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The United Nations Organization

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS A

NOBLE DOCUMENT

We have associated ourselves with the United Nations. This association does not deprive us of our independence. Of course, it limits our freedom in the sense in which it limits the freedom of every member country. That some limit should be placed on your field of action is the natural consequence of joining an organization of that nature. Our membership of the United Nations is a far greater limitation than our association with the Commonwealth of Nations. In fact, the latter is almost airy association, because it is not written down on paper or in any constitution or anywhere else; so long as we wish to be there, we can remain there.

To come back to the United Nations, we associated ourselves with the United Nations because we felt that some such world organization was very essential. The League of Nations had failed. The UNO seemed to be a similar attempt under wider and perhaps better auspices and so we joined it. I shall think that the Charter of the United Nations is a very fine and noble document

*Speeches* (1949-53), pp.22-3: from speech in

Parliament, New Delhi, June 12, 1952
THE UNITED NATIONS SERVES AN 

ESSENTIAL PURPOSE

In spite of its faults, the United Nations serves an essential purpose. If it did not exist today, undoubtedly, all the countries would come together to build up something like it again. I do not want that to happen. I attach the greatest importance to the United Nations but I must repeat that the United Nations has swerved from its original moorings and gradually become a protector of colonialism in an indirect way. This is a dangerous deviation. Instead of looking upon it as a great organization for peace, some of its members have gradually begun to think of it as an organization through which war can be waged.


FAITH IN UNO TO SOLVE WORLD PROBLEMS

I have no doubt that this Assembly is going to solve our problems.....We do not think that the problems of the world or of India can be solved by thinking in terms of aggression or war or violence. We are frail mortals and we cannot always live up to the teaching of the great man who led our nation to freedom. But that lesson has sunk deep into our souls and, so long as we remember it, I am sure we shall be on the right path. And if I may venture to suggest this to the General Assembly, I think that if the essentials of that lesson are kept in mind, perhaps our approach to the problems of today will be different; perhaps the conflicts that always hang over us will appear a little less deep than they are and actually will gradually fade away...
No one can be optimistic enough to think that all problems will fade away simply if we feel good; that is not what I mean to say. The problems are difficult and intricate and they will take a lot of solving. But I do feel that our approach to those problems should not be the approach of anger and passion and fear. Then, perhaps, the problems will gradually appear in a different light. Perhaps, we shall understand the other side better; perhaps, the fear of one another will grow less in our minds, and then a solution may come.


THE UNITED NATIONS THE BASIS OF A

WORLD GOVERNMENT

This United Nations, inspite of its failings and weaknesses, is something that is good. It should be encouraged and supported in every way, and should be allowed to develop into some kind of world government or world order.

*Independence and After*, p.214: from speech In Constituent Assembly, New Delhi, March 8, 1948.

THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

This great organization built for peace is itself engaged in sponsoring war today. I am not blaming anybody but only trying to analyse the situation as objectively as I can. Is it possible that the world has not grown up and is incapable of having an international organization for peace? I do not know.
People talk about a united world; many wise, intelligent and ardent people advocate the ideal of world federalism but we again and again prove ourselves unable to give effect to it. Is it possible for countries entirely different from one another in their political, economic and other policies to co-operate or must they remain apart? There was a time, centuries ago, when it did not much matter whether they did or not because there was no natural contact. Today, there is continuous contact, which can be friendly or hostile. I find myself wondering again and again whether an international organization, containing within its core countries with entirely different aims, can exist. I feel sure it can and, what is more see non reason why it should not function efficiently. After all when the United Nations was started countries like the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. did co-operate and come together before they drifted appear. For my part, I do not see why they should not be able to function together in an organization, provided, of course, they did not interfere with one another and so long as each was free to carry on the policy it chose for itself.

*Speeches* (1949-53), pp.246-7: from speech in Parliament, New Delhi, February 18, 1953, Delhi,

**INDIA CONTINUES IN THE UNO DESPITE DISAPPOINTMENTS**

We respect the United Nations and are all for a world organization dealing with such matters. It is right that we should remain a member of the United Nations, even though things do not always happen according to our wishes. We have
made it perfectly clear that we are not willing to jeopardize the interests of the people of Kashmir or those of our own people. Nobody will be allowed to impose anything dishonourable upon us. We have decided to await the verdict of the Security Council, however long it may be in coming. The way of peace is always the better and, in the longer. The way of peace is always the better and, in the longer run, the shorter way. The way of war is no way at all, for it solves nothing.


GREATER CONSERVATISM APPARENT IN

THE UNO

As the war has developed and the danger of a possible victory of the Fascist Powers has receded, has been a progressive hardening and a greater conservatism in the leaders of the United Nations. The Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter, vague as they were and limited in scope, have faded into the background, and the future has been envisaged more and more as a retention of the past. The struggle force, and has ceased to be an attack on the philosophy of the Nazis and the Fascists.

_The Discovery of India, p.655._
DISAPPEARANCE OF UNO A WORLD TRAGEDY

I have ventured, in all humility, sometimes to criticize those developments at the United Nations which seemed to me to be out of keeping with its Charter and its past record and professions. Nevertheless, I have believed and I do believe that the United Nations, inspite of its many faults, inspite of its having deviated from its aims somewhat, is, nevertheless, a basic and fundamental thing in the structure of the world today. Not to have it or to do away with it would be a tragedy for the world. Therefore, I do not wish this country of ours to do anything which weakens the gradual development of some kind of a world structure. It may be that the real world structure will not come in our lifetime but unless that world structure comes, there is not hope for this world, because the only alternative is world conflict on a prodigious and tremendous scale. Therefore, it would wrong for us to do anything that weakens the beginnings of a world structure, even though we may disagree with this particular organization and even though we may sometimes criticize it, as we have done.


WITHDRAWAL FROM THE UNO

Some Honourable Members have suggested, in a fit of frustration, that we should withdraw from the United Nations. That, if I may say so, with all respect, is immaturity. One cannot run away like this from a problem. The United Nations, inspite of all its failings—and there are many—is a great world
organization. It does contain within it the seeds of hope and peace, and it would be rather perverse for any country to try to destroy this structure because it is not to its entire liking. If a country does that, I have no doubt that it is that country which will suffer more than the organization. We cannot remain isolated in the world, cut off from everything and living a life of our own in our limited sphere. Most of us in India are so situated as to be normally isolated in our minds, in our social habits like eating, drinking and marrying. We isolate habits like eating, drinking and marrying. We isolate ourselves in castes, with the result that it is a unique Indian habit which does not prevail anywhere else in the world. We live in compartments, and therefore, perhaps, we easily think in terms of isolation as a country too. But the fact is that isolation in the past has weakened us very greatly and left us rather in the lurch when the world had advanced in terms of science or other developments. We cannot isolated, in fact, no country can be. Therefore, to talk of getting out of the United Nations or of otherwise keeping apart from all these problems is not to take cognizance of the realities of the situation.

*Speeches (1953-57)*, pp. 243-4 from speech in
Parliament, New Delhi, September 17, 1953.

Man does not live by politics alone, nor, indeed, wholly by economics. And so UNESCO came into being to represent something that was vital to human existence and progress. Even as the United Nations General Assembly represented the political will of the world community, UNESCO tried to represent the finer and the deeper sides of human life, and, indeed, might be said to represent the conscience of the world community...
I have called this great assembly the conscience of the world community. The problems we have to face, many complicated as they are, will never be solved except on the basis of good morals conscience. It is for this reason that I beg of you, distinguished delegates from the nations of the world, to pay heed to this collapse of conscience and good morals that we see around us, for unless we do so our fine ideals and the good work you have done will be shattered into nothingness.

May I also point out to you that a world organization like this cannot be properly constituted or function adequately if a large section of the world remains unrepresented here? I hope that three countries which have recently attained their independence—the Sudan, Tunisia and Morocco—will find a place soon in this organization to share the burdens and responsibilities of its labours. But I would specially refer to the People's Government of China and the six hundred million people who live in that great country who have so far not been represented here...

Our country is the large one and our population is considerable. But we have no desire to interfere with any country. We have no hatreds and we have been nurtured under the inspiring guidance of our great leaders, Mahatma Gandhi, in the ways of peace. We want to be friends with all the world. We know our failing and seek to overcome them, so that we might be of service to our own people and to the world.

_Speeches_ (1953-57), pp. 500, 503: from speech at the inauguration of the Tenth Annual Session of UNESCO, New Delhi, November 5, 1956.
THE UNO A POWER FOR PEACE

I have no doubt that the United Nations Organization – with all its weakness in enforcing decision- has been a power for peace in the world; and it may grow that way, That depends really on widespread public opinion.

Conversation with Mr. Nehru, p.87

INDIA NOT AFRAID OF THE FUTURE

I am not afraid of the future, I have no fear in my mind, and I have no fear, even though India, from a military point of view, is of no great consequence. I am not afraid of the bigness of great powers, and their armies, their fleets and their atom bombs. That is the lesson which my Master taught me. We stood as an unarmed people against a great country and a powerful empire. We were supported and strengthened, because throughout all this period we decided not to submit to evil, and I think that is the lesson which I have before me and which is before us today. I do not know if it is possible to apply this to the problems which face the world today. It is a terrible problem, but I think if we banish fear, if we have confidence, even though we may take risks of trust rather than risk violent language, violent actions and in the end war, I think those risk are worth taking.

APARtheid AND THE UNO

Apartheid is opposed to the whole spirit of modern thought, opposed to the U.N. Charter and contrary to the United Nations. The effect of racial relations is obviously a problem that fills people’s minds in the Commonwealth Conference and outside. Apart from the morality of it, it is a danger to world peace; also from that point of view it has to be considered.

The Hindu, May 3, 1960: from press interview to world

Correspondents at India House, London, during the

Commonwealth Premiers’ Conference.

The Role of the United Nations

I am grateful for the opportunity that has been given to me to address this great Assembly. I feel little embarrassed and a little overwhelmed by this occasion because this Assembly represents the world community, and, whether we who are present here are big men and women or small, we represent a mighty cause, and something of the greatness of that cause falls upon us too and makes us, for the moment, greater perhaps that we are.

Therefore, in venturing to address this Assembly, I feel embarrassed. You have been dealing with intricate and difficult problems, and I do not, and I would not, venture on this occasion to say anything about those problems that confront you. You carry the burdens and the sorrows of the world. But I have often wondered whether, in dealing with those problems, the approach that is normally made to them is a right one or not. The Charter of the United Nations, in noble language, has laid down the principles and the purposes of
this great organization. I do not think it would be possible to upon that language. The objective are clear; your aims is clear: and yet, in looking at that aim, we loose ourselves often, if I am venture to say so, in small matters and forget main objective that we are looking at. Sometimes it seems that the objective itself gets a little clouded and lesser objectives are before us.

I come from a country which, after a long struggle, though that struggle was a peaceful struggle, attained her freedom and her independence. In these long years of struggle we were taught by our great leader never to forget not only the objectives we had but also the methods whereby we should achieve those objectives. Always he laid stress on this, that it was not good enough to have good objective, that it was equally important that the means of attaining those objectives were good: means were always as important as ends. You will permit me to repeat this hear, because I am convinced that, however good the ends, the larger ends of the United Nation, or the lesser objectives which we may from time to time have before us, either as individual nations or as groups of nations, it is important that we should remember that the best of objectives may not be reached if our eyes are blood-shot and our minds clouded with passion.

Therefore, it becomes essential for us, for a while, to think more of how we are doing things than what we are aiming at, even though we should never forget what we are aiming at. It becomes necessary for us always to remember the principles and the purposes for which this great assembly was formed.

Now, a mere repetition of those principles and purposes would perhaps indicate to us how sometimes, with passion and prejudice, swerve always from
that path. This assembly took shape after mighty Wars and as a consequence of those wars. In the Preamble of your Charter you recount these. What has been the lessons of those Wars? Surely the lesson of those Wars has been that out of hatred and violence you will not build peace. It is a contradiction in terms. The lesson of history, the long course of history, and more specially the lesson of the last two great Wars which have devastated humanity, has been that out of hatred and violence only hatred and violence will come. We have got into a cycle of hatred and violence, and not be the most brilliant debate will get you out of it, unless you look some other way and find some other means. It is obvious that if you continue in this cycle and have wars which this Assembly was specially meant to avoid and prevent, the result will not only be tremendous devastation all over the world but the non achievement by any individual power or group of its objective.

How, then, are we to proceed? It may be that it is difficult to get and prejudice and out of her minds. Nevertheless, unless we try to proceed this way, to cast out this fear, we shall never succeed. Of that I am quite convinced.

You meet here representatives of all the nations of the world, or nearly all. Inevitably, you have before you the immediate great problems that confront more specially Europe, which has suffered so much.

May I say, as a representative from Asia that we honour Europe for its culture and for the great advance in human civilization which it represents. May I say that we are equally interested in the solution of European problems: but may I also say that the world is something bigger than Europe, and you will not solve your problems by thinking that the problems of the world are mainly
European problem. There are vast tracks of the world which may not in the past, for a few generations, have taken much part in world affairs. But they are awake; their people are moving, and they have no intention whatever of being ignored or of being passed by.

It is a simple fact that I think we have to remember, because unless you have the full picture of the world before you, you will not even understand the problem, and if you isolate any single problem in the world from the rest you do not understand the world problem. Today, I do venture to submit that Asia counts in world affairs. Tomorrow it will count much more than today. Asia till recently, was largely a prey to imperial domination and colonialism: a great part of it is free today; part of it still remains unfree: and it is an astonishing thing that any country should venture to hold and to said for this doctrine of colonialism, whether it is under direct rule or whether it is indirectly maintain in some form or other. After all that has happened, there is going to be no mere objection to that, but active objection, an active struggle against any and every form of colonialism in any part of the world. That is the first thing to remember.

We in Asia, who have ourselves suffered all these evils of colonialism and of imperial domination, have committed ourselves inevitably to the freedom of every other colonial country. There are neighbouring countries of ours in Asia with whom we are intimately allied. We look to them with sympathy; we look at their struggle with sympathy. Any power, great or small, which in that way prevents the attainment of the freedom of those peoples does an ill turn to world peace. Great countries like India, who have passed out of that colonial stage do not conceive it possible that other countries should
remain under the yoke of colonial rule. We in Asia regard it as a vital problem, because it has been a vital problem for us.

There is another question to which I want to draw attention --that is the question of racial equality, which is something which is laid down in the provisions of the United Nations Charter. It is well to repeat that, because after all this question of racial equality has frequently been spoken about in the Assembly of the United Nations.

I do not think I need dwell on any particular aspect of that question, but I would remind this Assembly of the world-wide aspects of this question. Obviously there are large regions of the world which have suffered from this racial inequality. We also feel that there is not part of the world where it can be tolerated in the future, except perhaps because of a superior force. If racial inequality is practiced, if it is a menace to world peace and if it violates the principles of United Nations Charter, to tolerate it is obviously to sow seeds of conflicts.

The effects of this inequality in the past have made themselves felt in Asia, Africa and other parts of the world much more than in Europe, leading towards conflicts in the future, because it is a problem which if it is not properly understood will not be solved.

It is a strange thing, when the world lacks so many things, food and other necessities, in many parts of the world and people are dying from hunger that the attention of this Assembly of Nations is concentrated on a number of political problems. There are economic problems also. I wonder if it would be possible for this Assembly for a while to take a holiday from some of the acute
political problems which face it, and allow men’s minds to settle down and look at the vital and urgent economic problem, and look at places in the world where food is lacking.

I feel that today the world is so tied up in fears, apprehensions, some of them justified not doubt, but where a person feels fear, evil consequences follow. Fear is not a good companion. It is surprising to see that this sense of fear is pervading great countries – fear, and grave fear of war, and fear of many things. Well, I think that is admitted, or it will be admitted, that no aggression of any kind can be tolerated, because the very idea of aggression must upset the balance and lead to conflict. Aggression of every type must be resisted.

There are other forms of fear; there is the fear of war. In existing circumstances it is difficult for people to say that they will not defend themselves, because if there is a fear of aggression one has to defend one’s self against aggression. We have to defend ourselves, but even in defending ourselves, we must not submit ourselves to this Assembly without clean hands. It is easy to condemn people. Let us not do so, for who is without blame, who cannot themselves be condemned? In a sense, of us all who are gathered here today in this continent of Europe– are there any amongst us who have not been guilty in many ways? We are guilty men and women. While we are seeking points where error occurs, we should not forget that there are none of us who is exempt from blame.

If we proceed to this problem, and discuss in peace the psychology of fear, if we realize the consequences of what is happening, it is possible that this atmosphere of fear may be dissipated. Why should there be this fear of war?
Let us prepare ourselves against any possible aggression, let no one think that any nation, any community can misbehave. The United Nations is here to prevent any fear or hurt; but at the same time let us banish all thought of an aggressive attitude whether by word or deed. However, I feel that few of us can altogether avoid this attitude, whether it is in the course of discussions before this Assembly or elsewhere. One tries to make one’s points by this sort of language. It is always easy to make one’s points in the course of a discussion but there always rests a bitterness which complicates the problem still further. As I have already said, I ask this Assembly to remember that such great problems cannot be solved if our eyes are blood-shot and our minds are obscured by passion.

I have no doubt that this Assembly is going to solve our problems. I am not afraid of the future. I have no fear in my mind, and I have no fear, even though India, from a military point of view, is of no great consequence. Still I am not afraid of the bigness of the great powers, and their armies, their fleets and their atom bombs. That is the lesson which my Master taught me. We stood as an unarmed people against a great country and powerful empire. We were supported and strengthened because throughout all this period we decided not to submit to evil, and I think is the lesson which I have before me and which is before us today. I do not know if it is possible to apply this to the problems which face the world today. It is terrible problem, but I think if we banish this fear, if we have confidence, even though we may take risks of trust rather than to risk violent language, violent actions and in the end war, I think those risks are worth taking.
In any event, there are risks- and great risks. If it is a question of taking risks, why take risks which inevitably lead to greater conflict? Take the other risks, while always preparing yourself to meet any possible contingency that may arise.

It is perhaps not very proper for me to address this great Assembly in such matters, because I have not been associated with it or with all these different problems in any intimate degree. However, there would have been no point in my addressing you merely to repeat certain pious phrases. I feel strongly about this matter, and that is why I should like to present the views and wishes of the Indian people. And the Indian people happen to be three hundred and thirty millions in number; it is well to remember that. We have had a year of freedom and a year of difficulty. We have overcome many of those difficulties and we shall overcome the others. We propose to go ahead at a rapid pace. We propose to build and construct and be a power for peace and for the good of the world. We propose to meet every aggression, from whatever quarter it comes, in every possible way open to us.

However, we do not think that the problems of the world or of India can be solved by thinking in terms of aggression or war or violence. We are frail mortals, and we cannot always live up to the teaching of the great man who led our nation to freedom. But that lesson has sunk deep into our souls and, so long as we remember it, I am sure we shall be on the right path. And, if I may venture to suggest this to the General Assembly, I think that if the essentials of that lesson- which is not alone a lesson of today, but the lesson of history- are kept in mind, perhaps our approach to the problems of today will be different;
perhaps the conflicts that always hang over us will appear a little less deep than they are and actually will gradually fade away.

I should like to state to this General Assembly, on behalf of my people and my Government, that we adhere completely and absolutely to the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and that we shall try, to the best of our ability, to work for the realization of those principles and purposes.

In conclusion, may I congratulate the General Assembly on the Resolution, introduced by the delegation of Mexico, which it has just passed. It is certainly a great Resolution. If the General Assembly follows up that Resolution, it will go a long way on the road toward peace and the solution of the problems that are before us. We may not solve those problems. No one can be optimistic enough to think that all the problems will fade away simply if we feel good; that is not what I mean to say. The problems are difficult and they will take a lot of solving. But I do feel that passion and fear. Then, perhaps, the problems will gradually appear in a different light. Perhaps we shall understand the other side better; perhaps the fear of one another will grow less in our minds, and then a solution may come. At any rate, even if a solution does not come, this pall of fear that surrounds us will grow less, and that in itself will be a partial solution of the world problem.

I wish to thank the President for this opportunity that he has given me to speak to the General Assembly.
Membership of the Security Council

As regards India's standing for the Security Council, I think that we should give up that idea completely for the present. It is clear that neither the US nor the UK will support us. Apart from that, I feel it is not consonant with our dignity to go about asking for support. If India is important, as she progressively is, others will have to take the initiative in this matter.

Apart from this, the membership of the political conference is more important a thing now than the Security Council.

Presidentship of the General Assembly

You will remember our getting a letter from the Thai Embassy asking for our support for their candidate for the Presidency of the UN Assembly. Please send an answer to them telling them frankly that we regret we cannot give this support as we intend having our own candidate.

I have sent you a separate brief note about informing Rajeshwar Dayal and others about the clear indication we have got of American support in this matter. You should send a special telegram to our High Commissioner in London asking him to inform the UK Government of this. In view of this we have definitely decided to permit our candidate to stand and we hope that the UK Government will in these circumstances also support our candidate.
APPENDIX B

The Palestine Issue

The Hon’ble Member of External Affairs said that he had only one point to add to the summary. Yesterday he had received a telegram from our Ambassador in Washington to the effect that the delegates from the Arab countries were likely to insist on an immediate decision of the Palestine issue and to oppose the appointment of a fact-finding committee. To provide for that eventuality he suggested the deletion of the word ‘strongly’ from the last sentence of the draft telegram which it was proposed to send to our Ambassador, and the addition of another sentence at the end of the telegram as follows: - “if, however, as you report in your telegram No. 342 dated 20.4.47 the Arab countries press for an immediate consideration of the substantive issues you should not oppose this”.

Recognition of Israel

The Egyptian Ambassador came to see me this morning. He conveyed to me the gratitude of his Government for the attitude that the Government of India had taken up in regard to the recognition of Israel. He said that when the Palestine issue was being considered by the United Nations and negotiations for truce were going on, any recognition was untimely to say the least of it. The recognition by a number of countries of Israel at this stage was obviously aimed at exercising some pressure in a certain direction and might almost be considered an unfriendly act.

He seemed to imply that the position would be different after the present negotiations are over or after the Security Council has come to a decision.
He then informed me that he had a long talk with the Dutch Ambassador about Indonesia and had impressed upon him the moderation of our attitude in regard to Indonesia and the desirability of the Dutch Government falling in line with it.

Korea Resolution

Thank you for your message about Korea Resolution in General Assembly. I have given much thought to this matter and am anxious that Resolution should be as uncontroversial as possible. But I feel that an indication giving a positive approach to the problem without any commitments is desirable. I realise that Geneva Conference on Korea was a failure and there need not be a going back to it. But some kind of a hint of continuation would probably be helpful. However, since you are unwilling to mention three Geneva Presidents, I would be agreeable to leaving out this part. I would suggest, however, that operative part (b) of your Resolution might be omitted. It appears totally unnecessary and would raise needless controversial debate. There are some other minor suggestions also which I have conveyed to Krishna Menon.

There need to no reference in Resolution to the report of Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. Some minor matters which are still pending with us might be mentioned in course of debate. But I hope this subject will not be closed. Necessity might arise later for it to be referred to.

I would welcome some Resolution on agreed basis, but if United States puts forward some other Resolution with which we are unable to agree, then it
might be desirable for us to express our viewpoint clearly about positive approach to Korean question.

Statement by the Government of India, 29th June, 1950

The Government of India have viewed with grave concern the developments in Korea involving as they do not evil war but also a threat to world peace. There have been a number of border incidents between North and South Korea in the past, but whatever the nature of these might have been it appears clear from the informations available to the Government of India that a large scale invasion of South Korea took place by armed forces of the North Korea Government. This information was supplied by a variety of sources, the most authoritative among them being the United Nations Commission on Korea on which India is represented, and which at the time of the invasion was in Seoul. In view of this information the Government of India’s Permanent Delegate to the United Nations and Representative on the Security Council, Sir B.N. Rau, supported the first Resolution of the Security Council which declared that such aggression had taken place and called for a ceasefire and withdrawal of the North Korean forces to the 38th parallel. This direction of the Security Council was not acted upon by the North Korean Government and their forces, and the invasion continued till it threatened the capital city Seoul itself. The Security Council met again to consider this rapidly changing situation and passed the second Resolution on Korea on the night of 27th June (New York Times). The Government of India’s representative in the Security Council was unable to participate in the voting on this second Resolution on Korea because he could not communicate it in time to his Government and obtain their instruction. The operative part of this Resolution recommends that
the Members of the United Nations furnish such assistance to the Republic of Korea as may be necessary to repel the armed attack and to restore international peace and security in the area. The Government of India have given the most careful consideration to this Resolution of the Security Council in the context of the events in Korea and also of their general foreign policy. They are opposed to any attempt to settle international disputes by resort to aggression. For this reason Sir B.N. Rau, on behalf of the Government of India, voted in favour of the first Resolution of the Security Council. The halting of aggression and the quick restoration of peaceful conditions are essential preludes to a satisfactory settlement. The Government of India, therefore, also accept the second Resolution of the Security Council. This decision of the Government of India does not, however, involved any modification of their foreign policy. This policy is based on the promotion of world peace and the development of friendly relations with all countries, it remains an independent policy which will continue to be determined solely by India’s ideals and objectives. The Government of India earnestly hope then even at this stage it may be possible to put an end to the fighting and to settle the dispute by mediation.

Prime Minister Nehru’s Message of July 13, 1950, to
Secretary Acheson

In interviews which your Ambassador has had with officials of the Ministry of External Affairs, we have explained India’s position in the Korean dispute.
India’s purpose is to localize the conflict and to facilitate an early peaceful settlement by breaking the present deadlock in the Security Council so that representatives of the People’s Government of China can take a seat in the Council, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics can return to it, and, whether within or through informal contacts outside the Council, the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and China, with help and cooperation of other peace-loving nations, can find a basis for terminating the conflict and for a permanent solution of the Korean problem.

In full confidence of Your Excellency’s determination to maintain peace and thus to preserve the solidarity of the United Nations, I venture to address this personal appeal to you to exert your great authority and influence in the achievement of this common purpose on which the well being of mankind depends.

INDO-CHINA

Appeal for Ceasefire

Now, I just mentioned that in Korea, whatever difficulties there might remain, the fact that war has stopped. It is a very big thing. Unfortunately, in Indo-China war has not stopped and is being continued in a very terrible way. It is six years now since this Indo-China war began and for the present I do not propose to say anything more about it, because of this that anyhow all of us here – and many others, I have no doubt – would obviously welcome some kind of ending of this actual war, but more especially when it has been proposed to discuss this matter two months hence by the great powers concerned. It seems a tremendous pity that this war should continue when a
serious attempt is going to be made to find a way out. Now, it is not for me to suggest anything, and certainly it is with no desire to intervene in any way or intrude or involve ourselves or anything like that, but I do venture to suggest to all the parties and the powers concerned that in view of the fact that this matter of Indo-China is going to be discussed at the Geneva Conference two months later, it might be desirable – it is desirable, I think – to have some kind of ceasefire without any party giving up its own position, whatever they might consider their right etc., because, once one starts arguing about rights, then there will be no end to that argument. So, I would make this very earnest appeal in all humility – and I am sure this House will join with me – to the powers to strive to have a ceasefire there. Then they can discuss it in their own way. I repeat that so far as we are concerned, we have no desire to interfere or to shoulder any burden or responsibility in this connection.

Relations with South Africa

No reference is made in this Aide Memoire on racial discrimination. I think a paragraph should be added. This would be the penultimate paragraph. This might run thus:-

The Government of the UK are aware of the deep feeling in India in regard to racial discrimination. The laws passed by the Government of the Union of South Africa and the general practice of that Government in regard to racial discrimination have led to strained relations between South Africa and India. Not only the people of India but the people of Asia generally as well as of Africa have resented this treatment of the non-white peoples in South Africa and this question has been raised repeatedly before the United
Nations Assembly. That Assembly has expressed its displeasure at the attitude of the Government of the South African Union. This has had no effect on the policies of the Union Government, which has defied or ignored the decisions of the UN Assembly. In a lesser degree, racial discrimination exists in other parts of Africa and is the cause of increasing bitterness. The Government of the United Kingdom will appreciate that people who are subjected or who may be subjected to this insulting and humiliating treatment can never accept it willingly. It can, therefore, only result in continuing conflict and increasing bitterness. For people in Asia and Africa, this question of racial discrimination is of vital importance.

I have read this Aide Memoire and have suggested above an additional paragraph.

I agree with Secretary General that this should only be given to the High Commissioner of the UK in Delhi. Copies of it should be sent to our High Commissioner in London, Shri K.M. Panikkar, and Shri Apa Pant and some of our other important Missions.