

21st Session

1432nd Plenary Meeting, 7th October, 1966

by Sadar Swaran Singh

Mr. President, may I once again offer to you, both on behalf of the Government and people of India and on my own behalf, our most sincere felicitations on your assumption of the high office of the Presidency of the twenty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly. We rejoice in your election for more than one reason. It is, if I may say so, a fitting recognition of your own eminence as a statesman. We rejoice also that the representative of a neighbouring country, Afghanistan, should have been chosen for this high and important office. I do not have to dwell on the nature of the close and intimate ties which bind your country, Mr. President, with my own. Indeed, this traditional friendship between our two countries may well be regarded as an example of good- neighbourliness in our part of the world.

Allow me, Mr. President, to take this opportunity to place on record our deep sense of appreciation of the work done by your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Amintore Fanfani, as President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly.

It will not be out of place if, at this stage, I express our earnest and sincere hope that U Thant, our respected Secretary-General, will not decline reappointment at this particular juncture. We are conscious of the considerations which have prompted U Thant to take his present decision. These very considerations impel us to urge him to reconsider his decision. We share his disappointment at the lack of "new ideas and fresh initiatives" in the field of disarmament. We share, too, in his concern about the financing of the peace-keeping operations of

the United Nations and about the lack of the impetus the United Nations Development Decade was expected to give to the urgently required technological breakthrough in the developing countries. We are equally concerned about the deteriorating situation in South-East Asia and, more particularly, in Viet-Nam. For these very reasons, we are convinced that this Organization needs his continued guidance and wisdom. While we welcome the decision of U Thant to be prepared to remain in office at least until the end of the present session, we join with the Members of the General Assembly in expressing the earnest hope that he will agree to accept a second term as Secretary-General.

Year after year, we have seen this Organization of ours grow as new States join our ranks. This year we have the pleasure of welcoming in our midst the new State of Guyana. Feelings of brotherliness and cordiality animate the relations between our two countries, and we now look forward to our working together in this Organization.

I should like to say how happy we are at the emergence of Botswana and Lesotho as independent, sovereign States. Soon, another State-Barbados-will also attain independence and sovereignty. We look forward to welcoming them here in the near future, and we have no doubt that they will all add to the strength of this Organization.

As one surveys the contemporary political scene across the continents of this world of ours, one is naturally oppressed by the weight of the many problems which continue to defy solution. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/6301/Add.

1] has reflected, with remarkable sensitivity, the general climate in which the world finds itself. I shall endeavour to deal with some of these problems which especially touch and concern us all vitally. But before I do this, I should like to mention one or two brighter aspects of the world scene.

We rejoice at the easing of the tensions between Indonesia and

Malaysia, and we are happy that Indonesia has decided to resume its rightful place in the United Nations. There is little doubt that Indonesia's return not only demonstrates the loyalty of its Government and its people to the principles and purposes of the Charter, but also reflects the inherent strength of the United Nations.

South-East Asia is in turmoil. Consequently, even a small beginning towards a peaceful settlement of

the conflict between Indonesia and Malaysia can have vital beneficial effects in this region. We offer our felicitations to the leaders of these two fraternal countries.

I should also like to say how happy the Government and people of India are at the resumption of normal diplomatic relations between Malaysia and Pakistan.

In the concluding observations the Secretary-General has made in the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization, he has referred to his endeavours "to help in the efforts which have been made to reduce the escalation of the conflict in Viet-Nam and to move to the conference table the quest for a solution of the problem". The approach he has indicated and the considerations which have weighed with him coincide with our own approach and our purpose. For nearly a quarter of a century now, the people of Viet-Nam have gone through suffering, misery and torture. That is tragedy enough.

What is worse is the constant danger that some day the war in Viet-Nam may overflow its own frontiers and engulf us all.

Situated as we are, as an almost neighbouring country of Viet-Nam, we in India are vitally affected by developments in that part of the world. Herein lies our deep interest. We are also concerned as holding the chairmanship of the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam. We also deeply feel that the entire area of the former Indo-China States will remain a source of extreme anxiety and even turbulence unless the situation in Viet-Nam is brought under control. And,

above all, we sense in the agony of Viet-Nam is brought under control. And, above all, we sense in the agony of Viet-Nam the haunting and brooding tragedy of a possible world conflict.

It is well to recall that after a Conference lasting several months, the Geneva Agreements were reached in 1954, by which the war of independence in Viet-Nam was brought to a close. What was stipulated at Geneva was that the cease-fire agreement should be respected and that steps should be taken to bring about a political settlement in Viet-Nam. To this end, it was envisaged that consultations should be held between the two sides in Viet-Nam to hold general elections in July 1956 for the reunification of Viet-Nam. It is the tragedy of Viet-Nam that these stipulations regarding the political settlement were not fulfilled in time.

For some time now, there has been recognition on all sides that there can be no lasting military solution to the Viet-Nam problem. If this is true, then the only alternative left is the earnest search for a peaceful solution. Moved by this primary consideration, my Prime Minister has been urging the stoppage of the bombing of North Viet-Nam, the cessation of hostilities and of all hostile action throughout Viet-Nam, a Geneva-type conference between the parties to the conflict and others vitally concerned so as to enable the people of Viet-Nam to decide freely their future without any interference or pressure from outside, and within the framework of the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

All of us can derive some encouragement from the fact that, even today, everyone directly concerned with the conflict in Viet-Nam subscribes to the continuing validity of the Geneva Agreements.

There can be no doubt that the world community is eagerly and anxiously searching for ways and means to bring the conflict in Viet-Nam to an end. We feel confident that, if the bombing of North Viet-Nam were ended, a way out could perhaps be found to move the parties from the battlefield to the conference table. We are equally confident that in the ensuing negotiations modalities could be worked out between all the parties concerned, including

the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam, for the full implementation of the Geneva Agreements. It is our earnest hope that the very compulsion to preserve national identity and national interests would make the Viet-Nam of the future self-regarding and independent. In this context, the Secretary-General has made a very wise observation when he states that "the basic problem in Viet-Nam is not one of ideology but one of national identity and survival".

The situation in Laos is integrally tied up with the situation in Viet-Nam. There could be no perceptible improvement in one without a corresponding improvement in the other. Should the conflict in Viet-Nam escalate, there is bound to be a corresponding escalation in Laos as well. In such an inherently difficult situation, we appreciate the efforts made by the Prime Minister of the Royal Laotian government, Prince Souvanna Phouma, to steer a middle course.\*

All of us should understand and appreciate the problems faced by Cambodia in the context of the situation in Indo-China. The courageous efforts of His Royal Highness, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, to safeguard Cambodia's neutrality and independence evoke in our hearts a sympathetic response. All of us owe it to the world community and to the cause of peace that we should have a clear understanding of the extremely difficult situation in which Cambodia finds itself.

May I refer briefly to another aspect of the picture in Asia. In one way or the other, China looms large on our horizon. I do not need to recapitulate all the efforts which we made from 1949 onwards to build our relations with that country on the basis of friendship. Under provocation, we made no move to assert ourselves, in our anxiety to convince the world how necessary it was that the People's Republic of China should not suffer from a sense of isolation. We do not, for a moment, regret having made a sincere effort in that direction. While we do not wish our vision to be clouded by our pre-occupation and concern, we are nevertheless left with a most serious problem on our hands across the entire stretch of our northern and north-eastern borders.

You, Mr. President, and all assembled here are familiar with the macabre drama enacted by China last year in delivering ultimatums to us. We stood our ground, and it is our firm resolve that, whatever sacrifices our people have to make, we shall never falter in the defence of our security and territorial integrity.

We have no objection-we never had any in the past-to China fashioning its destiny within the social, economic and political framework of its own choice. All that we seek is to reserve to ourselves a similar right. After all, peaceful co-existence would be a mere slogan unless all of us could feel a sense of assurance that we could fashion our respective destinies in the light of our own experience, tradition and circumstances. We therefore view with concern the adventurist postures and policies of China in defiance of the principles of peaceful co-existence.

While we have no illusion that China will change its policy overnight, we nevertheless believe that our attempts towards that end should not be given up. It is for this reason that we have continued to maintain the position that the People's Republic of China should be seated in the United Nations.

May I now deal with some of the, problems which continue to torture the continent of Africa. The United Nations cannot contemplate with equanimity the situation in which it finds itself there.

.....  
.....  
.....

Mr. Idzumbuir (Congo, Democratic Republic of), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The problem of Rhodesia is assuming an increasingly disquieting character. Some of us recently had occasion to discuss it elsewhere in great depth and over a long period. We, in India, are amazed at the staggering disproportion between the actual size of the problem and the ineffectiveness on the part of the

administering Power, in dealing with it.

Let us measure the dimensions of the problems which Southern Rhodesia presents. The last nineteen years have witnessed the emergence of as many as twenty-seven sovereign independent nations out of what was once the British Empire. Seven hundred million people, after long, bitter and strenuous struggle, attained their freedom. And, in each case, sovereignty was transferred on the basis of majority rule. The question simply is whether this vast historic process of the liberation of peoples is going to be reversed and set at naught by a mere 200,000 people in Rhodesia who are infected with pathological racist doctrines. This staggering fact cannot be hidden by any sophistication of language. This handful of men are defying with impunity the urge for freedom of four million people of Southern Rhodesia who rightly demand independence on the basis of majority rule and the "one man, one vote" principle. If this festering sore in Rhodesia is not healed quickly, its poisonous effects will corrode and corrupt the very vitals of the world community. And the price which we shall then pay will be far more terrible and costly than all the calculations that we might make of the cost at present. What could be more tragic than that our hope for the possibility of races living together in peace and cooperation should be shattered? The time has therefore come for immediate and effective action to end the illegal racist regime in Southern Rhodesia. We earnestly urge the United Kingdom to take the necessary action with a sense of urgency in order to discharge its responsibilities to itself and to the world community.

If the situation in Rhodesia is menacing, no less menacing are the policies and practices of the Government of South Africa and of the Portuguese colonialists. There may appear to the protagonists of Realpolitik an element of unreality in our trying to deal, year after year for nearly twenty years, with the problems of apartheid and the remnants of colonialism. The fact remains, however, that sooner or later these problems will have to be resolved one way or another. We hope that they will be resolved peacefully, reasonably and rationally. It is because we

persist in this hope that it is of vital importance that, year after year, this Organization must make its position abundantly clear. There is no government on this earth which can remain immune for ever from the pressures generated by the world community and the conscience which it embodies. It is in that hope and that faith that we have persisted and shall continue to persist in lending our support to the cause of the liberation of the peoples of South West Africa and of Mozambique and Angola.

This great Organization must give hope to all those who are suffering and striving for the liberation of mankind from dehumanising doctrines of racialism and intolerance, discrimination and oppression of one people by another.

This brings me to the problem of apartheid. And if I do not speak on this subject at length, it is because my delegation will have the opportunity of expressing its views when it comes up for more detailed consideration in the appropriate Committee. I should, however, like to say with all the emphasis at my command that the pernicious policies of apartheid provide the most explosive material for conflict and undermine the foundations of the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights.

All this we have said in the past, and we shall continue to caution the world community against the accumulation of inflammable material to which South Africa is so recklessly contributing.

While we denounce the rulers of South Africa for elevating to the level of State policies doctrines of racial intolerance and persecution, we must at the same time express our abhorrence of the policies of those who aid, assist and comfort South Africa for the sake of their commerce and trade and for other financial benefits. The many powerful friends by whose grace South Africa is enabled ruthlessly to suppress the indigenous people should really give some thought to the iniquity there is in trading human rights for commercial profit.



May I now refer briefly to another problem which vitally concerns us all—namely, the problem of disarmament and proliferation of nuclear weapons. At the very outset I should like to say that I do not have to present credentials concerning my country's unswerving loyalty to the principle of the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. Our record in this respect is as clean as it is above board.

The very fact of living daily with the ever-increasing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and delivery systems tends to make us insensitive to the menace which all this represents. In order to combat this insensitiveness and in order that the peoples of the world may understand what all this really involves, the Secretary-General has made an interesting suggestion. He has observed that "no organ of the United Nations has ever carried out a comprehensive study of the consequences of the invention of nuclear weapons" [A/6301/Add. 1]. He has suggested that "the time has come for an appropriate body of the United Nations to explore and weigh the impact and implications of all aspects of nuclear weapons, including problems of a military, political, economic and social nature, relating to the manufacture, acquisition, deployment and development of these weapons and their possible use" [ibid.].

We would heartily support such a study. Indeed, under the inspiration of the late Jawaharlal Nehru, our scientists had engaged, some ten years ago, in a preliminary study of the consequences of atomic explosions. The results of that study were published in the form of a book, but quite clearly we need to deepen the study.

There can be no doubt that the most serious menace which the world faces today rises from the feverish arms race that is going on among the nuclear weapon Powers. The arsenals of these nations are more than large enough to destroy the entire world several times over. And yet these nuclear weapon Powers are now going in the what they call a new generation of nuclear weapons and planning to add a new dimension to the arms race by embarking upon anti-ballistic missiles. In the context of this grave

situation, it is mere diversionary tactics to talk about a sixth or seventh or eighth nuclear Power.

The effect of this is to give sanctity to the existing nuclear weapon Powers, to their weapons and their proliferation. Indeed, it provides a justification for defiance of the will of the comity of nations as expressed in the test-ban Treaty. Fortunately for most of us, the international community does not look at the problems in that manner. It does not give its seal of approval to four or five countries and accord to them permission to proliferate these weapons. In so serious a matter one would not wish to engage making debating points. But, quite seriously, we believe that proliferation, whether vertical or horizontal, is a matter of the gravest consequence.

The General Assembly adopted a resolution at its twentieth session [resolution 2028 (XX)] on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, in which it was stated categorically that a treaty on the subject must be based on certain principles, one of which is that it should embody an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers.

It is to us axiomatic that all countries-those which possess nuclear weapons as well as those which do not-must assume similar obligations in respect of non-proliferation, and that there should be some progress on nuclear disarmament as a whole. We shall therefore continue to press for measures which could act as a genuine deterrent against nuclear proliferation and, at the same time, check the nuclear arms race among the nuclear weapon Powers.

I should now like to touch on the fringes of a problem which, in many ways, bedevils the developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. All of us are, in one way or another, involved in the process of transformation of our respective societies. The essence and substance of this process is that in this latter half of the twentieth century we are trying to do what Europe achieved over a period of three to four centuries. We are trying to

transform subsistence economies and archaic societies into modern societies with modern industry and modern agriculture. We are in the process of setting up modern nation-States. All the great tensions and conflicts stem from these efforts. To the extent that we sympathetically understand these processes of evolution, we might guide these vast changes into creative channels. However, one cannot help expressing disappointment at the apparent lack of understanding in many quarters.

Since the adoption in 1961 of its resolution on the United Nations Development Decade [resolution 1740 (XVI)], the General Assembly has increasingly turned its attention to the grave problem of the disparity between the standards of living of the developed and the developing countries. The turning-point came in 1964, when, at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the international community took a pledge to tackle this problem in a systematic and concerted manner and to provide for itself the machinery and the framework of a dynamic international policy for achieving this purpose.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development has completed two years of existence. The progress in the implementation of the recommendations adopted at the first session of the Conference has been disappointing. The annual report of the Secretary General of UNCTAD to the Trade and Development Board, which has just concluded its fourth session at Geneva, shows that the developed countries lack the will to implement the recommendations of the first Conference. Unless bold and imaginative steps are taken to implement the recommendations of the first United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the crisis of rising expectations in the face of diminishing fulfilment will get further aggravated and may lead to such deep frustration that it may shake the very foundations on which the international community is trying to build a new world order and lasting peace. The second session of the Conference, which is scheduled to be held next year, will provide an opportunity to devise ways and means to translate into concrete action the noble objectives embodied in the Final Act of

the first Conference. We welcome the unanimous decision of the Board to recommend to this Assembly that the second Conference be held at New Delhi, and we are happy indeed to have this opportunity to make our modest contribution to the success of the Conference.

Reports on world economic trends submitted by our distinguished Secretary-General, the 1965-1966 annual report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the reports of the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization and, most recently, the report on implementation submitted by the Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, present a picture of an all-round deterioration in the economic situation of the developing countries.

Poverty and stagnation in the developing countries have become more vicious. Those countries face the problem of the food gap, the problem of "debt explosion" and the problem of not being able to maintain the momentum of economic growth achieved so far. Under these pressures, many Governments in the developing countries are finding it difficult to maintain the socio-economic structure for the evolution of which they have made great sacrifices and which they cherish as one of their most important national achievements and objectives.

The rate of growth in the developing countries during the first half of the Development Decade not only fell short of the target of 5 per cent but was lower even than the rate of growth during the fifties. Taking into account the increase in population in developing countries, the increases in per capita income in these countries have been only nominal. This leads our world to a situation where the gap in the standards of living between the developed and the developing countries has widened further instead of narrowing. We gather from the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development on implementation that whereas the increase in per capita income in the developed countries during the first half of the Development Decade was \$60 per annum, that in the developing

countries was only \$2 per annum. Our attention has also been repeatedly drawn recently to the stagnation in the outflow of financial assistance to the developing countries during the first half of the Development Decade. During that period, the gross national product of the developed countries as a group has increased substantially per year, which has resulted in a fall in the ratio of capital outflow of gross national product of the developed countries assigned for aid to developing countries. The latest figures on the total debt burdens of the developing countries and their payment liabilities on this account show that the repayments of debts by developing countries now absorb more than half of the total inflow of financial assistance to these countries. If that trend is allowed to continue, in fifteen years' time the developing countries will be in the peculiar situation of earning only to pay their past debts.

In conclusion, may I make one or two observations of a general character.

Those of us who have endeavoured in our own imperfect way to pursue the policy which has come to be known as one of non-alignment and peaceful coexistence have always tried to ensure that our minds remain ever free from the passions and prejudices which may sway us from time to time.

If the world today, at least the European part of it, feels a little relaxed and talks with a certain amount of detachment about the emerging polycenterism, that is, in no small measure, due to the fact that a very large number of emerging countries have refused to be drawn into military alliances of one sort or another and have thus freed their minds from the conditioned reflexes created by such alliances. The detente in Europe, which we devoutly hope will persist, cannot however, have durability and stability unless policies triumph in Asia and Africa which consciously avoid interference of one sort or another in the affairs of other countries and consistently show respect for human rights.

In India, we strongly feel that the future of peaceful world

depends, in a decisive way, on the growth and consolidation of those tendencies which would scrupulously respect differences in political and social systems prevailing in the world. It is our firm belief that countries such as ours-newly emergent and trying to give bread and liberty to their people-can best serve the cause of peace in the work through consistent adherence to the principles of non-alignment. To the extent that this is recognized by the great and small Powers, we shall generate the confidence that nations can develop, give a better way of life to their peoples and maintain liberty and nation dignity in freedom and diversity.