in the world every individual ultimately, is alone and every nation is ultimately alone.

318

And India is Prepared to fight alone for what It thinks worth fighting for.

The fight is not always on the war front. Much of our fight has been a peaceful fight and this is our Preference. This is our way, that we should fight and struggle peacefully to establish these ideals. But we are not going to give up the ideals for anything or anybody. We owe a responsibility to our people and to our future generation. We want to bring well-being to our people, but we know that economic progress without social justice has no meaning, and economic progress and social justice without freedom for the people also has no meaning. All these things must go together.

We have learnt a lot from the West but we are determined not to become mere imitators of the West. We want to find our own direction and our own path., We want to find strength in the values which our people have held for all these centuries. By Western standards in many things, we may be behind and we may be backward, but we have got something in us that has kept us going.

I am asked the question time and again: "How is it that a woman can lead a Government or a country?" Do you know this question is never asked in India - not in the smallest village, because our society and our philosophy is based on the importance

of the individual. We are not concerned if this person is a man or a woman, if this person is a Christian or a Hindu, or a Muslim. We are Only concerned this is a human being, what has he to contribute to society? If he has something to contribute, society should make use of that contribution. This is that India is trying to do. I do not know whether we will succeed. We can only say that we will put all our strength in taking the country in that direction. We may succeed, we may not succeed. But unfortunately our Philosophy teaches us that you must do right regardless of whether It brings pleasure or pain, whether it brings success or failure. And we found although it seems a very Philosophical abstract thought, very practical as well. It is the one thing that really gives satisfaction and ultimately gives success also. And I think that in these years by having a democratic form of Government, we may not have achieved the material success that perhaps - I say perhaps because I am not sure that it would have happened -- we could have got by, say, a stronger type of Government - dictatorship or something like that. But if we have lost in that direction, I think, we have gained something by not taking that direction. That gain is in human values, it is in the dignity of the human being. It is the suffering to the individual which has been avoided. So I think that India has something to offer to the world, but India has also a great deal to take from the world. No country in today's world can live in isolation. Therefore, our policy has been that just as we try to talk and take the people of our country with us no matter how much against us, they may be, so with other nations. Today I have a tremendous majority. But on every issue I talk with all the leaders of the Opposition, some of them may have only one representative in Parliament, but still if he represents a different point of view, I talk with him or with her. And this is the strength of our Democracy and ultimately of our country. And I think this is the only way that can succeed in the world at large. We each have our way. But we say, what is there in common, what is there that can keep us together and help us to build one world?

I am, of course, very proud of our young people in India because in spite of enormous difficulties, I think they are facing the challenge of the future, and although sometimes their expression of dissent takes violent forms, which I certainly do not approve, I think they are generally groping for something worthwhile and I hope that by our work we can persuade them to do their groping in a more constructive, cooperative and peaceful way. So I would like to thank you once more for this privilege of allowing me to say a few words to you all and to give you the greetings on my own behalf and on behalf of the people of India.

319

USA INDIA PAKISTAN NEW ZEALAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA MALI UNITED KINGDOM OMAN

Date: Nov 01, 1971

December

	V	olume No		
1995				
Content				

Foreign Affair Record 1971 Vol. XVII DECEMBER

No. 12

CONTENTS

PAGE

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Committee

321

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

TEDERAL REI ODER OF GERMANT
Technical Cooperation Agreement 322 Inter-Governmental Agreement for West German Aid 322
GREECE
Indo-Greek Trade Agreement 323
INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS
Shri Swaran Singh's Address at General Assembly Welcoming U.N. Secretary General Speech by Shri Swaran Singh in the Security Council 325
Foreign Minister's Reply to Debate at U.N. Security Council on India Pakistan Conflict 342
Foreign Minister's Statement at Security Council on Soviet Plea for inviting Bangla Desh Representatives 349 Shi Sanga Singhla day to Sangita Council to Again Policieus
Shri Swaran Singh's plea to Security Council to Await Pakistan's Response to India's Unilateral Ceasfire 349
Shri Swaran Singh on Security Council Resolution on Indo-Pak Conflict 350 Shri Samar Sen's Speech at U.N. Security Council on Ceasfire
Demand in Bangla Desh Shri Samar Sen's Statement at UN Security Council 352
Speech by Shri S.Sen in the Security Council Urging hearing of
Bangla Desh Representative 359
MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS : EXTERNAL PUBLICITY DIVISION GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
(Continued Ovrleaf) PAGE
Speech by Shri S. Sen in the Security Council 365 Shri Samar Sen's Speech at U.N. General Assembly on Bangla Desh 372 Shri Samar Sen's Statement at Security Council on Problem of Zimbabwe 378
Shri I. J. Bahadur Singh's Speech at U.N. General Assembly on Situation in West Asia 381
NORWAY
Agreement for Family Planning Programme 383
PAKISTAN
Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on War by Pakistan 384 Prime Minister's Statement on Border Situation 384
Prime Minister's Statement on Surrender of West Pakistan Forces in Bangla Desh 385
Instrument of Surrender 386 Prime Minister's Statement on Cease-fire on Western Front 387

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLA DESH

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Recognition of Bangla Desh 388 Shri Swaran Singh Felicitates Foreign Minister of Bangla Desh 389

POLAND

Indo-Polish Trade Protocol 390

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Protocol on Instrumentation 391
Indo-Soviet Trade Protocol 391

UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid for Tuticorin Fertilser Plant 392

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Letter to President Nixon 393

Statement in Parliament on Suspension of U.S. Arms Supplies 394

(ii)

NORWAY SLOVAKIA GERMANY GREECE INDIA PAKISTAN ZIMBABWE POLAND USA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Intlo-Czechoslovak Joint Committee

Following press release was issued in New Delhi on December 6, 1971 on the signing of the documents relating to the agreed conclusions of the Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Committee held in Delhi:

"In the struggle in which we are engaged today, the Indian people can never forget the assistance rendered by the socialist countries

of Eastern Europe, particularly, the USSR and Czechoslovakia", the Union Foreign Trade Minister, Shri L. N. Mishra, said here today.

The Foreign Trade Minister was speaking immediately after the signing of the documents relating to the agreed conclusions of the Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Committee here today.

"It is in times like this that a country can test the value of its friendship with other nation", he added.

The Czechoslovak Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. A. Barcak, who signed the Agreement on behalf of his country described the Present moment as historic for India and said that his Government was paying full attention to the situation in this sub-continent. He expressed approval of the Indian Government's policies.

Mr. Barcak said that today's Agreement would signify the expansion and deepening of economic and political cooperation between India and Czechoslovakia in a systematic manner. He described the New Delhi discussions as very useful which would bring fruits in the very near future to both countries.

The Indo-Czechoslovak Joint Committee which concluded its discussions here today has set up two Working Groups on (i) Industrial Cooperation and Trade, and (ii) on Planning Scientific and Technical Cooperation. These Groups discussed cooperation between the two countries in a number of fields. In particular, a reference was made to the possibility of manufacturing new items in the Czech-assisted projects which are already working in India such as HMTP, Ranchi and BHEL Hyderabad. The Czechoslovak side made a number of recommendations regarding the full utilization of installed capacity in these projects and has offered to buy part of the products manufactured in these units.

In regard to commercial cooperation, the Committee noted the satisfactory pro-

gress that had been made since the last meeting of the Committee. The Czechoslovak side has agreed to send a delegation to India to study the possibilities of purchases of increased volume of Indian consumer goods and engineering products.

In the field of scientific and technical cooperation the Czechoslovak side has agreed to send more experts to India for assisting the various national laboratories. It has also been agreed that the Czechoslovak side would examine the possibility of establishing a farm machinery research and development institute, and to offer technical cooperation in such fields as high temperature ceramics, 'E' glass technology, fibre glass and fibre glass manufacture.

The two Ministers expressed their earnest desire for the implementation of the decisions taken at the meeting and for the identification further new fields in which the two sides could cooperate.

321

NORWAY SLOVAKIA INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Technical Cooperation Agreement

Following is the text of the press release issued in New Delhi on December 31, 1971 on the signing of a technical cooperation agreement between India and the Federal Republic of Germany:

An agreement on technical cooperation between India and the Federal Republic of Germany was signed here today. The agreement is an extension of the General Technical Cooperation Agreement signed between the two countries in March 1966, which expires today.

Under the new agreement, the Federal Republic of Germany will continue to give technical assistance to India in various development sectors by providing the services of experts, supplying equipment and by giving scholarships to Indian nationals. The agreement was signed on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany by its Ambassador, Mr. Guenter Diehl, and on behalf of India by Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

Since the first agreement was signed in 1966, the Federal Republic of Germany has given valuable technical assistance in the shape of experts, equipment and training places in various technical fields. The main beneficiaries have been the Indo-German agricultural projects at Mandi, Kangra, Almora and the Nilgiris, the Foremen Training Institute, Bangalore, the Central Staff Training and Research Institute, Calcutta, the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, the T.V. Station at Delhi and the proposed Bombay-Poona T.V. Station.

The agreement signed today provides an umbrella for continuing West German technical aid to the existing projects and for similar new projects.

GERMANY INDIA USA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

inter-Governmental Agreement for West German Aid

Following is the text of the Press Note issued in New Delhi on December 2, 1971 on the signing of an Inter-Governmental agreement on West German aid to India in 1971-1972:

The Federal Republic of Germany has extended to India assistance totalling Rs. 55.35 crores (DM 270 minion) for the year 1971-72. An Inter-Governmental agreement for this was signed here today following talks over the past few days with a 7-member official delegation from Bonn. The agreement was signed by the West German Ambassador, Mr. Guenter Diehl, and the head of the German delegation, Frau Helga Steeg, on behalf of the Federal Republic of Germany, and by Shri M. G. Kaul, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Finance, on behalf of India.

The economic assistance of Rs. 55.35 crores under this agreement will be utilised as follows:

- 1. Rs. 16.4 crores (DM 80 million) as commodity aid for the purpose of goods and services;
- 2. Rs. 6.15 crores (DM 30 million) for projects to be mutually selected; these projects are open for international bidding;
- 3. Rs. 4.1 crores (DM 20 million) for loans to small and medium undertakings by the Industrial Finance Corporation of India, the Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation of India and the National Small industries Corporation;
- 4. Rs. 6.15 crores (DM 30 million) for the financing of capital goods imports approved by the Indian Inter-Ministerial Committee for capital goods;

322

5. Rs. 14.555 crores (DM 71 million) towards deferment of certain repayments of principal in respect of ear-

lier West German credits maturing between April 1, 1971, and March 31, 1972;

- 6. Rs. 3.895 crores (DM 19 million) towards reduction of interest payments falling due between April 1, 1971 and March 31, 1972; and
- 7. Rs. 4.1 crores (DM 20 million) by way of liquidity assistance for meeting India's import requirements from any source.

TERMS OF ASSISTANCE

The amounts at 1 to 4 and 7 totalling Rs. 36.9 crores (DM 180 million) will be extended in the form of loans repayable in 30 years (including a grace period of 8 years) carrying an interest rate of 21/2 per cent per annum. The amount of Rs. 14.555 crores (DM 71 million) represents rescheduling over a period of 10 years of certain repayments falling due in the current financial year, carrying an interest rate of 3 per cent per annum. An amount of Rs. 3.895 crores (DM 19 million) will be made available as grant-in-aid.

The West German assistance is utilised by India for importing raw materials, components and other maintenance requirements for the economy, and equipment for various industries like automobile, chemicals, engineering, power, steel, etc.

The financial assistance under today's agreement is within the framework of the Aid India Consortium. The opportunity of the West German delegation's visit was utilised to discuss other economic matters of mutual interest with a desire to strengthen the economic ties between the two countries.

With the signing of this agreement, West German economic assistance to India by way of credits (including grant-in-aid for the reduction of interest charges) for India's development programme totals Rs. 1,085.51 crores (DM 5,295.16 million). In addition, total technical assistance commitments amount to Rs. 57.4 crores (DM 280 million).

Among the important projects undertaken with West German assistance are the Rourkela Steel Project, the Gujarat Aromatics Project, being implemented by the Indian Petro-chemicals Corporation, Rourkela Fertiliser Plant, Neyveli Mining Scheme, expansion of the Mysore Iron and Steel Works and its conversion into an alloy and special steel plant, New Government Electric Factory, Bangalore, expansion of the Kalinga Pig Iron Plant, the Kargali Coal Washery (Extension), the Sawang Coal Washery and Telco Tool Room Factory.

Amongst many projects set up with West German Technical assistance are the agricultural projects at Mandi, Almora and Nilgiri, the Indian Institute of Technology, Madras, and the Engineering Export Promotion scheme and the Foreman Training Institute in Bangalore.

GERMANY INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

GREECE

Indo-Greek Trade Agreement

Following press note was issued in New Delhi on December so, 1971 on the exchange of letters extending the, Indo-Greek Trade Agreement:

Letters were exchanged here today between Ms Excellency Mr. John Yannakakis, Ambassador of Greece in New Delhi and Shri V. S. Misra, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade, Government of India extending the validity of the Trade Agreement between India and Greece upto December 31, 1971.

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

A revision of this Trade Agreement is under consideration of both the Governments

323

and the extension of the present Agreement upto, December 31, 1971 has been agreed to, pending finalisation of the new trade Agreement.

India's exports to Greece stood at Rs. 191 lakhs during 1970-71, as compared to Rs. 189 lakhs during 1969-70, the major items of exports being non-electrical machinery and appliances, jute manufactures, handtools, coir yarn and manufactures and rubber manufactures.

India's imports from Greece which stood at Rs. 2.1 lakhs during 1969-70 increased to Rs. 159 lakhs in 1970-71, the major imports being fertilisers.

GREECE INDIA RUSSIA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Swaran Singh's Address at General Assembly Welcoming New U. N. Secretary General

The following is the text of a statement by Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, in the U.N. General Assembly, December 22, 1971 on the retirement of Secretary-General U Thant and appointment of new Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim:

We are coming to the close of a

momentous session of the General Assembly. During the session many important things have happened. As you rightly foresaw at the beginning of the session, the universality of this organisation has been further strengthened; not only has China taken its rightful place, but there has been an addition of new members. One of them is a close neighbour of ours and the other four, all Asian countries. We hope that in the not too distant future, our organisation will become a truly universal organisation where all sovereign independent nations win be represented, including divided countries.

We are deeply indebted to you, Mr. President, for the able manner in which you have cheerfully and smilingly helped us to cross over many difficult hurdles.- Your example has been an inspiration to all of us. We are particularly proud of the fact that you are an Asian and represent a great friendly neighbour of ours.

In the turmoil and turbulence of the debate, one does not realise some times the great labours put in by the Secretariat to help make the proceedings smooth and orderly. May I take this opportunity of conveying our sincere thanks through you, Mr. President, to the devoted band of workers in the U.N. Secretariat?

We shall miss a great Secretary-General who is leaving us soon. His sincerity, his devotion to the cause of peace, his dedication to the principles of the Charter, his noble and inspiring example which helped to create confidence in the impartiality of the U.N. Secretariat are all rare qualities which are necessary for any incumbent to this high office. My country recognised his great contribution to world peace by conferring on him the first Jawaharlal Nehru Award for international Understanding in 1967. We wish him a well-earned rest but we hope his advice will still be available to a of us in the years to come.

We are happy, Mr. President, that another sincere believer in peace who hails from a country that has always stood for the enduring and abiding values of life has been elected to succeed U Thant. We welcome Ambassador Waldheim as the new Secretary-General and wish him every success in the difficult task and the great and onerous responsibilities that he will have to shoulder in this high office.

324

The world is entering a new era full of challenges as well as opportunities. The United Nations will, we hope, not only reflect these new trends but also be successful in meeting the challenges and utilising the opportunities that the new trends offered. There will, of course, be many difficulties in our path but we earnestly believe that, with all its limitations and imperfections the United Nations is the only world organisation which can inspire confidence among all countries and peoples of the world. It should, therefore, be our task to strengthen this organisation In a manner that reflects both the realities of the world we live in as well as the ideals we strive for. The Secretary-General will have to play an important role and he can depend on the full cooperation of the Indian Delegation in the discharge of his high and noble tasks.

INDIA USA CHINA **Date**: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Speech by Shri Swaran Singh in the Security Council

Following is the text of the speech by the Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, at the U.N. Security Council during emergency debate on Indo-Pakistan Conflict on December 12, 1971: This is the second time within a fortnight that the Security Council is meeting
to deal with the tragic events in South Asia.
The concern of the international community
regarding this conflagration and its anxiety
to stem it as early as possible are understandable. The deliberations in the Security
Council between 4-6 December and later in
the General Assembly on 7 December under
the "Uniting for Peace" resolution indicated
the common concern of all with the situation
which is causing untold suffering to millions
of people in my part of the world.

But we should frankly ask ourselves - and I would be failing in my duty. if I did not ask the Council - if this common concern extends to all aspects of the situation, its causes and development to the present stage. The situation today is the culmination of the sufferings brought upon the people of Bangla Desh because of the unwillingness of the rulers of Pakistan to respond to the aspirations of the overwhelming majority of the people who formerly were part of the State of Pakistan.

My Government has taken note of the resolution which the General Assembly adopted at the end of its discussion on the situation in Bangla Desh and on the Indian sub-continent. While it constitutes a testimony of the unimpeachable concern of the United Nations for the cause of peace and the good intentions of most of the world community, it is also, in our minds, an acknowledgement of a fundamental and unfortunate limitation from which the United Nations- suffers in dealing with such situations. The United Nations had been faced for over nine months with a most challenging problem and the solution which it suggested was - if I may say so - unrealistic. My country finds it all the more regrettable because India is totally committed to the objectives and ideals of the Charter. If the international community had willed and acted in concert in time we would not have faced today the clouds of war which have now burst over the Indian sub-continent.

While the General Assembly made an appeal for cease-fire and withdrawal, there appears to have been no deliberation on whether such a cease-fire and withdrawal by itself would meet the immediate problems that today confront the people of India and Bangla Desh, problems which we have attempted to meet with restraint, caution and peaceful means; problems which are not of our creation and which we have had to face over the last nine months.

The compound tragedy originates in the denial, by coercive authority and brutality, of the legitimate and declared aspirations or the people of Bangla Desh. My country has been accused of having ulterior motives and subversive intentions against the neighbouring State of Pakistan. There have been consistent attempts at projecting the tragedy of Bangla Desh as a creation of India and a dispute between India and Pakistan. Those

325

attempts have, to my mind, unfortunately succeeded in adding another dimension to the struggle of the people of Bangla Desh against the Government of West Pakistan. This new dimension is the confrontation today between the armed forces of India and Pakistan.

It is a matter of grief for us that a military confrontation has come about. We believe that it has occurred because of the failure of the international community to act upon the realities of the situation as it developed and to meet it with objectivity and promptness in a manner which would have prevented it from deteriorating into this present stage.

My delegation has endeavoured, since the eruption of the crisis in what was East Pakistan on 25 March, 1971, to put the problem in perspective in world capitals as well as here at the United Nations. The effort was made by us at the highest possible level; and though the genesis of the problem was explained and the prognosis of its implications outlined repeatedly we regret to say that the International community failed to understand the problem in terms of its fundamental causation and thus found itself unable to remedy it at its root.

Since we are meeting today at a moment of deep crisis on the sub-continent, with violence and war stalking the land, the events which led to the present tragedy bear repetition. I feel compelled to recount these details as it is imperative to remove misunderstandings regarding the reasons for the present crisis, If the problem is to be resolved decisively and in a constructive manner.

The immediate origin of the crisis occurred some time between December 1970 and March 1971. After 23 years of unrepresentative rule and 13 years of military dictatorship which were matched by continuous economic exploitation and political discrimination by the vested interests of Pakistan against the East, the first ever free general elections were organized in Pakistan by the Government of President Yahya Khan in December 1970.

We welcomed the elections in the hope that apart from restoring the long-suppressed rights of the people of Pakistan to them, they would also open a new chapter of improved relations with this Important neighbour of ours.

Our hope found further confirmation in the electoral victory of political parties, both in the eastern and western wings of Pakistan, that really embodied the aspirations of the people of those regions.

This positive political development in Pakistan was, however, prevented from evolving to its logical, legal and political conclusion by the decision of the military regime of Pakistan to reject callously the clearly expressed demand of the East Bengali people for autonomy. This deepseated urge found incontrovertible expression in the massive victory of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman of the Awami League, not only in elections to the Provincial Assembly, but in elections to the National Assembly of Pakistan in which the Awami League commanded an absolute majority by win-

ning 167 seats out of 313 seats. The Awami League won 98 per cent of the seats in the National Assembly allotted to East Pakistan. It had 167 out of a total of 169 seats.

Instead of transferring power to the duly elected representatives of people, President Yahya Khan repeatedly postponed the convening of the national and provincial legislatures until mid-March.

The final preface to the brutal suppression of the declared wishes of the people of East Bengal took the form of a pretended negotiation., between President Yahya Khan and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman in the early part of March 1971, while in fact the Government of West Pakistan was undertaking a massive augmentation of its armed forces in Fast Bengal to terrorize and suppress the people of that area.

The climax of the conspiracy against the people of Bangla Desh occurred on the infamous night of 25 March, when the West Pakistani army went into action against them. Events took a catastrophic course and an international problem with explosive potentialities was created overnight. Informed international opinion, as reflected in the media and at least some Governments, recognized this straightaway. But the international community as a whole responded to the humanitarian aspects of the problem

326 sooner than to its political and other implications.

The Secretary-General issued his appeal for relief to the refugees on 19 May, 1971. His memorandum to the President of the Security Council was sent on 20 July, 1971.

In the meanwhile, a massive exodus into India of the people of Bangla Desh commenced on the night of 25 March, which still continues. This is an exodus unprecedented in known history across an international frontier. The threat to our security, stability and economy by what has been called the massive civilian invasion of refugees into India cannot be determined in tangible terms.

I had explained the implications, the brutal and continuing suppression of the people of East Bengal by the West Pakistani army in terms of its grave socio-economicpolitical consequences to India to the General Assembly in my statement on 27 September this year. I had underlined that the exodus of East Bengal refugees into India had created intolerable demographic pressures on the most densely populated neighbouring states and territories of India. I had pointed out that the entire administration of the Indian states into which these refugees came had to be geared to the relief of these refugees. The economic implications of the number of refugees, which now stands at 10 million, and the generated economic pressure on India can be discerned from the fact that our Finance Minister has made two additional provisions of nearly 330 crores of rupees, or approximately \$ 500 million, in our annual budget for the year 1971-72, which ends on 31 March, 1972. A smaller State would have collapsed in the face of such an influx.

Social friction, the fear of epidemics and the possibilities of communal and other tensions had to be countered. The refugees became an incalculable hindrance to our economic development for years to come. Their continuing exodus, without any hopes of their return, was a destructive obstacle to the very socio-political fabric of India.

Pakistan's repressive policies, compelling the unabated flight of millions through terror into our territory, posed a threat to the fundamental principles on which we have tried to build our society and to the hard earned stability that the Indian people had achieved by the labours of over a quarter of a century.

Our problems were accentuated by a deliberate and false propaganda offensive by the Government of Pakistan, first questioning the existence of the refugees and then ultimately describing them as a few miscreants and secessionists put up by India. When the facts became too manifest to be questioned, Pakistan then resorted to ques-

tioning their numbers as mentioned by India.

The people of Bangla Desh resorted to the only course open to them in the face of the violent and repressive denial of their declared aspirations, accompanied by unimaginable terror, brutalization and genocide. They became totally alienated from West Pakistan and took the decision to declare their independence on 10 April, 1971.

The West Pakistani military regime continued in its unimaginative, callous and fatal course. Things went from bad to worse. Mr. Bhutto, who now leads the, Pakistan delegation, himself acknowledged in July that the military could not solve Pakistan's problems. In spite of the counsels of reason by the international community, in spite of the appeals of the Secretaray-General to seek a political reconciliation taking due account of the welfare and fundamental human rights of the people of East Bengal, in spite of the humanitarian response of the International community to the refugee Problem, in spite of the restrained and non-interfering and humanitarian reaction of the Government of India, the Government of West Pakistan refused to come to term with the people of Bangla Desh and their already elected representatives led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was, from the beginning, imprisoned in West Pakistan and subjected to secret military trial carrying, we are told, the penalty of death. We do not even know whether he is still alive, but we do know that no one has been able to contact him.

The policy of repression and genocide continued unabated over the last nine months. In his statements and Pronouncements, President, Yahya Khan, since May last, refused deliberately to deal With the

327

basic problem which he himself had created; on the contrary, he banned the Awami League, arbitrarily disqualified a large number of the elected representatives of the provincial and national assemblies of East Bengal, and continued to hold the people of

Bangla Desh to ransom at gunpoint. To confuse the issue. Pakistan shifted the blame on to India. To confuse the issue further, Pakistan put out that the popular Awami League policies and decisions were inspired by the Government of India. India was accused of encouraging secession. The widespread resistance movement which emerged in Bangla Desh in the face of Pakistani repression was described as a subversive force organized by India. The mounting international pressure to recognize the aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh was sought to be countered by declarations of so-called amnesty - which did not cover the elected representatives of the people and by imposition of a civilian government in East Bengal constituted by quislings and unrepresentative politicians who had even lost the elections in December 1970.

These policies of the Government of Pakistan had the inevitable consequence of alienating even further the people of Bangla Desh and of strengthening their determination to break the colonial yoke of the West Pakistani regime and of channeling the freedom movement in a manner which would inevitably lead to emergence of Bangla Desh as an independent nation. Pakistan's military action and the snuffing-out of all human rights and the reign of terror which continues, have shocked the conscience of mankind. The popular revolt against these actions has a hard core of fighters who are former members of the East Bengal regiment and the East Pakistan Rifles, who took the cause of their people to their hearts. They were joined by thousands of highly motivated young men determined to end the tyranny once and for all.

During the general debate in the Assembly in September, I had attempted to explain the developing situation in its true perspective and I had appealed to the international community and to the United Nations to persuade the Government of Pakistan to see reason and to evolve a political settlement with the already-elected representatives of the people of East Bengal. I had stressed that in such an atmosphere of strife and ferment, the United Nations

remains the only hope for States and peoples; I had pointed out that it is in such moments that we all can prove that the ideals of the Charter are not static norms to which we re-dedicate ourselves for form's sake every year. I had forewarned the international community of our apprehensions that if, in spite of our declared commitments to the Charter, we found ourselves unable to face realities in the face of crisis born of violations of the very principles of the Charter, violations which were deliberate and calculated, as they are in case of Bangla Desh, then the United Nations would indeed be failing in its fundamental purpose, that it would be questioning its very existence and its principles.

It was our earnest hope that the incalculably grave consequences of the crisis created by West Pakistan in the East would be comprehended by the nations of the world, and that their undoubted influence would be brought to bear on the Government of West Pakistan to restore the fundamental rights of the people of East Bengal to them. Our hopes that the counsels of reason would prevail were, however, not fulfilled. The consequence is the conflict that we face today.

It is essential that in seeking a solution to the current conflict, the Security Council takes note of the events which led to this crisis. I shall come a little later to the immediate genesis of the problem over the last few days.

I would be failing in my duty, however, to the Council if I did not draw its attention to the consistent pattern of antagonism and hostility which has characterized Pakistan's Policies towards India since the emergence of India into independence. The origins of the Present conflict are to be found in the psychosis of hatred and war, continuously whipped up by the rulers of Pakistan, of which India has been repeatedly the victim.

We have repeatedly been accused of desiring the break-up of Pakistan, of nurturing not merely political but social, communal and cultural antagonism against the people of Pakistan, of having been parties to alleged subversions against this neighbouring State of ours. I could resort to an

328

interpretative and even rhetorical rebuttal of these allegations, but we all will agree that facts unmistakably reveal intentions even better than do arguments.

The leaders and the people of India accepted the desire of the Muslim majority areas of India to constitute themselves into a separate State, the State of Pakistan, nearly 25 years ago. But India, on its part, refused to accept the two-nation theory on which the demand for Pakistan was thought to be based. The result was that, at the time of the partition, India continued to have nearly 40 million Muslim citizens, whose number today is nearly 70 million. These are honoured and equal citizens of the secular, democratic Republic of India. The partition of the sub-continent, was accepted by us as an irrevocable political fact essential for the future welfare of the peoples inhabiting it. If there was any desire to prevent the creation or to question its separate existence, the people of India had sufficient political means to prevent the creation of Pakistan. Students of history will acknowledge the veracity of this assertion. Hardly had the ink dried on the agreements arranging for the partition of the country when we were faced with brazen aggression by our new neighbour, in Kashmir in 1947, a few months after the emergence of India and Pakistan as independent countries, an aggression motivated by a wish for territorial aggrandizement.

While we tried to stem the aggression, we brought it to the notice of the United Nations. Though the fact of aggression was proved and the identity of the aggressor incontrovertibly established, the United Nations, due to reasons which are incomprehensible, has not yet been able to arrange for the evacuation of the parts occupied by the West Pakistani troops. Though an uneasy peace prevailed in the area, India continued its attempts at reconciliation and a

building up of relations with Pakistan on positive and constructive lines. In spite of the military conflict imposed upon us soon after partition, we unilaterally honoured our economic and financial obligations, towards the new State of Pakistan, in glaring contrast to Pakistan's refusal to honour its commitments in this regard, regarding assets, evacuee property and border arrangements. We continued our efforts at increasing economic and cultural relations. Even at great sacrifice we were willing to share our resources with our neighbour, an outstanding example of which was our agreement to share our river water resources with Pakistan under the Indus Water Treaty of 19 September, 1960. The provisions of the Treaty constituted a drain on our own resources. While our policy of reconciliation continued, the response from Pakistan remained negative, even abrasive. The Government of Pakistan undertook a deliberate policy of pushing out its minority communities into India. Substantial sections of minority population were either massacred or driven into India from West Pakistan in the wake of partition. An unending trek of refugees from East Bengal into India started in 1947 where the minority communities were more populous. Pakistan made repeated but unsuccessful attempts to convert its aggression in Kashmir into an instrument of harassing India in the chancelleries of the world and in the United Nations. When those attempts failed it reverted to the naked use of arms against India in 1965, by undertaking armed intrusions into the Ram of Kutch first, and indulging in an all-out unprovoked aggression against India in Kashmir. India again came to the United Nations in the hope of finding redress. The events of the conflict of August-September 1965 in Kashmir, and the spirit of reconciliation which the Government and people of India showed at Tashkent following the conflict, are well known to the international community.

If India at any time had harboured design of territorial aggrandizement in what is now Bangla Desh, those designs would surely have been manifested in the conflicts of 1947-48 and 1965.

Our expectation was that the agreement at Tashkent would open a new chapter of friendship and co-operation between India and Pakistan. Our hope was that the spirit of Tashkent would overcome the bitterness

329

of the past. It was this hope that led the Government of India to send a high level delegation consisting of three Cabinet Ministers and five Principal Secretaries of the Government of India to Rawalpindi early in 1966 to work out the details of implementing the agreement of Tashkent. This delegation faced an intransigent and uncooperative Government of Pakistan. India still remained understanding and felt that some unilateral action on India's part would persuade it to take the hand of friendship extended by India. India unilaterally withdrew the trade embargo against Pakistan after the 1965 conflict. We returned all the goods and properties. We proposed the signing of a mutual no-war declaration. Pakistan's response to each of those gestures was unfortunately negative. The attitude of recrimination and hostility continued. Not only in bilateral relations, but every internal crisis in Pakistan born out of the unwisdom of the successive Governments of Pakistan continued to be laid at the door of India. holding India responsible by some curious logic.

The picture will not be complete if I do not recount how the successive regimes of Pakistan, dominated by its Western wing, treated the people of East Bengal. To put it in the words of the acting President and Prime Minister of Bangla Desh:

"It is well known that the people of Bangla, Desh were subjected to a long period of ruthless colonial domination, systematic exploitation and gross political and cultural discrimination by the successive regimes."

This pattern of discrimination and exploitation was evident in the beginning years themselves. Since 1948 the wish of the people of East Bengal to have their own

language - Bengali - as one of the official and working languages of Pakistan has been consistently rejected. The demand for an equal share in the wealth of the country, in holding responsibility for the administration of the nation, was rejected. When this intolerance of the West Pakistani ruling circle resulted in the emergence of regional movements for meeting the legitimate economic and political aspirations of the people of East Bengal, the movements were suppressed with police techniques and coercive authority. When political parties, representing the wish of the people of East Bengal, formed governments on the basis of local elections, they were dismissed on flimsy political and legal pretexts and subjected to martial law and military rule.

The history of political developments in East Bengal and the relations between the two wings of Pakistan from 1952 to 1971 is a sad chapter characterized by intolerance, repression and the ruthless denial of the fundamental rights and liberties of the majority of the population of Pakistan, the 75 million people of East Bengal. The political inequity of this is compounded further when one realizes, as I said, that the people of East Bengal constitute nearly 60 per cent of the total population of Pakistan. They earn most of the foreign exchange for Pakistan on which the economic development depends. It was the agricultural and industrial resources of East Bengal that sustained Pakistan's economy, and yet the fruits of the resources of East Bengal were not available to them. They served only one purpose; the perpetuation in power of an unrepresentative business-cum-military ruling circle and the ensuring of their continued prosperity at the cost of the sufferings of the millions in Bangla Desh.

Not only were their political aspirations denied, their will thwarted, their liberty suppressed, even the integrity and bona fides of their intentions were questioned by the unimaginative rulers of West Pakistan; their patriotism to their country was questioned. The legitimate expression of their grievances was characterized as conspiracies hatched by India. Their political movements were

ignored and each of their protests was perversely described as an Indian machination.

This policy of political discrimination and repression became unbearable not only in East Bengal but also in West Pakistan. The result was the political upheaval in

330

Pakistan, led by the present representative of Pakistan, His Excellency Mr. Bhutto, which resulted in the former President Ayub Khan's handing over Power to President Yahya Khan who assumed the direction of the affairs of his country with a welcome promise of returning power to the people of the country.

India watched the developments in Pakistan during the elections of 1970 with expectations and also hope. When President Yahya Khan announced the decision to hold free elections and a reed to the Awami League of East Bengal fighting elections on its declared and well known manifesto for provincial autonomy within a federal structure of Pakistan, we had every hope that a new era of democracy and freedom was due to emerge in Pakistan and also that relations between India and Pakistan would take a turn for the better, on more constructive lines. The elections were held in December 1970 and what followed is aptly described in a communication from the acting President and Prime Minister of Bangla Desh dated 15 October, 1971, to the Prime Minister of India.

This has been published and distributed widely:

"Over the last several years our People had waged a peaceful and nonviolent struggle for the attainment of our basic rights. Even after the successive Postponements of the convening of the National Assembly by the military regime of Pakistan, we did not resort to violence but continued our nonviolent struggle. The military rulers of Pakistan took advantage of this to gain time to employ the ruse of so-called negotiations till the night of 24 March while they were augmenting their military strength. Their plans became visible to the whole world on the black night of 25 March when they let loose their army under a premeditated plan on the innocent and defenceless men, women and children of our country. They made a special target of the intellectuals, the elite of the youth and the leaders of the workers, peasants and students. This left us with no alternative but to resort to arms."

I should like to add that these aspects were noted in one of the public statements made by no less a person than the distinguished leader of the Pakistani delegation.

That is the historical background in which the tragedy on the Indian sub-continent has been enacted since March last: I recounted some details of this in the earlier part of my statement. But the tragedy had to reach greater depths in terms of human sufferings, in terms of death and violence. By the middle of October the continuing influx of refugees from East Bengal had swelled their number in India to nearly 9.5 million. Apart from being a testimony to the continuing repression and brutality of the West Pakistan army, it also became the cause for a spontaneous and strong resistance movement within Bangla Desh itself.

We were informed by the acting President and Prime Minister of Bangla Desh that nearly half the territory of East Bengal was under their effective military and civil control at that time. That was borne out by the pronouncements of President Yahya Khan during the month of October, when he repeated his assertions of July and August that any success of the Mukti Bahini, the freedom-fighters of East Bengal, would be considered by him as an act of aggression which would justify his having "total and open war against India." His pronouncements to the press from that stage on became progressively more bellicose and assumed a threatening posture against

India.

On 12 October, in an address to the country, he blamed India for encouraging what he described the "secessionist" movement in East Bengal. Within a few days a massive build-up of the Pakistani army, including armour and artillery, against India's western frontiers, including the areas adjacent to the cease-fire line in Jammu and Kashmir, was organized by the West Pakis-

331

tan military regime. It is relevant to mention that the Chief United Nations Military Observer's inquiries regarding these troop movements were met with a blatant falsehood. He was informed that the troop movements were purely for training purposes.

India understandably responded to this impending threat to its territorial integrity and security and moved its troops forward in the western sector more than a week later. I should here emphasize that we did this while keeping the United Nations military observers in Kashmir fully informed.

The political propaganda was accompanied by continuing military provocations by Pakistan against us over the last 9 months. From 25 March to 15 November, 1971, there were over 600 military intrusions or border incidents committed by Pakistani forces on the Indo-East Bengal border. India had to lodge 1980 complaints against ceasefire violations in the Kashmir sector of our frontier with Pakistan during the same period. This sabre-rattling was accompanied by war hysteria. Important cities of West Pakistan held rallies and sent out processions with "Crush India" and "Conquer India" slogans. Photographs of this have appeared extensively in the international press. Apart from a threatening deployment of its land forces against India, Pakistani air intrusions into Indian territory both in the east and west were stepped up.

While these military provocations continued, Pakistan made suggestions regarding

troop withdrawals - and this was mentioned by the representative of the United States of America - posting of United Nations observers, and so forth, a series of deliberate gimmicks to hide its real intentions. The hypocrisy reached new heights in a so-called message of goodwill and friendship addressed by President Yahya Khan on 20 November to the Prime Minister of India. The Prime Minister of India reciprocated the message and made the suggestion that the tragedy in the sub-continent could be avoided by means of a political settlement between the Government of West Pakistan and the already elected leaders of East Bengal. While these messages were being exchanged Pakistan was planning further aggression.

On 21 November the West Pakistani army mounted a massive attack against Indian border posts in the Indo-East Bengal border in the Boyra area. After coming into conflict with the units of the freedomfighters of East Bengal, the West Pakistani troops continued their thrust towards the Indian border. It was a full-scale attack with armour and artillery, and when Indian resistance was firm Pakistan brought its air force into action. Similar incidents took place on the Assam-East Bengal and Tripura-East Bengal borders between 15 and 22 November this year. The Pakistani attacks were successfully resisted by the local commander of the Indian army and Pakistan also suffered losses of its planes while attacking Indian troops over our territory Two of the Pakistani pilots who were piloting these planes were captured on Indian territory after they had bailed out. These incidents were followed by the declaration of emergency by President Yahya Khan on 23 November, and on the same day in a press interview to the magazine Newsweek he stated that he expected to be "off on a war within 10 days". I would add that he kept the date.

Gravely concerned at the fast-deteriorating situation and hoping to retrieve it, the Prime Minister of India made a statement in the Indian Parliament on 24 November in which she said:

"Even though Pakistan has declared an emergency, we shall refrain from a similar step unless further aggressive action by Pakistan compels us to do so in the interest of national security. In the meantime the country should remain unruffled. The rulers of Pakistan must realize that the path of peace, of peaceful negotiations and conciliation is more rewarding than that of war and the suppression of liberty and democracy."

She also described the military actions between 21 and 22 November as "purely local action", thereby clearly indicating India's intention of doing all that is possible to de-escalate the situation.

332

The Government of Pakistan, as was shown later, was however, bent on escalating the situation further. The shelling of villages and armed intrusions on the Indian side of the border continued and to hide the reality of the situation, as well as their aggressive intentions, President Yahya Khan addressed several communications to the Secretary-General of the United Nations during the last week of November, accusing the Indian army of acts which are entirely fictitious and baseless. The truth of the matter was different and I shall come to it presently.

During this period the Mukti Bahini's successes inside East Bengal continued. Being frustrated in East Bengal, the West Pakistani army stepped up its military activities against India. We had received two communications, one on 15 October and another on 23 November from the Acting President and Prime Minister of Bangla Desh requesting the Prime Minister of India to acknowledge the increasing control of the Bangla Desh Government over East Bengal territory and to give it formal recognition. India, however, did not wish to exacerbate the deteriorating military situation by any precipitate political action. We still hoped at that late stage that the Government of Pakistan would accept the reality of the situation in East Bengal and negotiate a settlement with the already elected representatives of the people of East Bengal. This hope of ours was reflected in the tour of the five West European countries and the United States, undertaken by the Prime Minister of India, to persuade the world leaders to exert their undoubted influence on President Yahya Khan to come to a rational and practical political settlement of the problem. We are aware of the strenuous efforts made by many of the world leaders and would like to acknowledge the valuable efforts that they made in the cause of Peace.

Taking note of the deteriorating situation, the Prime Minister of India and I myself addressed communications to various world leaders in the third week of November, requesting them to do whatever they could to persuade the Government of Pakistan to avoid further violence in East Bengal and an aggressive war against us. These efforts were of no avail, as the events on 3 December revealed when Pakistan carried out a premeditated and massive aggression against India.

Pakistan has accused us of starting the present conflict, but the following facts would undoubtedly clarify the situation.

Friday 3 December, was allotted for unofficial work and Private Members Bill in the Parliament of India. Three senior members out of five of the Political Affairs Committee of the Indian Cabinet, including the Prime Minister, were in different parts of the country. The Prime Minister was in Calcutta addressing a massive public meeting. The Defence Minister, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, was in Patna, in eastern India, the Finance Minister, Mr. Chavan, was in Bombay in western India. Only I was in the capital to deal with parliamentary work connected with a private resolution moved by a Member of Parliament about relief to the East Bengal refugees. I had just finished addressing the Upper House of the Parliament, the Rajva Sabha, on this bill and was attending a function organized in connection with the silver jubilee of the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament, which was being presided over by the President of India, when, a little before 6 p.m., the first airraid warnings were sounded over Delhi. We heard over the AU India Radio at 6 p.m. that the Pakistani Air Force had carried out an extensive and unprovoked air strike against our cities and major air bases in northern India, namely, Amritsar, Pathankot, Srinagar, Avantipur, Uttarlai, Jodhpur, Ambala and Agra from 5.47 p.m. We later learned that this was an air strike carried out by the Pakistan Air Force in the hope of destroying our Air Force as a prelude to launching a full-scale ground attack against us. it was only one hour after the air strikes were initiated that Radio Pakistan announced at 7 p.m. on 3 December that India had started a ground attack against Pakistan in the western sector. The air attacks were followed by a massive artillery barrage from Pakistan on the Indian border posts and defence positions in Sulaimanki, Khem Karan, Poonch and other sectors of the Western front by the Pakistani Army,

The Prime Minister was informed of the Pakistani air attacks as she finished addressing the meeting in Calcutta, about 900 miles away from Delhi. We were still anxious not to get involved in an open war. We limited our Instructions to our armed forces to keep in defensive positions. The

333 Prime Minister addressed the nation a little after midnight between 3 and 4 December and she described the situation as follows:

"Today the war in Bangla Desh has become a war on India. This has imposed upon me, my Government and the people of India a great responsibility. We have no other option but to put our country on a war footing. Our brave officers and jawans are at their posts mobilized for the defence of the country."

Even in face of this unprovoked aggression India did not respond with a declaration of war. The President only declared a state of emergency for the whole of India, and we awaited further events. But the Pakistani air strikes continued through the night and their armed forces attacked us in strength

right across India's western frontiers. Whatever little doubts we had about Pakistan's intentions were clarified on the morning of 4 December when President Yahya Khan stated that "a state of war exists between India and Pakistan". It is in this context that India was compelled to take the necessary steps to defend its territorial integrity and security.

The representative of the United States has posed certain questions, asking me what our intentions are. I should like to put across to him my thought that it was President Yahya Khan who declared war against India. Has the United States inquired from him as to what his intentions were when he declared war?

It was after Pakistan's massive attacks on us and its extensive military provocations against India, both in the east and in the west, that India decided to move into Bangla Desh in support of the freedom-fighters of Bangla Desh, and also to repel Pakistani aggression in the west by all means and methods available. It is a well-known principle, recognized by the international community, that an aggressor cannot compel the aggressed to fight at a place of the aggressor's choice. Once we were attacked in a massive way we had to take all defensive action to safeguard our position and to defend the integrity and sovereignty of our country.

The Acting President and Prime Minister of Bangla Desh addressed a communication to the Prime Minister of India on 4 December, informing her that in view of the direct aggression committed by Pakistan against India on 3 December the freedom fighters of Bangla Desh were ready to fight the aggressive forces of Pakistan in Bangla Desh, in any sector or on any front.

They repeated their earlier request that India recognize the existence of the free Government of Bangla Desh, which was in control of the majority of the area of East Bengal. As Pakistan's blatant aggression on 3 December killed the hope of a political settlement leading to the fulfilment of the

legitimate aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh, the normal hesitation on our part to do anything which would come in the way of a political solution or which might be construed as intervention lost significance. The people of Bangla Desh, battling for their very existence, and the people of India, fighting to defeat aggression, found themselves partisans in the same cause, and therefore the Government of India accorded recognition to the People's Republic of Bangla Desh on 6 December. We delayed recognition of the Government of Bangla Desh to avoid any precipitation of the crisis, but the emergence of Bangla Desh was based on the declared and manifest will of the people of East Bengal. The Government of Bangla Desh is constituted by the freely elected representatives of the people of East Bengal, who contested the elections of December 1970. It was they who took the decision to declare the independence of their country on 10 April in the face of Pakistani repression. Still, we stayed our hand and did not accord any recognition but waited until 6 December.

An important consideration in our according recognition to Bangla Desh was that the brutalities and repression of the Pakistan Army against the civilian Population there were increasing in proportion to the successes of the Mukti Bahini. The Government of Bangla Desh conveyed to us the urgent need to restore normalcy and order in their territory. They requested us to come to the assistance of their freedom forces to re-establish order. Recognition was therefore necessary to provide a proper basis for our presence in Bangla Desh.

Secondly, we wanted to make it absolutely clear that the entry of our armed

334

forces into Bangla Desh was not motivated by any intention of territorial aggrandizement. That should satisfy the representative of the United States of America. We recognized Bangla Desh to provide a proper juridical and political basis for the presence of our army in support of the Mukti Bahini and the Bangla Desh Government in that country - apart from the fact that our action was in exercise of the defence of our country:

We have a clear and formal understanding with he Government of Bangla Desh that the armed forces of India shall remain in Bangla Desh territory only as long as the people and Government of Bangla. Desh require and welcome their presence. The alternative to those arrangements would have been chaos and repression in East Bengal and a misinterpretation of our intentions by interested parties. To sum up, therefore, recognition of Bangla Desh is apart from being an acknowledgement of an inevitable political reality, also an imperative requirement for the restoration of peace and stability in the area and for our own defence and security.

That is the perspective in which the Security Council should deliberate on the situation and devise means to restore normalcy to the region. The military conflict waging in the sub-continent, apart from being unfortunate, is unimaginable in terms of its violence and destruction. We do not doubt the motives and concern which prompted the General Assembly to adopt the resolution of 7 December asking for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal.

It is my submission that the appeal should be directed to the Government of Pakistan. It was not India which declared war or started war it was not India which is responsible for creating the original conditions that led to the present unfortunate conflict; it was not India which deliberately and systematically refused to meet the aspirations of the 75 million people inhabiting the country, which was once part of Pakistan; it was not India which perpetuated the repression, genocide and brutality which provided the springboard for the freedom movement of Bangla Desh, which led to the decision of the people of that region to create for themselves a free and independent nation; it was not India which forsook the long period of nine months during which a reasonable political settlement could have been evolved with the leaders and people of Bangla Desh; it was not India which refused to listen to the counsels of reason and the

impulses of wisdom generated by the international community for dealing with this situation.

It is not India which has tried to convert the issue of East Bengal into an India-Pakistan dispute for narrow purposes of power and exploitation. It is not India which has subjected the undisputed leaders of the people of East Bengal, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, to the unthinkable suffering of imprisonment and secret trial, which might even lead to a death sentence. It is not India which has set a record in political persecution, the genocide of a people and the suppression of human rights that inevitably led to the, present conflagration.

If India has been guilty of anything, it has been of its restraint, its willingness to keep all the options for peace and reason open for a period of nine long months, while 75 million people in the neighbouring region underwent untold suffering and while nearly 10 million political victims facing their own tensions and problems came to our territory.

The Government of Pakistan did not merely fail to utilize those intervening months to redress the situation but deliberately took decision after decision which could have only one ending, which is the present tragedy. The repression continued by the West Pakistani army in Fast Bengal over these intervening months; the deliberate flouting of the popular will in appointing civilian governments constituted by quislings and stooges; the repeated refusal to accept the true nature of the freedom movements of the people of East Bengal and the consistent and repeated attempts to inveigle India into a military conflict so that attention would be diverted from the evil and destructive policies of West Pakistan in East Bengal - all lead to only one conclusion: that President Yahya Khan and his Government did not look upon the nine months of restraint by. India and patience by the people of East Bengal as a period of option to settle the matter peacefully.

As the Government of Pakistan's policies have shown, they utilized this time to fore-

close each option offered to them by the international community, deliberately and finally. This present conflict between Pakistan and India, and Pakistan and Bangla Desh, is the inevitable consequence of a Government which believes that the feeble power of the sword can overcome the will of a people, the forces of democracy and the impulse of liberty.

It is in this context that I should like to deal with the views expressed by some representatives, particularly the representative of Pakistan, about India's so-called unwillingness to co-operate with efforts made by the United Nations to normalize the situation. The efforts made by the United Nations fall into two broad categories: the first dealing with the humanitarian and relief aspects of the problem created by the massive influx of refugees from East Bengal into India, and unsettled conditions created by the military repression by the West Pakistani Army inside East Bengal.

India was prompt in bringing this problem to the notice of the United Nations and all its relevant forums, and pointed out at the very outset that a final remedy to the humanitarian aspect of the problem cannot be found without a rational political settlement of it, according to the wishes of the People of East Bengal. While mentioning this, India, assured full cooperation to the United Nations in whatever interim measures the United Nations wished to take to bring succour and relief to the unfortunate millions of Fast Bengal.

Indeed, India has shouldered the major burden of taking care of the refugees; though the response of the international community has been generous, from the Very nature of the circumstances It is inadequate if we take into consideration the colossal size of the problem. India agreed to the location of the United Nations focal-point office in Delhi and rendered full cooperation and all facilities to the representatives of this office In organizing relief operations for the refugees. India has also

responded to the legitimate wish of the international community to assess the situation objectively by allowing free access to observers from all over the world to come and study this situation on the spot.

India has given all its resources and manpower, to the maximum extent possible, to alleviate the sufferings of the people of the neighbouring region and India remains committed in this regard until all the refugees return to their homeland for rehabilitation and resettlement. Although India is doing all this, as a trust on behalf of the international community, it is the responsibility of the international community to look after these millions of refugees.

We have appreciated the efforts made by the Secretary-General in this regard, but we remain convinced that the international community was mistaken in the hope that giving relief assistance to the refugees would be sufficient to overcome the declared wishes of the people of East Bengal. The real problem was the prevention of the re-imposition of the tyrannical rule of West Pakistan over them. The validity of our assessment has unfortunately but tragically been confirmed by events.

I should now like to come to the second category of views expressed in regard to the Political aspects of the problem. The Secretary-General, in his aide memoire of 19 July addressed to the Government of India, and in his memorandum addressed to the President of the Security Council, on 20 July, had acknowledged that one of the important reasons for the continuing stalemate in East Bengal was the breakdown of civilian administration in East Bengal and the lack of progress in achieving a political reconciliation. He had again rightly pointed out, in his annual report to the twentysixth session of the General Assembly, that a disaster of such vast proportions can only be met and remedied with due respect to the humanitarian and political principles.

At the beginning of the current session of the General Assembly, the outgoing President, Ambassador Hambro, as well as several representatives, including the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, the USSR and Sweden, had drawn attention to the root cause of the problem. It was the denial of the wishes of the people of East Bengal which led to the evolving crisis. In spite of this correct appreciation of the problem, the international community and the United Nations found themselves unable to exert effective influence on the

336

Government of Pakistan to bring about a political settlement of the problem according to the wishes of the people of East Bengal.

We in India, as well as people all over the world, noted with regret that this inability of She United Nations to deal with the root cause of the problem was frustrated by the tactics adopted by Pakistan. Pakistan made proposals for locating United Nations observers on both sides of the India-Pakistan border, for the deployment of contact groups. None of these proposals, even by implication, dealt with the political situation in East Bengal resulting from repression carried out by the Government of West Pakistan in that region. It was deliberately sought to con-Vert an issue which was primarily between the people of East Bengal and the Government of Pakistan into an India-Pakistan issue which would not have in any manner achieved the imperative requirement for a solution to the problem: namely, the restoration of the freedom, liberty and fundamental human rights of the people of East Bengal to them, and the creation of a political system in East Bengal according to their wishes.

The voluntary return of the refugees to their homeland under conditions of dignity and honour, with guarantees of rehabilitation and resettlement in their homeland, and the discontinuation of the military repression of East Bengal by the Government of Pakistan are directly interlinked. We had mentioned this apprehension of ours to the Secretary-General in our reply to his aide memoire of 19 July on 2 August 1971. We had reiterated this point of view in our statements to the General Assembly, its Committees and the

Security Council as well as in various other forums.

Informal consultations in the Security Council in July and August indicated that the international commitments could not, due to some limitations born of its commitments to the doctrine of domestic, jurisdiction, act in the matter. In the face of a direct and consistent violation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the provisions of Articles 55 and 56 of the Charter by Pakistan, the Security Council and the United Nations should have found themselves in a position to intervene in the matter and persuade Pakistan to return to the path of reason. This did not happen. While developments proceeded on their Inexorable course towards the present tragedy, the United Nations continued to be inhibited by considerations of domestic jurisdiction. When Pakistan initiated its massive military build-up against us in October and wished to stem the tide of freedom in East Bengal by a direct armed confrontation with India, the Secretary-General made a last, much appreciated, but unfortunately fruitless attempt to prevent the situation from deteriorating any further. He offered his good offices to both India and Pakistan in a communication addressed to President Yahya Khan and the Prime Minister of India on 20 October. But even this offer of good offices was not aimed at the root cause of the problem. The Secretary-General offered his good offices to mediate between India and Pakistan to de-escalate the military situation. But the fact of the matter was that the military situation was created by Pakistan in direct response to the increasing success of the freedom movement in East Bengal.

Pakistan accepted the Secretary-General's offer in the hope that the dignity of his office could be utilized, not only to prevent India from taking effective defensive action, but also to bolster the strength of the West Pakistani army against the freedom movement in East Bengal.

President Yahya Khan is on record that he would consider the success of the Mukti

Bahini a sufficient justification to launch a war on India. Since he himself had linked the military situation inside East Bengal - which was primarily a matter between the West Pakistani army and the people of East Bengal - with the military situation on India's western border, India could not but take note of the situation and react accordingly.

India was aware of Pakistan's motives in accepting the Secretary-General's offer and, therefore, while replying to the Secretary-General's communication of 20 October the Prime Minister of India stated in a letter of 16 November that the offer of good offices by the Secretary-General could be a constructive step provided it was directed towards bringing about a political settlement between the Government of Pakistan

337 and the people of Vast Bengal, according to the declared aspirations of the latter.

India assured its full co-operation to the Secretary-General if he undertook such an initiative to deal with the basic problem. India also assured the Secretary-General, and through him the United Nations that it had no aggressive intentions against Pakistan and that it would not start a military conflict.

The President of Pakistan made the last and desperate attempt to involve the prestige of the United Nations in perpetuating his policy of repression in East Bengal when he made a suggestion in his communication of 23 November to the Secretary-General that he would be willing to locate United Nations observers on the East Bengal side of the India-East Bengal border to verify the facts of so-called Indian aggression. This was, to our mind, a deliberate attempt at tarnishing the image of the United Nations by making it a party to the repression of the people. Pakistan's repeated assertions of cooperation with the United Nations in dealing with the problem has no meaning whatsoever in the context of President Yahya Khan's intransigence till today in coming to terms with the already elected representatives of the people of Bangla Desh and their undisputed leader Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

It would indeed the unfortunate if Pakistan's calculated policy to get the United Nations involved as a party to its oppression in Bangla Desh were passed off as adherence to certain stipulations of the Charter.

There is one other consideration of fundamental importance which I would like to raise. International law recognizes that where a mother State has irrevocably lost the allegiance of such a large section of its people - as represented by Bangla Desh - and cannot bring them under its sway, conditions for the separate existence of such a state come into being. It is India's assessment that this is precisely what has happened in Bangla Desh.

The overwhelming majority of the elected representatives of Bangla Desh have declared themselves in favour of separation from the mother State of Pakistan and have set up a new state of Bangla Desh. India has recognized this new State. The armed forces of the new State have been long gaged in a struggle against the forces of West Pakistan in Bangla Desh. In these circumstances, is it realistic to call upon India to cease fire without at the same time giving even a hearing to the representatives of Bangla Desh, whose armed forces numbering about 150,000 are engaged against the forces of West Pakistan?

India earnestly hopes that, in the light of the facts set out above, the United Nations will consider once again the realities, of the situation so that the basic causes of the conflict are removed and peace is restored. Given an assurance of a desire to examine these basic causes with objectivity, India will not be found wanting in offering its utmost co-operation.

The struggle that the people of India and the people of Bangla Desh are engaged in today is a struggle for their territorial integrity and security; for their fundamental liberties; for the preservation of the ideals of democracy, secularism and non-alignment;

for the strengthening of the forces of peace; for upholding the very principles of the Charter which Pakistan is guilty of violating. This is a struggle not merely for survival in dignity and freedom of nearly one-sixth of mankind, but for survival of the international community within the framework of international covenants and agreements which the peoples of the world have so laboriously built up after two holocausts during this century.

In this context I should like to assure the Council that India has no territorial ambitions in Bangla Desh or in West Pakistan. India would be willing to discuss any cease-fire or withdrawal which would ensure the freedom and aspirations of the people of Bangla Desh, and which would ensure the vacation of aggression by Pakistani troops from Indian territory.

During the conflict India stands committed in dealing with the enemy forces according to the Geneva Conventions. India's Chief of Army Staff has assured his Pakistani counterparts of this commitment of the Government and the people of India on 7 December. He has gone one step further in assuring the West Pakistani troops in

338

East Bengal of their safe evacuation to West Pakistan if they would surrender and discontinue their repression of the civilian population of Bangla Desh.

We are meeting today to deal with a crisis unprecedented in the annals of the United Nations. India's record of cooperation with the United Nations over the last 25 years and its unqualified commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter are well known and there for all to see. While repeating the Government of India's assurance that it will cooperate with the United Nations in any realistic effort that it would make to deal with the root cause of the problem, I should like to add that India will not be deflected from the vital task of ensuring its own territorial integrity and security by any attempts undertaken from any quarter.

I would also be amiss in defining the realities of the situation if I did not reiterate that any solution to the present conflict will have to take into account the views of the Government and people of Bangla Desh. Initiatives by the United Nations or from other quarters which ignore the existence of a nation of 75 million people with a Government of their own choice, who are the main party affected by this crisis, cannot succeed.

I cannot but affirm our determination in this regard, because India is fighting today for the preservation of the basic principles on which its people and its Government have sought to build a future. When our very survival is in question we cannot but commit our total mental, moral and material resources for its sake.

It is our earnest hope that the international community will appreciate the realities of the situation, as perhaps the future stability and peace of South-East Asia depend on the resolution of this conflict on a rational and realistic basis, ensuring peace, prosperity and justice. I should like to assure the Council that India will do its utmost to meet this objective.

The Council is the instrument of the United Nations to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council is bound by the noble principles and purposes of the Charter, These principles and purposes have to be applied to each concrete situation. The Security Council has failed in many cases in the past to ensure international peace and security because it has failed to take note of the realities of each concrete situation. If the Security Council wants to ensure peace and security in the present crisis and I presume it does want to do this - it would be failing in its duty if it did not take note of the glaring fact that is there for everyone to see, namely, the successful struggle of the 75 million people. of Bangla Desh to assert their birthright of freedom and independence. Any proposal or resolution of the Security Council that does not take note of the existence of the Government of Bangla Desh, established by the

democratic will of the people, and the fact that it is in effective control of its territory, would be a hollow and empty resolution devoid of any effect.

I would therefore submit most earnestly and with due respect that the participation of the representatives of Bangla Desh, and giving them a hearing to state their case, is imperative for the success of any proposal for a cease-fire, not only in Bangla Desh, but also in the west. The situation in the west has been created by Pakistan in order to cover up its failure in the east. The Security Council must recognize this link between the situation in the east and the west, and the fact that no cease-fire can be effective on the ground unless it has the consent of the Government of Bangla Desh. Without this there can be no durable peace, there can be no just peace or security in the Indian subcontinent. I am glad that this question was raised in the earlier discussions and it is my earnest hope and appeal that it win not be shelved again.

Before I conclude, I should like to read out the communication addressed by my Prime Minister to the Secretary-General, as it sums up our basic approach to this problem:

"Excellency,

"India's dedication to the purposes and principles of the Charter is well known. It is borne out by our record over the last twenty-six years. India has not been content merely by giving verbal or moral support to the United

339

Nations but has been in the forefront of a selfless struggle in the defence of peace, against colonialism, imperialism and racialism. Indian soldiers have sacrificed their lives in carrying out missions of peace in Korea, in Congo and in West Asia.

"Decisions of the United Nations and resolutions adopted by its various organs and agencies have always received our most earnest and careful consideration. Consequently, the Government of India have studied with great care the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on the 8th December, 1971 on the present grave situation in the Indian sub-continent.

"We are glad to note that the resolution acknowledges the crucial importance of the voluntary return of the refugees to their homes. It may be worth-while to recall briefly the circumstances in which these millions of refugees were driven out of their homeland.

"On 25th March, 1971, the Government of Pakistan launched an assault on the people of their eastern province, whose only crime was that they had voted democratically. Millions of innocent, unarmed citizens were uprooted from their homes, and hundreds of thousands were killed or maimed. However great our concern for justice and sympathy for human suffering, we could perhaps have taken a detached view, had these terrible events not occurred along the borders of several of our eastern states. More than 10 million people have so far sought shelter in our territory to escape death and dishonour at the hands of the West Pakistan army. The burden of taking care of such a large influx in so short a time has been a crushing one. Our entire administration in the eastern region is at a standstill and the daily life of the people dislocated, because of schools, hospitals and other public buildings being occupied by the refugees. Social and political tensions have been generated throughout the country and our economy has been disrupted, adversely affecting our growth. Even more serious, our security has been imperilled. Has the United Nations considered the unprecedented situation created by one member of the United Nations for another member?

"India has always stood for total non-interference by one State into the

domestic affairs of another State. However, if one State deliberately drives millions of its citizens across the territory of another State and casts upon the receiving State unconscionable burdens, what remedies are open to the receiving State which has become a victim of domestic policies of a member State of the United Nations?

"Has any country faced such a gigantic problem for no fault of its own? For nine long months India staggered under this load and exercised the utmost self-restraint. Even if other countries were not moved by the agony of the people of East Bengal or the difficulties created for India, we had hoped that their desire to preserve peace in this area would lead them to take some steps to reduce the tension.

"However, India's efforts were in vain; The military rulers of Pakistan have not been able to comprehend the forces of history and the people's deep desire for justice and democratic rights. The military rulers are impervious to the fact that through their callous policies they have irrevocably alienated the people of East Bengal.

"Pakistan has based its propaganda on two points:

"First, it is alleged that the entire trouble is of Indian instigation. This allegation has been proved false by the democratic elections in which the Awami League won 167 out of 169 seats and by the many Dacca-based foreign correspondents who have been sending eyewitness reports of what is happening there. Secondly, the whole question is projected as one of religion. It is relevant to remember that the bulk of the people of East Bengal, who have revolted against the military Government of West Pakistan, are of the Islamic faith and no less devoted Muslims. In fact,

340

the majority of the total population of

both wings of Pakistan lived in its Eastern Province.

"Despite the Pakistan Government's effort to explain away their predicament as the result of alleged interference, India on her part did everything to prevent the issue from becoming internationalized, and consistently advocated a political solution between the Government of Pakistan and the genuinely elected leaders of East Bengal. If the world were anxious to treat this as an internal question of Pakistan, it should have ensured that such vast proportions of the population of East Bengal were not driven out of their homes and their homeland into our country.

"When nations have talked to us of peace they have overlooked the slaughter of men, women and children; they have forgotten the fate of 10 million refugees and thus totally ignored the moral and legal responsibility of the rulers of Pakistan. A call to cease fire coupled with expressions of hope that the refugees would voluntarily return appears to India to have no purpose other than to cover up the annihilation of an entire nation. How can foundations of peace be built on such a basis? India cannot be a party to the violent suppression of the rights of the aggrieved people of Bangla Desh. If the United Nations is interested in the whole truth, the representatives of the Bangla Desh Government should be heard. Why should it depart from this tradition?

"Any objective consideration would show that the conditions necessary for the restoration of peace and the return of millions of refugees can be created only through the withdrawal of West Pakistani forces. It is cruel to, expect that these refugees who have suffered so much at the hands of the West Pakistani forces should contemplate return to their homeland while it is still under their occupation. So far as the armed forces of India are concerned, there can

be a cease-fire and withdrawal of India's forces to its own territory, if the rulers of West Pakistan would withdraw their own forces from Bangla Desh and reach a peaceful settlement with these who were until recently their fellow-citizens. but now owe allegiance to the Government of Bangla Desh which has been duly constituted by the representatives chosen freely in the elections held in December 1970. Merely to express a wish for the return of the refugees without taking into account the necessary preconditions is to show a callous disregard for the immense suffering which these people have endured.

The Government of India is prepared to consider the call for cease-fire. Indeed, India concluded cease-fire agreements with Pakistan in 1948 and 1965. Neither gave assurance of continued peace. The last one of 1965, which was followed by a solemn inter-state agreement signed at Tashkent, failed to bring about the peaceful relations we so ardently desire.

" India feels legitimately aggrieved that in calling for a cease-fire, the United Nations makes no distinction between the aggressor and its victims. It is, therefore, necessary to restate the facts.

"On 3 December, 1971, when Prime Minister of India was in Calcutta, the Defence Minister in Patna and the Finance Minister in Bombay, Pakistan's armed forces launched aggression against India. On that day around 5.30 p.m. the Air Force of Pakistan made simultaneous attacks on India's airfields in the following towns: Amritsar, Pathankot, Srinagar, Avantipur, Uttarlai, Jodhpur, Ambala and Agra. The West Pakistan army opened an attack by continuous shelling of our defensive positions on a wide front including Sulaimanki, Khemkaran, Poonch and other sectors. The Government of West Pakistan has alleged that India had attacked sometime in the course of

the day but since there was no basis whatever for their allegation, it could obviously not mention the places. These are uncontested facts. India, which is exercising the inherent right of self-defence, cannot be equated with Pakistan. India is a victim of Yet another unprovoked Pakistani aggres-

341

sion and is engaged in defending its national sovereignty and territorial integrity in the exercise of Its legitimate right of self-defence.

"There is one other consideration of fundamental importance which India would like to urge: International Law recognizes that where a mother-State has irrevocably lost allegiance of such a large section of its people as represented by Bangla Desh and cannot bring them under its sway, conditions for the separate existence of such a state come into being. It is India's assessment that this is precisely what has happened in Bangla Desh. The overwhelming majority of the elected representatives of Bangla Desh have irrevocably declared themselves in favour of separation from the mother-State of Pakistan and have set up a new state of Bangla Desh. India has recognized this new State. The armed forces of the new State have long been engaged in a struggle against the forces of West Pakistan in Bangla, Desh. In these circumstances, is it realistic to call upon India to cease fire without the same time, giving a hearing to representatives of Bangla Desh whose armed forces are engaged against the forces of West Pakistan?

"India earnestly hopes that in the light of the facts set out above, the United Nations will consider once again the realities of the situation, so that the basic causes of the conflict are removed and peace is restored. Given an assurance of a desire to examine these basic causes with objectivity, India will not be found wanting in offering its utmost co-operation."

The representative of the United States of America has raised certain points. Some of these are covered in what I have already stated, but I would like to examine and consider very carefully all his points. With these observations at this stage, I should like to reserve my right of further comment upon certain specific points that have been raised by the representative of the United States of America.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA PERU CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UZBEKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM MALI FRANCE SWEDEN SWITZERLAND CONGO KOREA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Foreign Minister's Reply to Debate at U.N. Security Council on India-Pakistan Conflict

Following is the statement by the Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, at the emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council on December 13, 1971:

I listened with great attention to the speakers and the interventions made yesterday. I was deeply impressed by the anxiety and-sincere desire of the security Council to find a lasting and durable solution to the tragic situation that has developed in the subcontinent. I should like to pay a special tribute to you, Mr. President, for the able manner in which You conducted the deliberations on such an important and delicate subject. I should also like to say that whether we agree with the points made by various delegations or not, we appreciate their efforts to find a solution that is acceptable to the parties concerned as well as to the members of this Council. It is in this spirit of co-operation and understanding of

the necessity of viewing all aspects of this problem that I should like to place before you the point of view of the Government of India on some of the issues that have been raised.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood if I refer to some of the points made so vehemently and rhetorically by my friend the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Pakistan. I have admiration for his ability, and we in India recognize him as the democratically elected leader of the largest single Party of West Pakistan. We hope that the time is not far off when the military rulers of West Pakistan will also respect the verdict of their people and give Mr. Bhutto an opportunity to form a representative Government with whom, we hope, it will be possible for us to deal in order to remove the root-causes of tension existing between our two countries and usher in an era of peace, friendship and mutual co-operation.

342

I should like to emphasize that we have nothing but the friendliest feelings for the people of Pakistan. We wish them well. There are many historical links that bind us together. Geography makes us close neighbours. I was, therefore, very happy to hear from my friend the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, when he said that both India and Pakistan, which are poor countries in spite of their vast natural resources, could work together towards social and economic progress of both of their peoples and for peace on the subcontinent. I wish to assure him that we sincerely share those feelings.

While it is necessary and laudable to cherish these common objectives, it is not enough. We have to work together in order to achieve them. Let us examine what are the impediments in our way. If India has done anything to hamper the development of friendly relations between our two countries and peoples, I would be the first to admit it. If Pakistan or other countries have wittingly or unwittingly created conditions which have made it difficult for our two countries to come closer in peace and friend-

ship, they must make amends so that the situation improves.

We accepted the partition of the subcontinent in 1947 without reservations. We respected the sovereignty and independence of Pakistan and made very possible effort to come closer to them. I need not go into past history to prove this. What is much more important is the present and the future relationship of our two countries.

Taking the present situation, let us examine how and why it has arisen and come to its present dangerous pass. The distinguished Foreign Minister of Pakistan rightly emphasized the principle of respect- for sovereignty and territorial integrity. But what is Pakistan's record in this respect? May I ask him who armed and trained some of the tribal dissidents on our eastern frontiers for a number of years? May I also ask him who started the war in Kashmir in 1947? it is well-known that up to May 1948, Pakistan had denied the presence of its troops in Kashmir, and it was only when the United Nations Commission discovered their presence that the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Sir Zafrullah Khan, had to admit that Pakistani regular troops had been sent into Kashmir. I am referring to this fact not because I wish to convert the present debate into a debate on Kashmir, but only to remind the members of this Council that It is necessary to bear in mind the past history of the relations between India and Pakistan in order to assess the present situation.

I was somewhat shocked, but not surprised, to hear from my friend, Mr. Bhutto, references to the past 1,000 years and more in which he referred to the incursion by Mohammad Bin Qasim. I was shocked to hear from him that, according to his reading of history, Pakistan had been denied areas or territories in the subcontinent at the time of partition. However, I was not surprised to hear Mr. Bhutto's threat about 1,000 years of war because we have heard these threats from him from time to time. Is Mr. Bhutto still harbouring dreams and visions of conquering India and coming to Delhi as a victor? He made the astonishing

statement yesterday that if Pakistan had received half the military aid that India had received, Mr. Bhutto would be sitting in Delhi today. May I remind him of the \$2,000 million worth of military hardware that Pakistan received from its great benefactor and ally from 1954 onwards which enabled Pakistan to invade India in 1965 and which is being used again today against both Bangla Desh and India. I do not wish to go into all these facts, but I think it necessary to do so because Mr. Bhutto's reading of history throws more light on his dreams and ambitions than on historical facts.

I shall not take it upon myself to reply to the charges which he has levelled against the USSR. The representative of the Soviet Union has already made some comments in this respect. I, however, feel duty-bound to answer some of these uncalled for attacks that he has made about the implications of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation which was signed on 9 August of this year. It hardly lies with the Foreign Minister of Pakistan to shed crocodile tears on the so-called abandonment of India's policy of non-alignment when, according to Mr. Bhutto himself, Pakistan is still a member of two military alliances. However, just to set the record straight, I should like to draw his attention to article IV in the Indo-Soviet Treaty, which expresses the Soviet Union's respect for India's policy of

343

non-alignment as an important factor for Peace. Mr. Bhutto's concept of non-alignment does not carry conviction. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace and Friendship is not aimed against any country. It seems, however, that Mr. Bhutto, who perhaps harbours dreams and Visions of conquering the whole subcontinent, regards this Treaty as an impediment in the achievement of these aims.

Mr. Bhutto made a reference to the United States Seventh Fleet. I do not wish to take this up with him. That is a matter for the representative of the United States of America to deal with. But I should like to correct him on an incorrect statement that he made, perhaps out of ignorance, or may

be deliberately. India has not made a declaration about the blockade of the Bay of Bengal, as Mr. Bhutto asserted. India-has issued only a contraband Control order, which every country against which a state of war has been proclaimed by another country is entitled to do under international law. India has no desire to interfere with the freedom of the high seas, or genuine trade and commerce, or the shipments of food and relief goods to Bangla, Desh. But India has the right to ensure that no contraband goods reach Pakistan, which has declared war on India. Nothing in the Charter or in international law prevents a country from taking steps to safeguard its security and defend its territorial integrity if another country declares war on it.

We should like to assure all Governments of the world that India will do everything Possible to protect the persons and Properties of their nationals who are entrap. ped in the areas of conflict. We are signatories to the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of prisoners of War and Civilian personnel. We have issued strict instructions to our armed forces to adhere faithfully to the letter and spirit of these Conventions. We do not think that there is any reason for any Government to feel unduly concerned about the safety and security of their nationals in this area so far as India is concerned. It is for them to consider whether they should approach the authorities of Bangla Desh, who are in effective control of most of these areas, and ask the forces of West Pakistan not to take any steps which may endanger the lives of their nationals there.

In this connexion I should like to inform the members of this Council that India, on more than three occasions, had given categorical assurances to the Secretary-General, of the United Nations that India would give facilities for foreign and United Nations personnel to be evacuated from Karachi as well as Dacca. It was not India, but Pakistan, which put obstacles in this operation. However, we are glad that almost all the persons have been safely evacuated from those areas and only a handful remain at their own wish.

May I revert to some other observations made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Mr. Bhutto seems to be suffering from some imaginary fears. No one has asked Pakistan not to be friendly with other countries. We would ourselves like to be friends with Pakistan. But we will not give up our friendship with other countries if Pakistan demands this as the price for our friendship with it. We welcome the trends towards lessening of tension and normalization of relations between all countries of the world. It is our earnest desire to be able to normalize our own relations with Pakistan in the not too distant future.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan referred to a number of countries, neighbours of India, with which India has the friendliest of relations. He took it upon himself to insinuate that they were in danger of being gobbled up, as he described it, by India. I do not know who gave him the authority to speak on behalf of these friendly neighbours of India. However, it is Mr. Bhutto's privilege to speak as he likes and I should not like to reply to these base. less and deliberate calumnies levelled against my country. Suffice it to say that India harbours no designs on the territory, sovereignty or integrity of any of its neighbours. Mr. Bhutto is perhaps irked. by the fact that these countries do not see eye to eye with him about the genesis and the solution of the situation in Bangla Desh.

Mr. Bhutto gave a long discourse on secession and autonomy. He even went so far as to threaten the creation of Bangla Deshes in Europe, in Africa, Asia and elsewhere. If the majority population of any country is oppressed by a militant minority, as is the case in Bangla Desh and in southern Africa, or in Palestine, it is the inalienable

344

right of the majority population to Overthrow the tyranny of the majority rulers and decide its destiny according to the wishes of its own people. The birthright of the majority of the population of a country to revolt against the tyranny and oppression of a militant minority cannot be denied under the principles and purposes of the Charter or according to international law.

Mr. Bhutto has painted a picture of India as a big predatory Power which is "trying to bulldoze small nations". He has argued that Pakistan which is smaller than India could not possibly have any aggressive designs against its big neighbour. Perhaps Mr. Bhutto is deliberately forgetting that there are instances in history - if I may add, recent history - where military dictatorships of smaller countries have launched aggressive wars against larger countries. I need quote only the example of Hitler's Germany and its aggression on the Western allies and the Soviet Union.

I do not wish to elaborate on the brief description I gave yesterday of how the present tragedy started. I should, however, like to re-emphasize that India did not start this war and is prepared to stop it if Pakistan is also prepared to do so and remove the root causes of this conflict so that we will not have to go from cease-fire to cease-fire and from one war to another war. The people of Bangla Desh, who formed a majority of the population of what was Pakistan and who have today declared their independence have to be a necessary party to any cease-fire or withdrawal of troops. This must be recognized. There cannot be any effective cease-fire or durable peace in the subcontinent without this. Whether Pakistan likes it or not, whether we like it or not, the reality of the sovereign State of Bangla Desh is there for all to see.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan waxed eloquent about the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign country. Was it India that drove 10 million refugees into another country or was it Pakistan that drove them out of East Bengal at the point of the bayonet? Is this interference or not in India's internal affairs? Who trained the Nagas and the Mizos whose cause Mr. Bhutto chose to champion? Who violated our borders on the land and in the air before the present conflict escalated? Who flouted the will of the 75 million people

of Bangla Desh? Certainly, not India. It was Pakistan and not India. And yet Mr. Bhutto waxed eloquent and praised the Bandung principles and Panch Shila. Deeds surely are much more eloquent than words.

It was not India that sought to dismember Pakistan. It is the oppressive regime of West Pakistan which has dismembered Pakistan by its own actions. The struggle for freedom of the 75 million people of Bangla Desh, which has now been crowned with success, speaks for itself. History is replete with examples of people's struggles to form new States free from domination by others. This is what the freedom of Bangla Desh represents. No one can twist the principles of the United Nations Charter to deny the rights of the majority of a nation to assert its independence from a minority military dictatorship which denies them fundamental freedoms, human rights and democratic liberties.

An attempt has been made by the representative of Pakistan to say today that if Bangla Desh is accepted and recognized, every other country will be threatened with dismemberment. This is a grave misrepresentation of the issues at stake. Of course, there are in every country some people who are discontented or dissatisfied. But what holds a nation together is a spirit of understanding and accommodation, which is a political process, and not tanks or machine guns. What is distinctive and unique about the Bangla Desh situation is that it represents the majority of the people of Pakistan as a whole, and its demand for autonomy expressed through approved constitutional channels were met by a military repression which killed more people than the Vietnam war or the Middle East war and resulted in 10 million human beings fleeing to a neighbouring country for refuge.

The representative of the United States raised a number of points yesterday and addressed some questions to me. I answered some of them very briefly yesterday. I should like to answer him in greater detail now.

The representative of the United States

tried to argue that the United States effortstowards a political settlement had been making good Progress and seemed to imply that

345

India had impatiently precipitated the conflict and, therefore bore the major responsibility for it. This one-sided and partisan attitude of the representative of the United States has shocked and surprised us. The United States is entitled to its own opinions and interpretations. So are we. But facts are facts and must be stated.

Right from the beginning of this unfortunate situation that has arisen in the subcontinent, India had been asking for a political settlement acceptable to the elected and acknowledged representatives of the people of Bangla Desh. Last Sepetmber I had the honour of urging this on the Honourable President of the United States, when he was good enough to grant me an audience. More than a month ago, our Prime Minister came to re-emphasize the urgency of this problem. We went so far as to suggest that a gesture by President Yahya Khan to release Sheikh Mujibur Rahman would automatically defuse the situation and pave the way for a peaceful political settlement. But after all these months of so-called quiet diplomacy by the united states, what has been the result? According to the statements of the United States Government itself, no United States representatives have been allowed to catch even a glimpse of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. All that the United States got from President Yahya Khan was permission to have access to the defence counsel of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. We do not know whether they have so far been able to use this Privilege granted to them by president Yahya Khan, and if so, with what results. Nothing has been told to us. We are entitled to ask this question of the respresentative of the United States.

The second declaration made by the representative of the United States was that the President of Pakistan was prepared to consider - only consider - appointing a nominee who would have a dialogue with a nominee of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, while

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, who could have been either the Prime Minister or the President of the whole of Pakistan, remained incommunicado, in prison, unaware of what is happening and while no one would know if the nominee was really his or that of President Yahya Khan. This generous offer of President Yahya Khan speaks for itself and needs no comment. The United States Government may have been satisfied with it, but no one in Bangla Desh was.

The third proposal conveyed to us by the United States Government was that President Yahya Khan was willing to appoint a nominee who would talk to an approved Awami League leader in Bangla Desh against whom there was no major charge levelled by Pakistan. I need hardly remind the representative of the United States that such a member of the Awami League handpicked by President Yahya Khan could hardly be expected to speak on behalf of the 75 million people of Bangla Desh. In fact the President, the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Bangla Desh Government have all been charged with heinous crimes. No wonder this so-called proposal was not taken seriously by anyone.

While these were the Proposals which the United States Government had been able to extract from President Yahva Khan for a political settlement, the realities were quite different. There was a deliberate attempt by President Yahya Khan to obstruct and defy the will of the people through a number of measures that he undertook, such as banning the Awami League as a political party, declaring 78 out of the 167 elected leaders of the Awami League as disqualified, as having lost their membership, holding farcical by-elections and declaring 58 discredited and previously defeated candidates as having been elected unopposed to these very seats. What is more, he had promised to hand over power to these stooges and quislings and to hold a session of the National. Assembly represented by these people by 27 December 1971. This was the "one month more" to which the Foreign Minister of Pakistan was referring so frequently yesterday. He asked with his usual rhetoric, if

India could wait patiently for nine months, why it could not wait for one month more. I should like to tell the representatives at: both the United States and Pakistan that all these proposals were categorically rejected by the elected leaders of the people of Bangla Desh, who now form the Government of Bangla Desh. A government formed by stooges and quislings could not exist even, for a single day except with the help of the West Pakistan army in Bangla Desh. In fact the people's wrath was roused to such an extent that some of those quislings and

346

stooges had to be given protection by the Pakistani police and armed forces in their very homes. They cannot even move about. It was not India that did not wait but Pakistan which thought it necessary to start military aggression against India on 3 December in order to cover up its failure in the Fast and to internationalize the conflict. Far from being able to persuade President Yahya Khan to agree to a political settlement or to the withdrawal of West Pakistani forces from East Bengal, we are now being accused by the United States of intransigence. it is indeed strange logic to put the blame on India for the intransigence of President Yahva Khan or for the United States failure to persuade him to come to the path of peace and reason.

The representative of the United States wanted to ask me a few more questions about India's intentions. I should like to ask the representative of the United States whether he has asked Pakistan what its intentions are, and what were its intentions in declaring a war, as President Yahya Khan did on 4 December and committing aggression against our land air frontiers. I shall refrain from asking the representative of the United States some questions about the intentions of the United States in other parts of the world, thousands of miles away from America, where United States troops have been engaged for years in bloody conflict which has not been brought to the Security Council, where appeals have been rejected and where withdrawal of foreign forces has

been resisted. I shall refrain from asking those questions, because this is not the occasion to do so. I shall, however, not hesitate to answer the three questions that he asked me.

Let me reiterate what I stated yesterday. First, we have no intention whatsoever of acquiring any part of West Pakistan or of Bangla Desh by conquest or otherwise. Our recognition of the People's Republic of Bangla Desh makes it quite clear that we have no territorial designs on Bangla Desh. Secondly, if Pakistan removes the threat to our security, we shall be glad to consider any reasonable proposals for a cease-fire and mutual withdrawals in the wake of a political settlement in the East acceptable to the elected representatives of Bangla Desh.

As for Paklstan-occupied Kashmir, I would suggest to the representative of the United States to put this question to Pakistan concerning what its intentions are, because it appears to be concentrating only on that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is on our side of the cease-fire line. Pakistan has used force against our territory of Kashmir on two occasions in the past, in 1947 and 1965, and is at this very time concentrating practically all its infantry, artillery, armour and air force in a massive attack across the cease-fire line in order to extend its occupation and aggression in Kashmir. We shall certainly use force to repel Pakistan's renewed aggression, whether it is in Kashmir or anywhere else in India. Let there be no mistake about it. It is Pakistan that has violated and is violating the ceasefire line, as is proved by the fact that we had to lodge about 1,000 complaints of violations of the cease-fire line by Pakistani forces with the military observers of the United Nations between the end of March and the end of November this year. The violation of the cease-fire line by Pakistan on 3 December, by the mounting of a massive attack on the Indian part of Jammu and Kashmir, which is on our side of the cease-fire line, was confirmed by the report by UNMOGIP in document S/10412.

We are shocked and surprised that, in-

stead of tackling the basic cause of this grim tragedy and its consequences, the United States Government should think it fit to apportion blame without ascertaining the correct facts and to lay the major responsibility for this situation on India and not on Pakistan, on which the entire responsibility of the situation rests.

We hope that, even at this late stage, a great country like the United States will not try to score debating points and thereby further complicate the already complicated situation and make it even more difficult to defuse the situation and thus de-escalate the conflict.

I now turn to the draft resolution in document S/10446, which is before the Council. The one-sided approach in the statement of the representative of the United States to which I have referred is amply reflected in this draft. While preambular paragraph 6 pays lip service to the

347

desirability of finding a political solution there is nothing in the operative paragraphs to implement this pious wish. No resolution which does not recognize the existence and the rights and obligations of the people of Bangla Desh in any cease-fire agreement can be effective or of any practical value.

The draft resolution is also defective in that it applies Charter principles selectively, instead of applying them consistently. For example, it totally ignores those Charter principles, as well as other instruments, which prohibit the massive violations of human rights. The world has not so far seen such a massive violation of human rights since the Charter was promulgated as in Bangla Desh during the past nine months. This has been recognized by the world. Even the other instruments suggested in the draft resolution are selectively applied. For example, preambular paragraph 8 recalls the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted unanimously last year. I should like to point out that operative paragraph 22 of that Declaration makes it clear that the massive violation of

human rights is a direct threat to the security of nations. And yet, this principle accepted by us all last year and so relevant to the Bangla Desh situation finds no place in the draft resolution.

It has been suggested that the vote in the General Assembly is a vote against the Indian position on this question. We do not regard it as such; the resolution in the General Assembly acknowledged that the root cause of the trouble lay inside Fast Pakistan even though no effective formula to solve the basic problem was suggested. It therefore becomes the duty of the Security Council to ensure that this is incorporated in the operative Part of any resolution that the Security Council might adopt.

Furthermore, a vast majority of the delegations which supported the resolution did not take a position on Bangla Desh, as Mr. Bhutto has asserted.

A cease-fire and withdrawal in any resolution of the General Assembly dealing with the situation of the armed conflict is natural and understandable, and we respect these sentiments. We have ourselves advocated such measures in other appropriate situations. We are not opposed either to a cease-fire or to a withdrawal. However. there can be no viable cease-fire or durable peace without going into the reasons, the origin and the development of the situation which has resulted in an armed conflict. No two situations are exactly similar. Nor can a simple formula be applied to all situations some of which are more complex than others. I have already stated that India has no desire or intention to continue this armed conflict a day longer than necessary in the right of our self-defence. Any assessment, any resolution, any recommendation on the present situation must therefore, take into account all the basic factors which have led to the present situation. I would, therefore, earnestly urge this august Council to consider the following important suggestions for dealing with the situation effectively: (a) the right of the people of Bangla Desh to be heard in any discussion of the problem; (b) the right of the people of Bangla. Desh

to be made a party to any cease-fire arrangements that may be proposed; (c) a political solution of the situation in Bangla Desh in accordance with the wishes of the people of Bangla Desh as already declared by their representatives elected in the December 1970 elections.

If the above three essential ingredients are accepted as an integrated whole then we are confident that a cease-fire can be brought about without any further delay and withdrawals of the armed forces of Pakistan from Bangla Desh as well as the armed forces of India from there and mutual withdrawals of both India and Pakistan from each other's territory arranged through appropriate consultations.

In order to achieve the above objectives it is necessary to recognize the fact that Golden Bengal, as graphically described by the Deputy Prime Minister of Pakistan, belongs neither to Pakistan, nor to India. Golden Bengal belongs to the people of Bangla Desh and to nobody else.

348

INDIA PAKISTAN USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC SWITZERLAND MALI GERMANY INDONESIA VIETNAM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Foreign Minister's Statement at Security Council on Soviet Plea for inviting

Bangla Desh Representatives

Following is the text of Statement of the Foreign Minister of India, Shri Swaran Singh, in the U.N. Security Council on December 13, 1971 over-ruling the Soviet Delegate Mr. Malik's point of order asking the Council to invite Bangla Desh represenMr. President, It is not my intention to challenge your ruling, but I thought it better that the position should be clarified. You stated that your ruling did not mean that persons who might be competent to give information about what is happening there would be barred. The representative of the Soviet Union has pointed out that he had not suggested that they should be invited as representatives of the State, but under rule 39 as persons competent to supply the Council with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence.

This is a matter which is not denied by anyone - and I suppose it will not be denied even by the representative of Pakistan that apart from the armed forces of India and Pakistan being engaged in the conflict in Bangla Desh, there is also a large number of persons armed, organized and accepting the orders of the government of Bangla Desh who are participating in partisan activities and carrying on their fight for maintaining their freedom. Whereas I can understand the reluctance to invite them as representatives of the State, any discussion which is calculated to restore normalcy in that area and create conditions in which the hostile armed activities should come to an end, is not practical and does not have any content or meaning unless a group which is functioning there, according to us in their capacity as persons who belong to the armed forces of the government of Bangla Desh, is heard by the Council. Other countries may not recognize them" but the reality is there, and in that capacity persons who might be competent to give information regarding what is happening in the area, information which will enable the Security Council to decide on adequate measures in accordance with whatever may be the wish and desire of the Council, should give that information within the meaning of Rule 39. Those decisions will actually have to be implemented in the area. By that process those persons will also be involved in establishing a durable peace. It appears to be absolutely essential that an opportunity should be given to such

persons to enable the Security Council to understand the issues involved and also to allow them to assist the Security Council in enforcing any decisions that it may take to restore peace and to bring about, normalcy in that region.

With these observations, I would strongly urge the Security Council or you, Mr. President, to consider the desirability of affording an opportunity to such persons, within the meaning of Rule 39.

INDIA MALI PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC USA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Swaran Singh's plea to Security Council to Await Pakistan's Response to India's Unilateral Ceasefire

Following is the text of the statement by the Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, at the Security Council session on December 16, 1971 urging the Council to await Pakistan's response to India's unilateral cease-fire before further discussion:

I have to give some very brief information to this Council, The Prime Minister of India has made a statement and I have been informed that I should convey this information to the Security Council. I quote the statement that the Prime Minister of India has made:

"We have repeatedly declared that India has no territorial ambitions. Now as the Pakistani armed forces have surrendered in Bangla Desh and Bangla, Desh is free, it is pointless in our view to continue the present conflict. Therefore, in order to stop further bloodshed and unnecessary loss of life, we have ordered our armed forces to cease-fire everywhere on the western front with effect from 20.00 hours repeat 20.00 hours IST (Indian Standard Time) on Friday the 17th repeat 17th December 1971. It is our earnest hope that there will be a corresponding immediate response from the Government of Pakistan."

I should like to add only one word, that Friday, 17 December 1971, at 20.00 hours in Indian Standard Time is equivalent to 10.30 a.m. New York Time, on 17 December. This is the information that I wanted to convey to the Council.

In a nutshell, the fighting in Bangla Desh has already stopped, and in the west the Prime Minister of India has unilaterally issued orders to stop fighting, effective from 10.30 a.m. on 17 December. I thought that this information would be relevant in the context of the problem that is before the Security Council.

I would earnestly make a suggestion that the announcement made by the Indian Prime Minister that she has issued orders for a unilateral cease-fire effective from 20.00 hours Indian Standard Time on 17 December is an Important announcement. I appreciate the anxiety of the international community to bring about the cease-fire immediately. The response of the West Pakistan Government to this unilateral proposal of the Prime Minister of India is not yet available. In consonance with the general desire expressed by the international community to bring about a cease-fire immediately, I believe that the proposal made by the Government of India is a positive and a constructive one. After this peace proposal is consolidated and the cease-fire actually becomes operative, all other matters can be gone into.

I have already answered the inquiry which the representative of Somalia has made, and if he cares to go through the record he will find the answer to it. But at the present moment I would earnestly suggest that this Council may think it more profitable to bring about the cease-fire, and that thereafter all others matters can be discussed. I am not shying away from any discussion. It is a very important and a very relevant matter, and I am prepared to discuss it. But I thought that in response to the universally expressed desire for bringing about a cease-fire, the proposal made by the Government of India is a positive one. I would appeal to the Security Council to bring about a cease-fire before we discuss the juridical or other matters.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA MALI SOMALIA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Swaran Singh on Security Council Resolution on Indo-Pak Conflict

Following is the text of the Statement by the Foreign Minister, Shri Swaran Singh, in the Security Council on December 21, 1.971 after the adoption by the Council of the resolution on Indo-Pakistani conflict:

The resolution which has Just been adopted by the Council is, we understand, the result of almost continuous discussions among various members of this Council. We are most appreciative of the efforts made by the Ambassador of Somalia, ably supported by many of his colleagues in the Council, to work out a draft resolution which has found general acceptance in the Council. I should like to take this opportunity to make a few observations on the resolution and to mention some basic points.

The resolution refers in its second preambular paragraph to General Assembly resolution 2793 (XXVI) of 7 December 1971. My delegation had voted against that resolution in the General Assembly. The position of the Government of India has already been stated in its communication contained in document S/10445, dated 12 December 1971, to the Secretary-General, and we stand by that position. The substance of the General Assembly resolution was introduced soon after in the Security Council in a different form, but the Council did not adopt it. We are, therefore, entitled to question the rele-

350

vance of the reference to that resolution in the resolution which the Council has just adopted.

The last preambular paragraph of the resolution states that cease-fire and cessation of hostilities prevail. We are glad that the initiative taken by the Prime Minister of India led to a response from Pakistan and that cease-fire became effective. We are willing to arrive at agreed arrangements with the parties concerned, to settle not only withdrawals but also other problems which have arisen as a result of this conflict, by mutual negotiation. This point has been stressed by several members of the Security Council.

As regards the eastern theatre, the existence of Bangla Desh and of the Bangla Desh Government cannot be ignored. We have always taken the view that the Bangla Desh representatives must be heard. Unfortunately, in spite of our protests, the Council did not respond to this suggestion.

We have made it amply clear that the Indian armed forces shall be withdrawn from Bangla Desh as soon as practicable. With the independence of Bangla Desh and the surrender of Pakistani troops there, their earliest possible repatriation from the eastern theatre has to be arranged. They are under our protection and we have undertaken to treat them in accordance with the Geneva Conventions. The presence of the

Indian forces in Bangla Desh, is therefore, necessary for such purposes as the protection of Pakistani troops who have surrendered to us and for prevention of reprisals and the like. We shall withdraw our troops from Bangla Desh as soon as these tasks have been accomplished. The Government of Bangla Desh has already set up a civil administration which will, we hope, relieve us in the nearest possible future of the necessity of being present there. We have no desire to stay there a day longer than necessary.

I must also add that Pakistan has no longer any right to keep any troops in Bangla Desh, and any attempt by Pakistan to enter Bangla Desh by force would create a threat to peace and security and could endanger peace and stability once again. This is a reality which the international community cannot ignore.

As regards the western theatre, the international frontier between India and Pakistan is well defined. However, as a result of hostilities, certain areas of Pakistan are now under the control of Indian troops, and a much smaller area of India is under the control of Pakistani troops. We accept the principle of withdrawals. This is a problem we wish to negotiate and settle with Pakistan as early as possible, and we look forward to co-operation from Pakistan in this regard.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India. However, in order to avoid bloodshed and for preserving peace, we have respected the cease-fire line supervised by UNMOGIP. In the course of this conflict, as also in 1965, it was crossed by troops of Pakistan at various places. India had therefore to cross this line then, as now. There is thus need to avoid the repetition of such incidents by making some adjustments in the cease-fire line in order to make it more stable, rational and viable. This we propose to discuss and settle with Pakistan.

Operative paragraph 6 of the resolution requests the Secretary-General to keep the Council informed of developments. The Government of India will be glad to keep the

Secretary-General informed of an important and significant developments. However, it is our hope that negotiations between the parties themselves will start in all seriousness and with speed, and resolve all the problems that have arisen.

The Ambassador of Somalia has been kind enough to mention the unilateral declaration by India and say that India has no territorial ambitions. While we adhere to this declaration, we regret that no similar declaration has yet been made by Pakistan.

I have made these observations on the resolution in order to make our Position clear so that there may be no doubt about it in any future discussions on the subject. The Government of India will give due consideration to the resolution of the Council and make further comments if they deem any necessary.

I would have liked to conclude on a note of hope. At last in Pakistan a democratically elected leader, who was with us only a few days ago, has become President of that country. We welcome his coming to power and we look forward to working with him to improve our bilateral relations. When he

351

was here he spoke of the need for a vision of the future. However, we are disappointed at the tone and content of his very first statement after becoming President. India regrets that there is so far no visible change in Pakistan's policy of conflict and confrontation. We had hoped that Mr. Bhutto would make a fresh beginning. While we still hope that second thoughts will prevail, we cannot ignore the declaration made by him as President and Martial Law Administrator of Pakistan

Perhaps after making a careful assessment of the situation, and keeping in mind the interests of his own people and the peace and progress of the whole sub-continent, Mr. Bhutto may in the near future adopt a more objective and far-sighted attitude.

I agree with the representative of

France that this tragedy could have been prevented if the international community had acted earlier, particularly when atrocities were being committed in what was at that time East Pakistan. We agree with the representative of Belgium that real efforts will have to be made by India and Pakistan themselves, and the door for dialogue should remain open. That is our approach to finding a satisfactory solution of our problems with Pakistan.

This is not an occasion to indulge in recrimination or polemics. It is more important to think of steps to consolidate the cease-fire and arrive at a durable peace in our area. Therefore, I do not think it necessary or desirable to reply to the slanderous allegations and baseless charges made by a certain country. We should not like to interpret its views as an indication of a desire to interfere in our affairs. I believe it is the wish of this Council, as much as that of the people of the sub-continent, that we should work out our own solutions. We have no feelings of animosity against the people of Pakistan. We wish them well. We want to work in co-operation with them for our mutual benefit. As many representatives have said, we are blood brothers, to use the words of the representative of Burundi, or twin brothers, to use the words of the representative of Nicaragua.

I agree with the representative of Pakistan that an untold number of lives was lost and that the United Nations failed to take timely action. If the international community had taken action on the basic causes of the conflict before it started, it could perhaps have been avoided. The representative of Pakistan used a dangerous word - genocide - in speaking of what is happening now in Bangla Desh. Would he not call the killing of 1 million persons on grounds of differences of race, culture and language a genocide?

The will of 104 Members of the General Assembly has been misinterpreted by the representative of Pakistan. We share the desire and the anxiety of the General

Assembly for peace, for a cease-fire and withdrawal, but there can be no durable peace unless the root cause of the problem - respect for the human rights and fundamental freedoms of the 75 million persons of Bangla Desh - is recognized.

Now only Pakistan but India too has gone through a most difficult time. Bangla Desh has had a most tragic and traumatic experience, resulting in 1 minion Persons being killed and 10 million driven out of their homes. We regret that no reference has been made to that in the resolution. Now that hostilities have ceased, it is our earnest hope that the three countries of the sub-continent - Bangla Desh, Pakistan and India - will co-operate and usher in an era of peace, progress and prosperity.

INDIA PAKISTAN USA MALI SOMALIA SWITZERLAND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE BELGIUM BURUNDI

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Sen's Speech at U. N. Security Council on Ceasefire Demand in Bangla Desk

Following is the text of the speech of the Permanent Indian Representative, Shri Samar Sen, at the U.N. Security Council on December 4, 1971 on ceasefire demand in Bangla Desh:

I am grateful to the Council for the invitation to India to participate in this important debate, but I should. like to make it quite clear, at the beginning, that we are not here under Article 31 of the Charter. We are here under rules 37 and 38 of the rules of procedure. This point is most important for us, and I shall elaborate on it

352

We have heard a long statement from the Ambassador of Pakistan, which tells the story from 21 November, and quickly - and I thought rather casually - brushes aside much that has happened before. We do not represent a military regime and I do not wish to go into many military details now. But I would, however, suggest that it is neither right nor proper that we should start our discussion on any particular date.. The history which lies behind this great tragedy has been reported by many people, but I shall only quote a few paragraphs from the Secretary-General's report, which is part of the agenda item. The Secretary-General says:

"7. It is for these reasons that I am taking the unusual step of reporting to the President of the Security Council on a question which has not been inscribed on the Council's agenda. The political aspects of this matter are of such far-reaching importance that the Secretary-General is not in a position to suggest precise courses of action before the members of the Security Council have taken note of the problem. I believe, however, that the United Nations, with its long experience in peace-keeping and with its varied resources for concilation and persuasion, must, and should now play a more forthright role in attempting both to mitigate the human tragedy which has already taken place and to avert the further deterioration of the situation." (S/10410, p.4)

Therefore, the first problem we are facing, the particular situation we are fronting today, has a long history behind it. This history is essentially a history between the West Pakistan regime and the people of Bangla Desh. Therefore, without the participation of the people of Bangla Desh, it would be impossible for us to obtain a proper perspective of the problem.

The Ambassador of Pakistan brushed aside these people as groups of either refugees or rebels. They are nothing of the sort. They are the elected representatives of 75 million people. There is neither normalcy nor peace in East Pakistan, and as a result, we have suffered aggression after aggression. Now, in order to come to a solution which would be acceptable to the Council and acceptable to those who are responsible for running the country, It is essential, in our opinion, that the representatives or Bangla Desh should be present here. I am most grateful to the representative of Italy for having mentioned that I was perhaps out of order in bringing up this question, but as the representative of Pakistan has already pointed out, this is a substantive matter.

Now, the Ambassador of Pakistan starts the story from 21 November. I have here a report which has just come in: Security Council document S/10412 of 4 December. Paragraph 4 of that report states the following:

- "4. On 3 December 1971, the Chief Military Observer, on the basis of reports from United Nations Military Observers, reported as follows (all time indications WPT):"- which I believe is West Pakistan Time -
- "(a) Srinagar airfield bombed at 1745 hours on 3 December.
- (b) United Nations Military observers at Field Station Poonch reported at 2020 hours that Pakistan troops had crossed the cease-fire line at the Poonch crossing point ... at 1910 hours. At 2140 hours, the station reported that shelling had commenced from the India side of the line toward the Pakistan side, and at 2256 hours it reported that the area of Poonch was under fire from Pakistan artillery.
- (c) Field station Kotli reported at 2145 hours that small-arms fire from Pakistan pickets towards Indian pickets had commenced at 1930 hours and was continuing.

- (d) Field Station Jammu reported at 2245 hours that heavy artillery fire from both sides had commenced at 2215 hours and was continuing.
- (e) Field station Sialkot reported at 2250 hours that rounds of artillery were landing in their vicinity.
- (f) Field station Rajouri reported at 2250 hours that they had been informed by the local military authority that fighting was taking place along the cease-fire line from Poonch to Naushera.

353

(g) The Chief Military Observer considers that hostilities along the ceasefire line have commenced, and he will instruct the Military Observers to remain at their stations." (S/10412, page 4)

Therefore, to begin with, the whole picture given by the Ambassador of Pakistan is a build-up for military action. Now, he asked the question, why is it necessary for Pakistan to take military action against India, which is so much more powerful, has a more numerous population, and so on? The answer to that question is very simple. Pakistan, for the last 23 years, has not been broken up by India. Pakistan has been ruling its own people by military might and at one stage, when they had the opportunity to express what kind of government they want, the Pakistan military machine was put into operation to suppress the wishes of the, people. So it is not India that is breaking up Pakistan; it is Pakistan that is breaking up Pakistan itself and, in the process, creating aggression against us.

The first stage of this Problem was that when Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the elected leader of Pakistan, held his election on the basis of a six-point programme, there was not a single complaint, even from the military rulers of Pakistan. They accepted that programme, and, as a basis of it, the elections were held. When the elections were held and it was found that Sheikh Mujibur,s party had won 167 seats out of a total House of

300, what was the response of the Pakistani military rulers? They negotiated all over the place. Nothing was known of these negotiations until Mr. Bhutto produced his book, which is now known as The Great Tragedy.

I shall not weary the Council by reading this book, but It will show what machinations, what intrigues, had gone on in order to hold East Pakistan by force. We had repeatedly told United Nations Members, bilaterally and in various United Nations forums, that one cannot hold 75 million people by force of arms. Did anybody listen then?

We are most grateful that the concern of the Council has been shown over the recents events, but it still is a matter of great surprise and infinite regret to us that when so many men, women and children were butchered, raped, massacred, no action was taken. We cannot forget this background if we are to consider the problem seriously.

After the election were held, Mujibur Rahman was then described as a future Prime Minister of Pakistan. Today he is rotting in gaol. No one knows what has happened to him. I have not met any man, woman or child who can come here and say "I have seen Mujibur Rahman in person". After that, military repressions were unleashed in a manner and in a way which would shock the conscience of mankind. Villages are burnt, children killed, women raped. And those of you who have seen the films of these incidents can bear testimony to them.

It is not good enough to say that Pakistan has gone through a great tragedy and therefore we must all sympathize with it and forget these incidents. These incidents happened and, as a result, 10 million people came to India as refugees.

Now, was that not a kind of aggression? If aggression to another foreign country means that it strains its social structure, that it ruins its finances, that is has to give UP its territory for sheltering the refugees. if it means that all its schools have to be

closed, that its hospitals have to be closed, that Its administration is to be denuded. What is the difference between that kind of aggression and the other type, the more classical type, when someone declares war, or something of that sort? But that is not enough. The Ambassador of Pakistan gives details that we went into Pakistan territory after 21 November. We did; I do not deny it.

We did this because we had no option. The Pakistan Army put its cannons on the frontier and started shelling our civilian villages. They have been accustomed to killing their own people. I do not believe that is their privilege. I think this is a barbaric act. But after having killed their own people they now turn their guns on us. Eight hundred and ninety complaints of border violations have been made to Pakistan since 25 March. What was the response to these? They rejected them all. They continued to shell our villages, kill our civilians.

354

What is the remedy left to us? To kill their villagers with guns on our side, or to go and silence their guns? We decided to silence their guns, to save our civilians.

Pakistan made a great rhetorical statement that it had not taken any military actions, that President Yahya Khan offered to withdraw, and so on and so forth. What are the facts? Pakistan moved its troops to the frontier long before we did. We responded by moving our troops. Pakistan declared a national emergency on 23 November 1971. We declared it on 3 December 1971. Pakistan has launched a campaign of "crush India", "conquer India", and has engaged in a completely orchestrated campaign of war mentality. As a response, we have said that we are not going to start a war; we shall not fight a war; but if anyone starts a war, we shall defend ourselves.

The question arises: Why is Pakistan doing all this? The answer again, as I said, is simple; but I had to give this little background. After having failed totally to suppress the Bengali rebellion, as they call it

- the Bengali liberation front, as we call it - they have to find some device to justify their peculiar dilemma. They have sought to justify this dilemma by making rather fantastic proposals for inviting India to join and co-operate with them in repressing and punishing the Bengalis. In other words, we should enter into a partnership with Pakistan for carrying out the unspeakable deeds that they are perpetrating against the Bengali people. Well, we refused. We still refuse.

Then there was a great hue and cry to internationalize the problem: diplomatic moves, various moves in the United Nations through these proposals for observers, and this, that and the other - all designed to make it into an Indo-Pakistan dispute. Once it is turned into an Indo-Pakistan dispute, people will forget what the Pakistan army is doing in East Pakistan. They can go on burning their villages, raping their women and so on. People will then forget and say that it is an Indo-Pakistan dispute. It is extraordinary, therefore, to find that today, when pressure for action is so great in some quarters, this background is forgotten.

Here we have three or four main factors, none of which has been properly considered by the Security Council. What happened to the campaign of genocide? Did the United Nations respond? What happened to the total elimination of all democratic rights? Did the United Nations respond? What happened to the millions of people who had been driven from their homes and who are creating such a burden on India? Was any solution found? After this position has been reached, a large number of appeals are made. All kinds of unreal statements of "normalcy" having returned to Pakistan are put out. To what extent normalcy has been restored can be judged by the fate of the United Nations relief programme in East Pakistan itself. Time and again assurances were given that this relief equipment - trucks, vehicles, boats - would not be used by the Pakistan Army. But this is precisely what has happened. Time and again assurances were given that relief operations would reach the victims for whom they were intended. Only

the other day, Mr. Paul-Marc Henry explained in great detail before the Third Committee that this was almost impossible. So there is no normalcy; there is only butchery. As a result of butchery more people have come over to our areas.

Much has been said about the return of the refugees. It would be interesting to know why the refugees are still coming if such normal heavenly conditions exist in Pakistan. They are coming because they are being terrorized, they are being butchered. That is why they are coming. And we cannot take any more. We have told the international community time and again that we have come to the end of our tether. The situation is intolerable. We cannot go on paying \$ 3 million a day to look after the refugees. And still they come - not because we are looking after them well; in fact, we are looking after them extremely badly with our limited resources. There are bad sanitary conditions and many other evils. The refugees are living in most horrible conditions. None the less they come. Nobody wants to leave his home to live in such conditions unless there am compelling reasons to do so. These compelling reasons are the brutalities of the Pakistan Army, the denial of the rights of 75 million people, the total negation of everything that human life stands for, the deliberate attempt to hold. under colonial rule 75 million persons whom they have exploited for 23 years. I have all

355

the statistics here. I shall make a fuller statement to establish all these points. There is complete domination, complete subjugation, complete military butchery. Against that, the people revolted.

We hear a great deal about the revolutionary doctrine: peoples' rights. I do not know how these revolutionaries will behave when Bangla Desh becomes independent, as it certainly will. It will become independent, not merely because India helps it - India will continue to help it - but because the spirit of man in 75 million persons cannot be crushed. They have tried everything. They have tried military means. They have

tried fictitious administration. They have tried phantom elections. They have put out bulletins, declarations. Nothing has any effect.

Now, the Security Council is meeting and we are regaled with a long tirade about Indian wickedness for breaking up Pakistan in our selfish interests, to become a great Power - quotations from various books and jurists and academicians. They have broken themselves up. We are facing the consequences.

The only question now is: How do we stop this? It is not a Pakistan representative that we have heard today; it is half a Pakistan representative that we have heard today. The other half is waiting somewhere in the wings to be called. If the Security Council, in its wisdom, does not do it, the situation will not get better; it will get worse.

Much has been said about a cease-fire. I have looked at some of these documents floating, around, about a cease-fire. A ceasefire between whom and. whom? Shall we release the Pakistani soldiers by a so-called cease-fire so that they can go on a rampage and kill the civilians in Dacca, in Chittagong, and in other places? Is this the kind of cease-fire we desire? Are the soldiers meant to fight and die for whatever cause they believe in, whether it is the cause of civili-Zation or the cause of darkness, or are they to be relieved from this Particular duty for which they have taken an oath so that they can go and butcher women and rape young girls of 19, 17, 15, 13, 11 and even less?

I hear some jocular comments from the gallery. Perhaps we are privileged to hear this humour, but I do not find it humorous at all. The Pakistani delegation has probably arranged all this. Thank you.

I do not find it at all humorous that women should be raped. And this raping is not because of lust, but because of a deliberate campaign to humiliate people. In our part of the world, if a woman is raped it has various social consequences of a most unbearable nature, and many people, rather

dramatically perhaps, say that it is better to be killed than to be raped. The Pakistan army knows that, and this campaign of rape is on a systematic basis so that the people of East Pakistan can be humiliated.

This is the situation in which Pakistan finds itself. How to extricate itself? The only way to extricate itself is to involve India, and this has been done, as I said, first through refugee aggression, and now through military aggression. We have suffered at the hands of Pakistan four aggressions, and we are not going to take it any more. I wish to give a very serious warning to the Council that we shall not be a party to any solution that will mean continuation of oppression of East Pakistani people, whatever the pretext, whatever the ground on which this is brought about. So long as we have any light of civilized behaviour left in us, we shall protect them. We shall not fight their battle. Nobody can fight other people's battles. There are great Powers seated around this table that have found out to their own cost that people cannot fight other people's battles, that they have to fight them themselves. But whatever help we can give, whether in the form of aid to the refugees. in the form of medicines, or in any other form, we shall continue to give it. Secondly, we shall continue to save our own national security and sovereignty. If Pakistan, by bombing our villages, by raising a hue and cry of internal interference or crossing the frontier, believes that we shall just quietly take all these killings, I think they should think again. We will not permit our national security, our safety or our way of life, to be jeopardized by any of these means. Let there be no doubt about that.

I should also make it quite clear that this build-up of military attack has been accompanied by the most absured statements. Pakistan now comes up and says, "Why do you not shake hands and be friends?" Yet; President Yahya Khan made

356

a statement in Le Monde of Paris in which he described our Prime Minister in such offensive terms that, in spite of all my bad training, I cannot bring myself to say those words. This is the kind of people we are dealing with. They have neither a solid base nor any civilized standards nor any political wisdom at all.

Pakistan is saying: "We offered to have observers. We offered withdrawal", and so forth. Why are the situations first created and then all these offers made? But about one thing they could do. not a word is said. They could come to a political settlement with the elected leaders. That could be quite peaceful. But no, that is not to be done. All our friends tell us that great pressure has been brought to bear on President Yahya Khan to come to a political settlement. And what is the result? Nil, absolutely nil. The great General does not listen to the other great generals, perhaps.

So there is no way open for Pakistan now except to heat up the military situation - which it has done, as I explained, first on the eastern front by bombing our villages, and on the western front by a wanton attack on our cities, by suddenly, on the second night, sending several planes. The Ambassador of Pakistan says, "We bombed only a few cities and villages near the frontier". But they came as far and as deep down as Agra - 300 miles.

Is that a picture of premeditated armed intervention on the part of India? Would the Prime Minister of India go to Calcutta to see the refugee camps if she was thinking of launching an attack on Pakistan on that day? If the Security Council believes that, let it believe it, but I would warn again that nothing will stop us from protecting our own territory, integrity and sovereignty and our national security and our human values.

Without taking too much time, I wish to say that I hope I shall be able to reply to all the little details which the Pakistan Ambassador gave; but today I want to Put this broad picture in front of the Security Council and to hear what the others have to say before I come back again. My purpose, is again, to say that the main parties to this dispute, whether militarily, politically,

civilly or any other way we look at it are East Pakistan and West Pakistan East Pakistan as represented by Bangla Desh, who were elected, as I said, with the army's full consent.

Incidentally, the army had the full authority to cancel the Constitution, even after it had been drawn, but then got cold feet, according to Mr. Bhutto. If such a request is made, President Yahya Khan will find it very difficult to reject the proposal.

So there was no alternative left but to crush. And how was that process of crushing carried out? Negotiations were carried on in Dacca in most extraordinary circumstances, and at the same time the Pakistan army was reinforcing itself. Today we are told that some plane which was hijacked was hijacked by Indian agents. If it was done like that, if it was done by Indian agents, why was the hijacking incident, the blowingup of a plane, greeted with parades in the Lahore streets and televised as if it were some kind of civilized conduct that any State should be proud of? And if anyone knows anything about Pakistan - and I do know a little - none of these things could happen without direct Government approval.

Now again we are told that all these massacres were necessary because something had happened before 25 March. If anything did happen, the world did not know about it. Thirty-five foreign correspondents were bundled out, on the night of the 28th, from the Lahore Hotel and the Dacca Hotel. They were there, they did not write. They are not worried about reprisals in West Pakistan. In fact, nothing of the sort happened. It is one of the. many afterthoughts that have been built up on the Propaganda front of Pakistan over the last nine months.

Over the last nine months the struggle of the armless, defenceless people of East Bengal has been going on against the regime of military men in West Pakistan. It is not West Pakistanis who are involved; it is the military regime that is doing all this, and there is already a murmur of protest even in West Pakistan, little as they have heard of what has actually gone on. They have

little wish to believe all this. They are decent human beings. They do not believe that their own army - of which, I think, they are quite, rightly proud - could stoop to

357

these low deeds, these massacres and these, barbaric attempts to suppress a population of 75 million people.

Under the resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly there are certain criteria laid down concerning how and when an area can be regarded as non-self-governing. If we applied those criteria to East Bengal, and if we had a little more morality, we could declare East Pakistan a non-selfgoverning territory. Let it not be said that because I talk of morality I am self-righteous - although I think that, as between Pakistan and India, we are so right and they are so wrong that I have every right to be selfrighteous. This is treated as if it were some kind of monstrous charge to be right. It is not a monstrous charge to be right. We are glad that we have on this particular occasion absolutely nothing but the purest of motives and the purest of intentions: to rescue the people of East Bengal from what they are suffering. If that is a crime, the Security Council can judge for itself. However, if a crime is to be perpetrated by actions such as some of the proposals for resolutions today envisage and India is to be made a partner of that crime, we shall resolutely and stoutly say no. No one can remove us from our path by mere resolutions and mere exhortations. The question of a cease-fire, as I have already mentioned, is one not between India and Pakistan but between the Pakistan Army and the Bangla Desh people. Therefore let us hear them before we go further into this debate.

I should like to take this Opportunity to make a few comments and state my Government's views on the proposals before the Council as frankly and as fairly as I can. The main concern shown during the debate is to arrest any further fighting immediately. That is in our view quite understandable but quite unrealistic. It is unrealistic in the sense that it would not stop the Mukti Bahini

from fighting or the Pakistani Army from continuing its oppression and sending more and more refugees into India. As I have already explained, we cannot take any more refugees-

I should like to say that had this concern for saving lives been matched with a similar concern for saving countless lives during the last nine months, it would have, been a source of some comfort to my Government and the Indian people. What, indeed has happened to our conventions on genocide, human rights, self-determination, and so on?

It is in this context that we find it very regrettable - indeed most deplorable - that a decision of this nature which concerns 75 million persons should be taken without listening to their own representatives.

I therefore state again that while we shall make a fuller statement later we do protest and resent the fact that this kind of decision is being taken without consulting the people who are most deeply and intimately concerned.

Secondly, I should like to say - as I have said before - that this is the fourth time Pakistan has committed aggression against India. On previous occasions India has not had a Proper discussions of this problem and certainly not a proper solution, and we have a strong sense of grievance in this respect. We are therefore not going to submit to any Pressures or threats from any quarter. We reserve our right to take, and to continue taking, all appropriate and necessary measures to safeguard our security and defence against aggression from Pakistan. We should be failing in our duty if we did not make it absolutely clear that any interference in India's right of selfdefence or any encouragement or cover to Pakistan's aggression win produce grave consequences to the peace and security of this whole region, and let the United Nations and all the members of the Security Council: not fail to take full note of this warning.

We should be extremely sorry if they ignore heeding our considerations as they

have done on previous occasions.

Lastly, we deeply regret that Pakistan has been encouraged over these last nine months to commit all kinds of atrocious deeds and aggression against India because it has been supported by several countries - for whatever reasons, and I shall not go into those reasons. We are absolutely convinced that but for this encouragement, such an attitude on the part of Pakistan would not have been evident.

358

INDIA USA PAKISTAN ITALY OMAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC FRANCE UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Son's Statement at UN Security Council

Speaking during the U.N. Security Council emergency debate on December 4, 1971, Permanent Indian Representative Shri Samar Sen, made the following statement:

I should like to take this opportunity to make a few comments and state my Government's views on the proposals as frankly and as fairly as I can. The main concern shown during the debate is to arrest any further fighting immediately. That is in our view quite understandable but quite unrealistic. It is unrealistic in the sense that it would not stop the Mukti Bahini from fighting or the Pakistani Army from continuing its oppression and sending more and more refugees into India. As I have already explained, we cannot take any more' refugees.

I should like to say that had this concern

for saving lives been matched with a similar concern for saving countless lives during the last nine months, it would have been a source of some comfort to my Government and the Indian people. What, indeed, has happened to our Conventions on genocide, human rights, self-determination, and so on?

It is in this context that we find it very regrettable - indeed most deplorable - that a decision of this nature which concerns 75 million persons should be taken without listening to their own representatives.

I therefore state again that While we shall make a fuller statement later we do protest and resent the fact that this kind of decision is being taken without consulting the people who are most deeply and intimately concerned.

Secondly, I should like to say - as I have said before - that this is the fourth time Pakistan has committed aggression against India. On Previous occasions India has not had a proper discussion of this problem and certainly not a proper solution, and we have a strong sense of grievance in this respect. We are therefore not going to submit to any pressures or threats from any quarter. We reserve our right to take, and to continue taking, all appropriate and necessary measures to safeguard our security and defence against aggression from Pakistan. We should be failing in our duty if we did not make it absolutely clear that any interference in India's right of self-defence or any encouragement or cover to Pakistan's aggression will produce grave consequences to the peace and security of this whole region, and let the United Nations and all the members of the Security Council not fail to take full note of this warning.

We should be extremely sorry if they ignore heeding our considerations as they have done on previous occasions.

Lastly, we deeply regret that Pakistan has been encouraged over these last nine months to commit all kinds of atrocious deeds and aggression against India because it has been supported by several countries

for whatever reason and I shall not go into those reasons. We are absolutely convinced that but for this encouragement, such an attitude on the part of Pakistan would not have been evident.

INDIA UNITED KINGDOM PAKISTAN USA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Speech by Shri S. Sen in the Security Council Urging hearing of Bangla Desh Representative

Following is the text of the statement by India's Permanent Representative, Shri S. Sen, on December 5, 1971 at the U.N. Security Council urging that the Security Council should hear Bangla Desh representative:

I am glad to see that practically all those who have spoken about the application of the representative of Bangla Desh to be heard by the Council have treated this problem as a substantive problem. Therefore, I should like to make a few comments, although, following yesterday's point of order by our friend and colleague from Italy, I am not sure if, under rules 37 and 38 of the rules

359

of procedure, delegations such as mine, which have been invited here by courtesy. are really out of order in making comments on points of order.

However, to begin with I shall simply reply to the Chinese delegation's standard accusations with standard indifference. I shall simply say that we have no experience of interfering in other people's affairs so long as they do not interfere in ours. Other countries have vast experience in such inter-

ference and can always warm up to the subject.

With respect to Bangla Desh, we are discussing a most serious matter, and I think everyone round the table is agreed that the major party in the problem we are discussing is Bangla Desh. The elected representatives of Bangla Desh represent 75 million People, which is the majority of the whole population of Pakistan.

Now let us turn to rule 39, which states:

"The Security Council may invite members of the Secretariat or other persons, whom it considers competent for the purpose, to supply it with information or to give other assistance in examining matters within its competence."

Let us start by analysing the sentence backwards. We assume that the subject we are discussing is matter within the Council's competence. The only question is: Can the representative of Bangla Desh supply us with information or give us assistance in discussing this matter? If the Council decides that such a representative win not be in a position to supply information or give other assistance relevant to examining the question before us, then of course the Bangla Desh representative will have no ground to be dissatisfied if the Council rejects his request. if, on the other hand, the Council is satisfied that he can supply us with in formation and give us assistance in examining matters within its competence, then I think that under rule 39 the Council can easily invite him. Speaking for myself, I have-not the slightest doubt that he can and he should and he must supply us with information and extend to us other assistance which will help us in appreciating the problem before us, a problem of great dimension and of great gravity, and which help us to reach a satisfactory cc

I do not know how these things are arranged but I was under the impression that there would be another speaker between the representative of Pakistan and myself.

However it makes no difference because I think I can easily reply to the various points he made yesterday - as indeed I promised I would do - and to some of the points he made toddy.

Let us first look at the military affairs to which are referred at the beginning of his statement yesterday. As I said, he represents a military regime and therefore he has a the military details handy. However, we are not without some army and it is not altogether impossible for us to get some Information. I shall just give you the list of incidents on the Bengal front on 7 November.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army started firing towards the Indian villages of Rahimpur and Gourangala under Kalamchoura police station in Tripura. Ten artillery shells and 14 bombs landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army opened fire LMG and MMG fire towards the Indian village of Gourangala in Tripura.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army, opened fire towards the Indian village of Mandabag in Tripura. Several bombs of 3 mortar and a number of artillery shells landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army subjected the Indian village of Kasba in Tripura to intermittent firing. Several landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army opened fire towards the Indian village of Simna in Tripura. Several artillery shells landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 several artillery shells landed inside Indian territory when the Pakistani Army opened fire towards the Indian border outpost of Sidhai in Tripura.

On 7 November 1971 several LMG, MMG and 2 mortar shells landed inside Indian

360 territory when Pakistani Army opened fire

towards the Indian village of Amlighat near Sabroom police station.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani At-my opened fire towards the Indian village of Triprua. Several artillery shells landed in-Malua under Belonia police station in side Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army opened fire towards the Indian village of Belonia in Tripura.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani troops opened unprovoked fire towards the Indian village of Chandannagar under Kamalpur police station in Tripura. Several artillery shells landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army opened fire from Dhalai area towards Indian territory in Tripura. Several artillery shells landed inside Indian territory.

On 7 November 1971 Pakistani Army subjected the Indian village of Ran gauti under Kailashahar police station in Tripura to heavy and intermittent firing.

On 7 November 1971 several shells 3 mortar fired by Pakistani Army landed inside Indian village of Puran Raj Bari in Tripura.

That is the record of one day. I am quite sure the Council would not like me to recite this litany of military aggression from Pakistan day after day. But if the Council is interested, I am fully prepared to do so. It does shock the credibility of anyone listening to the representative of Pakistan for him to say that villages are not fired upon or that we am not compelled to take action in retaliation, that the only option open to us was to kill civilians or to silence the guns, to refer to all the offers to withdraw to a peacetime station, to any agreed limit, to anything they suggested. But anyone who has read the Proposals will be interested to find that all these offers were related to one fundamental point - that we must cease heping what they call the "guerillas" and the President of Pakistan must be satisfied that

we have been good boys. That was one of the conditions attached to most of these socalled proposals. And yet the question still remains unanswered: if the intention was not to provoke hostilities with India, why did the Pakistan Army move forward to these positions? That question still remains unanswered and I have repeatedly made it clear to my colleagues and to the representative of Pakistan himself, when he was on speaking terms with me, that we will not tolerate intrusion, aggression in our territory by the Pakistan Army and if they continue to do it they must take the consequences. And that is a statement I wish to make again in this Council, that we shall have nothing to do with aggression from Pakistan any longer. We have suffered four times and we are not prepared to suffer any more.

But let us turn to the other aspects. He makes a long song and dance - forgive my vulgar, rather casual, expression which The New York Times does not like - that we are training, arming and doing all kinds of things to subvert, pervert, invert, convert and revolutionize East Pakistan. Let me repeat what I read out in the General Assembly on 13 October 1971. I said - it is always a bit of a bore to quote from one's own speeches, but sometimes-it saves time:

"Pakistan accuses India of creating tension on the border and of supporting the freedom-fighters inside East Bengal. I would in this context read out what the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington had to say on 15 August 1971 - not 15 April, not 15 May, but 15 August - on the ABC Television Network. Incidentally, the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington is the brother of the representative of Pakistan here" - he no longer is because he has been transferred -

"...."There were at least about 160,000 armed personnel who defected on account of Awami League propaganda. The army was asked on the 25th of March to go and deal with these 160,000 armed people. Who are those people?

"In the same interview the Pakistan Ambassador answered:

"There are not only East Bengal Rifles; there were East Pakistan Rifles; there was a border military force; there were armed police.'

361

Now the question is, where did they get their arms from?

The Ambassador said:

"These weapons came from looting of armouries and government stores and from the armouries of reserve police and so on, weapons that had been collected by force, by militant student bands who were going and knocking at the doom of the houses and asking people to deliver their guns and whatever sporting rifles - guns and rifles - they had. These were not collected from the East Pakistan Rifles. We wish we had taken the trouble to disarm them before."

That is the beginning of the story. That is how they got their arms. That is how the guerillas started fighting for their liberty.

In the same context one of the difficulties of answering the representative of Pakistan is that he roams so wide and large over the same theme, that India is guilty for arming the guerillas; India is guilty over the elections; India is guilty for the Mukti Bahini; India is guilty for the Awami League, for their programme. It is extraordinarily creditable for us that such allusions should be made, but let me point out three things. Mr. Bhutto, who is no friend of India as I mentioned to you yesterday has written a big book and not a word has been said about Indian influence on elections or subsequent actions, or the exploitation of the refugees, on which the representative of Pakistan is always waxing eloquent. We

give shelter to refugees. We give shelter to all refugees - east, north, south, west, who flee from terror and from oppression. We have no apologies to make for our humanitarian action. If they flee from terror we give them shelter. If other governments do not like it, it is too bad. I do not have to go into the business of Tibetan refugees; it has been mentioned again and again, and if the representative of China has any fears that we shall launch aggression against China because of the Tibetan refugees, I can assure him that fear is completely unfounded and indeed us charges are both base and baseless,

So no press reports wrote about It. No Pakistani wrote about it. Pakistanis are gloating about the successful election. We are indeed very happy they had a successful election in Pakistan. We hoped that, for a change, our relations would improve. Our country was going to have an election and our Government was returned to power with an overwhelming majority. We were looking forward to an economic break-through, with friendly relations with Pakistan. Was that the sign for plotting the dismemberment of Pakistan? These charges are flung, day in and day out, without the slightest evidence and without the slightest proof and I must protest most vigorously at this kind of nonsense being tolerated.

Let us see another charge. Just before President Ayub Khan retired, he had brought up another charge called the Agartala conspiracy case. Now let us see what Mr. Bhutto - who, as I said, is no friend of India had to say about the Agartala conspiracy case:

"If Ayub Khan had at this stage heeded my advice, a reasonable compromise could have been reached, recognizing the basic merits of the case. If Ayub Khan had done in 1966 what he sought to do at the round table conference in 1969, the problem of Pakistan would not have come to such a pass. Unfortunately, Ayub Khan chose what he called the language of weapons and not the weapon of language. He arrested

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. The Agartala. conspiracy case - which made headlines - which followed, was handled in disastrously clumsy manner and boomeranged so seriously that we still are reeling from its consequences. Only Sheikh Mujibur Rahman benefited from this case. If all of the most important political issues are handled in this clumsy way, we must reap the consequences whether it is in the military field or in the political field. This has been the story again and again."

Since we are on the subject of Mr. Bhutto, I might touch on a humorous subject. Mr. Bhutto had gone to see President Yahya Khan in his presidential palace in Dacca. After the meeting was over Mr. Bhutto ran into Mr. Mujibur Rahman in the

362

presidential drawing-room, and this is what Mr. Bhutto had to say:

"At this point, thinking that the room might be bugged, we walked out to the verandah towards the back of the house and sat in the portico behind the President's saloon".

I do not have to comment on this. If the Presidential palaces are bugged in this way so that two leaders like Mr. Bhutto and Mr. Rahman do not feel safe to converse, on political matters no doubt, then I have no further comments.

Much has been said about atrocities. The Pakistan delegation, I suppose like many of us, read some of the popular journals but popular journals are not the type of documents we should quote in the Security Council. Here is a journal called Foreign Affairs - an American quarterly review of October 1970, price \$ 2.50 a copy - and since I am in America where many of the qualities are to be judged by the price tag, I suppose it is a good journal. Here is a very good article; at least, I think it is good: "Pakistan Divided" by Sydney Schanberg:

"In short, the fanatic fury of a holy war seems to have been the overriding reason why the Pakistani Government loosed the army on the Bengali population. This is not hard to understand when you recall that Pakistan is a State based on religion, where democratic traditions are almost non-existent and where the popular will has been often frustrated. When the army troops began their rampage that first night, they seemed to be enjoying themselves. As Punjabi patrols emerged from alleys after killing unarmed Bengalis, they came out with their hands upraised shouting 'Victory to God' or 'Long live Pakistan'. That was the spirit where the Muslims Killed Muslims in the name of religion".

Then, a little further on, Mr. Schanberg says:

"At this writing, foreign diplomats estimate that the army killed at least 200,000 people, Bengalis. Despite claims that normalcy prevails in the province, the military has not been able as yet to restore law and order or establish even a semblance of governmental administration."

This particular conclusion has been reinforced again and again to such an extent that I think it is a waste of breath and time to go on repeating the same story.

Much has been said about autonomy and independence. I am slightly tired of saying the same thing in different forums of the United Nations. There was no demand foe independence at the time the elections were held, or when the negotiations were undertaken. The demand for independence only started when the military crack-down took place, and if there is any doubt in this respect, let those representatives of countries who have well-stocked achives come along and say this is not so. I doubt that they will.

To go back to another aspect, Washington's call with the others for a Security Council meeting yesterday represented the

welcome, though tragically tardy, recognition of those dangers and of the essential role of the United Nations in restoring and maintaining peace. For months the United States resorted to ineffectual secret diplomacy that bypassed and served to paralyse the World Organization. The Nixon Administration adopted a public posture of mock even-handedness which had the effect of exacerbating the Indo-Pakistan conflict. It ignored the fundamental threat to India posed by Yahya Khan's harsh repression in East Pakistan.

"The United States Government is still sidestepping the central issue and is responding, with flagrant injustice in attempting to pin the major responsibility for the present conflict on India. If Security Council's intervention is to have any chance of restoring peace between India and Pakistan, the United States and the United Nations must recognize and deal with the basic problem in East Pakistan."

If this particular statement had been made by an Indian spokesman, our aid would have been cut, we would have been put on - the mat and given a lecture as if we were some kind of native children from a mis-

363 sionary school. But this was not made by a spokesman of the Indian Government. This was made by the respectable New York Times.

Yesterday the representative of the United States said:

"In an effort to end the bloodshed, to save lives, to reduce the untold suffering, we are introducing a draft resolution which. . .

and so on and so forth.

Now this bloodshed, this concern for the saving of lives, this concern for the reduction of untold suffering, would it not have been better expressed a few months earlier?

Would it have been too much to ask of the

United States Government to make a public declaration expressing concern at all the humiliations, all the tragedies, all the suffering and all the brutalities that people were enduring? However, this is how politics rubs: let it be.

That also brings us to the Chinese draft resolution. As I said, I hope that I shall continue to treat all Chinese utterances with a degree of Indifference because they only read out statements which have been made in Peking for the last six months. There is nothing new in them. But it is extraordinary that a country which is supposed to represent all revolutionary forces should be taking this attitude. I can only explain it by assuming that they think time is on their side and that there will be plenty of opportunities to change the direction of the sails according to the wind.

Now I come to the draft resolutions before us. As I explained, it is not for India to agree or disagree to cease-fire resolutions; It is for the Bangla Desh Government because they are fighting for their liberty and for their lives. If they agree, we shall see what can be done. But we cannot be involved in a dishonest agreement to cease-fire, knowing fully well that we shall not be able to keep it because, as I said repeatedly yesterday, we have no desire to oppress People who are already sufficiently oppressed, in spite of the great invocation of the religion of Allah by the rulers of Pakistan.

I have only one more point to make before I finish, and it relates to our request, that Bangla Desh representatives should be heard. I do not quite understand the concern of the representative of Pakistan. We do not want to extend international recognition by listening to a Bangla Desh representative in the Security Council. If we did want to give recognition, we, as the Government of India, could have done so a long time ago. We shall do it when we think the normal criteria for recognition have been established, when we think that they deserve it, not because of the wish, but because of their ability to govern the country. It has nothing to do with Security Council attendance. Security Council attendance is governed by rule 39 of the rules of procedure. If there is any doubt about it, I wonder how many people have considered the number of representatives of various countries and areas who have come before us and given their views. The only question about listening to Mr. Justice Chowdhury - who, incidentally, was the Pakistan representative on the Human Rights Commission until he was removed very recently - reminds me of another remark because the Pakistan Ambassador is always saying that the Indians are at the back of all these evils, but how many ambassadors have defected? How many soldiers have defected? How many Ministers have defected? I have received letters from people who are leaving the Service today and those letters would bring tears to the eyes of even very hardhearted people. Are these the people who are to be influenced by Indian propaganda. Indian machinations? If that is the nature of the Pakistan Foreign Service, then I do not have to make any further comments. At any rate, many people have appeared before the Security Council; even today we have pending requests from some delegation - I think it is the Soviet delegation - for two representatives of the black population of Rhodesia to be heard. I wonder if the representative of Pakistan will object to such appearance. I have also before me a complete record of all those who have appeared before the Security Council, and I find the names of people from the Palestine movement and of various other people who have appeared before the Security Council, including the Mayor of Jerusalem at one stage. So I do not think we need be frightened by this question of recognition through the Security Council. We are not going to recognize anyone through the Security

364

Council. All those people who have appeared have not been recognized, and I am quite sure that Mr. Ian Smith will not recognize the existence of the black community or of their rights merely because their spokesmen come and speak here. I am quite sure that the President of Pakistan will not recognize Mr. Justice Chowdhury as the spokesman of

Bangla Desh. If we are to proceed in this matter in an intelligent way, in a realistic way, we cannot do so without listening to the party most interested in it.

Lastly, I thank the Council for a very patient hearing in spite of sudden outbursts of anger, because I do feel angry when nonsensical charges are made in the Council and so much time is taken up. We sat up until 1.30 this morning, and much time has been taken up by unnecessary polemics, propaganda, controversies - and Bengal is burning.

I simply wish to correct a few facts.

It is quite true that the United States Government has been extremely generous with its money in looking after the refugees. I have made many public acknowledgements of it and, if necessary, I shall repeat once again for the records of Security Council that the United States Government has been extremely generous with money in looking after the refugees. But the claim that they have contributed most in financial terms is simply not correct. India has contributed more. do not claim any credit for It; I do not think it is entirely a matter of money. But I again say for the sake of fact that we have spent more.

My regret was not because the money has not been forthcoming but that no official condemnation of what was going on in East Pakistan has been forthcoming. If it is true - and I do not yet have the facts; the United States delegation has much more information than I have - that 120,000 Indian soldiers are in East Pakistan, I have explained the background in which they are there. But I have not heard any regrets about 80,000 Pakistan soldiers who, in the words of Mr. Schanberg, were described as having gone on a rampage against the civil population. That was also a time to apply the tourniquet.

Lastly, with great deference I would say that I said nothing about the President of the United States. I believe that I am too seasoned an official to reflect on any

President - and head of State - in the Security Council. I read a quotation which said: "The Nixon Administration". Now that is the style of the American language. They do not describe their Government as the Government of the United States but as the "Nixon Administration" or "Taft Administration" or "Eisenhower Administration". So if any excuse is to be given, It is to be given, by the American language, not by the Indian Ambassador.

INDIA ITALY USA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM CHINA AUSTRALIA ISRAEL

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Speech by Shri S. Son in the Security Council

Following is the text of the speech by Permanent Representative at the U.N., Shri S. Sen in the Security Council on December 6, 1971 during debate on Bangla Desh:

I think I owe It to the Council to report certain developments which have taken place since we adjourned last night. About an hour and a half after that adjournment the Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Gandhi, made a statement in our Parliament, in New Delhi. I think I can, do no better to discharge my duty than to read her statement as she delivered it in the Indian Parliament. She said:

"The valiant struggle of the people of Bangla Desh in the face of tremendous odds has opened a new chapter of heroism in the history of freedom movements. Earlier they had reported a democratic victory in their elections,

and even the President of Pakistan had conceded the right of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to become the Prime Minister of Pakistan. We shall never know what intervened to transform this benevolent mood and realistic approach - if it really was that - to destruction and a posture of open hostilities and repression.

365

"We are told that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his party, the Awami League, had planned a non-violent movement of resistance to the Government of West Pakistan but were caught unawares and overtaken by a brutal military assault. They had no alternative but to declare independence. The East Pakistan Rifles and the East Bengal Regiment became Mukti Fauj and later Mukti Bahini, which was joined by thousands of young East Bengalis determined to sacrifice their lives for their freedom and right to fashion their future. The unity, determination and courage with which the entire population of Bangla Desh is fighting have been reported by the world press. These events on our doorstep and the resulting flood of refugees into our territory could not but have far-reaching repercussions on our country. It was natural that our sympathy should be with the people of Bangla Desh in their just struggle, but we did not act precipitately in the matter of recognition. Our decisions were not guided merely by emotion but by assessment of the prevailing and future realities. With the unanimous revolt of the entire people of Bangla Desh and the success of the struggle it has become increasingly apparent that the so-called mother State of Pakistan is totally incapable of bringing the people of Bangla Desh back under its control. As for the legitimacy of the Government of Bangla Desh the whole world is now aware that it reflects the will of the overwhelining majority of the people, which not many governments can claim to represent. In Jefferson's

famous words to Governor Morris, the Government of Bangla Desh is supported by the will of the nation substantially expressed'.

"Applying this criterion, the military regime in, Pakistan, whom, some States are so anxious to buttress, is hardly representative of its people, even waging war against them. The normal hesitation on our part not to do anything which could come in the way of peaceful solution or which might be construed as an intervention has lost significance. The people of Bangla Desh battling for their very existence and the people of India fighting to defeat aggression now find themselves partisans in the same cause. I am glad to inform the House that in the light of the existing situation and in response to the repeated requests of the Government of Bangla Desh, the Government of India have, after most careful consideration, decided to grant recognition to the People's Republic of Bangla Desh. It is our hope that with the passage of time more nations will grant recognition and that the People's Republic of Bangla Desh will soon form a part of the family of nations.

"Our thoughts at this moment are with the father of this new State, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. I am sure that this House would wish me to convey to their Excellencies, the acting President of Bangla Desh and the Prime Minister, and their colleagues, our greetings and warm felicitations. I am placing on the table of the House copies of communications which we have received from the Government of Bangla Desh. The Honourable Members will be glad to know that the Government of Bangla Desh have proclaimed their basic principles of State policy to be democracy, socialism, secularism and the establishment of an egalitarian society in which there would be no discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex or creed. With regard to foreign relations the Bangla Desh Government

have expressed their determination to follow a policy of non-alignment, peaceful co-existence and opposition to colonialism, racialism and imperialism in all its manifestations. These are the ideals to which India also is dedicated. The Bangla Desh Government have reiterated their anxiety to organize the expeditious return of the citizens who have found temporary refuge in our country and to restore their lands and belongings; to them. We shall naturally help in every way in these arrangements. I am confident that in future the Governments and peoples of India and Bangla Desh who share common ideals and sacrifices, will forge a relationship based on the principles of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal

366

affairs, equality and mutual benefit Thus, working together for freedom and democracy, we shall set an example of good-neighbourliness which alone can ensure peace and stability and progress in this region. Our good wishes to Bangla Desh."

Now, I read this statement in full because I believe it is important enough to be recorded in full and for people to hear it in full. But more important than that, this recognition of Bangla Desh has put the relationship of India to Bangla Desh in a completely different legal, political and constitutional context; and I would request the Council to realize this new development before any decision is taken.

Since we have now recognized Bangla Desh, I think I should take a few minutes of the Council's time to go back - not too much, but a little bit - into the history. It has been said that the autonomy movement led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman soon became a movement for independence, and that this would have brought about the disintegration of Pakistan. May I just read a very short paragraph from Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's

presentation of the six-point programme which is the fomula for autonomy. This is what he says:

"Sixthly, let me humbly remind my West Pakistani brothers and sisters that when we demanded Bengali to be made one of the two State languages of Pakistan you condemned it as a move to undo Pakistan. When, again we demanded a joint electorate, particularly in the context of parity in representation demanded by you, you condemned that demand to have been inspired from across the border. Both of these two demands have now been accepted, but there has been no undoing of Pakistan due to their acceptance. Does it not put you to shame that every bit of reasonable demand of East Pakistan has got to be secured from you at tremendous cost and after bitter struggle, as if snatched from unwilling foreign rulers as a reluctant concession? Does it do you any credit? Please put a stop to such attitude once and for all. Please be brothers instead of rulers."

Now, after the military crackdown, as I pointed out yesterday, independence was suddenly declared. - And this is what the Prime Minister of the new State of Bangla Desh has to say on that:

"Pakistan is now dead and buried under a mountain of corpses. The hundreds and thousands of people murdered by the army in Bangla Desh will act as an impenetrable barrier between West Pakistan and the people of Bangla Desh. By resorting to preplanned genocide Yahya must have known that he was himself digging subsequent Pakistan's grave. The massacres perpetrated by his orders, by his licensed killers, of the people were not designed to preserve the unity of the nation. They were acts of racial hatred and sadism, devoid of even the elements of humanity. Professional soldiers, on orders, violated their code of military honour and were seen as beasts of prey who indulged in an orgy of murder,

rape, loot, arson, destruction, unequalled in the annals of civilization. These acts indicate that the concept of two countries is already deeply rooted in the minds of Yahya and his associates who would not dare commit such atrocities on their own continent. Yahva's genocide is thus without political purpose. It serves only as the last act in the tragic history of Pakistan which Yahya has chosen to write with the blood of the people of Bangla Desh. The objective is genocide and scorched earth before his troops are either driven out or perish. In this time he hopes to liquidate all political leadership, intelligentsia, and administration, to destroy our industries and, public amenities. And, as a final act, he Intends to rage lour cities to the ground.' Already his occupation army has made substantial Progress towards this objective. Bangla Desh will be set back 50 years as West Pakistan's Parting gift to a people they have exploited 23 years for their own benefit".

This declaration was made on 17 April 1971.

In this context I should like to read an article which appeared in The New York Times today. Some of the members may have read it, but perhaps the non-English-speaking members have not. In order to respect the wishes expressed-by the represen-

367

tative of the United States, I shall leave out from this article all references to the Nixon Administration, to the President, and so on. I hope, however, he will indulge me if I do include in my reading references to our own Government and to our own Prime Minister, however critical they may be. This is what is said:

Suppose that Britain, in the 1930s, had responded to Hitler's savagery by the early threat or use of military force Instead of appearsement....

So one must think after the American statement over the week-end blaming India for the hostilities with Pakistan. Few things said in the name of the United States lately have been quite so indecent. The anonymous State Department official who made the comment matched Uriah Heep (I do not know this gentleman) in sheer oleaginous cynicism about the facts of the situation and about our own moral position.

Consider first the immediate origins of this dispute. They are exceptionally clear as international relations go."

May I make a diversion. For nine months now the international community has received a large number of reports written by most distinguished civil servants both of this Organization and of its specialized agencies. If the Council is not even pre-Pared to listen to the Bangla Desh representative because of procedural and other political reasons, which I have not understood and against which I have protested, surely these reports could have been made available. But no, that will do harm to whatever interests are being served by this debate. Now I continue the quotation:

"The military junta that rules Pakistan under President Yahya Khan held an election. The largest number of seats was won, democratically, by a Bengali Party that favoured effective self-government for East Pakistan. Yahya thereupon decided to wipe out the result of the election by force."

Now I should like to call the attention of those gentlemen who still preach democracy to bear this point in mind. I continue reading from The New York Times:

"Last March West Pakistan troops flew into the East in large numbers and began a policy of slaughter. They murdered selected politicians, intellectuals and professionals, then indiscriminate masses. They burned villages. They held public castrations.

"To compare Yahya Khan with Hitler is of course inexact. Yahya is not a man with a racist mission but a spokesman for xenophobic forces in West Pakistan. But in terms of results - in terms of human beings killed, brutalized or made refugees - Yahya's record compares quite favourably with Hitler's early years.

"The West Pakistanis have killed several hundred thousand civilians in the East, and an estimated ten million have fled to India. The oppression has been specifically on lines of race or religion, The victims are Bengalis or Hindus, not Czechs or Poles or Jews, and perhaps therefore less meaningful to us in the West. But to the victims the crime is the same.

"This record has been no secret to the world."

That is why I refer to the reports which are already available in the United Nations but which, for some reason, have not seen the light of day.

I continue to read:

".....The refugees were there in India to be photographed in all their pitiful misery."

I then leave out a sentence, and go on:

"....not a word about the most appalling refugee situation of. modem times. Private diplomacy was doubtless going on, but there was no visible sign of American pressure on Yahya Khan for the only step that could conceivably bring the refugees back - a political accommodation with the Bengalis.

"Pakistan's argument was that it was all an internal affair. Yes, like the

368

Nazi's treatment of German Jews. But even if one accepts as one must that Pakistan was bound to defend its territorial integrity, this issue had spilled beyond its borders. The refugee impact on India very soon made it clear that the peace of the whole sub-continent was threatened.

"It was as if the entire population of New York City had suddenly been dumped on New Jersey to feed and clothe - only infinitely worse in terms of resources available. Yet when Indira Gandhi went to the capitals of the West for help in arranging a political solution in East Pakistan, she got nothing.

"The Indians can be sanctimonious" -

I do not mind quoting against my country, my Government or my Prime Minister from a newspaper of repute.

--"Mrs. Gandhi acts for Political reasons, not out of purity of heart. India has helped the Bangla Desh guerillas and, in recent weeks, Put Provocative pressure on East Pakistan. AU true. But given the extent of her interest and the intolerable pressure upon her, India has shown great restraint.

"After all, India has not intervened in a civil conflict thousands of miles from her own border:'

I shall skip the rest of that paragraph.

"American policy towards the Indian sub-continent is as much of a disaster by standards of hard-nosed common sense as of compassion. India may be annoying and difficult, but she does happen to be the largest nation in the world following our notions of political freedom. In position and population she is by far the most important country of Asia apart from China. To alienate India - worse yet, to act so as to undermine her political stability - is a policy that defies rational explanation."

It is not my habit to give quotations either from newspapers or anything else, but since we are coming to the conclusion of the debate I thought I should depend on some other and wiser people and not only on my own statements and conclusions.

Here is Senator Church, who has just come back from India. I shall not read the whole of his statement - which he made only this morning - because it-would take rather too much time, but I shall read the two brief concluding paragraphs:

"I find it odd to understand why there is such a pro-Pakistani bias in American policies. India's position in the war which has now broken out is not only consistent with her professed ideals but is also the position which is most likely to prevail. By showing such favouritism towards West Pakistan we side with the probable loser and we forfeit the goodwill of the freedom fighters in East Pakistan, as well as the people of India.

"Unless one believes that West Pakistan represents the wave of the future on the sub-continent it is impossible to reconcile this Government's bias towards Yahya Khan's Government with the role in regard to the interests of the United States."

Of course, we are not interested in, or even concerned with, the interests of the united States. The United States is quite capable of looking after its own interests in a variety of ways. One of the ways has been to cut off economic aid to India recently - yesterday, I think - but we can live with that. We. are not frightened by any threats or cuts. But we have to consider what we should do.

Before the Council proceeds to the vote - and I hope I may have another opportunity to explain a few more details on the various resolutions and put our point of view once again before the Council - at this stage I shall make a few other comments on our attitude to the resolutions.

Firstly, after all we have said, not only now but over the last few months. We cannot expect that any man of reason should equate India with Pakistan in any resolution or decision. We do not expect that, and we certainly do not accept It. We do not expect any reasonable man to do it, and if he does

369

we cannot accept it. We are not in the same category as Pakistan. If, Mr. President, you wish me to elaborate, I can do so; but I think the point is already well known.

Secondly, we think it is wrong, illogical, undesirable - disastrous, even - to have to come to a decision without taking into account the point of view of the Bangla Desh representatives, the representatives of the main party involved in these tragic circumstances. However, it is not the first time that the Security Council or the United Nations has taken an unrealistic decision simply to show that it is up and alive and can act. We are not letting the Council down. Fair enough. We are all faithful Members of the United Nations and we should uphold the dignity and prestige of all its organs. But let us not say that by passing a purely unrealistic resolution we have done anything except console ourselves. That by itself would not be so bad, but if in the process we give a false hope to the world at large that, I think, will be a disaster.

Thirdly, we shall not, we cannot and we must not accept any resolution or decision which does not go to the root cause of the matter. It is no good saying we think we should cut off a limb here or a limb there to save the life. The fact of the matter is that this body has been rotting for nine months and no one has taken any notice. Now, after all these months, when we come to this extraordinary session of the Council, not to go to the root cause is another shibboleth on which no solid foundation can be built. We are meeting here in an extraordinary session - and how extraordinary it is. Pakistan is shrieking and shouting about aggression and so on, and yet it did not ask for a Council meeting. Has any gentleman at this table stopped to think why it has not? Probably they do not have to think. Probably they know. Over the last nine months, how many attempts have been

made to bring the question to the Council or any other United Nations body? All attempts have been frustrated.

My friend and colleague the representative of Italy was President of the Security Council in the month of August, I think. On 20 July the Secretary-General sent his Memorandum. Why was that Memorandum not acted upon? We all know why. In the month of July the representative of Pakistan was flying from Geneva to New York to stop any discussions here, to stop any discussions there; and those attempts went on for months. Reports were suppressed; discussions were inhibited; a complete veil of silence and secrecy was thrown over this. Then suddenly we come up and say, "The world is in flames. We must do something. But we must not consider any of the vital problems." That is an approach which we totally deplore and certainly denounce.

Mr. President, we are coming to the end of the debate, and I am grateful to you and to the Council for this opportunity to make a few comments.

This debate has shown that selectivity is the order of the day. Now, several principles have been quoted by various delegations: sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-interference in other peoples' affairs; and so on. But I wonder why we should be shy about speaking of human rights. What happened to the Convention on genocide? What happened to the principle of self-determination? What happened to all the other social rights and conventions which you have so solemnly accepted? Are we, therefore, to be selective in serving what is known as the motto of our era - peace. progress and justice? What happened to the justice part?

We cannot proceed on this important and very serious matter in that selective way. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has been quoted. What happened to article 22 of that Declaration? What happened to the other articles? According to your views, you can select as you like but when I select a parti-

cular article, then that is being selective.

I should have thought that the normal, civilized course of debate would be for each speaker to support his agreement with the best evidence available; and if that is a crime then I have to be taught all the lessons of democracy all over again.

I was also glad to hear that the people of the United States support their Government. I should have thought that in an elected government - one elected for at least four years - that is a self-evident truth. But I was glad to have that confirmation

370

Then I was told that we are here not to apportion blame but to do something to calm down the fire which is raging. I can recall areas not far from India where warfare had been going on for years. I shall leave history to judge how and at what speed human lives are saved and the flames of conflict put out. Did we not then consider justice and the question of blame? I shall leave it at that.

Now, when we started this debate I asked myself and some of my friends what exactly the Council would wish to achieve When I came here to participate in this important debate, in spite of many reservations mainly for reasons I will explain briefly in a minute - I had hoped that the Council would proceed on the basis of that threefold motto of peace, progress and justice.

Let me not be solf-mouthed about it: those who cry for peace, progress and justice must realize that these principles apply to all areas - not merely to India and Pakistan, not merely to this area or that area, but to all areas. We are all committed to them, and we cannot separate these concepts merely because someone feels something ought to be done quickly after having slept on it for nine months.

The second question I asked myself was: can we achieve it? I think we can achieve it The Security Council has enough power to achieve it, but I rather doubt it will exercise that power. That power could have been exercised a long, long time ago. We are bogged down on the matter of internal jurisdiction, and so on and so forth, and there has been no attempt yet today to have us look at the problem in its entirety and take suitable decisions. No, we are very anxious to get rid of a resolution somehow or other.

Then I asked myself: how should we achieve it? Now, here is where my hesitation, reservations and protests come in. I should have thought, I repeat, that any consideration of the question of cease-fire should require the parties who are fighting. I suppose it is not the intention of the Council that fighting between Pakistani soldiers and the people of East Pakistan should not be halted, and that violent massacres should go on all over the place, and that those who resist those massacres should be blamed for resisting them. I should have thought that the intention of all men of goodwill would be to put an end to all hostilities. And we have just heard that it is a secessionist movement - I have again and again explained that aspect of the problem, and we do not have to dwell on it - that the Pakistani army can take whatever action it likes against helpless women, children and men, but they must not resist because that is immoral.

That is why I wanted Bangla Desh people to come and give us their view. But that has not happened. In this system of unrealism can the Council really expect to come to any sensible decision?

Now, let me explain very briefly what some of these realities are. Refugees are a reality. It is not a question of economic strain alone. I have explained that again and again, so I shall not go into that. But anyway, refugees are a reality. Genocide and oppression are realities. The intense desire of people to live their own lives, in their own way is an overwhelming reality. There is no hope of Pakistan ever controlling these lives. Total collapse of all the administration of Government is a reality. The extinction of all civil rights is a reality. Armed conflicts of various kinds are realities. Provocation and aggression of various

kinds by Pakistan from 25 March onwards is a reality. As a result, retaliation has followed in exercise of the right of self-defence, and we have warned that we shall exercise this right without hesitation. Recognition by India of Bangla Desh is a reality. Bangla Desh itself is a reality. If those who do not accept these realities or the facts on which these realities are based, they are entitled to do so. We are not here to convince those who do not wish to be convinced. Those who do not wish to see facts, nobody can make them see facts. As the saying goes, no one is so blind as the man who refuses to see.

If we go against these realities it is not India which will suffer but, I fear, the entire concept of the United Nations. We thank the Soviet Union, not because of the India-Soviet Treaty, but because it is one of the countries which has accepted these realities as they are. The realities have also been dawning on various quarters, but much too slowly. After nine months we are Still not anywhere near reality.

371

Now, much has been said about the India-Soviet peace treaty, that it is a bond of slavery. Now, those who believe that a country like India today can be controlled and ruled by some other power, however powerful it is, are not lacking in erudition. They do not need erudition, but they need attention in some other field. Pakistan continues to represent that the elections and subsequent wiping out of their verdict by force was inevitable because of the secessionist elements. Again, I shall leave it at that because we know the facts much too well. I simply wish to make our position quite clear at this stage. We have made it clear before but again, I should read out formally a brief paragraph about our position:

"We have made our position perfectly clear and we shall adhere firmly to it, for what is at stake - perhaps it is difficult for others to understand it - is our national security, our entire social and economic fabric, and the complex of life of our 500 million people of India, and many others besides. We have faced aggression from a neighbour four times and we are threatened again. The sizes of different countries have little relevance, for small powers can have powerful allies, expensive and efficient military machines, and strange ambitions. Added to this, we face the mortal danger through the annihilation of 75 million people at our doostep. This cannot but fail to overwhelm us and we shall not tolerate it."

INDIA USA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC CHINA ITALY SWITZERLAND

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Sen's Speech it U.N. General Assembly on Bangla Desh

Following is the text of speech by India's Permanent Delegate Shri S. Sen at the emergency meeting of U.N. General Assembly on December 7, 1971:

The gravity and importance of the situation which the General Assembly is discussing today is manifest from the manner of our discussion. It is not often that the procedures under which we meet today are employed. In keeping with the importance of the subject and its implications, our discussion should be full and comprehensive and take everything into account before the Assembly takes a decision.

I emphasize the vital need to take all factors into account It is precisely because this was not done that the General Assembly

is faced with this situation which has been developing for many months. The world was aware of it but, except for India, which received the refugees fleeing from terror and oppression, no decisive action was visible. As it developed, some of its aspects grew to such dimensions that they could no longer be ignored. But the belated recognition by the world community did not and will not solve the problem unless and until all the aspects are considered simultaneously and comprehensively.

Over the last nine months India has made repeated attempts to inform international opinion. We did this through extensive bilateral contacts at the highest possible level, and in such international forums as were available within and outside the United Nations. International opinion was also informed by the press, by diplomatic channels and by reports of many international organizations, but most of those reports were not made public.

As is now well known, the present situation began in what was then Fast Pakistan on the night of 25 March 1971. As early as 30 March I gave a note to the Secretary-General and requested him to circulate it to all the Members of the United Nations. I should like to remind Members of that note and, with permission, I shall read parts of it.

"Since November 1969, when the President of Pakistan announced that the elections would take place in Pakistan in the latter part of 1970 through which transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people of Pakistan would be effected, the Government and the people of India, who have always entertained the friendliest feelings for the people of Pakistan, had hoped that a democratic evolution in that country would follow its natural course. Consequently, India hoped that after the announcement of the results of the

372

elections in December 1970, the elected representatives of Pakistan would have evolved a constitution reflecting the urges of the vast majority of the people in that country. In the words of the Prime Minister of India, we had welcomed this, not because we wanted interference in another country's affairs but because they are values for which we have always spoken."

Many representatives here will remember that India has perhaps been one of the most active countries to take part in a large number of civilized documents and instruments that we have adopted. We are proud of our participation, but we do think that all these instruments, all these principles, all these codes of morality, must be taken together and not to be torn piecemeal to serve the temporary purpose of this country or that. I continue with my quotation:

"The Government and the people had entertained the belief that a democratic and stable Pakistan would cooperate with her neighbours, and particularly India, in a new attempt to bring about peace and stability in South Asia. Events since 25-26 March, however, have taken a different and tragic turn. Instead of the peaceful evolution that India and the world were anticipating, there is now a bloody conflict.

"The political talks between the concerned parties in Pakistan failed. The elected National Assembly did not meet. Meanwhile, the regular. units of the Pakistan army were ordered to take massive action against East Pakistanis in order to crush their movement. New Martial orders were issued. Total censorship and curfew were imposed.

"The magnitude of the loss of life and property in such armed action is self-evident. We are concerned that in these circumstances the international community can and should take suitable action. The scale of human sufferings is such that it ceases to be a matter of domestic concern of Pakistan alone." I should like to read that sentence again:

"The scale of human sufferings is

such that it ceases to be a matter of domestic concern of Pakistan alone. No country in the world can remain unconcerned in a fast moving situation where thousands of lives are lost"

When I wrote that letter it was "thousands of lives"; since then it has been hundreds of thousands; the general estimate in the press is one to two million.

"Inaction and silence in the fact of this human tragedy could be interpreted by all those who suffer as helplessness, if not indifference, of the outside world. While the Government of India have acted with great restraint and scrupulously avoided any interference in this tragic affair of Pakistan, the reaction of the people of India to the massive killing of unarmed people by military force has been both intense and sustained. The Government of India cannot but take notice of this reaction, particularly as reports of increasing repression by the Pakistani armed forces continue to pour in. There is intense shock and sorrow and horror at the reign of terror that has been let loose. The common bonds of race, religion, culture, history and geography of the people of East Pakistan with the neighbouring State of West Bengal contribute powerfully to the feelings of the Indian people.

"In these circumstances, the Government of India believe that unless maximum restraint is exercised by the armed forces of Pakistan and international opinion gives sympathy and succour toward the people of Pakistan, tension in the subcontinent is bound to increase."

On 23 April I informed the Secretary-General of the massive influx of refugees who had started coming into India as a result of these tragic developments-

In May, India raised this question in the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council. In June we brought this to the Economic and Social Council itself. In subsequent months we tried to discuss it

whenever we could in the General Assembly. Meanwhile we raised it in many international forums outside the United Nations, such as the International Parliamentary Union. The reaction even of humanitarian concern was. halting. When it was expressed it confined itself to sympathy for the suffer-

373

ing of the refugees, but there was reluctance to look at the events which had caused the suffering and to seek any solution for its consequences beyond the provision of refugee relief.

The Secretary-General issued an appeal for the refugees on 19 May 1971. Other implications and consequences of the problem were also recognized by the Secretary-General in his memorandum of 20 July 1971 to the President of the Security Council, But even then, Member Governments were reluctant to analyse and accept the root cause - which had, however, been widely recognized unofficially in various ways.

Before I come to the basic cause, I should like to provide a little background. The geographical, cultural and ethnic peculiarities of Fast Pakistan are well known. East Pakistan comprises not only the major part of the population of the whole of Pakistan, but it produces the bulk of Pakistan's foreign exchange and export earnings. Those who compare the East Pakistan problem with that of Biafra should remember this particular difference, that not only is there a distance of 1,000 miles between East and West Pakistan, but the majority of the people of Pakistan live in East Pakistan; and, therefore, there is no question of secession of the majority from the minority. Nor was it originally a secessionist movement; it was a movement for autonomy, it was turned into a movement for independence and secession by the military crackdown of the night of 25 March.

For 23 years there had existed and developed in what was then East Pakistan and is now Bangla Desh a demand for autonomy, inspired by continued economic exploitation and political domination and discrimination

by West Pakistan. Some delegations dismiss these things as: "Some mistakes are made in all countries", and so on. These are not mistakes made here and there. They are mistakes sustained, continued, and which lead to tragic consequences. This demand for equality was always rejected, and when it was finally expressed in an overwhelming manner through the elections of December 1970, an attempt was made to suppress it with the utmost brutality amounting to genocide. This is a central fact which is still ignored by many Governments. Apart from the humanitarian concern for the plight of the refugees and the belated recognition of the tensions which have been growing as a result of the influx. It has, of course, been recognized by international public opinion and press. It was expressed succinctly by the resolution adopted by the Latin American Parliament in Caracas on 27 August 1971. I shall not read the entire text of that resolution, but it is a very moving one. The reason why I shall not read it is that it would take a little time and I should again be accused of filibustering, which is a peculiarly American political tactic; we are not familiar with it in India.

Had the United Nations recognized these facts earlier it would have been able to influence the developments of the present crisis, but the concept of domestic jurisdiction, non-interference in internal matters, and territorial integrity, was successfully advanced to inhibit this. These concepts are indeed of fundamental importance, but it is not sufficiently realized that the savage repression applied by the Pakistan Army against the people of Bangla Desh was of such magnitude, so genocidal, and so designed as to annihilate a people that it was beyond the scope of normal standards of reasoning and judgement.

The movement for autonomy was transformed overnight into a movement for national liberation. Fifty thousand regular soldiers and policemen defected. They were joined by another 150,000 people who had obtained anus in Pakistan at the time of the military crackdown. So there was already a corps of 150,000 armed men when the

military crackdown took place. This is not my statement; it is a statement. made by the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington. This is the corps which was the basis of all Mukti Bahini activities. They were Joined by massive defection of diplomats, ministers, civil servants, bank clerks, persons from every walk of life you can think of. So those who talk about interference in Pakistan's affairs engineered and prompted by India right from the beginning might do well to consider these facts also.

In turn that brutality fired and stimulated increasingly large popular resistance. Each and every army action of reprisal against the civilian population produced new

374

fighters for the freedom of Bangla Desh. The truth of the matter is that where there is oppression there is bound to be resistance; when oppression is total, resistance is also total. Thus the theory that India worked for the dismemberment of Pakistan is both false and misleading. Pakistan broke itself up on the night of 25 March this year. We realized that fact and had to adjust ourselves to the new reality. We hoped that Pakistan would also adjust itself by peaceful means, but it paid no heed to these means and continued its military suppression.

Not only did 10 million refugees come to us as a result - and they still continue to come - but our security was also threatened, our social and economic fabric endangered and international tension increased. There was hardly any response from the international community, which seemed paralysed and did not take any action to prevent the massive extinction of human rights and genocide.

But we could not ignore what was happening next door to us and its effect on our national integrity. Thus, what had started as an internal matter of Pakistan became an internal matter of India, although the events in East Pakistan should have been the concern of the international community. A grave civil aggression took place against India. None the less, in spite of these diffi-

culties, in spite of our slow and gradual realization of the indifference of the outside world and the determination of the Pakistani army to continue to hold 75 million persons by force of arms - in spite of all those things, we still hoped that a peaceful solution would be found which would meet the wishes of Bangla, Desh.

However, It had also become Increasingly clear for many months that the military Government of Pakistan had also come to realize that it could not hold 75 million persons by force and that, therefore, the only possibility open to them was to involve India in a military conflict so that the worlds attention would be diverted from what was happening in East Pakistan and so that a face-saving escape might be provided.

After they had come to that conclusion - which, I repeat, was that they could not hold 75 million persons by force of arms - the only question was how the military action against India was to be brought about and when. Preparations were made, threats were issued and a crush-India campaign was launched

We reacted and warned of the consequences. But Pakistan paid no heed. Pakistan then started shelling our villages, and we retaliated. Then the Pakistan air force attacked our cities and military airfields in an Israeli-type attack by air. By sheer luck we had been forwarned about that attack and were able to disperse our aircraft.

And once again when the realization came that even armed aggression against India would not succeed, United Nations help was invoked. But, of course, that is a realization one does not like to declare publicly, and it is therefore no wonder that Pakistan did not call for a Security Council emergency meeting.

Pakistan has consistently accused India of interference and involvement in the situation which had led to the establishment of Bangla Desh. I must clearly point out the stage at which we became affected and involved. The demands for autonomy re-

peatedly expressed, the demands for the granting of official status to the Bengali language, the demands to end economic exploitation and political discrimination were not of India's making, The elections of December 1970 and their overwhelming results were not of India's making. The armed resistance of the people of Bangla Desh to the brutal military action of the Pakistan Government was not of India's making. The flight of 10 million refugees was not of India's making.

We were deeply concerned by what had been happening on our doorstep since 25 March. It was a movement for national liberation which was rapidly intensifying, with continued military suppression and without any attempt at a political solution. Moreover, it had caused the civilian invasion of refugees into India. On 24 May 1971 Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi said in Parliament:

"These 23 years and more we have never tried to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan, even though they have not

375

exercised similar restraint And even now we do not seek to interfere in any way. But what has actually happened? What was claimed to be an internal problem of Pakistan has also become an internal problem of, India. We are therefore entitled to ask Pakistan to desist immediately from all actions which it is taking in the name of domestic jurisdiction and which vitally affect the peace and well-being of millions of its own citizens. Pakistan cannot be allowed to seek a solution of its political or other problems at the expense of India and on Indian soil. Has Pakistan the right to compel at bayonet point not hundreds, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of its citizens to flee from their homes? For us it is an intolerable situation. Not only India but every country has to consider its interests. I think I am expressing the sentiments of this august House and of her people when I raise my voice against

the wanton destruction of peace, goodneighbourliness and the elementary principles of humanity by the insenate action of the military rulers of Pakistan. They am threatening the peace and stability of the vast segment of humanity represented by India."

The intolerable situation to which our Prime Minister referred has continued and the threat to our stability and security has continued and increased. On every occasion when we have brought it to the notice of the world, Pakistan has replied to us by accusing us of dismembering it. But it was in fact Pakistan which was dismembering itself all these months. When the People's Republic of Bangla Desh was proclaimed on 17 April, its Prime Minister said that Pakistan was dead and buried under a mountain of corpses, the persons murdered by the Pakistan army.

Late last week Mr. Bhutto, the West Pakistan leader, himself confessed that old Pakistan is dead. The Secretary-General referred in a memorandum to the conflict between the principles of territorial integrity of States and of self-determination. It was Pakistan which engineered this terrible conflict by its own actions in what was once its own territory. As a result a new nation has been born in our subcontinent.

We now come to more recent developments, When Pakistan found it could not Impose its military solution in Bangla. Desh, it sought to create a confrontation with India in the desperate hope that a campaign against India would somehow restore its defunct status. The military suppression in Bangla Desh was deliberately spilled over across Indian borders, and when India reacted quite sharply Pakistan launched an all-out attack against India's western borders a thousand miles away from Bangla Desh.

That attack, which is now partly documented by the reports of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) circulated by the Secretary-General, took place on 3 December. India, which had been suffering under an intolerable strain aggravated further by

military provocations for the last nine months, had once again to react. This time we were determined that these intolerable burdens should be decisively removed.

It is not only a question of removing these burdens; it is also necessary for us to take into account the present and future realities. The genocide being committed in Bangla Desh is a reality. The struggle of Bangla Desh against this genocide is a reality. The existence of Bangla Desh is a reality. No recommendations for solving the present crisis can be effective if they ignore or side-step or postpone these realities, and the Governments which do so not only do not contribute to a solution but also go against the forces of history. Bangla Desh is there. It is the eighth most. populous country in the world. Its only goal, as its Prime Minister has said, is to rebuild a new nation from the ashes and carnage left behind by the occupation army of Pakistan.

I quote the Prime Minister of Bangla Desh from his statement made on 17 April:

"We now appeal to the nations of the world for recognition and assistance - both material and moral - in our struggle. Every day it is delayed a thousand lives are lost and more of Bangla Desh's vital assets are destroyed. In the name of humanity act now and earn our undying friendship."

The Security Council in its meetings over the last three days wished to work towards a cease-fire and the cessation of hos-

376

tilities and withdrawal. These are all urgent objectives, but they must be complete and not one sided. The hostilities are taking place not only between the armies of India and Pakistan but also between the Pakistan army and the Mukti Bahini of Bangla Desh. No cease-fire could be realistic or effective if it did not take into account the Mukti Bahini. No withdrawal of forces could be effective or realistic if it did not cover the occupation forces of Pakistan in Bangla

Desh. It is impossible to hide from these facts behind concepts which no longer apply to the situation. In our view, the only practical solution for putting out all hostilities is for the Pakistan troops to withdraw from Bangla Desh and to work for the ceasefire and withdrawal in the west. The situation would have been quite different if West Pakistan had any hope of holding onto Bangla Desh against the wishes of 75 million people. What has been taking place in Fast Pakistan during the past 25 years amounts to nothing but internal colonialism. Like the people of the United States of America nearly two centuries ago, the People of Bangla Desh pronounced and asserted the right to a separate existence as a separate nation. Nor will they forget what the policy, over the years, of arming, funding and defending the military dictatorship of West Pakistan has meant to them in terms of blood and tears, in terms of death and devastation

The Security Council addressed itself to these matters, but it could not bring itself to see them fully. It could not make up its mind to hear the representative of Bangla Desh. Without hearing him and so taking into account the wishes of 75 million people, how could it be possible to come to an effective decision? This was one of the reasons for the inaction of the Security Council so far. The General Assembly has no veto, but that-does not absolve it from being realistic or considering this grave and grievous problem in all Its aspects. Hasty action and nervous measures, however well intentioned, will further complicate an already complex problem.

It is very difficult fork the people of Bangla Desh to understand the international concern when they are finally about to throw up the foreign yoke, when not a leaf moved when they were being butchered and killed and raped and burned. What a travesty of truth It is to suggest that the refugees who are running away from these systematic and calculated horrors were being used by us for political purposes. What are these purposes? And how do the refugees help in serving these purposes? I do not wish to repeat all

the other points which were discussed in the Security Council and some of which were again referred to by some of the delegations in our discussions today in the Assembly. I cannot help feeling that some of the chagrin against India is perhaps due to the fact that all that we have been saying would come to pass has indeed happened. But this is no credit to India. We live in the area and should know what goes on there.

The question is what should be done now. Simultaneously, together with the cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the Pakistani occupation army from Bangla Desh, the leader of Bangla Desh, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, must be released from the Pakistani prison where he has been languish-Ing since 25 March; and the leaders of Pakistan must initiate with him a peaceful recognition of Bangla Desh. These peaceful means are still possible. And yet it is not too late, perhaps, even for this Assembly, to recommend these steps to the Government of Pakistan.

As everyone knows, India recognized the People's Republic of Bangla Desh two days ago. If reports are to be believed, yet another State has recognized it, and I am sure more will follow. But irrespective of the speed and rate of such recognition, the fact remains that in so far as the Implementation of any resolution of the Assembly is concerned, nothing can be done unless it is acceptable to the Government of Bangla Desh. I would request the Assembly not to overlook this central fact.

Much has been said about India's attitude to various proposals mid offers made in the past. I shall not go into, that part of the history. Those who care to find out what the truth is will have no difficulty. I would, however, like to thank all those voluntary organizations and private individuals who have shown such a remarkable selflessness and sensitivity in helping us to look after the refugees. They do not necessarily come from any rich country; they do not necessarily come from any poor country;

they come from all over the world, from any longitude and any latitude, and we are infinitely grateful to all these Individuals and all these organizations, as Indeed we are much grateful to all those Governments who have helped us in looking after the refugees.

In conclusion, I should simply say that the problem the Assembly is facing is one of the adoption of a resolution. What India is facing is the problem of decent Survival and the danger of annihilation of proud and friendly neighbours. We shall face this mortal problem with all that we are worth.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VENEZUELA UNITED KINGDOM ISRAEL

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri Samar Sen's Statement, at Security Council on Problem of Zimbabwe

Following is the text of speech by India's Permanent Representative, Shri Samar Sen at the U.N. Security Council on December 30, 1971, on the problem of Zimbabwe:

I am grateful to you and the Council for allowing me to speak on the important problem of Zimbabwe. India has constantly and consistently taken great interest in the struggle for independence of all colonial territories. Quite naturally, our first concern was with the countries of Asia, where most of the territories are now independent. Unfortunately, in Africa a large number of territories have still to achieve their goal of independence.

On the specific question of Zimbabwe,

we cannot help feeling that the discussion in the Council over so many years has had an air of fiction, and yet of finality.

We cannot ignore the fact that the Council is a political body, and not a forum for deciding legal issues, for which we have a separate, expensive and generally underemployed organ. However, as is inevitable, legal issues are brought up to support different political views.

The first fiction is that the United Kingdom has claimed, and we have accepted that it is responsible for the administration and defence and external relations of Southern Rhodesia. The United Kingdom delegation has admitted more than once that it has neither the administrative machinery nor the Power to enforce any decision on Southern Rhodesia or on its rebel regime. Responsibility without power is the first fictitious responsibility the Council is faced with.

The second fiction is that no British Government can be expected to use force against its kith and kin. We consider, from such knowledge of history as we have, that there is not a single instance where white people have used force against other white people for the simple benefit of the blacks. If this is accepted, the question is not one of using force against kith and kin - the example of Northern Ireland cannot be overlooked - but one of historical conflict of the races. We wish it were not so and, in any event, we have to take note of the British declaration that they cannot and will not use force to solve this problem.

The third element - another fiction - is that sanctions as such could bring down the Ian Smith regime in Southern Rhodesia. I shall not delve here into the details of the evolution of the sanctions in the Council, but it has been well established that the sanctions have not been effective and that they cannot be effective unless they are extended to South Africa, South West Africa, and Me Portuguese colonies in Africa. Such an approach too has been rejected.

Given those important considerations, the question is why are we discussing Rhodesia, and what we hope to achieve through this discussion. It is also pertinent to ask why the United Kingdom Government has brought this question before the Council, not only when the sanctions were to be Imposed, but On many other occasions. A careful study of the documents makes it clear that the United Kingdom's decision to have this subject thoroughly debated in the United Nations is closely connected with the requirements of their domestic politics. At various stages, if the United Nations could or would underwrite the decisions of the British

378

Government of the day, it would, of course, be of great advantage; but so far as the decisions themselves am concerned, It seems to us that they are taken in London without any inhibition about what the Security Council and the United Nations may or may not have recommended or decided.

The finality I have referred to is to be seen in the present proposals for a settlement. It is quite clear to us that, irrespective of what the Council may decide, the British Government has charted a course of action which it is determined to follow. Many other speakers have already referred to the various ways in which the present proposals conflict with the attitude, decisions and recommendations of the United Nations, and it is not necessary for me to elaborate on them.

The representative of the United Kingdom has pointed out that, in the absence of the kind of settlement that has now been worked out, the system of apartheid would have been extended in all its evil aspects to Southern Rhodesia, that Zimbabwe would have formed some kind of hegemony with South Africa and the Portuguese colonies, and thus would have further impaired the welfare, if not the progress, of the black people in Zimbabwe.

On the other hand, it is evident not only that apartheid is rampant in Rhodesia, but that in the present proposal every word breathes the doctrine of racial discrimination. Its basic assumption is that the blacks are backward and irresponsible and have to be ruled by the whites for many, many long years to come.

We do not see any significant difference between the policy of apartheid as practised in South Africa and the system prevailing or proposed in Zimbabwe. Secondly, Southern Rhodesia is already closely allied to South Africa and the Portuguese colonies. We do Pot see that the present proposals would in any way weaken Southern Rhodesia's links with those neighbouring colonial territories or the racist Government of South Africa, which also illegally controls South West Africa - or Namibia. The danger that if some such settlement as has been proposed by the United Kingdom Government were not put into effect South African hegemony would be consolidated In those parts of Africa is therefore not established.

Even on the assumption that such hegemony will take place, what greater harm could come to the black Population than what it is already suffering and is expected to suffer for an indeterminate period of time? We would rather put up with these dangers and difficulties and hope that black nationalism will assert itself, with such help as it can obtain from outside, than give the impression that some visible progress is being made by perpetuating white domination over millions of black Africans.

It is in this context that we find that none of the five principles which British Command Paper 4835 mentions in its opening paragraph has been respected. I shall examine the fifth principle first, as it is of paramount importance, for the other four principles depend on it, what-ever detailed interpretations one may give to them.

The fifth principle states that the British Government would need to be satisfied that any basis proposed for independence was "acceptable to the people of Rhodesia as a whole". A commission, under Lord Pearce - whose ability, integrity and capacity to understand the black people of Southern Rhodesia need not be questioned -

will explain the proposals, which are complicated enough, and obtain African reaction.

We should not at this stage anticipate what the result of this consultation will be, but, clearly, the explanation will be limited to only the present proposals, without any alternative, and there will also be no public criticism or discussions of these proposals by the political parties and leaders, many of whom are in goal and are not likely to be released for this purpose. Certainly, they will not be allowed the normal Political work which a matter of this importance would require.

It is of utmost importance that the people as a whole be informed by supporters and critics of the settlement of its substance and significance. This right has been denied to the people. The Emergency Powers Act and Regulations, the African Affairs (Maintenance) Act, the Unlawful Organisation Act, among many others, will continue to operate. These measures give extraordinary

379

executive and police control over the movement of persons, the holding of public meetings, the publication of newspapers, and all other devices for any democratic discussions. Anyone expressing an opinion or even not expressing any opinion at all - is subject to possible detention at the discretion of the authorities.

The commission under Lord Pearce will, therefore, have an impossible task in ascertaining the genuine wishes of the people of Southern Rhodesia under a state of emergency with the police State intact, recognised political leaders detained, the major political parties banned, and all channels of communication - radio and television included - available only to the parties in Parliament. Some delegations have suggested that the association of the United Nations with the task which Lord Pearce will undertake, as also with various other stages of the settlement, would be an improvement. We do not share that view, for the conditions in Southern Rhodesia are such that nothing which is not to the liking of the white illegal

and racist regime of Ian Smith can be expressed - far less approved. It is for that reason that the representatives of the Zimbabwe people cannot appear before the Council, and the opinions collected by the British Foreign Secretary cannot be made available.

In those circumstances, the association of the United Nations would simply give respectability to the suppression and oppression of the black people in Southern Rhodesia, and we hope that the United Nations will not be an instrument for such a folly.

I shall now turn to the first principle, of "unimpeded, progress of majority rule". Every ingenious method of impeding progress has been employed; the impeding of time, the impeding of immigration, and, finally, the impeding of the commission from looking over the whole question again. The basis of voting is money and education. I wonder how many people, even in the United Kingdom, would be qualified to vote if those criteria were applied. In my own country we have given the voting right to all people, men and women, at the age of 18. We do not regret it - in fact, we are proud of it and our experiment has shown that people do not need money or four years of secondary education to exercise their franchise in a responsible manner. There are many independent African countries where these criteria do not apply, and it cannot. be seriously argued that the blacks in Southern Rhodesia are less responsible than any other group of people anywhere in the world. The whole basis of voting there is built on apartheid and a determined attempt to continue that while rule. Even if everything goes well - which is more than doubtful, as has been explained by various speakers before me the total number of African seats in the House of Assembly will be only ten more than the number of white seats, and this too will be achieved some time in the future - perhaps 50 years hence - and will depend, to a great extent, on the good faith of the white minority. This is indeed very far from the majority rule based on the principle of universal adult franchise.

The second principle speaks of guarantees to the given by a Government which has not shrunk from rebellion and by a Prime Minister who has not hesitated from breaking his oath to his own Sovereign. Is he or his successor likely to be deterred from breaking or circumventing the entrenched guarantees if he finds, them inconvenient at any time?

The third principle about the improvement of the political status of the African population does not even come up to the standards of the 1961 Constitution - and they are deplorable enough.

The fourth principle on progress towards ending racial discrimination is to be applied in such a manner as to bring about some slight improvement in some distant future. The progress foreseen is so marginal that it hardly merits any real recognition.

I could take up any and every detail of the complicated proposals and demonstrate, as indeed has been done by many others, that in its entirety it simply means the maintenance of the status quo with some promises and faint hopes, here and there, and leaving the entire future of this country to the white racist minority regime. It has further been proposed that once these proposals have been given effect to the sanctions should be withdrawn, and the independence of Southern Rhodesia recognised. In due course, I suppose, we shall be witnessing diplomatic relations with that country, and perhaps even face an application for its membership

380

of the United Nations. We have indeed moved a long way from the days when the British Government declared that it would use every practicable means available to it to bring down the regime of Ian Smith.

In these circumstances, the United Nations can certainly adopt resolutions rejecting the British proposals, but in our view since the decision of the British Government has been approved by the British Parliament, that Government is not likely to be deflected by whatever resolution the Council may adopt. On the other hand, the British

Government has indicated that it is prepared to maintain sanctions until the present proposals have been worked out. We think that these sanctions should be strengthened, universally and compulsorily applied and that all escapes prevented to the best of the United Nations and the other Governments ability. This will neither bring down the regime of Ian Smith nor introduce majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. It will, however, prove that international opinion is anxious to put as many obstacles as possible for Mr. Ian Smith, and will in no way be a party to give respectability or recognition to his regime. Meanwhile, one would hope that nationalism of the Africans, particularly of the black people of Zimbabwe, would be strengthened to a point when the white racists of that area, as also of South Africa and the Portuguese colonies in Africa, will have no alternative but to deal with the blacks as men and women of equal worth, and of equal merit and of equal dignity. We would rather wait than compromise with human lives and human values. No self-respecting Asian or African can take any other view.

INDIA ZIMBABWE USA IRELAND SOUTH AFRICA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC UNITED KINGDOM NAMIBIA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

INDIA AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Shri I. J. Bahadur Singh's Speech at U.N. General Assembly on Situation in West Asia

Following is the text of the speech by the Indian Delegate, Shri I. J. Bahadur Singh, at the U.N. General Assembly on the situation in West Asia on December 11, 1971:

The lands where West Asia and North

Africa approach each other are among The most important areas of our world. They are among the cradles of our civilization. From ancient times they have been the crossroads of three continents. In modem times their importance is even more enhanced. It is a matter of deep concern that this important area is also the scene of continuing tensions and conflicts which threaten international peace and security. This concern and anxiety is redoubled when we look at the root causes of these tensions and note that such attempts as are made to solve them are time and again frustrated.

The root causes of the tension in the area of the Middle East are well known and have been well known for many years. Vast territories in the Middle East remain under foreign military occupation. Hundreds of thousands of persons have been displaced from their homes, many of them for the second and third times of their lives. It is the continuation of these factors which has created permanent tension in the area and given rise to conflict. But these causes are of even more abiding significance. Wherever in the world they exist, they create tension and jeopardise peace. Whenever territories come under forcible foreign military occupation, whenever people are deprived of their inalienable rights and driven out of their homelands, whenever human rights and dignity are violated, there is always tension, conflict and a threat to international Peace. Speaking about this question in the general debate in September, our Foreign Minister said the following:

"In the Middle East, the lack of progress in the implementation of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) is creating new tensions. The cease-fire, accepted as a temporary measure to help the Parties negotiate a settlement through Ambassador Jarring, has unfortunately tended to freeze the situation in favour of the aggressor, despite the willingness shown by the Arab countries to go to the farthest limit in meeting their obligations under the abovementioned resolution. Our own conviction that no country should be

allowed to retain foreign territories taken by force of arms remains unshaken, and we would reiterate that this problem will not be solved unless Israel withdraws from the Arab territories which it has occupied since 5 June 1967 and restores the legitimate rights of the Palestinian refugees." (1940th meeting p. 47).

That was the statement made in the general debate by Sardar Swaran Singh, our Foreign Minister.

As I was saying, wherever situations exist which are likely to lead not only to tensions but to conflict, it is very necessary for us to address our minds to the situation. Not only in the Middle East but in other areas of the world also we see today that alien military domination, dispossession of peoples from their homelands and denial of their rights lead to situations of tension and conflict. India has always had a consistent approach to these questions. We are against the acquisition of territories by military conquest and we believe that foreign military annexation should be vacated. We also firmly believe that the inalienable rights of people dispossessed from their homelands or driven out of their homelands should always be respected. Only in this way can peace and harmony prevail.

These views are based on principle and not on bilateral considerations. Thus in the Middle East question we have always held that a permanent solution ensuring peace and justice can be found only on the basis of the vacation by Israel of the foreign territory it at present occupies and on the basis of respect for the Inalienable rights of the people of Palestine.

These and other elements for a solution of the Middle East question were contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967). I recall that that resolution was unanimously adopted by the Security Council and there is a wide, continuing consensus that it provides a just basis for a settlement of this question. However, three years have passed,

and it still remains to be implemented. In the absence of its implementation, tensions have continued to persist and have on several occasions erupted into hostilities. At present there is a precarious cease-fire and tensions continue to mount. To avoid their eruption once again - and it must be remembered that any resumption of hostilities in that area would be fraught with wide-reaching consequences - it is a matter of the greatest urgency that the process of the implementation of resolution 242 (1967) be set into motion without any further delay.

In his report (A/8541) the Secretary-General has given a concise and comprehensive account of the efforts made by his representatives with a view to giving effect to resolution 242 (1967). It is unmistakably clear from that report why these efforts have failed so far. The Secretary-General has stated:

"After recalling the responses of The United Arab Republic and Israel to Ambassador Jarring's initiative of 8 February, I said that I continued to hope - as I still do - that Israel would find it possible before too long to make a response that would enable the search for a peaceful settlement under Ambassador Jarring's auspices to continue."

It is not necessary for me to dwell on the details of the attempts which have been made by the Secretary-General's representatives over the past few months. These details are too well known and they have been repeated here by a number of speakers who have preceded me. In essence, Israel is not prepared to give a commitment that it will withdraw from Arab territories occupied by it. The representatives of Israel have themselves said so. It is clear for all of us to see that that is the main obstacle today in the search for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

We believe that the object of our present debate should not be confined merely to reactivating the Jarring Mission, but it should in addition make sure that this Mission will succeed. That, of course, depends on Israel for whose favourable response the Secretary-General has appealed. It also depends upon those who support and encourage Israel in the course of action which it has followed so far.

It is well known that the United States is the principal supporter of Israel. The United States is a great Power with global responsibility and influence. It is also a party to resolution 242(1967). It was only the other day, in another context, that we heard the representative of the United States im-

382

pressing upon us the duties of Members of the United Nations to act in accordance with the Charter provisions. But, if I may be allowed to say so, one's practice must be consistent with one's preaching. The practice has shown a greater concern with the letter of the Charter and less with the spirit. We cannot quote the letter of the Charter, and that too selectively, and altogether forget its spirit. We cannot ignore fundamental values and realities in regard to any problem which the United Nations has to consider. Protestations of support for peace should not be accompanied with actual support for those who dominate territories by military force and deprive people of their inalienable rights.

Withdrawal is urged not upon those who occupy foreign territories by force and are out to annex them but upon those who act in self-defence in support of popular aspirations. Ultimately it is the people and their inalienable rights which count, whether this is in the Middle East or in Vietnam or in Bangla Desh.

When the Mission of Ambassador Jarring ran into difficulties for the reasons so clearly given in the Secretary-General's report, the United States took the initiative for seeking an interim solution. When the proposal was made by Secretary of State Rogers in this regard, we were very hopeful that its outcome would resolve some of the difficulties which existed in that area. Unfortunately, in spite of the best efforts and the positive contribution made by the Arab Governments - principally the Arab Repub-

lic of Egypt - the situation did not unfold itself as we thought it would. The results of the work undertaken by Ambassador Jai-ring have to be borne in mind consistently as the principal objective which we should have in mind. We also note with great satisfaction the efforts which have been made by the African Heads of State in their recent tours of the area and in their very careful and deliberate consideration of how they could contribute to peace in this aera. This reflects the deep desire of Africa for peace and justice. The results of the Mission are not fully known to us. We hope that it will succeed in removing the obstacles which are clearly identified in the Secretary-General's report. We look forward to the work of this Assembly in coming to a conclusion which will lessen rather than heighten tension in the area.

INDIA USA ISRAEL CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC VIETNAM EGYPT

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

NORWAY

Agreement for Family Planning Programme

Following Press Note was issued in New Delhi on December 22, 1971 on the signing of an agreement between India and Norway for Family Planning Programme:

An agreement for a grant of Norwegian Kroner 8 million to the Government of India for partial financing of the All India Hospital Post-parturn Programme was signed here today. Shri R. N. Madhok, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Health and Family Planning, signed the agreement on behalf of the Government of India, while His Excellency the Ambassador of Norway did so on

behalf of the Government of Norway.

An amount of Rs. 27.5 million has been provided in the Fourth Five Year Plan for establishing Post-partum centres in 59 hospitals. The present Norwegian grant for the financial year 1971-72, will enable the Department of Family Planning to extend the programme to another 63 hospitals in the country.

Each centre established under the All India Hospital Post-partum, Family Planning Programme will involve a non-recurring expenditure of about Rs. 194,000 and a recurring expenditure of Rs. 67,000.

383

NORWAY INDIA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Broadcast to the Nation on War by Pakistan

Following is the text of the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi's broadcast to the nation on December 4, 1971 on Pakistan's launching of full-scale war against India:

I speak to you at a moment of grave peril to our country and to our people. Some hours ago, soon after 5.30 PM on December 3, Pakistan launched a full-scale war against us. The Pakistani Air Force suddenly struck at our airfields in Amritsar, Pathankot, Srinagar, Avantipur, Uttarlai, Jodhpur, Ambala and Agra. Their ground forces are shelling our defence positions in Sulaimanki, Khemkaran, Poonch and other sectors.

Since last March, we have borne the heaviest burden and withstood the greatest pressure, in a tremendous effort to urge the world to help in bringing about a peaceful solution and preventing the annihilation of an entire people, whose only crime was to vote for democracy. But the world ignored the basic causes and concerned itself only with certain repercussions. The situation was bound to deteriorate and the courageous band of freedom fighters have been staking their all in defence of the values, for which we also have struggled, and which are basic to our way of life.

Today the war in Bangla Desh has become a war on India; This has imposed upon me, my Government and the people of India a great responsibility. We have no other option but to put our country on a war footing. Our brave officers and Jawans are at their post mobilised for the defence of the country. An emergency has been declared for the whole of India. Every necessary step is being taken, and we are prepared for all eventualities.

I have no doubt that it is the united will of our people that this wanton and unprovoked aggression should be decisively and finally repelled. In this resolve, the Government is assured of the full and unflinching support of all political parties and every Indian citizen. We must be prepared for a long period of hardship and sacrifice.

We are a peace loving people. But we know that peace cannot last, if we do not guard our democracy and our way of life. So today, we fight not merely for territorial integrity but for the basic ideals, which have given strength to this country, and on which alone we can progress to a better future.

Aggression must be met, and the people of India will meet it with fortitude and determination and with discipline and utmost unity.

Jai Hind.

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Border Situation

Following is the text of the statement made by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, on the border situation in the Lok Sabha on December 4, 1971:

This morning the Government of West Pakistan has declared war upon us. We meet as a fighting Parliament. A war has been forced upon us, a war we did not seek and did our utmost to prevent. The avoidable has happened. West Pakistan has struck with reckless perfidy.

Last evening the West Pakistan Air Force violated our air space wantonly and attacked a large number of our airfields. Simultaneously their ground forces shelled our positions along the Western border. Their propaganda media have made totally baseless allegations that India had launched an assault.

The news reached me, just as I was A leaving Calcutta. Immediately on my return I took counsel with my colleagues and with the leaders of the Opposition parties We were all of one mind - united in our resolve that the nation's freedom should be defended and unanimous that the aggressor should be beaten back. I am sure that the same sense

384

of solidarity will mark our work in the difficult days ahead. A state of Emergency has been proclaimed. We are approaching the House to adopt the Defence of India Bill. Our feeling is one of regret that Pakistan did not desist from the ultimate folly and sorrow that at a time when the greatest need of this sub-continent is development, the people's of India and Pakistan have been pushed into war. We could have lived as good neighbours but the people of West Pakistan have never had a say in their destiny. In this grave hour, our own dominant emotion is one of confidence and faith.

For over nine months, the military regime of West Pakistan has barbariously trampled upon freedom and basic human rights in Bangla Desh. The army of occupation has committed heinous crimes, unmatched for their vindicative ferocity. Many millions have been uprooted; ten millions have been pushed into our country.

We repeatedly drew the attention of the world to this annihilation of a whole people to this menace and to our security. Everywhere the people showed sympathy and understanding for the economic and other burdens and the danger to India. But Governments seemed morally and politically paralysed. Belated efforts to persuade the Islamabad regime to take some step which could lead to a lasting solution fell on deaf ears.

The wrath of the West Pakistan army has been aroused because the people of Bangla Desh have stood and struggled for values which the army is unable to comprehend, and which it has suppressed in every province of Pakistan. As the Mukti bahini's effectiveness increased, the West Pakistan army became more desperate. Our tradition is to stand not with tyrants but with the oppressed. And so the anger has been turned upon us.

West Pakistan has escalated and enlarged the aggression against Bangla Desh into full war against India. War needs as much patience and self-restraint as does peace. The military regime of West Pakistan will go all out to sow suspicion and rumour in the hope of fomenting communal tension and internal trouble. Let us not be

taken in by their designs. We must maintain unity and a sense of high purpose.

We should be prepared for a long struggle. High production, agricultural and industrial, is the foundation upon which defence rests. The courage and fighting capability of the jawans have to be backed by the dedication of the farmer, the worker, the technician and the trader.

The business community has a special responsibility to resist the temptation to hoard or to charge higher profit. Artistes and writers, teachers and students, the nation looks to them to defend our ideals to keep high our morale. To the women of our country, I make special appeal to save every possible grain and rupee, to avoid waste. The sacrifice of each of us will build the nation's strength and enduring power.

We have stood for peace but peace itself has to be defended. Today we are fighting to safeguard our territorial Integrity and national honour. Above all, we are fighting for the ideals we cherish and the cause of freedom.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Surrender of West Pakistan Forces in Bangla Desh

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in Parliament on December 16, 1971 on the surrender of West Pakistani forces in Bangla Desh: I have an announcement to make. The West Pakistan forces have unconditionally surrendered in Bangla Desh. The instrument of surrender was signed in Dacca at 16.31 hours I.S.T. today by Lt. Gen. A.A.K. Niazi on behalf of the Pakistan Eastern Command. Lt. Gen. Jagjit Singh Aurora, GOC-in-C of the Indian and Bangla Desh forces in the Eastern Theatre accepted the surrender. Dacca is now the free capital of a free country.

This House and the entire nation rejoice in this historic event. We hail the people of Bangla Desh in their hour of triumph. We hail the brave young men and boys of the Mukti Bahini for their valour and dedication. We are proud of our own Army, Navy, Air Force and the Border Security Force, who have so magnificently demonstrated their quality and capacity. Their discipline and devotion to duty are

385

well known. India will remember with gratitude the sacrifices of those who have laid down their lives, and our thoughts are with their families

Our Armed Forces are under strict orders to treat Pakistani prisoners of war in accordance with the Geneva Convention and to deal with all sections of the population of Bangla Desh in a humane manner. The Commanders of the Mukti Bahini have issued similar orders to their forces. Although the Government of Bangla Desh have not yet been given an opportunity to sign the Geneva Convention, they also have declared that they will fully abide by it. It will be the responsibility of the Government of Bangla Desh, the Mukti Bahini and the Indian Armed Forces to prevent any reprisals.

Our objectives were limited -- to assist the gallant people of Bangla Desh and their Mukti Bahini to liberate their country from a reign of terror and to resist aggression on our own land. Indian Armed Forces will not remain in Bangla Desh any longer than is necessary. The millions who were driven out of their homes across our borders have already begun trekking back. The rehabilitation of this war-torn land calls for dedicated team work by its Government and people.

We hope and trust that the Father of this new nation, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, will take his rightful place among his own people and lead Bangla Desh to peace, progress and prosperity. The time has come when they can together look forward to a meaningful future in their Shonar Bangla. They have our good wishes.

The triumph is not theirs alone. All nations who value the human spirit, will recognise it as a significant milestone in man's quest for liberty.

PAKISTAN INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM SWITZERLAND

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PAKISTAN

Instrument of Surrender

Following is the text of the instrument of surrender signed in Dacca on December 16, 1971 between the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, of Indian and Bangla Desh forces and the Commander Eastern Command (Pakistan):

The Pakistan Eastern Command agree to surrender all Pakistan Armed Forces in Bangla Desh to Lieutenant General Jagjit Singh Aurora, General Officer Commanding-in-Chief of the Indian and Bangla Desh forces in the eastern theatre. This surrender includes all Pakistan land, air and naval forces as also all paramilitary forces

and civil armed forces. These forces will lay down their arms and surrender at the places where they are currently located to the nearest regular troops under the command of Lieutenant-General Jagjit Singh Aurora.

The Pakistan Eastern Command shall come under the order of Lieutenant-General Jagjit Singh Aurora as soon as this instrument has been signed. Disobedience of orders will be regarded as a breach of the surrender terms and will be dealt with in accordance with the accepted laws and usages of war. The decision of Lieutenant-General Jagjit Singh Aurora will be final, should any doubt arise as to the meaning or interpretation of the surrender terms.

Lieutenant-General Jagjit Singh Aurora gives a solemn assurance that personnel who surrender shall be treated with dignity and respect that soldiers are entitled to in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention and guarantees the safety and well-being of all Pakistan military and paramilitary forces who surrender. Protection will be provided to foreign nationals, ethnic minorities and personnel of West Pakistan origin by the forces under the command of Lieutenant-General Jagjit Singh Aurora.

Sd/- Sd/-

(Jagjit Singh Aurora) (Amir Abdullah Khan Niazi)
Lieutenant-General Lieutenant-General
General officer Com- Martial Law Administrator,
manding-in-Chief Zone B And Commander,
Eastern Command Eastern Command,
(India) (Pakistan)
16 December, 1971 16 December, 1971

386

PAKISTAN INDIA USA SWITZERLAND

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

PAKISTAN

Prime Minister's Statement on Cease-fire on Western Front

Following is the text of the Statement by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in the Parliament on December 17, 1971 on Ceasefire on Western Front:

On March 31, 1971, six days after the great upheaval in Bangla Desh, I had the honour to move a Resolution in this House.

I said then that India's permanent interest in peace and our commitment to uphold and defend human rights demanded the immediate cessation of the use of force and of the massacre of the defenceless people of Bangla Desh. I had called upon all peoples and Governments to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to immediately end the systematic decimation of a people.

I had concluded my statement by expressing the profound conviction of this House that the historic upsurge of the 75 million people of East Bengal would triumph. We also gave an assurance that their struggle and sacrifice would receive the wholehearted sympathy and support of the people of India.

Today the pledge we then made together in this House and in the country stands redeemed.

It is natural that the people of India Should be elated. We can also understand the great rejoicing of the people of Bangla Desh. I share the elation-and the joy. But as the Gita, says, neither joy nor sorrow Should tilt the balance of our equanimity or blur our vision of the future.

All those who have borne arms, all those who have been involved in the planning and direction of the operations, an the people of India who have responded so generously - these are to be thanked and congratulated.

It is a victory but a victory not only of arms but of ideals. The Mukti Bahini could not have fought so daringly but for its Passionate urge for freedom and the establishment of a special identity of Bangla Desh. Our own forces could not have been so fearleas and relentless had they not been convinced of their cause.

India has stood for breadth of vision, tolerance of the points of view of others, of being in the battle, yet above it.

We stand for democracy, for secularism and for socialism. Only this combination opens the way for full freedom, gives protection to the weaker sections and the opportunity for the growth of different personalities. We believe that no nation can be built on concepts which are negative or which do not have meaning for all its people. Unfortunately, Pakistan had based its policies on hatred for and confrontation with India.

While we re-dedicate ourselves to our ideals, I hope the people of Pakistan will seek a path which is more in keeping with their circumstances and needs. These 24 years we have heard many aggressive speeches and much abusive and false propaganda. against us. We cannot believe that this is the true voice of the Pakistani people. They have been kept in darkness by their successive regimes.

We want to assure them that we have no enmity towards them. There are more things in common than those which divide us. We should like to fashion our relations with the people of Pakistan on the basis of friendship and understanding. Let them live as masters in their own house and devote their energies to the removal of Poverty and inequalities In their country.

It is this sincere desire which Prompted us late evening to instruct our Army, Navy and Air Force to cease operations from 2000 hours today on all fronts in the West.

I am grateful for the support which all political parties of the country have given throughout this difficult period and specially to this Initiative on behalf of peace.

This offer was communicated to the world community by our Minister of External Affairs, Sardar Swaran Singh, in New York. We also had it formally conveyed to the Government of Pakistan through the Swiss Embassy. We hope that the People and rulers of Pakistan will appreciate and reciprocate this offer.

387

The consequences which flow from a failure to do so will rest squarely upon the military rulers of Pakistan. However, regardless of what happens on the Western front, let us not be complacent. The coming months specially will bring new and complex problems. We must be ever vigilant to safeguard our integrity and our interests, and above all the fundamental beliefs of our national existence.

PAKISTAN USA INDIA UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLA DESH

Prime Minister's Statement in Parliament on Recognition of Bangla Desh

The Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, made the following statement in Parliament on December 6, 1971 announcing the decision of the Government of India to grant recognition to the Government of Gana Praja Tantri Banglaa Desh:

The valiant struggle of the people of

Bangla Desh in the face of tremendous odds has opened a new chapter of heroism in the history of freedom movements.

Earlier, they had recorded a great democratic victory in their elections and even the President of Pakistan had conceded the right of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to become Prime Minister of Pakistan. We shall never know what intervened to transform this benevolent mood and realistic approach, If it really was that, to deception and the posture of open hatred.

We are told that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his party, the Awami League, had planned a non-violent movement of resistance to the Government of west Pakistan. But they were caught unaware and overtaken by a brutal military assault. They had no alternative but to declare for independence. The East Pakistan Rifles and East Bengal Regiment became the Mukti Fauj and later the Mukti Bahini, which was Joined by thousands of young East Bengalis determined to sacrifice their lives for freedom and the right to fashion their future. The unity, determination and courage with which the entire population of Bangla Desh is fighting have been recorded by the world Press.

These events on our doorstep and the resulting flood of refugees into our territory, could not but have far-reaching repercussions on our country. It was natural that our sympathy should be with the people of Bangla Desh in their just struggle. But we did not act precipitately in the matter of recognition. Our decisions were not guided merely by emotion but by an assessment of prevailing and future realities.

With the unanimous revolt of the entire people of Bangla Desh and the success of their struggle it has become increasingly apparent that the so-called mother State of Pakistan is totally incapable of bringing the people of Bangla Desh back under Its control. As for the legitimacy of the Government of Bangla Desh the whole world is now aware that it reflects the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, which not many Governments can claim to represent. In

Jefferson's famous words to Governor Morris, the Government of Bangla Desh is supported by the "will of the nation, substantially expressed". Applying this criterion, the Military regime in Pakistan, whom some States are so anxious to buttress, is hardly representative of its people even in West Pakistan.

Now that Pakistan is waging war against India, the normal hesitation on our part not to do anything which could come in the way of a peaceful solution, or which might be construed as intervention, has lost significance. The people of Bangla Desh

388

battling for their very existence and the people of India fighting to defeat aggression now find themselves partisans in the same cause.

I am glad to inform the House that in the light of the existing situation and in response to the repeated requests of the Government of Bangla Desh, the Government of India have after the most careful consideration, decided to grant recognition to the GANA PRAJA TANTRI BANGLAA DESH.

It is our hope that with the passage of time more nations will grant recognition and that the GANA PRAJA TANTRI BANGLAA DESH will soon form part of the family of nations.

Our thoughts at this moment are with the father of this new State Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. I am sure that this House would wish me to convey to Their Excellencies the Acting President of Bangla Desh and the Prime Minister and to their colleagues, our greetings and warm felicitations.

I am placing on the Table of the House copies of the communications which we have received from the Government of Bangla Desh. Hon'ble Members will be glad to know that the Government of Bangla Desh have proclaimed their basic principles of State policy to be democracy, socialism, secularism and the establishment of an egalitarian

society in which there would be no discrimination on the basis of race, religion, sex or creed. In regard to foreign relations, the Bangla Desh Government have expressed their determination to follow a policy of nonalignment, peaceful co-existence and opposition to colonialism, racialism and imperialism in all its manifestations. These are the ideals to which India also is dedicated.

The Bangla Desh Government have reiterated their anxiety to organise the expeditious return of their citizens who have found temporary refuge in our country, and to restore their lands and belongings to them. We shall naturally help in every way in these arrangements.

I am confident that in future the Governments and the peoples of India and Bangla Desh, who share common ideals and sacrifices, will forge a relationship based on the principles of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit. Thus working together for freedom—and democracy we shall set an example of good neighbourliness which alone can ensure peace, stability and progress in this region. Our good wishes to Bangla Desh.

INDIA USA PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLA DESH

Shri Swaran Singh Felicitates Foreign Minister of Bangla Desh

Following is the text of the message from Shri Swaran Singh, Foreign Minister of India on December 7, 1971 to Mr. Khan-

dakar Moshtaque Ahmed, Foreign Minister of the Gana Praia Tantri Banglaa Desh offering felicitations on the occasion of full diplomatic recognition by the Government of India to the Gana Praia Tantri Bangla Desh:

Excellency, I am happy to extend to Your Excellency and, through you, to the Government and People of Bangla Desh the felicitations of the Government and people of India and my own on the occasion of full diplomatic recognition by the Government of India to the Gana Praja Tantri Bangla Desh.

Pakistan is waging war not only against Bangla Desh but also against India. The people of India fighting to defeat Pakistani aggression feel proud to be with the people of Bangla Desh and the brave Mukti Bahim who have, through these dark months, opened a new chapter of heroism in the history of freedom movements. The emergence of Bangla Desh into freedom and independence is a vindication of the will of the people. I am confident that the Governments and peoples of India-and Bangla Desh Will together soon eradicate the last vestiges of Pakistani military oppression from your country. Our two peoples, who share com-

389

mon Ideals and sacrifices, will, I am sure, forge a relationship based on the principles of mutual respect for each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in Internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit. May the relationship between our two countries set an example of good neighbour-liness, stability and progress for this region and for the world.

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

INDIA SENEGAL CAPE VERDE PAKISTAN UNITED KINGDOM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

POLAND

Indo-Polish Trade Protocol

Following is the text of the press Note issued in New Delhi on December 16, 1971 on the conclusion of talks between the Indian and Polish Trade Delegations and signing of a Trade Protocol for 1972:

At the conclusion of talks between the Indian and Polish Trade Delegations, a Trade Protocol for 1972 has been signed here today.

The Protocol envisages trade turnover between the two countries to rise to Rs. 92 crores in 1972.

The Principal items of India's exports to Poland will be railway wagons, textile machinery and accessories, hand tools and pneumatic tools, refrigerators and deep freezers, water Coolers and bottle coolers, various other engineering goods such as airconditioning equipment, typewriters, industrial ventilators, etc., sanitary fittings, glazed tiles, various plastic goods, linoleums, various chemicals and pharmaceuticals, drugs and medicines, sports goods, dehydrated vegetables, leather and other types of footwear, finished leather, tanned and semi-tanned hides and skins, jute goods including jute cloth, cotton textiles, cotton Yarn, carpets, readymade garments, animal feed compounds, instant tea, processed mica, iron ore, de-oiled groundnut cakes and other de-oiled cakes, various consumer durables and industrial products.

The principal items of imports from Poland will be urea, sulphur, roiled steel products, zinc, newsprint, ships and ship-equipment, mining machinery, dye-intermediates, intermediates for pharmaceutical industry, various chemicals such as sodium nitrate, sodium nitrite, caprolactum, etc.

Poland has shown interest in new and non-traditional items and the 1972 Trade Protocol accordingly provides for increased scope for exports of non-traditional goods from India to Poland and lesser exports of traditional goods.

Both Governments have noted with satisfaction the steady growth of mutual trade between India and Poland. It has been agreed that in order to bring about further expansion and diversification in the two way trade exchanges, possibilities of commercial, industrial and technical cooperation need to be fully explored by identifying spheres where bilateral collaboration can be usefully undertaken.

The Indian Delegation was led by Shri K. K. Dwivedi of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and the Polish Delegation by Mr. J. Michalski of the Treaty Department, Ministry of Foreign Trade.

390

POLAND INDIA USA CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Protocol on Instrumentation

Following press note was issued in New Delhi on December 9, 1971 on the signing of a protocol between India and the Soviet Union on instrumentation:

A Protocol between India and the Soviet Union was signed in New Delhi today. Prof. Siddheshwar Prasad, Deputy Minister for Industrial Development, signed on behalf of India and His Excellency Mr. Arutunov, Deputy Minister for Automation and Instrumentation, USSR, signed on behalf of the Soviet Union. The Soviet authorities have agreed to assist India in further diversifying the product range of the Instrumentation Limited, Kota to enable the latter to manufacture further sophisticated and modern range of products like Control Valves. These items are at present by and large imported for use in precision measurement and control instrumentation schemes and this diversification will help in greater self-reliance.

The precision Instruments plant at Kota has been established with technical and financial assistance from the USSR. It went Into commercial production in September 1968. The activities of the plant have been extended to cover provision of precision instrumentation scheme. In the very first year of its full production, the plant has been able to break-even and show a net profit of over Rs. 20 lakhs. For the year 1970-71, the net profit is Rs. 155 lakhs and the plant has declared a maiden dividend at 6%. The turn over at this plant during 1970-71 was of the order of Rs. 5.3 crores and the company expects to reach a turn over of nearly Rs. 11 crores in another two to three years time.

The Soviet Delegation commended the progress made by the Instrumentation Limited, Kota in the implementation of the project and also expressed confidence over the technical competence developed by the company in undertaking further diversification schemes to manufacture more sophisticated items of instrumentation and also promised to render all possible assistance to the company to achieve this objective.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Indo-Soviet Trade Protocol

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi On December 24, 1971 on the conclusion of trade talks between a Soviet Trade Delegation and Indian Trade Delegation:

Negotiations on the Trade Protocol for the Year 1972 were held in New Delhi from December 14 to December 24, 1971 between the Soviet Trade Delegation and the Indian Delegation.

Negotiations were conducted in an atmosphere of mutual understanding, cordiality and friendliness. The two sides discussed in detail the fulfilment of the commitments for mutual supply of the goods in 1971. The delegations noted with satisfaction that the commitments of the first year of the Trade Agreement between India and the USSR for 1971-75 are being successfully met as a result of which further growth in trade between India and the Soviet Union In 1971 is taking place. The two sides examined in detail the possibilities of further deepening and strengthening of commercial relations between the two countries in 1972. Measures for facilitating the further development of trade within the frame work of the Five Year Trade Agreement and in the light of the developmental plans of the two countries were also considered.

391

The Soviet Delegation was received by Shri L. N. Mishra, Minister of Foreign Trade, Shri T. Swaminathan, Cabinet Secretary and Shri H. Lal, Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Trade.

From the Indian side the documents relating to the Trade Protocol for 1972 were initialled today by Shri V. S. Misra, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Trade of India and on behalf of the Soviet side by

Mr. N. P. Shiriaev, Chief of the Department of Ministry of Foreign Trade of the USSR.

In accordance with the earlier agreed arrangements the final talks and signing of the Trade Protocol between India and the USSR for 1972 will take place in Moscow in the beginning of 1972.

INDIA USA RUSSIA

Date : Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED KINGDOM

British Aid for Tuticorin Fertiliser Plant

Following is the text of a press release issued in New Delhi an December 18, 1971 on the completion of arrangement for release by Britain of aid funds to assist build a fertiliser plant in Tuticorin:

Under arrangements completed in New Delhi today, Britain is to release aid funds within a maximum of ∞ 7.74 million (Rs. 13.93 crores) to help build a fertilizer complex at Tuticorin in Tamil Nadu.

The complex will be constructed and operated by the Southern Petrochemical Industries Corporation Limited (SPIC). The rupee costs of the project are being met from equity contributions and loans from Indian financial Institutions.

Britain's contribution to the project will be used to cover the foreign exchange cost of British equipment and services required for the construction of an ammonia, plant. The British contractor is Power Gas Limited of London, a Davy-Ashmore Company, who are supplying a design for the plant and assisting with Procurement and other services. The contract between SPIC and Power Gas is to come into effect on December 31.

The plant will produce daily 1,100 metric tonnes of ammonia. This will be used in the manufacture of both urea and complex fertilisers in further plants which are to be constructed with the assistance of Japanese firms.

British aid for Tuticorin is being provided under the series of U.K./India Mixed Project Loans. These loans are interest-free and repayable over 25 years with an initial grace period of 7 years during which no capital need be repaid.

Earlier this year, Britain allocated & 7 million (Rs. 12.6 crores) of aid to the Indian Farmers Fertiliser Co-operative project now being built in Gujarat. Other major project financed out of British aid are the construction of three ships for the Shipping Corporation of India and the Scindia Steem Navigation Company. Further projects are under discussion with the Indian Government, and the British Government has indicated that it will allocate & 72 million (Rs. 129.6 crores) of project aid to India over the four financial years 1970-71 to 1973-74.

392

INDIA USA UNITED KINGDOM RUSSIA JAPAN

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Prime Minister's Letter to President Nixon

Following is the text of the letter dated

December 15, 1971 from Shrimati Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India, to His Excellency Mr. Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America on events in Bangla Desh:

Dear Mr. President,

I am writing at a moment of deep anguish at the unhappy turn which the relations between our two countries have taken.

I am setting aside all pride, prejudice and passion and trying, as calmly as I can, to analyse once again the origins of the tragedy which is being enacted.

There are moments in history when brooding tragedy and its dark shadow-, can be lightened by recalling great moments of the past. One such great moment which has inspired millions of people to die for liberty was the Declaration of Independence by the United States of America. That Declaration stated that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of man's inalienable rights to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness, it was the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

All unprejudiced persons objectively surveying the grim events in Bangla Desh since March 25 have recognised the revolt of 75 million people, a people who were forced to the conclusion that neither their life, nor their liberty, to say nothing of the possibility of the pursuit of happiness, was available to them. The World Press, Radio and Television have faithfully recorded the story. The most perceptive of American scholars who are knowledgeable about the affairs of this sub-continent revealed the anatomy of East Bengal's frustrations.

The tragic war, which is continuing, could have been averted if during the nine months prior to Pakistan attack on us on December 3, the great leaders of the world had paid some attention to the fact of revolt, tried to see the reality of the situation and searched for a genuine basis for reconciliation. I wrote letters along these lines. I

undertook a tour in quest of peace at a time when it was extremely difficult to leave the country in the hope of presenting to some of the leaders of the world the situation as I saw it. It was heart-breaking to find that while there was sympathy for the poor refugees, the disease itself was ignored.

War could also have been avoided if the power, influence and authority of all the States and above all of the United States, had got Sheikh Mujibur Rahman released. Instead. we were told that a civilian administration was being installed. Everyone knows that this civilian administration was a farce; today the farce has turned into a tragedy.

Lip service was paid to the need for a political solution, but not a single worth-while step was taken to bring this about. Instead, the rulers of West Pakistan went ahead holding farcical elections to seats which had been arbitrarily declared vacant.

There was not even a whisper that anyone from the outside world had tried to have contact with Mujibur Rahman. Our earnest plea that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman should be released, or that, even if he were to be kept under detention, contact with him might be established, was not considered practical on the ground that the U.S. could not urge policies which might lead to the overthrow of President Yahya Khan. While the United States recognised that Mujib was a core factor in the situation and that unquestionably in the long run Pakistan must acquiesce in the direction of greater autonomy for East Pakistan, arguments were advanced to demonstrate the fragility of the situation and of Yahya Khan's difficulty.

Mr. President, may I ask you in all sincerity: Was the release or even secret

393

negotiations with a single human being, namely, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, more disastrous than the waging of a war?

The fact of the matter is that the rulers of West Pakistan got away with the impres-

sion that they could do what they liked because no one, not even the United States, would choose to take a public position that while Pakistan's integrity was certainly sacrosanct, human rights, liberty were no less so and that there was a necessary interconnection between the inviolability of States and the contentment of their people.

Mr. President, despite the continued defiance by the rulers of Pakistan of the most elementary facts of life, we would still have tried our hardest to restrain the mounting pressure as we had for nine long months, and war could have been prevented had the rulers of Pakistan not launched a massive attack on us by bombing our airfields in Amritsar, Pathankot, Srinagar, Avantipur, Uttarlai, Jodhpur, Ambala and Agra in the broad daylight on December 3, 1971 at a time when I was away in Calcutta, my colleague, the Defence Minister, was in Patna and was due to leave further for Bangalore in the South and another senior colleague of mine, the Finance Minister, was in Bombay. The fact that this initiative was taken at this particular time of our absence from the Capital showed perfidious intentions. In the face of this, could we simply sit back trusting that the rulers of Pakistan or those who were advising them, had peaceful, constructive and reasonable intent?

We are asked what we want. We seek nothing for ourselves. We do not want any territory of what was East Pakistan and now constitutes Bangla Desh. We do not want any territory of West Pakistan. We do want lasting peace with Pakistan. But will Pakistan give up its ceaseless and yet pointless agitation of the last 24 years over Kashmir? Are they willing to give up their hate campaign and posture of perpetual hostility towards India? How many times in the last 24 years have my father and I offered a Pact of Non-aggression to Pakistan? It is matter of recorded history that each time such offer was made, Pakistan rejected it out of hand.

We are deeply hurt by the innuendos and insinuations that it was we who have precipitated the crisis and have in any way thwarted the emergence of solutions. I do not really know who is responsible for this calumny. During my visit to the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Austria and Belgium, the point I emphasised, publicly as well as privately, was the immediate need for a political settlement. We waited nine months for it. When Dr. Kissinger came in August 1971, I had emphasised to him the importance of seeking an early political settlement. But we have not received, even to this day, the barest framework of a settlement which would take into account the facts as they are and not as we imagine them to be.

Be that as it may, it is my earnest and sincere hope that with all the knowledge and deep understanding of human affairs you as President of the United States and reflecting the will, the aspirations and ideal ism of the great American people, will at least let me know where precisely we have gone wrong before your representatives or spokesmen deal with us with such harshness of language.

With regards and best wishes.

Yours sincerely, Sd/ Indira Gandhi

USA INDIA PAKISTAN FRANCE GERMANY AUSTRIA BELGIUM

Date: Dec 01, 1971

Volume No

1995

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Statement in Parliament' on Suspension of U.S. Arms Supplies

Following is the text of the statement by the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Swaran Singh, in Lok Sabha on December 3, 1971 regarding the reported decision of the United States Government to suspend with immediate effect all arms supplies to India and also to cancel commitments a made:

Government have been informed by the U.S. Government that in view of what they regard as "the deteriorating situation

394

in South Asia, and continued military engagements between Indian and Pakistani armed forces". They have as of December 1, 1971 decided:

- (i) to suspend the issuance of all future munitions list licences for India,
- (ii) not to issue any new licenses or renew existing ones, and
- (iii) to cancel several licenses, the total value of which according to their estimates is approximately \$ 2 million.

For months India had been drawing the attention of the United States and other Governments of the world to the enormous burden imposed on her by the inhuman atrocities of the Pakistan regime in Bangla Desh and suggesting that they should direct their efforts to persuade Pakistan to stop its military repression and to negotiate a political solution with the already elected representatives of Bangla Desh. Their efforts to persuade the military regime in Pakistan have not borne any fruit. The continuing presence of ten million refugees on our soil and a daily influx of over ten thousand, together with the concentration of Pakistani troops all along our border and hundreds of violations of our ground and air and continuous shelling of our territory endanger our security. We cannot be silent spectators of this serious development. We are, therefore, surprised that the U.S. Government should have reacted to these developments in the manner they have done.

USA INDIA PAKISTAN

Date: Dec 01, 1971