MECHANISM OF INDIA'S PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Having analysed how the United Nations serves as an instrument of national diplomacy in the preceding chapter, an attempt is made here to examine the mechanism of India's participation in the political process of the United Nations.

India, of course, has been an original Member of the United Nations, but it was in October 1945 (that is, second part of the first session of the General Assembly) a delegation representing the people of India joined, for the first time, the world community of nations.¹ When India gained Independence a year later, its participation as an independent, sovereign state became more real. Thus, for obvious reasons, analysis attempted here regarding India's representation and diplomatic interactions covers the period beginning October 1945.

An adequate perspective of India’s participation in the United Nations requires that it be studied in the context of the principles and objectives of India’s foreign policy. The major thrust of India’s foreign policy was spelled out by Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Vice-President of the Interim Government in his very first radio broadcast:

We propose, as far as possible to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war. 2

From the above and subsequent pronouncements in those formative years, the basic principles could be deduced as follows: (a) the pursuit of peace, not through alignment with any major power or group of powers, but through an independent approach to each controversial or disputed issue; (b) the liberation of subject peoples; (c) the maintenance of freedom, both national and individual; (d) the elimination of racial discrimination, and (e) the elimination of want, disease and ignorance which affect the greater part of the

---

world's population.\textsuperscript{3} In order to pursue the above policy, India viewed the United Nations as an "incomparable vehicle of communication"\textsuperscript{4} through which the woes of the weaker nations could be aired with no economic and political subordination to any given great Power or group of great Powers. Besides, the United Nations could become a useful instrument of negotiation for the reconciliation of national interests of Member States.\textsuperscript{5} But the United Nations—increasingly becoming an integral part of the system of international politics—could not be expected to overlook the realities of the post-war world. Mirroring the dominant trends of inter-State relations, it became an area of cold war between two ideologically opposite groups of States led by United States on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other. Each side was seeking victory at the expense of the other. To India, these developments tended to precipitate tension;
and, therefore, it refused to join one big Power's attempts to
triumph over the other, for it would only endanger the inter-
national political environment. In its view, the United
Nations could only be an instrument of peaceful change—
however piecemeal it might be. The United Nations has the
potential of playing a helpful role in such basic tasks as
protection of human rights, liberation of dependent peoples
and development of economically backward countries.

In regard to the maintenance of international peace
and security, India believed that the United Nations should
emphasize methods of pacific settlement of disputes rather than
enforcement measures. It was feared that over-emphasis on
enforcement measures would tend to disrupt rather than
strengthen the Organization.

From a different angle, the United Nations offered
a forum which provided unique opportunity to the Indian
Government to interact with fellow governments for promotion
of its national and larger interests. To sum up, the
objectives of India's foreign policy were fortuitously in

---

6 Some sections of the Indian public interpreted
that India's views did not help the eventual evolution of
the United Nations into a World Government. They cited, as
examples, India's stand against the 'Uniting for Peace'
Resolution and some of the resolutions on the Hungarian
question. See R.S. Manchanda, "U.N. as a Factor in
India's Foreign Policy", Guest (Bombay), no. 59, October-
December 1963, pp. 40-47.

7 India and the United Nations, n. 1, p. 213.
conformity with the Purposes of the United Nations. Indeed, there has been complete congruence between the two. Thus, the United Nations has played and should continue its role as a factor in the realm of India's foreign policy planning and its implementation. The effective accomplishment of the foreign policy goals would, thus, naturally depend on its diplomatic conduct at the United Nations. It should be noted, in this context that any study of the substance of India's foreign policy, its changing and continuing characters during all these decades could be a useful exercise if the administrative and organisational aspects also are given due attention. Accordingly, a discussion of various instruments of India's participation in the United Nations is made in the following pages.

Ministry of External Affairs: UN Division

Independent India inherited from its colonial rulers a well-established administrative machinery in all fields of governmental activity except one, i.e. the conduct of foreign affairs and diplomacy. The Consul of India did have political department but it served largely as an appendage of the British Foreign Office. There were certainly, a handful of Indians who occupied high positions but these Indians were never exposed to subtle art of negotiation and other aspects of diplomacy. Therefore, India had to
start from the scratch in devising its administrative machinery and recruiting afresh its diplomatic personnel. In 1947, after Independence, a distinct apparatus was established named as "Ministry of External Affairs and Commonwealth Relations". Two years later the appendage "Commonwealth Relations" was dropped. The Ministry of External Affairs, as it is currently called, is now the co-ordinating centre for the conduct of the country’s foreign relations. 3

The work of the Ministry is carried out at two different levels—political and bureaucratic. The political branch consists of the Minister for External Affairs under the overall authority of the Prime Minister. The Minister for External Affairs may, sometimes, be assisted by Ministers of State, Deputy Ministers, and Parliamentary Secretaries—all being members of either House of Parliament. During the Nehru era, Prime Minister himself was the Minister of External Affairs; he was assisted by other junior members of the Ministry. 9 At present, one Minister holding cabinet rank

---


9For instance, Nehru used to have Parliamentary Secretaries (Mrs Laxmi Menon and Sadat Ali Khan), whose function was to assist him in the parliamentary work of the Ministry. At times, he used to have Deputy Ministers (to name a few, B.V. Keskar, A.K. Chanda) too. It was only after Nehru’s death in 1964, a fullfledged cabinet minister (Sardar Swaran Singh) took charge of the Ministry under Lal Bahadur Shastri’s Prime Ministership.
is looking after the work of the Ministry. 10 Thus, in brief, the shape and strength of the political wing has followed no set pattern all through the years.

On the other hand, bureaucracy in the Ministry is comparatively well-organized both from hierarchical and functional viewpoints. The bureaucratic component in the Ministry is headed by a senior official bearing the designation of "Foreign Secretary". 11 The work of the Ministry is looked after by twenty-one divisions (thirteen territorial and eight functional).

Of the eight functional divisions, the one that deals with the United Nations matters is the "UN and Conference Division" (commonly known as the UN Division), which was incepted in 1960. 12 The division, for administrative

---

10 Reference is to P.V. Narasimha Rao who took charge of the Ministry with a cabinet rank, when Indira Gandhi returned to power in early 1980. There are no Ministers of State or Parliamentary Secretaries, etc. assisting him.

11 The Ministry was headed previously by an official holding the designation of "Secretary-General" (in existence till 1964 with a brief gap during 1952). Now, the Foreign Secretary is the head of the foreign service personnel working in more than 127 resident missions all over the world and 21 desk divisions in Delhi.

12 For details of the administrative arrangements on the UN matters in the initial period after independence, see A. Appadurai, "India's Participation in International Organizations - Administrative Aspects", India Quarterly, vol. 6, 1950, pp. 247-61.
purposes, has been normally headed by a senior officer with a rank of Joint Secretary. He is assisted by two Deputy Secretaries, two Under Secretaries and a limited number of Research Officers. Recently, an Additional Secretary has been given overall charge of the Division. Its work is divided between the three sub-divisions designated as UN-I, UN-II, and Disarmament.

The Division deals with almost all aspects of the United Nations work. Its role is of an intermediary agency between the Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations (both in Geneva and New York) and the political leadership whom it helps in arriving at decisions. According to some analysts,\textsuperscript{13} the work of the Division falls into four broad areas: First, matters (like disarmament) in which it has primary responsibility and on these matters other ministries are also consulted. Second, serving as one of the clearance points on economic, social and related matters, even though these are frequently the primary concern of other operating ministries. Third, matters concerning United Nations and other international conferences. Also, the Division gets in touch with other ministries to consider composition of

\textsuperscript{13}See, for instance, Charles P. Schleicher and J.S. Bains, \textit{The Administration of Indian Foreign Policy Through the United Nations} (Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., 1969). Especially see the section entitled, "The UN and Conference and Disarmament Division", in the Chapter on "Ministry of External Affairs", pp. 49-67.
delegations, arrangements for conferences scheduled to be held in the country. Fourth, it has a limited role in working with the United Nations field offices operating in India.

Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, New York

The most important institution, providing the vital link in regard to India's participation in the United Nations with the Ministry, is the Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, New York. The Permanent Mission, in a way, is similar to a traditional embassy in a national capital in terms of structure and objective. Like other embassies, its main task is to safeguard and promote India's national interests. Functionally, however, there is a vital difference.

Broadly, the functions of the Permanent Mission, centre around advising the Government on the advantages and disadvantages of utilizing the United Nations as a diplomatic instrument on a given question, whether and how a question could be raised, and also on the manner of participation.\textsuperscript{14}

The Mission's chief function, as is the case with an Indian embassy in a national capital abroad, is to work for the advancement of national policy aims through

participation in the political processes at the United Nations. The Permanent Mission is engaged in "negotiation and parliamentary action". Participating in public debates, negotiating with representatives of other Member States on various questions on agenda, and introducing amendments/draft resolutions form part of this function. This function is generally related to, and reassessed in the light of the final conclusions usually reached in the form of resolutions.

The diplomatic personnel of the Mission form the nucleus of the national delegations sent to the regular sessions of the General Assembly and various other bodies of the United Nations.

Another function of the Mission concerns the collection of information and other data relating to various international questions and situations. This covers, also, liaison with the various levels of officials in the Secretariat. The information collected and conveyed to the Ministry helps provide "feed-in" for policy formulation. One more important function is to "represent" the country in an effective manner. As part of this function, the Mission maintains close formal and informal contacts with the Missions of other Member States. Last, "public relations" constitutes, as in the

\[5\text{Ibid., p. 256.}\]
case of other embassies, an important part of the Mission's functions. 16

As regards the organizational aspects of the Permanent Mission, it has varied from time to time. Generally it is composed of officers having the rank and status of the officers of various cadres as in an Indian embassy in national capitals. The diplomatic corps of the Mission consists of attaches, advisers, first/second secretaries, counsellors, ministers and ambassadors assisted by secretarial staff.

The Permanent Representative normally holds the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary and is responsible for the diplomatic as well as the administrative work of the Mission. He is generally a senior career diplomat. Unlike some other Permanent Missions, India has not followed the practice of appointing political figures. 17

In his day-to-day work, he is assisted by a deputy permanent representative and other officials holding varied


17In the United States, the Permanent Representative is generally named a member of the Cabinet. In the United Kingdom too, the post assumed political significance when it was elevated to the rank of Minister of State in the Cabinet. But, given the political situation in India, neither of the above may suit the country's needs better than the present arrangement.
ranks. The duties of these officials are not rigidly defined. The allocation of a particular work to a particular officer is usually made at the discretion of the Permanent Representative.

An analysis of the composition of the Permanent Mission indicates that it had not adhered to any set strength of diplomatic and other personnel. The data contained in the table (Appendix I) shows\textsuperscript{13} that as of 1951, the Indian Mission was headed by a Permanent Representative,\textsuperscript{19} having the rank of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, which arrangement continued till May 1956 when it was upgraded to the level of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The average tenure of a Permanent Representative was about three years (with the exception of Arthur S. Lall who held the position for about five years) till 1963 and from then on it has been five years (again with the exception of Brajesh Chandra Mishra, who was replaced in less than two years). The relevant details are provided in Appendix II.

\textsuperscript{13}This study is mainly based on the information available in the "U.N. Blue Books" a periodical publication listing diplomatic personnel of the Permanent Missions.

\textsuperscript{19}He was assisted by one Alternative Representative (perhaps similar to the present post of Deputy Permanent Representative), one First Secretary and one Second Secretary (both assigned to the Security Council Affairs).
The position of 'Alternative Representative' (perhaps similar to the present Deputy Permanent Representative) existed in 1951. The post remained unfilled when the then incumbent Rajeshwar Dayal succeeded B.N. Rau as Permanent Representative in 1952. The post was revived when an official bearing the rank of a counsellor was named as Deputy Permanent Representative in 1964. It was made a full-fledged post with the rank of a minister only since 1972.

A counsellor's post was instituted in 1957 (a First Secretary was designated as such by promotion in the service). Again, from 1954 till 1968 the official holding the rank of Counsellor was designated concurrently as Deputy Permanent Representative; and from 1959 to 1971 one of the two Counsellors was designated as the Deputy Permanent Representative. During 1972-79 two officers were designated as Counsellors in the Mission. In 1980, three Counsellors were posted, may be as a brief departure or perhaps as one of the measures to improve the personnel position.

The number of officials, bearing the rank of First Secretary, varied from time to time: 3-4 in 1950s, 4-6 in 1960s, 2-6 in 1970s. Another interesting feature concerns the posting of a Military Adviser holding the rank of Lieutenant Colonel. This post existed between 1957 and 1967, presumably to assist and advise the Mission in the matter of peace-keeping operations—then a major preoccupation
of middle ranking Powers like India.

Legal matters were generally looked after by a First Secretary, no matter if the officer was qualified in the field or not. However, for the first time in 1957, a Legal Adviser was assigned to the Mission and since then the post has been in existence. A number of Research Officers holding the rank of attache also constituted part of the Mission.20

One conclusion that can be drawn from the above analysis is that even though the strength of diplomatic officials in the Mission has been progressively increasing (from 6 in 1951 to 10 in 1954, 11 in 1957, and 17 in 1961),21 the creation or continuation of different posts depended, to a large extent, on the position, seniority and grade of the officials likely to be posted and/or actually posted. There

20 Beginning 1950s until the late 1960s, the practice of making use of local researchers continued. Later, it is understood, this practice was given up.

Under the present arrangement, the service officers, assigned to various committees, are asked to do the background research work also. A view was expressed informally in the Mission that the huge preparatory work can be looked after better by individual officers than by dumping the whole work on one or two research officers.

21 As of March 1991, at least seventeen Missions are larger than India's in strength, while the average strength of all the Missions comes to 10.7—much below the Indian Mission's 17. The fact that the Mission's strength has been progressively increasing—keeping in view the growing need—is a welcome trend because some countries, for instance Israel, now-a-days, as revealed in the course of informal conversation, are compelled to reduce staff in their Missions for reasons of economy.
is no set quota for various categories of posts. In this regard, an analyst is of the assertion that India's personnel policy, unlike that of most other countries follows no pattern of 'Continuity and change'.22 He further comments:

India is among the very few Member States, and the only one among the major or medium ranking Powers, not to adhere to any personnel policy consistently. A career diplomat who is good enough to be Consul in a chancery is considered to be good enough to handle UN diplomacy even if he has never been exposed to an international conference. He has to meet just one requirement: his earlier posting should entitle him for a posting in an "A" station. [Emphasis added]

This criticism is reinforced by the Pillai Committee, set up to go into various aspects of the working of Indian Foreign Service. In its view:


The writer notes three patterns of personnel policy followed by various countries in regard to their missions. First, the head of the Permanent Mission and some other personnel change now and then, but a large number of advisory personnel are kept on a permanent and continuous basis. This policy is followed by the United States and France. Second, Pakistan and some other countries follow the practice of having a special cadre in its Foreign Service specifically assigned to international organizations. Third, Egypt and the United Kingdom keep their career diplomats on an average for a duration of four years. The substitutes arrive one year in advance and get acquainted with all the ropes of corridor diplomacy and parliamentary diplomacy while working with the incumbent. pp. 324-5.
The theory that all officers who have been promoted to, say, Grade V, are equal in all respects and will do equally well in all assignments is facile and fallacious. Each may have an area or field which may be his forte, and it should be the task of the administration to identify this special talent and employ it to best advantage. 23

Explaining the official position, Krishna Menon has specified the kind of personnel needed to work at the United Nations thus:

[He] don't want any 'genius'. He would ruin us at the U.N. — that is not that is wanted. We need good men, men with dedication and a sense of proportion. We don't need self-opinioned heroes... 24

What one could learn from the discussion with officials in New York and New Delhi, supplemented by an analysis of transfer/posting pattern of diplomatic personnel, is that the permanent representative is not taken into confidence in these matters.

As noted earlier, the Mission officials take active part in the diplomatic interactions in New York. They, inter alia, form the nucleus of a number of delegations sent to participate in the deliberations of various United Nations bodies. Among these delegations, annual delegations sent for

23 Report of the Pilkai Committee, n. 8, p. 50.
24 Brecher, n. 5, p. 119.
the regular sessions of the General Assembly are particularly important, for they are composed of not only ministers and senior officials, but also non-officials belonging to various walks of public life.

Delegations to the General Assembly

As is the practice with any Member State, India sends every year delegations to the regular sessions of the General Assembly (also to its special sessions and other United Nations bodies too, as and when required). Each delegation consists of representatives, alternate representatives and a number of advisers. The delegations are normally headed by the Minister for External Affairs or Minister of State for External Affairs; in their absence, the Permanent Representative heads them. The officials of the Permanent Mission and the Ministry of External Affairs form the nucleus as well as the bulk of these delegations. The non-officials are drawn from various walks of public life, viz., legislators, academicians, lawyers, journalists, non-governmental organizations, etc.

---

25 Non-official individuals are nominated as India's representatives to such bodies as the Commission on Human Rights, Commission for Social Development, etc. They are assisted by the officials of the Permanent Mission. Most of the subsidiary bodies of the UN are, however, looked after by the Mission's officials.
The data contained in Appendix III gives interesting information on the patterns of composition of the delegations sent, over the years, to the General Assembly sessions. The total strength of the delegations ranged from nine (for the second part of the Third Session) to forty-one (for the Twelfth Session).²⁵ In all the delegations, a substantial section of the non-official delegates were drawn from Members of Parliament. Most of them belonged to the ruling party, but occasionally some members belonging to the opposition were also sent.²⁷ On the other hand, professionals, like lawyers, jurists, academicians, journalists, etc. were given irregular representation.²³

²⁵ It has to be noted that the bulk of the delegation's strength were the officials. Their strength ranged from a minimum of six to a maximum of thirty-five in respect of the delegations sent to the second part of the Third Session and the Twelfth Session respectively.

²⁷ In recent years, for instance, A.C. George (1977) and V.B. Raju (1978), who belonged to the opposition in Parliament, were included in the delegations.

²³ It may be noted that the profession-wise break-up of delegates is neither suggestive nor conclusive in regard to what professions need be represented. Indeed "professional" status of a delegate has little or nothing to do with one's nomination. Political considerations generally govern the choice of non-official personalities as members of these delegations. This observation is applicable to various journalists, lawyers, academicians, and persons associated with all other professions.
The delegates participate in the political process of the United Nations on the basis of instructions given by the Ministry. The nature and the extent of instructions given to delegates depend, to a very large extent, on the political and personal equation the delegates have with the Prime Minister or the Minister for External Affairs. For instance, Krishna Menon received no instructions, as he had the confidence of the Government. Elaborating on his experiences, Menon told:

In the absence of a particular instruction I voted according to my discretion....When I wanted instructions I sent a telegram to the Prime Minister setting out the case suggesting how and what should be done; in fact more or less informing him what our instructions should be. He [Nehru] would usually send a telegram back and say, "I generally agree with your analysis. You must use your discretion." 29

Other heads of Indian delegations could not fit in Krishna Menon's shoes. The exercise of their discretion in a given situation or adherence to instructions or seeking of fresh instructions largely depended on the situation involved and the personal equation which the leader of the delegation had with the Prime Minister or the Minister for External Affairs.

---

29 Brecher, n. 5, p. 95. Menon further revealed that other delegates at the United Nations knew about it. He added, "Sometimes, to gain time, I would say, 'I want time for instructions', which I was entitled to say. And they often laughed."
In the context of the diplomacy conducted in the United Nations, it is obvious that the most important function of a delegation/mission is to win friends and influence other delegations. This calls for intensive interactions with all delegations as also active role in the caucusing groups, formal debates and discussions. Accordingly, the delegates keep in close touch with various levels of representatives of other countries. It is also important that each delegation should be easily accessible to all other delegations, both big and small. A former Indian Permanent Representative makes the following observation in the context:

An impatient and only moderately intelligent negotiator whose timing is poor and who will be sitting at home or playing golf when the sequence of developments requires that he should be visiting the opposite numbers or refining his draft proposals, or doing both, will not help the cause of the negotiation. 30

The Permanent representative and his deputy are generally concerned with the overall activity, while other officials' contacts are focussed mostly on their counterpart in other Missions as also with the officials concerned in the Secretariat.

30 Arthur Lall, Modern International Negotiation: Principles and Practice (New York, 1955), p. 358. The author, else reveals that he used to meet at least thirty delegations/missions a day for discussion on various matters.
Co-ordination is one of the useful means through which the effectiveness of delegations in the diplomatic milieu at the United Nations can be improved. During the General Assembly sessions, the Indian Mission (like the Missions of all major countries) follows the practice of holding meetings of the delegations every day, generally in the morning. During the day's proceedings, the Permanent Representative and the Deputy Permanent Representative keep track of the developments through the Mission's personnel, assigned to look after the work of various committees.

Interaction between the Ministry and the Mission is also an important aspect. The Indian Permanent Mission has instant communication facility, and telex messages are exchanged every day with New Delhi. The Mission feeds the Ministry with the necessary information and suggests various options open and seeks instructions. There may be, however, occasions which leave little time for seeking instructions. On such occasions, the officials in the Mission act or react keeping in view the broader framework of India's policy. In some cases, where vote on a particular question involves vital implications, the Permanent Mission would not like to act independently and, therefore, would seek definite instructions from the Ministry. How effectively this process works is difficult to analyse.

It should be noted, in sum, that the composition of the delegations and their working methods did not conform
strictly to any procedures and practices. Flexibility has been a major characteristic all through the years.

Changing Patterns of India's Participation in the UN

What has been attempted in the preceding pages is an outline of the mechanism of India's representation and participation in the United Nations. Before examining in some details the three specific questions—which came up before the United Nations during 1970s—it will be pertinent here to survey the evolution of India's policy at the United Nations and the changing international scenario from the late 1940s to the period relevant to the three case studies.

India's foreign policy and its conduct at the United Nations was guided, during the first seventeen years after the Independence, by Jawaharlal Nehru, its Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs. There were others, like Krishna Menon, who played a major role; it is, however, undeniable that all of them took guidance from Nehru and in matters where discretion was left with others, Nehru exercised overall supervision. Every aspect of policy had the imprint of Nehru's personality and
Beginning 1950s India, a newly independent State, loomed large on the international scenario. Representing the aspirations of the peoples who were still under the colonial rule and adhering to an independent policy of not aligning with any military alliance system, India was soon at the centre of the international efforts at the United Nations to strengthen the area of peace. India's role in the Korean crisis, the developments leading to the Geneva accord on Indo-China, the Suez crisis and the establishment of the United Nations Emergency Forces, and the conflict situations in Lebanon (1958) and the Congo bears the point.  

31 K. P. S. Menez in his autobiography Many Worlds (London, 1965) says that India's foreign policy had to necessarily rest on the "intuition" of one man, Jawaharlal Nehru, who was Foreign Minister and Prime Minister. However, the author notes that Nehru's intuition was fortunately combined with his knowledge and wisdom. pp. 271-2.

It should be noted here that India's active role was largely the result of a fortuitous concatenation of circumstances and the then prevailing international situation. As a leading non-aligned nation, India could play a mediating role during the cold war period. India's views and statements were given more consideration by the two sides as they reflected the concern and the policies of the newly emerging nations of Africa and Asia in the United Nations. Its views were also treated as an indicator as to which of the great Powers was gaining support in the United Nations. This was also the time when Indian representation included, besides Krishna Menon, some able diplomats who had acquired good understanding of the political processes and procedures and could make effective use of them in the United Nations. Thus, assisted by various factors, India could play a larger role than its economic and military potential warranted.

However, the international scenario started changing significantly in the 1960s, which in turn brought about noticeable shifts in India's image and policy in the United Nations. With the increase in membership which resulted in a phenomenal expansion of the Organization in the 1960s—in 1960 alone, as many as eighteen newly independent

---

African States were admitted—the situation has dramatically changed. New Members wanted to play a leading role and understandably India took a back seat. Again, in view of the decline of bipolarity and the cold war, and the emergence of new centres of power—especially in Western Europe—there was less scope for a middle man’s role which India could play in the 1950s.

The developments leading to the Sino-Indian war in 1962 and what followed had a great impact on India’s policy as well as its image. India realised that ideals and principles were good, but they had their limitations. Hence, India was forced to pay more attention to defend its territorial integrity, and to seek appropriate means for the same. The growing Sino-Soviet rift, the beginning of the Super Power detente, and, nearer home, the closer linkages between Peking and Islamabad were some of the developments that added new dimensions to international politics of 1960s and the 1970s. Perhaps, India learned the hard way to determine priorities in its foreign policy objectives, and to acquire the means to achieve them, keeping its practical experiences spread over more than two decades in view. India, therefore, could approach various international issues in a more realistic manner.
than the case was when it emerged as a newly independent nation.

Bearing in mind the above analysis, an attempt is made in the following chapters to examine, in some details, India's interactions in relation to three select questions that were discussed in the United Nations bodies during 1970s.