

20th Session

1358th Plenary Meeting,

by Sadar Swaran Singh on 12th October, 1965

The election of His Excellency Amintore Fanfani, Foreign Minister of Italy, as President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly, has been a source of great satisfaction to us. His election to this high office was a tribute to the great country which he represents and also a testimony to the high esteem in which Foreign Minister Fanfani is personally held by us all. The government and the people of India have close and friendly relations with the Government and the people of Italy. It is, therefore, with particular sorrow that my delegation learnt of the accident suffered by the President of our Assembly a couple of days ago. We wish him speedy recovery and hope that he will return to preside over our meeting with renewed vigour.

I should also like to take this opportunity to place on record our appreciation of the work done by His Excellency Mr. Alex Quaison-Sackey, the Foreign Minister of Ghana, who presided over the nineteenth session of the General Assembly with such distinction under the most trying and unusual circumstances.

I wish also to welcome to the United Nations the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldiv Islands and Singapore. With the addition of these three sister Afro-Asian States, the membership of the United Nations has risen to 117 and we have come nearer to our goal of universality. In the tradition of Afro-Asian co-operation my delegation looks forward to close collaboration and association with the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldiv Islands and Singapore both in the United Nations and outside. We wish the people of these countries all progress and prosperity.

Since I spoke in the General Assembly last year [1301st meeting], our Organization has passed through a period of much travail and uncertainty, as well as a sharp controversy which could have shaken it to its very foundations. I say this because the controversy which immobilized this great Assembly had financial, constitutional and political aspects. The very fact that the protagonists on the two sides of this debate refused to allow the struggle to be fought to the bitter end and rather permitted a consensus to grow, and that finally both sides bowed to that consensus, showed that they were determined to preserve the Organization. It would be idle to pretend that period of forced inactivity of the Assembly, and the underlying difference of opinion between the two super-Powers, has not affected us all. But equally we must recognize that it has had the effect of focussing the attention of the peoples of the world on the weakness as well as the strength of this house which we have all built, brick by brick.

That it was in this year of internal crises of the Organization that for the first time a Member State pulled out of it must be considered unfortunate; it is also a portent and a warning. This withdrawal is being exploited by another Member State, which seems to find the responsibility of fulfilling its obligations under the Charter too onerous. All these years that we have spent in striving to bring the Organization closer to our goal of universality would have gone in vain if in addition to the withdrawals of Member States from the Organization, those which are yet to join us were to start prescribing conditions for their own participation-conditions which the Organization, they demand, must fulfil before they will join it. The need for the participation of the People's Republic of China in all the activities of the Organization is obvious; and time and again my delegation has supported moves in this direction. It is also clear that Indonesia should return to the fold. Equally obvious, however, is the fact that the Organization could not survive if

it were to give in to threats or accept conditions. The coming months, years and decades should show whether the peoples of the world, dreading the scourge of war, have acquired the maturity and the seriousness of purpose which are essential for the preservation of peace, so that to them forbearance is not merely a necessity but a principle.

The trouble spots of the world and violent interference in the affairs of others have mostly arisen because States have not refrained in their international relations from resorting to threats or to the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of other States. The desire for territorial aggrandisement and the chauvinism of certain States has led to the repeated use of force despite the clearly enunciated principles in the Charter of the United Nations. The policy of confrontation with the State of Malaysia is one example. Hardly had that State come into being when it was faced with threats of annihilation backed up by penetration of armed infiltrators. While our desire to maintain friendly relations with Indonesia is sincere, our sympathies are with the peace-loving State of Malaysia in its hour of need.

For two years now the brave people of Cyprus have been facing interference from without, armed and otherwise-interference designed at best to curb the sovereignty and independence of the State of Cyprus and at worst to partition the Island along sectarian lines. We in India were subjected to this cursed process decades ago culminating in the partition of the country in 1947. As we have all seen, partition only creates new problems. We therefore view with the utmost sympathy the efforts of the Government of Cyprus to maintain the unfettered sovereignty, independence and unity of the State of the Cyprus.

Our own experience in the past few months with two powerful

neighbours has shown us that there is still a strong urge in those two countries to take recourse to arms. Twice in the last six months my country and my people have faced blatant and adventurist aggression from Pakistan. During the same period we have faced ultimatums and serious threats of aggression from the People's Republic of China. It is clearly established that there was a sinister connexion between the aggression of one and the ultimatums of the other. These two forces of reaction, fanaticism and violence seem determined to combine against all those values which we cherish. It appears to us that these dictatorships next to us abhor the prospects of our success in combining the democratic way of life with planned economic growth. The world is aware that we have all along been firm adherents of the policy of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. It was with this faith, and in the secure trust that aggression and trespass against us, if only brought to the notice of the United Nations, would be effectively tackled, that we continued to concentrate on the task of improving the standard of living of our own people. However, the inability of the United Nations and of the international community to condemn the aggressor and lend succour to the victim of aggression has caused deep disappointment. In our case, as in other areas, especially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, peace and justice have been the victims of international power politics.

I mentioned a moment ago how, within the last six months, we have twice become the victims of Pakistani aggression. The first time was in April last, when Pakistan surreptitiously moved its forces into the Rann of Kutch and later, with heavy armour, took certain posts well within our territory in that area. Our only fault there was that, while defending ourselves, we refused to allow the strife to be escalated. For the sake of peace and the establishment of good-neighbourly relations we indicated to Pakistan ourselves and through others that we were prepared to exercise the utmost restraint in spite of grave provocation. Thus once again we have proof of our earnest desire to reduce tensions

and of our willingness to resolve differences between our two countries. It was the same spirit which had moved our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, on 28 November 1950 to offer Pakistan unconditionally a no-war pact, an offer which was renewed by Prime Minister Shastri last year. Pakistan's aggression in the Rann of Kutch and in Kashmir this year reveals why it was consistently refused to accept an offer of this nature.

It was in this larger context that we signed, on 30 June 1965, the Agreement on the Rann of Kutch, a boundary dispute born out of the spurious claims made by Pakistan. Pakistan mistook our readiness to arrive at a peaceful settlement, our self-restraint, as a sign of weakness.

Even before the ink was dry on the Pakistani signatures on this Agreement, Pakistan commenced on 5 August a fresh and major aggression against India. In fact, while the Kutch Agreement was being signed, preparations were already in full swing in Pakistan to send across the old cease-fire line thousands of troops in civilian disguise. Starting on 5 August 1965, this aggression continued unchecked and unabated despite the fact that India promptly took it up with Pakistan. India brought this to the attention of the United Nations Chief Military Observer, General Nimmo; the Chief Military Observer brought it to the attention of the Secretary-General; and finally, the Secretary-General himself brought it to the notice of the Security Council on 3 September 1965.¹ Pakistan's replies were a bland denial of responsibility, a familiar technique adopted by aggressors. Between 5 August and 14 August, we showed the utmost forbearance and self-restraint, hoping that our protests to Pakistan and the reports of the United Nations Observers about the massive assault on the cease-fire line would have some effect. For ten long days while armed marauders were on the rampage, we kept hoping that good sense might prevail, that good advice might be forthcoming, and that pressures for peace might emanate from the United Nations. In the

meanwhile, our brave people in Kashmir threw some of the infiltrators out and rounded up a good number. But as some of them were being dealt with, more armed aggressors in civilian disguise came in, wave after wave, each one equipped with hand-grenade, rifles, Stern guns and other automatic weapons as well as material for sabotage and incendiary action. Conclusive evidence was forthcoming from these armed personnel captured by us to show that thousands more were poised for further infiltration. In order to meet this continuing aggression, our security forces, in an entirely defensive and limited action, moved to block the routes and plug the passes in that mountainous terrain through which the infiltrators were coming.

Clearly, the rulers of Rawalpindi, engaged in a planned campaign to subjugate our people and grab our territory in Kashmir, entertained the wild hope that the people would rise in revolt. When this hope was shattered and the people of Kashmir fought the armed marauders manfully and with valour, the rulers of Rawalpindi decided to turn their violent political gamble into a full-scale military adventure. On 1 September Pakistan crossed the international boundary and the old cease-fire line, causing the uprooting of thousands of people and posing a grave and imminent threat to the only line of communication between the State of Jammu and Kashmir and the rest of India. The line of communication was the road to Ladakh in North-Eastern Kashmir, where the Indian troops, ever since the Chinese invasion of 1962, have safeguarded the cause of liberty at the price of eternal vigilance. Pakistan crossed into our territory with the maximum force and fanfare. A force of two regiments of heavy tanks, supported by Pakistan infantry and with air cover, penetrated twelve to fifteen miles within Indian territory, while the Commander-in-Chief of Pakistan, General Musa, exhorted his troops to bite the enemy deeper in order to destroy him. On 5 September they extended the area of conflict by undertaking aerial bombing of the town of Ranbirsinghpura in Jammu and the city of Amritsar in the Punjab. It was then that India took action in self-

defence.

I have gone into this matter in some detail because I want to inform this Assembly of the anatomy of this second aggression by Pakistan against India. In defence of the motherland against this treacherous aggression, our armed forces displayed rare courage and valour in the face of superior weaponry, thwarting the design of the Pakistani aggressor to grab our territory. The whole country, all my countrymen of all faiths, stood as one man in the defence of the motherland. This was the biggest disappointment to and defeat for Pakistan, which had pinned its hopes on the emergence of forces of discord and disintegration in India.

Some of the representatives have expressed concern about the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. We fully share their concern, as indeed we appreciate their sincere desire for lasting peace between our two countries. This conflict is not of our seeking; at no time have we sought it. Eighteen years ago we came to the United Nations as complainant against Pakistani aggression. Our approach to the United Nations is a testimony to our faith in peaceful methods of resolving situations. In that faith we have tried every possible method to develop and maintain friendly relations with Pakistan. It was in that faith that we tried our utmost to prevent conflict from escalating and promptly responded to the appeal of the Secretary-General and the Security Council for an unconditional cease-fire.

As the representatives will appreciate, peaceful and friendly relations among States are not possible without a genuine respect for the rule of law, and for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of one's neighbours. Three times in eighteen years Pakistan resorted to the use of force against India, contrary to its obligations under the Charter.

A lasting peace between India and Pakistan cannot be brought about by ignoring these facts, much less by appeasing the aggressor. It is therefore necessary for me to make my government's position clear beyond any shadow of doubt. Legally, constitutionally, morally and on the basis of the will of the people, the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union. This is the position on which India takes its stand and will continue to do so. The people of Jammu and Kashmir, together with their fellow citizens in other parts of India, are the architects of the largest democratic State in the world, a State rooted in popular will expressed through freely chosen institutions and periodic general elections, based on adult franchise. There is no better way of giving reality to the freedom of a people.

While Pakistan pursues the path of violence and aggression, while it talks to us and to the United Nations in terms of threats and while it attempts to enlarge the struggle on our northern frontiers, we cannot do any less than defend ourselves. But let Pakistan think in terms of taking its covetous eyes off our territory, let Pakistan think in terms of not trying to undermine or erode the territorial integrity and secular democracy of our country, and it will find in us the friendliest and most co-operative of neighbours ready to resolve our differences.

Although we have been preoccupied with our own immediate and pressing problems, I wish to assure this Assembly that the major problems of the world, such as decolonisation, apartheid, disarmament and economic development of the less developed world, are very much in our thoughts. When India threw off the shackles of colonial rule in 1947, the shape of the world changed, a historic event which released the forces of freedom and progress. As a founder Member of the United Nations, India took the

initiative in pressing for the liberation of subject peoples everywhere in the world. In the Trusteeship Council, in the Fourth Committee and in the Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories, my delegation persistently championed the cause of freedom and independence and exposed the misdeeds of the colonialists in Africa, Asia and Latin America. In the early years we were in minority and the imperialist and colonialist Powers controlled and managed even the agenda and the discussions in the United Nations. It was an uphill task even to get items relating to apartheid and colonialism included in the agenda of the General Assembly. I am happy to say that in this regard the United Nation has made very great progress, and the colonial Power can no longer manipulate the agenda of the General Assembly or mislead it into believing the conditions in Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique, Angola, Aden and other colonial territories, are by any means satisfactory.

In December 1960, the General Assembly adopted the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XVJ)], and in 1961 the Assembly established-by resolution 1654 (XVI)-the Special Committee on Decolonization, with which we have been intimately associated. The discussions in that Committee have exposed to the world the appalling conditions that prevail in the remaining colonial territories, and it is to the work of the Special Committee that the peoples in colonial territories have looked for hope and inspiration. The resolutions adopted by the Committee as a result of the sustained and dedicated efforts of its Afro-Asian members, have had beneficial results. But the hard core of colonialism still remains entrenched in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique and so-called Portuguese Guinea. It is not fortuitous that the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and South Africa are colluding to suppress the indigenous people in denying their freedom and fundamental rights.

South Africa continues unabashed its policies of apartheid in defiance of world opinion and has gone further by extending them

to the Mandated Territory of South West Africa. It was my delegation which first brought this question of South West Africa before the United Nations, and the people of South West Africa have our full sympathy and support in their struggle against the South African racist regime. India has not only disapproved of and condemned Portuguese colonialism, but we have taken positive action against the colonial Powers. The freedom struggle in Angola and Mozambique and the so-called Portuguese Guinea is a source of inspiration to freedom-loving peoples and we hope that all Member States will give their full support to the resolutions adopted by the Special Committee during its tour of Africa in May-June of this year.

Equally dangerous and ominous is the situation in Southern Rhodesia, where a white minority regime is allowed to continue its repressive rule over a vast African population against its wishes. The equivocal posture adopted by the United Kingdom with regard to Southern Rhodesia is as disappointing as its regrettable. The United Kingdom is responsible for the administration of the colony of Southern Rhodesia and it must take steps to see that Southern Rhodesia gets independence without delay under a government which is fully representative of the people of the territory, a government that is elected on the basis of one man, one vote. It is for the government of the United Kingdom to see that all repressive legislation is withdrawn and freedom fighters released from prisons.

The territories of British Guyana, Mauritius and Fiji are ripe for independence and freedom. But the traditional divisive policies of the United Kingdom have resulted in creating tensions among the peoples, thus retarding their emergence into freedom. We are gravely concerned at the recent developments in Aden, where the Constitution has been abrogated and a reign of terror and repression unleashed to suppress the brave Arabs struggling for their freedom. It is the duty of the United Kingdom

Government to implement General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) so that the people in Aden, British Guyana, Fiji, Mauritius, Basutoland, Bechuanaland andm Swaziland and many other territories attain their independence immediately. It is no use telling the world that they have given independence to 700 million people

during the last twenty years. Freedom is never given by colonial Powers. It is taken by colonial peoples after hard and bitter struggle and it is extraordinary that the colonial Powers should take credit for this. As long as there are any people anywhere in the world who are not yet free and independent, India will continue to fight for their rights and freedom.

One of the issues that has long been a source of great concern to India is the question of the racial policies of the Republic of South Africa. The pernicious policies of apartheid provide the most explosive material for conflict and cut at the very root of the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and are contrary to civilized behaviour.

We in India have been associated with the struggle for racial equality in South Africa for the past sixty years. The name of Mahatma Gandhi is synonymous with this struggle. We first brought up this matter before the United Nations in 1946 and we were the first country to break diplomatic commercial and trade relations with South Africa. Even long before General Assembly resolution 1761 (XVII) was passed, we had adopted the measures enumerated in that resolution. It is a matter of regret to us that many countries continue to have commercial, trade and other contacts with Government of South Africa, thus assisting that Government in its ruthless suppression of the indigenous people. To the powerful Western friends of South Africa, we address an appeal to carry out the provisions of that resolution and undertake an economic boycott of South Africa. Unless those countries put into

practice what they have said in this Assembly, the South African Government will not change its policies because an economic boycott merely by the countries of Africa and Asia will not put sufficient pressure on that Government to alter its racist policies.

My delegation promptly responded to the appeal of the Chairman of the Special Committee on Apartheid to give financial assistance to the families of the victims among those valiant fighters against racism. We hope and trust that all members of the General Assembly will respond to that appeal and give generously to this fund.

The people and the Government of India fully support the just struggle of the people of South Africa and are determined to give them whatever support they need.

The goal of a world without arms and wars continues to remain one of the primary objectives before the international community. The General Assembly has since its very inception given its most earnest consideration to the problems of disarmament and measures aimed at the lessening of international tension. It is true that the progress achieved so far has been somewhat slow, but this is to some extent inevitable, because the goal of a disarmed world is completely unprecedented in the history of mankind. Again, disarmament is a highly complex matter and requires patient, careful and serious examination, which has to take account of security and other vital considerations.

The question of disarmament has been considered in various forms and some limited agreements have been reached. One of the most constructive debates took place recently in April-June 1965 in

the Disarmament Commission, which comprises the entire membership of the United Nations and thus represents the aspirations and anxieties of the international community. The Disarmament Commission, in its two resolutions,² laid down useful guidelines and provided a fresh mandate, particularly in regard to priorities, to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament for its work as a negotiating body.

The Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, which has been holding a continuing conference since 1962, has just concluded a six-week session. As at its past sessions, the Committee considered in a thorough manner the questions of general and complete disarmament and measures aimed at the lessening of international tension. In particular, the Committee devoted its concentrated attention to the questions of a comprehensive test ban treaty and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. India took an active part in these discussions and along with the other non-aligned members submitted joint memoranda³ containing proposals, which could form the basis of agreements on these two most important issues in the field of disarmament today.

The Assembly is aware of the deep anxiety with which my country has viewed the continuance of nuclear tests, the initiatives that we have taken and the persistent efforts that we have made to secure a complete prohibition of all nuclear and thermonuclear weapon test explosions for all time. My Government was, therefore, gratified when the partial test ban Treaty was concluded and it was not only one of the first to subscribe to the Treaty, but has striven to secure adherence by all countries and also extension of the Treaty so as to cover underground tests as well. We are firmly of the view that the Treaty should receive universal adherence so that the present and future generations of mankind are saved the grave damage to their health from the deadly fall-out and a curb is placed on the nuclear arms race. It is a matter of profound regret to my delegation that the People's

Republic of China, along with certain other countries, has not so far considered it necessary to accede to the Moscow Treaty. The nuclear test by China earlier this year, at a time when the Disarmament Commission was meeting in New York, can only be regarded as a deliberate affront to the world community.

As regards underground nuclear tests, we believe that, notwithstanding differences among nuclear Powers regarding the question of identification and the need for verification, a partial treaty could be entered into for cessation of tests above a certain threshold, which could be agreed upon by the nuclear Powers. This threshold could be lowered subsequently as a result of the continuing exchange of scientific data and other negotiations. At the same time, we consider it imperative that while negotiations are going on to resolve the differences between the nuclear Powers, all underground tests should be discontinued forthwith.

My delegation also feels that the question of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons should be accorded high priority. It was at India's request that an item on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons had been included in the agenda of the last session of the General Assembly⁴ and we welcome the initiative of the Soviet Union in this matter at the current session [A/5976]. Even though my country has possessed the capacity for quite some time now to manufacture nuclear weapons, we have refrained from doing so. We believe that not only any further proliferation of nuclear weapon capabilities should be checked but the existing proliferation should be reversed.

My country has made certain specific proposals in this regard at the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and I would not like to repeat them here. I would, however, reiterate our firm conviction that the only practical approach to

this problem of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is that both the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers should undertake simultaneous obligations through an international instrument that might be agreed upon. It is essential that, while the non-nuclear Powers renounce production, acquisition and control of and access to nuclear weapons, the nuclear Powers should also refrain simultaneously from further production of these weapons and their delivery vehicles and reach agreement on a reduction of existing stockpiles. That would really be the essence of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Disarmament Commission, to which I referred earlier, has recommended to the Assembly, vide its resolution of 11 June 1965,⁵ to consider urgently the proposal made by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in October 1964, for the convening of a world disarmament conference to which all countries would be invited. My delegation was a co-sponsor of the resolution adopted by the Disarmament Commission. We consider it important that the world disarmament conference should take place as early as possible and that France and the People's Republic of China should take part in it.

My delegation earnestly hopes that the discussion on disarmament in the First Committee will be fruitful, so that, when the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament reconvenes in Geneva soon after the debate here, it may be able to reach agreements on a comprehensive test ban and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and thereby make possible more agreements in the field of disarmament.

I have spoken at some length on the political problems that confront this Organization. These are no doubt urgent problems that require our utmost attention. But the solution of these

problems is not an end in itself; it is only a means towards the achievement of a higher objective, an objective which is solemnly enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, namely, "the promotion of the economic and social advance of all peoples". It was for the fulfilment of this objective that the General Assembly designated the current decade as the United Nations Development Decade. We have already reached the mid-point of the Development Decade. It is time for us to take stock of our achievements during the first half of the Decade and to draw up a plan of action for the second half.

Although the United Nations and its agencies have been making ceaseless efforts for the attainment of the goals which we set for ourselves for the Development Decade, the progress so far has been painfully slow. That we shall have to intensify our efforts considerably in this direction if we expect to come within sight of our goals cannot be better emphasized than by recalling the poignant words of the distinguished Secretary-General in his report to the thirty-ninth session of the Economic and Social Council: "The misery of much of the developing world is a progressive misery. It threatens to grow worse in the second half of the Decade".⁶ And again, in his introduction to this year's annual report to the General Assembly [A/6001/Add.1, sect. II/1. the Secretary-General has reminded us that "shocking disparities in conditions and levels of living" continue to persist. But let these words not lead us into despair and inaction; on the contrary, they should goad us into more intensified activity to meet the challenge that faces us of removing the spectre of poverty from the world and making it a better place in which to live for all peoples.

The developing countries of the world, which are struggling hard to improve their economic conditions, had placed very high hopes in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which for the first time focused attention in a unified manner on their

problems in the various fields and called for an integrated approach to their solution on the part of the developing as well as the developed countries. These hopes and aspirations found eloquent expression in the Final Act of the Conference⁷. Since then, some progress has been made in implementing the recommendations contained in the Final Act with regard to the setting up of the organisational machinery. The Trade and Development Board has held two sessions and the various committees set up by the Board have started functioning. However, as the Secretary-General has pointed out in his report to the General Assembly, despite the progress made in the organizational and administrative field, the hopes generated in the developing countries by the agreements reached in Geneva have not been fulfilled. The organisational machinery added to the United Nations family at the last session of the General Assembly got off to a good start at the first session of the Trade and Development Board, which devised the means to launch the new machinery. But unfortunately, the Board at its second session found itself confronted with serious difficulties because of our inability to organize ourselves with enough courage, purpose and coherence to create a society in which the fruits of progress are more equally shared. We sincerely hope that the developed countries will adopt a more constructive attitude and will take the initiative in dispelling the clouds of doubt which engulfed the second session of the Board.

My delegation will address itself in some detail to the various issues related to economic development in the deliberations of the Second Committee. At this stage, I would like to make a general reference to one or two important issues which are likely to come up for decision at this session. One such issue is the establishment of the proposed capital development fund which has been recommended by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.⁸ My delegation feels that it would be useful to have such a fund, which could provide capital assistance to the developing countries in the form of grants and "soft loans".

While I am on the subject of economic assistance to developing countries, I would like to pay a tribute to the successful activities of the Special Fund and the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance, which continue to make an invaluable contribution to the development effort of the developing countries. We support the Secretary-General's call for increasing the annual target for voluntary contributions to the two programmes to \$200 million. We also welcome the progress made in the establishment of the Asian Development Bank, which can play a very useful role in the economic development of Asia.

Another important decision which this Assembly will be called upon to take is the proposed establishment of a specialized agency for industrial development, which has also been recommended by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.⁹ My delegation expresses the hope that the examination by the General Assembly of the recommendations on the subject by the Conference on Trade and Development and the Economic and Social Council will lead to the prompt establishment of the Agency for Industrial Development, which could provide effective assistance to the developing countries in the promotion and acceleration of their industrial development.

I have come to the end of my review of the urgent problems of the world, more particularly problems of our own region, as they appear to us and as we prepare to face them - problems of defence and disarmament, politics and international intercourse, economic relations and developmental activities. And now I ask myself where exactly the United Nations stands, twenty years after the founding of the Organization. It is clear that these twenty years have seen both the rise and the decline of monolithic systems- in the field of defence as well as in the field of international trade and economics. I would make bold to say that the winds which sweep our globe are not winds that can be characterised as either East wind or West wind, North wind or South wind. They are

winds of co-operation and cohesiveness, on the one hand, and winds of confrontation and fragmentation on the other.

On the one hand, in our world, there is an effort to build and consolidate institutions which make economic co-operation and collaboration workable, first on a regional and then on a global basis; there is an attempt to draw a tally of how much conservation is possible of resources that can be utilized for the have-nots of our earth, if only the dream of total disarmament can be made a reality. Thus we keep working to safeguard liberties through opposition to fragmentation.

On the other hand, there is at work the classic dictum, "Separate your enemies, sow seeds of disintegration in their midst, and then finish them off one by one". The new nation-States of Africa and Asia are thus facing, even before they have had a chance to consolidate their freedom, this threat of disintegration, because there are in the world adventurist Powers, self-styled revolutionaries, who, hearkening back to primeval instincts of section and religious loyalties, wish to do nothing so much as to scatter the seeds of disruption and disintegration as far and as wide as they possibly can.

We in India have had some experience of fighting these attempts to divide us through hearkening to religious loyalties. We are determined to be on the side of those forces in this world which work for co-operation and collaboration for the purpose of consolidating and conserving resources for growth on a regional and global basis. We view the United Nations as a symbol of these principles of cooperation, collaboration and consolidation. And we see the United Nations as a rallying point for all progressive forces opposing the attempts to fragment new nations.