APPENDIX I

THE INDIAN STATES IN NEW INDIA

1. General Policy

The position of the Indian States in Independent India was foreshadowed by the Cabinet Mission, which used the following words in its statement of 16th May, 1946: “It is quite clear that with the attainment of independence by British India, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth, the relationship which has hitherto existed between the Rulers of the States and the British Crown, will no longer be possible. Paramountcy can neither be retained by the British Crown nor transferred to the new Government. . . . At the same time the States are ready and willing to co-operate in the new development of India. The precise form which their co-operation will take must be a matter for negotiations during the building-up of the new constitutional structure, and it by no means follows that it will be identical for all the States.” The Cabinet Mission recommended that: “(1) There should be a Union of India, embracing both British India and the States, which should deal with the following subjects: Foreign Affairs, Defence, and Communications; and should have the powers necessary to raise the finances required for the above subjects. (2) The States should retain all subjects and powers other than those ceded to the Union.”

The position was further elucidated as follows by the Cabinet Mission in its Memorandum on States’ Treaties and Paramountcy presented to the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes on 22nd May, 1946: “When a new fully self-governing or independent Government or Governments come into being...His Majesty's Government will cease to exercise the powers of Paramountcy. This means that the rights of the States which flow from their relationship to the Crown will no longer exist and that all the rights surrendered by States to the Paramount power will return to the States. Political arrangements between the States on the one side and the British Crown and British India on the other hand, will thus be brought to an end. The void will have to be filled either by the States entering into a federal relationship with the successor Government or Governments in British India, or failing this, entering into particular political arrangements with it or them.”

The Rulers of the States agreed to accept the Cabinet Mission's plan.
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Their viewpoint was shown as follows in a resolution passed by the Standing Committee of the Chamber of Princes on 29th January, 1947: “(1) The entry of the States into the Union shall be on no other basis than that of negotiation, and the final decision will rest with each State...which can only be taken after consideration of the complete picture of the constitution. (2) All the rights surrendered by the States to the Paramount power will return to the States. The proposed Union of India will, therefore, exercise only such functions in relation to the States in regard to Union Subjects as are assigned or delegated by them to the Union. Every State shall continue to retain its sovereignty and all rights and powers except those that have been expressly delegated by it. There can be no question of any powers being vested or inherent or implied in the Union in respect of the States unless specifically agreed to by them. (3) The Constitution of each State, its territorial integrity and the succession of its reigning dynasty in accordance with the law, custom and usage of the State, shall not be interfered with by the Union or any part thereof.”

But after the declaration regarding the partition of India some of the bigger States like Travancore and Hyderabad pleaded that they could not accept the original plan to which they had given their assent on the basis of a United India. They even thought that they were entitled to declare their independence in the changed situation, and talked of entering into treaty relations as between one sovereign State and another. The leader of the Muslim League supported this new attitude, but it did not accord with the views of the Congress leaders and other prominent politicians. In a meeting held on 15th June, 1947, the All-India Congress Committee stated that they could not “admit the right of any State in India to declare its independence and to live in isolation from the rest of India.” “Such a declaration,” in the opinion of Mahātmā Gāndhi, “was tantamount to a declaration of war against the free millions of India.” Pandit Nehru said that “any recognition of any such independence by any foreign power, whichever it may be and whatever it may be, will be considered an unfriendly act.” In a statement of 17th June, 1947, Dr. Ambedkar asserted that according to certain aspects of British Constitutional Law and also International Law, there were some flaws in the Cabinet Mission’s memorandum regarding lapse of Paramountcy. His view was that the States “will be sovereign States to the extent they are, but they cannot be independent States so long as they remain under the suzerainty, as they must be, either of the Crown, if India remains a Dominion, or of the successor State, if India becomes independent.”

Sardar Patel took charge of the Indian States Department created by the Government of India, on 5th July, 1947, “to deal with matters arising between the Central Government and the Indian States.” Following his advice as well as that of Lord Mountbatten, all the States, with a few exceptions, decided, on 25th July, to accede to the Indian Union in
accordance with an Instrument of Accession which provided that, pending the promulgation of a constitution by the Constituent Assembly, in which the States would be equitably represented, the Dominion Parliament would legislate for the acceding States in matters relating to Defence, External Affairs, Communications and other ancillary subjects.

The policy of the Government of the Indian Dominion regarding the States proved successful in most cases. Their relations were regulated by two processes. One was the merger of the smaller States either into a unit administered by the Central Government, or into the neighbouring Provincial administrations, as for example the merger of the Eastern States into the Provinces of Orissa and the Central Provinces, and of the Deccan States and the Gujarāt States into the Bombay administration. The other process was that of the integration of a number of States into bigger administrative combinations, as for example the United State of Matsya (18th March, 1948), the United State of Kāthiāwār (Saurāshtra) (15th February, 1948), the United State of Rājasthān (25th March, 1948 and 18th April, 1948), the United State of Vindhya Pradesh (4th April, 1948), the United State of Gwālīor, Indore and Mālwā (Madhya Bhārāt Union, 28th May, 1948), and the Patīāla and East Punjab States Union (15th July, 1948). The administration of a Union of 21 States, known as Himāchal Pradesh, and of Cutch, together having a total area of 19,061 square miles, passed under the control of the Centre.

There still remained some small States and also a few major States unaffected by the processes mentioned above. Regarding such major States the policy of the Government of the Indian Union was stated in the Dominion Parliament on 15th March, 1948, by Mr. N. V. Gadgil (Indian Minister of Works) speaking on behalf of Sārdar Patel: “There is no desire on our part, in any way, to compel or coerce them into merger or integration. If they wish to remain as separate autonomous units, we would have no objection, but if the Rulers and the people of any of these States desire to merge with the neighbouring Province or form a Union with the neighbouring States on a voluntary basis, obviously the Government of India cannot say ‘No’. . . . It is clear, however, that in these States, which remain separate units, there would be continuous popular pressure for the grant of full responsible government. I hope the Rulers of these States will appreciate the necessity of retaining the affection and goodwill of their subjects by timely concessions, rather than futile resistance to popular demands. . . . Our policy in regard to them remains . . . their continued autonomous existence unless both the Rulers and the people desire otherwise.”

Along with the modifications in the pattern of an old structure, there took place a considerable transformation of the inner set-up of the States and a reorientation to the attitude and policy of the Rulers towards their peoples. Not only did they introduce various measures for improving the
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economic condition of their respective areas, but "practically every State" as the White Paper on Indian States, issued by the Government of India in July, 1948, noted, "announced its intention to grant full responsible government, and in a vast majority of them power has already been transferred to the people". The same document significantly notes that "a bloodless revolution has been brought about, on the one hand, by the operation of democratic forces unleashed by freedom, and on the other, by the patriotic attitude of the Rulers who have been quick to appreciate the change".

The State of Junagadh and a few adjoining States joined the United State of Kathiawar (Saurashtra) (31st December, 1948). Mayurbhanj merged into Orissa, Kolhapur into the Bombay Province, and Rampur and Banaras into the U.P. Cochin was amalgamated with Travancore. The biggest Union of Indian States, and one of the biggest political and administrative units of India, known as the "Greater Rajasthan Union", was inaugurated on 30th March, 1949. It has within its fold 15 ancient Rajput States with an area of 120,000 sq. miles, a population of about 13 millions, and an annual revenue of about 10 crores of rupees. The great State of Baroda merged into the Bombay Province on 1st May, 1949, and Bhopal, Cooch Behar, Tripura, and Manipur passed under the Central administration. Thus before the end of November, 1949, the integration of Indian States was completed with the exception of Hyderabad and Kashmir.

2. Hyderabad

A settlement with Hyderabad, which has a special position as the biggest State in India and having a Muslim ruler over a very large Hindu population, raised highly intricate issues. On 29th November, 1947, Hyderabad entered into one year's Standstill Agreement with the Indian Union to maintain the status quo which had existed before 15th August, 1947.

In the opinion of Syed Kasim Razvi, President of the Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin, the Standstill Agreement in no way interfered with the status of Hyderabad as an independent sovereign State, while Paramountcy was "buried deep once for all". But the Government of India felt that from considerations of defence, internal security, and economy, India would remain exposed to grave dangers with an independent Hyderabad. "An independent State completely landlocked within the heart of another is," they noted in their White Paper on Hyderabad, "an unheard-of proposition."

Besides this fundamental point of divergence between India and Hyderabad, some newly arisen internal and external factors further complicated the situation. The activities within the State of the Majlis Ittehad-ul-Muslimin and of the Razakars under the leadership of Kasim Razvi, and
incidents on the borders of the Indian provinces of Madras, Central Provinces and Bombay, were a standing menace to peace and harmony, and caused much anxiety in the minds of responsible people in different quarters.

All negotiations between Hyderabad and the Indian Union from January, 1948, proved abortive. The Nizam’s Government refused to accept the suggestion made by the Governor-General on behalf of the Government of India for Hyderabad’s accession to the Indian Dominion, and also another suggestion of the Government of India for the introduction of responsible government in the State. During the final phase of the negotiations in 1948, a Draft Agreement was drawn up. On 18th June, 1948, three days before his departure from India, Lord Mountbatten appealed to the Nizam to accept the Draft Agreement, but to no effect.

On the Hyderabad Government’s rejection of the Draft Agreement, the Government of India put some economic pressure on the former. But this did not improve matters. The forces that worked against accession to the Indian Dominion held a position of vantage in that State and made warlike preparations, such as an increase in the State Army, the formation of irregular armies, and the smuggling of arms and ammunition from abroad with the help of foreign adventurers. Further, the growing violence of the Razakars inside Hyderabad State and in the border tracts of the Indian Union seriously menaced law and order. So the Government of India reiterated their demand for immediate disbandment of the Razakars, and also asked the Nizam to facilitate the return of the Indian troops to Secunderabad, where they had been stationed before their withdrawal early that year according to the Standstill Agreement. The Nizam, who had already appealed to the United Nations against India, would not accept these terms. At this the Government of India informed the Nizam’s Government in a final letter on 11th September that they now considered themselves free to take whatever action they thought necessary to restore law and order.

The Indian troops marched into the Hyderabad State on 13th September. The Government of India declared that it was not an “act of war” but a mere “police action” intended “to restore peace and tranquillity inside the State and a sense of security in the adjoining Indian territory”. At 4.30 p.m. on 18th September, 1948, Major-General El Edroos, Commander, Forces of the Hyderabad State, surrendered on behalf of the Nizam to Major-General J. N Chaudhury, Commander of the First Armoured Division of the Indian Army. Kasim Razvi was arrested and the Razakar organisation was broken up. The Laik Ali Ministry, which had filed complaint against India before the Security Council, resigned on 17th September, and the Nizam cabled on 22nd September to the effect that he had withdrawn the Hyderabad case from the Security Council and that the delegation sent there by the outgoing Ministry had no authority to represent him or his State.
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Restoration of peace and order being considered by the Indian Government the first and foremost need of the hour, the affairs of Hyderabad were placed under the control of Major-General J. N. Chaudhury, as Military Governor, to be assisted by a staff of Civil Officers. The Nizām readily accepted the new situation and offered his full co-operation. Order and tranquillity were gradually established by effective administrative measures. On 26th January, 1950, Hyderabad acceded to the Indian Union. As a result of the reorganization of States in 1956, to which reference will be made later in detail, Hyderabad, as a separate State, has now ceased to exist.

3. Kashmir

While the Hyderabad problem seemed to be nearing solution, the situation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir remained grave and critical. Situated in the extreme north of the Indian sub-continent, this State covers an area of 84,471 square miles. On the north-east it is bordered by Tibet, on the north by Chinese Turkestan (Sinkiang), and on the north-west by the Soviet Republic of Turkestan and by Afgānistān. On its western border lies Pakistān, and to the south it touches Pakistān and the Dominion of India. The census of 1941 recorded that the total population of the State was 4,021,615, of whom 77.11 per cent were Muslims, 20.12 per cent Hindus, and 2.77 per cent Sikhs and Buddhists. In view of geographical contiguity and the greater numerical strength of the Muslims in this State, Pakistān was naturally anxious to bring it under her influence.

The State of Jammu and Kashmir was subjected to repeated tribal raids from across and within the Pakistān area soon after the partition. On the rapid advance of the raiders up the Jhelum Valley Road, threatening even Srinagar, the Government of Jammu and Kashmir sought assistance of the Government of the Indian Dominion. On 26th October the Māhārāja of Kashmir formally acceded to the Indian Union, and this step was fully approved by Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, leader of the All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference, an organization, enjoying a large measure of popular confidence and support in the State. The Government of India, while accepting this accession as a provisional step, expressed the view that the future of Kashmir should be decided in accordance with the popular will ascertained by means of plebiscite or referendum.

The first contingent of Indian troops reached Kashmir by air on the morning of 27th October, 1947. On 31st October, an interim Emergency Administration was formed with Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah as its head, which, with the help of Indian forces, successfully resisted tribal raids, believed to be encouraged and supported by Pakistān, whose sympathies were for the Azad Kashmir Government, an organization opposed to the new Government in Kashmir. On 31st December, the Indian Union sent
a memorandum to the Security Council of the United Nations urging the latter "to call upon Pakistan (a member State), to put an end immediately to the giving of such assistance, which is an act of aggression against India". After fruitless efforts at mediation for about five months the United Nations sent a Commission to study things on the spot. This Commission reached India in July, 1948 and on 13th August, 1948, suggested a "Cease Fire" agreement between India and Pakistan. The Indian Union agreed, but the Pakistan Government was not prepared to accept the "Cease Fire" resolution without attaching certain conditions which were unacceptable to the Commission. The presence of Pakistan troops in Kashmir territory was now admitted by the Pakistan Government, and the relations between the two Dominions grew extremely strained. Happily good sense ultimately prevailed, and one minute before midnight on 1st January, 1949, a mutual "Cease Fire" agreement was concluded between the Governments of the Indian Union and Pakistan. Hostilities ceased and Admiral Nimitz was appointed U.N. Administrator for the plebiscite. It was hoped that the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir would be determined by a plebiscite held under satisfactory conditions.

In April, 1950, the Security Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon as the U.N. Representative, in place of the U.N. Commission, to help the parties for "the expeditious and enduring solution of the dispute which has arisen between the two Governments in regard to the State of Jammu and Kashmir". But his efforts proved to be of no avail. On his request to be relieved, the Security Council appointed Dr. Frank Graham as U.N. Representative on 30th April, 1951. The latter's efforts were also fruitless.

In 1951 a Constituent Assembly met in Jammu and Kashmir to frame a constitution for the State. In February, 1954, the accession of the State to India was ratified by the Constituent Assembly, and in November, 1956, it adopted a constitution legalizing the status of Jammu and Kashmir as a unit of the Indian Union. The Constituent Assembly dissolved itself on 26th January, 1957, after the formal inauguration of the new constitution. On 26th July, 1957, Bakhsh Ghulam Mohammad was sworn in as Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir. Yuvaraj Karan Singh was elected unopposed for another term of office as Sadar-i-Riyasat of Jammu and Kashmir. Two days before this date, the Security Council passed a resolution calling for a status quo in Kashmir. A resolution sponsored in the Security Council by four countries—Britain, Australia, Cuba and the U.S.A.—for sending United Nations forces to Kashmir for the solution of her problem was vetoed by the U.S.S.R. on 20th February, 1957. The deputation of Gunnar Jarring of Sweden, President of the Security Council, with instructions to explore the possibilities for settlement of the Kashmir dispute and report to the Security Council before 30th April, 1957, did not produce any concrete result. The revival of the Graham Commission by a resolution of the Security Council was likewise abortive.
The Kāshmir problem has been before the Security Council for more than a decade, but no solution has been reached. In the absence of the requisite conditions, and in view of the continuance of Pakistan’s aggression in a portion of the State, the question of a plebiscite is now dead so far as the Government of India is concerned. It is significant to note that the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kāshmir itself declared the accession of the State to India as final.

On 27th August, 1965, units of the Pakistani forces invaded Indian territory, after irregular forces had infiltrated into Kāshmir earlier in the same month. (For fuller details of these events, and of the subsequent Tashkent Declaration, see Appendix III.)

Recently an accord has been reached about which an announcement was made in Parliament by India’s Prime Minister and Sheikh Abdullah was sworn in as Chief Minister of Jammu and Kāshmir on 25th February, 1975. The main features of the accord are:

1. Sheikh Abdullah returns to power after over two decades with the resignation of Syed Mir Qasim who has willingly made way for the Sheikh as party leader.

2. The special status of Jammu and Kāshmir as guaranteed under Article 370 of the Constitution is to continue. There is to be no amendment of the Constitution to facilitate any change.

3. Neither the State Assembly nor the State unit of the Congress Party is to be dissolved. The Plebiscite Front is to be “reorganized” or may even be dissolved in view of the new political developments. The Sheikh may later seek a mandate from the people, but the plebiscite issue is dead.

4. The accession of Jammu and Kāshmir to India is not questioned, and Sheikh Abdullah declared that he had accepted the accession as final.

5. To begin with, the Sheikh is to have a small cabinet comprising of Ministers of unquestioned integrity and representing the various regions of Jammu and Kāshmir.

6. There is to be no repeal of the laws passed after August, 1953 when the Sheikh was removed from office, and therefore, there is to be no return to the pre-1953 position as was earlier demanded by the Sheikh.

By an Act of Parliament, the State of the Indian Union previously known as Punjab was divided into two states—Punjab and Haryana—on 1st November, 1966. According to the North-Eastern Areas (Reorganization) Act, 1971, five States and two Union Territories were created in the northeastern part of the country. The five new States are: Assam, Meghalaya, Tripura, Manipur, and Nagaland. The two new Union Territories are: Arunachal Pradesh (previously known as NEFA) and Mizoram (earlier called the Mizo Hills District)—the latter was inaugurated as a Union Territory on 21st January, 1972. However, these new units share certain features. For instance, Assam, Meghalaya, Manipur and Tripura have a
common Governor, and these five States and the two new Union Territories have a common High Court.

The reorganization of territories in north-east India was effected to enable the diverse ethnic and linguistic groups who inhabit the area to shape their own destinies without interference and to remove the feeling that they were being exploited by others.


The Minister of External Affairs, Government of India, Mr. Y. B. Chavan, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Portugal, Dr. Mario Soares, signed at New Delhi on 31st December, 1974, on behalf of the Heads of their respective countries, a Treaty on "recognition of India's sovereignty over Goa, Damān, Diu, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and related matters. Diplomatic relations between the two countries, which had been broken off in 1955, were renewed immediately upon the signature of the Treaty." This Treaty, both believed, buried "20 years of conflict" and established "a basis for friendly co-operation" by the exchange of delegations in economic, technical, and cultural fields.
APPENDIX II

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

The Constituent Assembly which first met on 9th December, 1946 (p. 980),
took three years to complete its work, and the new Constitution was adopted
and signed by the President, Dr. Rājendra Prasād, on 26th November,
1949. The formation of the Sovereign Republic was proclaimed on 26th
January, 1950, the twentieth anniversary of Independence Day (p. 974).
It is a bulky document covering about 270 pages, and its main provisions,
as given below, were:

A. INDIAN UNION

1. India, that is Bhārat, is a Sovereign Democratic Republic1 and a
Union of States. These States are divided into four categories, viz.:

(A) Assam, Bihār, Bombay, Madhya Pradesh (Central Provinces and
Berar), Madras, Orissa, Punjab (E. Punjab), the United Provinces,8
and West Bengal.

(B) Hyderabad, Jammu and Kāshmir, Madhya Bhārat (p. 984),
Mysore, Patialā and East Punjab States Union, Rājasthān, Sau-
rāshtra, Travancore-Cochin, and Vindhya Pradesh.

(C) Ajmer, Bhopāl, Bilāspur, Coorg, Delhi, Himāchal Prāadesh, Kutch,
Manipur, and Tripurā.

(D) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands.

The first category consists of the former provinces of British India, while
the second and third comprise the old Indian States, either single or
integrated into unions, together with three Chief Commissionerships
(centrally administered territories) of old, viz. Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg,
and Delhi.

1But it is still a member of the Commonwealth of Nations. The present status of India
is regulated by the "India (Consequential Provision) Bill" passed by the British Parlia-
ment, which received the Royal Assent on 16th December, 1949. This Act, while recog-
nizing India as a Republican State, preserves for her the rights and privileges at present
enjoyed by the Indians under British law.

8The name of this Province was altered to Uttar Pradesh in January 1930.
2. The Constitution guarantees to all citizens freedom of speech and expression, the right to assemble peaceably, and freedom of conscience and worship, subject to general considerations of public security and morality.

3. All citizens, irrespective of religion, race, caste, sex, and place of birth, shall enjoy equality before the law and no disability shall be imposed on them in any respect.

"Untouchability" is abolished and its practice in any form is forbidden.

4. No person shall be deprived of his life, property or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. The law may provide for preventive detention of a person for three months and even for a longer period, either on the recommendation of an Advisory Board, or in accordance with a law passed by Parliament.

The law authorizing compulsory acquisition of property should provide for compensation.

C. THE UNION GOVERNMENT

5. The executive power of the Union is vested in the President of India, who is elected for five years by the members of an electoral college consisting of (a) the elected members of both Houses of Parliament and (b) the elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States.

6. There is also a Vice-President of India elected for five years by the members of both Houses of Parliament, assembled at a joint meeting.

7. There is a Council of Ministers with the Prime Minister at the head to aid and advise the President. The Prime Minister is appointed by the President, and the other Ministers are appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the House of the People.

8. There is a Parliament for the Union consisting of the President and two Houses known respectively as the Council of States and the House of People.

9. The Council of States consists of (1) not more than 238 representatives of States, elected by the elected members of the Legislative Assembly of each State, and (2) 12 members nominated by the President on the ground of their having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, and social service.

10. The House of the People consists of not more than 500 members directly elected by the voters in the States. For this purpose territorial constituencies have been specially created in such a manner that there is not less than one member for every 750,000 of the population and not more than one member for every 500,000 of the population.
11. The Council of States is not subject to dissolution, but one-third of its members retire on the expiration of every second year. The House of the People, unless sooner dissolved, continues for five years. Both the Houses must meet at least twice in every year.

12. The Vice-President of India is the ex-officio Chairman of the Council of States, which elects a Deputy Chairman. The House of the People elects its own Speaker and Deputy Speaker. These officers and members of the two Houses receive salaries and allowances as fixed by Parliament.

13. A Money Bill may originate only in the House of the People and is passed even if the Council of States does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House of Parliament, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses, or, in case of disagreement, passed in a joint sitting of the two Houses by a majority of the total number of members of both Houses present and voting.

14. The President’s assent is necessary before a Bill becomes law, and he may withhold his assent and return the Bill with his suggestions; but if the Bill is passed again by the Houses he cannot withhold his assent.

15. There is a Supreme Court of India consisting of a Chief Justice of India and, until Parliament by law prescribes a larger number, not more than seven other judges. It has original jurisdiction in any dispute between two or more States and between the Government of India and one or more States. An appeal lies to the Supreme Court, from the judgment of any High Court in a State. A judge of the Supreme Court (or of the High Court of a State) shall not be removed from his office except after an address by each House of Parliament passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting.

D. THE STATES (CATEGORY A)

16. There is a Governor for each State appointed by the President for a term of five years and holding office during his pleasure.

17. There is a Council of Ministers with the Chief Minister at the head to aid and advise the Governor. The Chief Minister is appointed by the Governor, and the other Ministers by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister. The Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Legislative Assembly of the State.

18. There is a Legislature in every State which consists of the Governor and the Legislative Assembly, but there is an additional House, known as the Legislative Council, in Bihār, Bombay, Madras, Punjab, the United Provinces, and West Bengal.

19. The members of the Legislative Assembly are chosen by direct election, on a scale of not more than one member for every 75,000 of the population.
20. The total number of members in the Legislative Council is not to exceed one-fourth of the total number of members in the Legislative Assembly. Of these one-third are elected by the Municipalities, District Boards and other local authorities; one-twelfth by graduates of three years' standing; one-twelfth by teachers of three years' standing; and one-third by the members of the Legislative Assembly. The remainder are nominated by the Governor and consist of persons having special knowledge or practical experience in literature, science, art, the co-operative movement, and social service.

21. The duration of the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly is the same as laid down respectively for the Council of States and the House of the People in para. 11.

22. Every Legislative Assembly chooses two of the members respectively as Speaker and Deputy Speaker thereof. Every Legislative Council chooses two of its members respectively as Chairman and Deputy Chairman thereof. These officers as well as the members of the two Houses receive such salaries and allowances as may be fixed by the Legislature of the State.

23. A Money Bill may originate only in the Legislative Assembly, and is passed even if the Legislative Council does not agree to it. All other Bills may originate in either House, and are deemed to have been passed only when agreed to by both Houses. But in case of difference, if the Legislative Assembly passes the Bill a second time, it becomes law without the approval of the Legislative Council.

24. The Governor has the same power of assenting to, or withdrawing his assent from, a Bill passed by the Legislature as is possessed by the President (vide para. 14). But the Governor may also reserve such a Bill for the consideration of the President.

E. THE STATES (CATEGORIES B, C, D)

25. The main difference between the States belonging to categories A and B is that while the executive head of the former is a Governor, that of the latter is the Rājapramukh, usually the ruler of the old State (or of one of them in the case of an integration of States). The appointment of the Rājapramukh is regulated by the agreement entered into between each such State and the Government of India. The third and fourth categories of States are administered by the Head of the Indian Union, through a Chief Commissioner appointed by him or through the government of a neighbouring State.

F. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE UNION AND THE STATES

26. Generally speaking, the Parliament may make laws for the whole or any part of India, and the Legislature of a State may make laws for the
whole or any part of the State. But the Constitution specifically lays down three lists of subjects, with respect to the first of which the Parliament, and with respect to the second, the Legislature of the State, has exclusive power to make laws; and both have concurrent powers of legislation in regard to the third.

27. The Union List includes, among others, defence of India, naval, military, and air forces, arms and ammunitions, foreign affairs including diplomatic representation, war and peace, railways, maritime shipping and navigation, airways, posts and telegraphs, currency, trade and commerce, with foreign countries, inter-State trade and commerce, banking, insurance, and financial corporations, regulation of mines and mineral development, regulation of labour, manufacture of salt, High Courts, certain institution of all-India importance, certain taxes like income-tax, duties of customs, and duties of excise.

28. The State List includes, among others, police, administration of justice (except constitution of High Courts), prisons, local government, education, communication (within the State), forests, fisheries, and several taxes.

29. The Concurrent List includes, among others, criminal law, civil and criminal procedure, preventive detention for the security of the State, Trade Unions, ports, inland shipping and navigation, trade, commerce and price-control.

30. The executive power of every State is to be so exercised as to ensure compliance with the laws made by Parliament. It shall not impede or prejudice the exercise of the executive power of the Union which extends to the giving of such directions to a State as may appear necessary to the Government of India.

31. Detailed regulations are laid down for the distribution of revenues between the Union and the States, and provision is made for the appointment of a Finance Commission from time to time to revise such distribution.

---

G. SUFFRAGE AND QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP OF LEGISLATURE

32. Every citizen of India, of not less than twenty-one years of age, is entitled to vote in the elections to the House of the People and to the Legislative Assembly of the State to which he belongs.

33. No citizen of less than thirty years of age is qualified for the membership of the Council of States or the Legislative Council; the minimum age for the membership of the House of the People and Legislative Assembly is twenty-five years.

34. For a period of ten years from the commencement of this Constitution seats shall be reserved in the House of the People for the Scheduled
Castes and Scheduled Tribes, in proportion to their population, and the President may nominate not more than two members of the Anglo-Indian Community to that House.

H. EMERGENCY PROVISIONS

35. The President or the Governor of a State may, when the Houses of Legislature are not in session, promulgate an Ordinance, having the same force and effect as an Act of the Legislature, if he thinks it necessary to take immediate action. Such Ordinances shall cease to operate at the expiration of six weeks from the reassembly of the Legislature, or earlier if the Legislature disapproves of them.

36. If the President is satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India or any part of it is threatened, he may issue a Proclamation to that effect. While such a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation, the executive and legislative powers of the Union practically supersede those of the States.

37. If the President is satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the Government of a State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution, he may, by Proclamation, assume to himself or vest in the Parliament all or any of the powers and functions of the Government of the State.

38. The Proclamation, referred to in the two preceding paras., shall cease to operate at the expiration of two months unless approved by both Houses of Parliament before that date, or in case the House of the People was dissolved at the time, within thirty days of its reconstitution.

I. MISCELLANEOUS

39. Either House of Parliament may bring a charge of Impeachment against the President for violation of the Constitution. If it is passed by a majority of two-thirds, and is also sustained, after due enquiry, by a similar majority of the other House, the President shall be removed from office.

40. Subject to certain general restrictions which the law imposes, trade, commerce, and intercourse throughout the territory of India shall be free.

41. The Constitution provides for the appointment of a Public Service Commission both for the Union and the States, an Attorney-General for India, a Comptroller and Auditor-General of India, as well as Advocate-Generals and High Courts for States.

42. For a period of fifteen years the English language shall continue to be the official language of the Union. Thereafter the official language shall be Hindi in Devanāgari script.
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43. The Legislature of a State may by law adopt any local language as its official language provided that the official language of the Union shall be used for communication between two States.

I. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Since 1951 there have been no less than eighteen amendments to the Indian Constitution. The more important of these are noted below:

1. Notwithstanding Article 15 of the Constitution the State is now authorized to make "special provision for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens or for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes".

2. The State is authorized to impose reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by Article 19, in the interests of the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality, or in relation to contempt of Court, defamation or incitement to an offence.

3. Important modifications in the provision for compulsory acquisition or requisitioning of property and State Monopolies.
   Clause 6 of Article 19 was modified as follows:

   "Nothing shall affect the operation of any existing law in so far as it relates to, or prevents the State from making any law relating to—

   (i) the professional or technical qualifications necessary for practising any profession or carrying on any trade or business, or

   (ii) the carrying on by the State, or by a Corporation owned or controlled by the State of any trade, business, industry or service, whether to the exclusion, complete or partial, of citizens or otherwise.

As the validity of the laws for the abolition of Zamindari was challenged, this amendment sought to place these laws retrospectively beyond challenge in the Courts.

The Constitution (Fourth Amendment) Act of 1955 by amending Articles 31, 31A and 305 of the Constitution authorized the State to acquire or requisition private property compulsorily for a public purpose and barred any reference to a Court of Law regarding the quantum of compensation fixed by the Legislature.

The Constitution (Fifth Amendment) Act of 1955 by amending Article 3 provided that no Bill for the purpose of changing the area or boundaries of States could be introduced in either House of Parliament "except on the recommendation of the President and unless the Bill has been referred by the President to the Legislature of that State for expressing its view thereon" within a specific period.
The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act of 1956 carried into effect the reorganization of States on the basis of the proposals of a special committee appointed for the purpose. The different categories of States mentioned above were abolished and all the fourteen States were placed on the same footing. Certain territories were characterized as Union Territories to be directly administered by the Centre. There were thus fourteen States and six Union Territories. The six Union Territories were: (1) Delhi, (2) Himāchal Pradesh, (3) Manipur, (4) Tripura (5) The Andaman and Nicobar Islands, (6) Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands. The fourteen States were Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihār, Bombay, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Madras, Mysore, Orissa, Punjab, Rājasthān, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, and Jammu and Kāshmir. Of the former ten Part A States, Assam, Orissa, and Uttar Pradesh have not been territorially affected by this reorganization. There were some boundary readjustments for West Bengal, Bihār and Madras. The Andhra State, as created in 1953 out of the northern part of Madras, was designated Andhra Pradesh, and was enlarged by the merger of the portion of Hyderābād known as Telengāna. Bombay became the largest State in point of area by the merger of Kutch and Saurāshtra and the Marāṭhi-speaking districts of Madhya Pradesh and Hyderābād. The new Madhya Pradesh, in spite of the loss of Vidarabha or the eight Marāṭhi-speaking districts, emerged as the second largest State by the addition of Madhya Bharat, Bhopal, and Vindhya Pradesh. The former State of Patiala and East Punjab States Union was added to the Punjab. The Kanarese-speaking districts of Hyderābād were added to Mysore. Travancore-Cochin, with some territorial adjustments, assumed the new name of Kerala. The outstanding features of the reorganisation were (1) the abolition of Rājpramukhs, (2) establishment of zonal councils with advisory capacity in relation to inter-State affairs or border disputes and (3) provision for linguistic safeguards. The Bombay State has been reorganized by the Bombay Reorganization Act which received the assent of the President of India on 25th April, 1960, and it has been divided into two States, viz. the Gujarāt State and the Mahārāṣṭra State.

According to the Constitution (Tenth Amendment) Act, 1961, the former Portuguese enclaves of Dadra and Nagar Haveli were incorporated within India, their administration being carried on under the rule-making powers of the President.

The Constitution (Eleventh Amendment) Act, 1961, provided for the election of the Vice-President by an Electoral College consisting of members of both the Houses of Parliament. It also amended Article 71 by making it clear that the election of the President or the Vice-President could not be challenged on the ground of any vacancy in the appropriate Electoral College.

According to the Constitution (Twelfth Amendment) Act of 1962, the Portuguese possessions of Goa, Daman and Diu became part of the Indian
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territory as from 20th December, 1961, being governed since that date as a Union territory.

By the Constitution (Thirteenth Amendment) Act, 1962, Nagaland was created as the sixteenth State in the Indian Union. Pondicherry, Karikal, Mahe and Yanam became part of Union territory from August, 1962, after the ratification of the Treaty of Cessation by India and France. These territories were specified as a Union territory called "Pondicherry" by the Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Act, 1962. It also provided for new legislatures, on the pattern that prevailed in some of the former States, for the Union Territories of Himachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Goa, Daman and Diu, and Pondicherry.

The Constitution (Fifteenth Amendment) Act of 1963 made the President of India, in consultation with the Chief Justice of India, the final arbiter in a dispute about a High Court Judge's age and shortened the procedure for disciplinary action against Government employees.

The Constitution (Sixteenth Amendment) Act of 1963 amended Article 19 in such a way as to give to the States power to make any law imposing reasonable restrictions on the exercise of fundamental rights in the interest of "sovereignty and integrity" of the country.

The Constitution (Seventeenth Amendment) Act of 1964 enlarged the definition of "estate" and extended protection to various State Land Reforms Acts so that their validity might not be questioned in Courts of Law.

The Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Act also dealt with the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the High Courts and constitutional safeguards for linguistic minorities. Following a treaty concluded between the Government of France and the Government of India, the French territories in India comprising Pondicherry and Karikal on the Coromandel coast, Yanam on the Andhra coast and Mahe on the coast of Kerala were included in the Schedule to the Constitution of India as Union Territory of Pondicherry by the Constitution (Fourteenth Amendment) Act of 1962.

Some significant Amendments have been made in the Constitution of India during the recent years.

The Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act of 1966 provided that in Article 3 of the Constitution the following explanations shall be inserted at the end, namely, Explanation 1—In this article in clauses (a) to (e) "State" includes a Union Territory, but in the proviso "State" does not include a Union Territory. Explanation 2—The power conferred on Parliament by clause (a) includes the power to form a new State or Union Territory by uniting a part of any State or Union Territory to any other State or Union Territory.

This amendment became necessary as the Government acceded to the demand for the creation of a new State out of the Punjab State on linguistic basis and so the old Punjab State was bifurcated into two States, called Punjab and Haryana. The Government also intended to transfer some
areas of Himachal Pradesh—a Union Territory—to the new Punjab State.

According to the Constitution (Nineteenth Amendment) Act, 1966, in Article 324 of the Constitution in clause (1) the words "including the appointment of election tribunals for the decision of doubts and disputes arising out of or in connection with election to Parliament and to the Legislatures of States" were omitted.

The Constitution (Twentieth Amendment) Act of 1966 inserted a new Article 233A after Article 233 to validate the appointments, postings, transfers, and judgments, decrees, sentences, and other orders whose appointments were declared void by the Supreme Court.


By the Constitution (Twenty-second Amendment) Act, 1969, Article 244A was added to the Constitution providing the formation of an autonomous State comprising certain tribal areas in Assam and creation of local Legislature or Council of Ministers or both. Article 371B was added empowering the President to provide for the constitution and functions of a committee of the Legislative Assembly of the State.

The Constitution (Twenty-third Amendment) Act of 1970 provided that Article 330 of the Constitution, in sub-clause (b) of clause (1), for the words "except the Scheduled Tribes, in the Tribal areas of Assam", the words "except the Scheduled Tribes in the tribal areas of Assam and in Nagaland" shall be substituted. In Article 333 of the Constitution, for the words "nominate such number of members of the community to the Assembly as he considers appropriate", the words "nominate one member of that community to the Assembly" shall be substituted. In Article 334 of the Constitution for the words "twenty years", the words "thirty years" shall be substituted.

According to the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1971, (i) "Notwithstanding anything in the Constitution, Parliament may in exercise of its constituent power amend by way of addition, variation or repeal any provision of this Constitution", and, (ii) that the President shall "give his assent to a Constitution Amendment Bill if it has been passed by both the Houses" and (iii) that "nothing in Article 13 (which provides that the State shall not make any law which takes away or abridges fundamental rights) shall have application to laws passed under the 24th Amendment."

The Constitution (Twenty-fifth Amendment) Act of 1971 (it was passed by the two Houses of Parliament in 1971 but received the President's assent on 20th April, 1972) sought to remove the difficulties for giving effect to the Directive Principles of State Policy by the Supreme Court's interpretation in the Bank Nationalization Case of 1970 of the word "compensation" in clause 2 of Article 31. The Act substituted the clause, replacing the word "compensation" with the word "amount". The substituted clause ensured
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that "property can be compulsorily acquired or requisitioned for a public purpose for an amount which may be fixed or determined in accordance with the law and this shall not be called in question in any court on the ground that the amount is not adequate or that the whole or any part of such amount is to be given otherwise than in cash." The Act also introduced a new Article 31C which ensured that "the law passed to give effect to the Directive Principles shall not be deemed to be void on the ground that it takes away or abridges any of the rights contained in Articles 14, 19 or 31."

The Constitution (Twenty-sixth Amendment) Act of 1971 inserted a new Article in the constitution expressly terminating the recognition already granted to Rulers of States, abolishing Privy Purses and extinguishing all rights, liabilities and obligations in respect of Privy Purses.

The Constitution (Twenty-seventh Amendment) Act of 1971 provided for inclusion of the Union Territory of Mizoram in Article 239A of the Constitution to give it a Legislature and a Council of Ministers. It also provided that the Administrator of a Union Territory with Legislature shall have the power to promulgate Ordinances when the Legislature is not in session.

By the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act a new Article 312A was inserted after Article 312 of the Constitution investing the Parliament to "vary or revoke conditions of service of officers of certain services". The Parliament may by law—

(a) vary or revoke, whether prospectively or retrospectively, the conditions of service as respects remuneration, leave and pension and the rights as respects disciplinary matters of persons who, having been appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the crown in India before the commencement of this Constitution, continue on or after the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act, 1972 to serve under the Government of India or of a State in any service or post:

(b) vary or revoke, whether prospectively or retrospectively the conditions of service as respects pension of persons who, having been appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the Crown in India before the commencement of this Constitution, retired or otherwise ceased to be in service at any time before the commencement of the Constitution (Twenty-eighth Amendment) Act, 1972:

Provided that in the case of any such person who is holding or has held the office of the Chief Justice or any other judge of the Supreme Court or a High Court, the Comptroller or Auditor-General of India, the Chairman or other member of the Union or a State Public Service Commission or the Chief Election Commissioner, nothing in sub-clause (a) or sub-clause (b) shall be construed as empowering Parliament to vary or revoke, after his retirement to such post, the conditions of his service to his disadvantage
except in so far as such conditions of service are applicable to him by reason of his being a person appointed by the Secretary of State or Secretary of State in Council to a civil service of the Crown in India.

By the Constitution (Twenty-ninth Amendment) Act the Kerala Land Reforms (Amendment) Acts of 1969 and 1971 are included in the Ninth schedule of the Constitution of India and thereby the Acts which had been struck down in parts by the Supreme Court and the Kerala High Court are validated.

According to the Constitution (Thirtieth Amendment) Act (passed by two Houses of the Parliament in 1972 but which received the President's assent on 22nd February, 1973), Article 133 of the Constitution was amended providing for an appeal to the Supreme Court from any judgment, decree or final order in a civil proceeding of a High Court if the High Court certifies that "the case involves a substantial question of law of general importance and needs to be decided by the Supreme Court".

On 15th May, 1973, Parliament passed the Constitution (Thirty-first Amendment) Bill increasing the maximum strength of the Lok Sabha from 525 to 545.

The Constitution (Thirty-third Amendment) Act of 1974 was passed by Parliament on 14 May, 1974, investing the Speakers and Chairmen of Legislatures with powers to reject such resignations of members they thought to have been extracted by coercive means.

The Parliament passed The Constitution (Thirty-fourth Amendment) Act on 28th August, 1974. By it land ceiling laws and land tenure reforms were protected against litigation in courts. This amendment added twenty laws prescribing lower land ceilings and removing intermediary tenures to the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution which protects laws against litigation on the ground that they violate Fundamental Rights.

The Constitution (Thirty-sixth Amendment) Act was passed by the Parliament in September, 1974, giving Sikkim, which had been hitherto an Indian "protectorate", the new status of an "Associate State". It provided representation of the people of Sikkim in the Indian Parliament. According to the Amendment, after Article 2 of the Constitution, the following Article shall be inserted, namely: "2A Sikkim, which comprises the territories specified in the Tenth Schedule, shall be associated with the Union on the terms and conditions set out in that Schedule. 'The Government of India' shall be solely responsible for the defence and territorial integrity of Sikkim and for the conduct and regulation of the external relations of Sikkim, whether political, economical or financial." As regards Sikkim's representation in Parliament it is provided that "there shall be allotted to Sikkim one seat in the Council of States and one seat in the House of the People". The "Representative of Sikkim in the Council of States shall be elected by the members of the Sikkim Assembly" and the "representative of Sikkim in the House of the
People shall be chosen by direct election, and for this purpose, the whole of Sikkim shall form one parliamentary constituency to be called the parliamentary constituency for Sikkim."

Of late some highly significant Amendments have been made in the Constituency of India. On 1st August, 1975, the President gave assent to the Thirty-eighth Amendment Act "making President's power to declare emergency and to promulgate ordinances non-justiciable". The Lok Sabha passed on 7th August, 1975, the Constitution (Thirty-ninth) Amendment Act to place beyond challenge in courts the election to parliament of a person holding the office of Prime Minister or Speaker and the election of President and Vice-President.

Further, the Lok Sabha passed on 25th May, 1976, the Constitution (Fortieth) Amendment Act "extending the scope of Article 257, relating to territorial waters to include the concept of exclusive economic zone and to enlarge the list of entries in the Ninth Schedule to give protection to certain State and Central Laws, mostly connected with land reforms."

On 25th June, 1975, the President of India declared a state of emergency in the country "due to the existence of a threat to the security of India from internal disturbance". On 29th June he issued an ordinance amending the Maintenance of Internal Security (Amendment) Act under which "no grounds need be given for detention".

On 1st July, 1975, the Prime Minister in a broadcast to the nation announced a package of economic measures—the 20-point Economic Programme. The twenty points are:

2. Implementation of agricultural land ceilings and speedier distribution of surplus land and compilation of land records.
3. Stepping up of provision of house sites for landless and weaker sections.
4. Bonded labour, wherever it exists, will be declared illegal.
5. Plea for liquidation of rural indebtedness. Legislation for moratorium on recovery of debt from landless labourers, small farmers and artisans.
6. Review of laws on minimum agricultural wages.
7. Five million more hectares to be brought under irrigation. National programme for use of underground water.
8. An accelerated power programme. Superthermal stations under central control.
9. New development plan for development of handloom sector.
10. Improvement in quality and supply of peoples' cloth.
11. Socialization of urban and urbanisable land. Ceiling on ownership and possession of vacant land and on plinth area of new dwelling units.
12. Special squads for valuation of conspicuous construction and prevention of tax evasion.
13. Special legislation for confiscation of smuggler’s properties.
15. New schemes for workers association in industry.
17. Income Tax relief to middle class; exemption list to be placed at Rs. 8000.
18. Essential commodities at controlled prices to students in hostels.
20. New apprenticeship scheme to enlarge employment and training, especially of weaker sections.

The Constitution (Thirty-ninth Amendment) Act, 1975 laid down: “For Article 71 of the Constitution, the following article shall be substituted, namely: subject to the provisions of this Constitution, Parliament may by law regulate any matter relating to or connected with the election of a President, or Vice-President including the grounds on which such election may be questioned:

“Provided that the election of a person as President or Vice-President shall not be called in question on the ground of existence of any vacancy for whatsoever reason among the members of the electoral college electing him.”

The Constitution (Forty-second Amendment), Bill which was finally passed by the Parliament on 11th November, 1976 received President’s assent on 18th December, 1976, after which it was ratified by more than half the number of States. It has been regarded as a restraint on the country’s Democracy in certain respects. It gave primacy to the Directive Principles enumerated in the Constitution over all Fundamental Rights and made all the Directives enforceable through the Courts. The Directives also became Rights under the amended Constitution. The measure reasserted once for all the supremacy of Parliament over other wings of Government and asserted its power to amend any provision in the Constitution. No change made by it in the Constitution could henceforth be challenged in any courts of law on any ground whatsoever. It incorporates for the first time in the Preamble the words “Sovereign, Socialist, Secular, Democratic Republic”. An exhaustive chapter on the Citizens’ Fundamental Duties was included for the first time in the Constitution. The role of the judiciary became subordinate and some of its powers removed and its jurisdiction curtailed. The federal character of the Indian Union remained unchanged. The new Constitutional changes were to be ratified by the States. The Central Government became stronger as a result of these changes. No change was made in the rights of the minority communities as these were guaranteed under the Constitution originally.
The Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Act introduced by the Law Minister in the Lok Sabha seeks to delete the anti-democratic provisions enacted in the Constitution by a previous Amendment (Forty-second Amendment). The High Courts will get back their jurisdiction. With deletion of Articles 32A, 131A, 144A, 226A and 228A the High Courts will again supervise the law and the decisions of all courts functioning within the States. They will once again get the power to determine the constitutional validity of all laws, including laws made by Parliament. There will be no constraints, either in the Supreme Court or in the High Courts, regarding the number of judges "who should pronounce enacted laws as invalid".

At a meeting held at the Prime Minister's residence on 31st December, 1977, there was a consensus of opinion for addition of a separate provision to Article 368 of the Constitution to the effect that before any amendment to the Constitution relating to certain specific matters is given effect to, it will have endorsement through a referendum. A view is being taken in the Janata Government that some sections of the Amendment can be retained without violating the Janata Party's pledges to the people.
APPENDIX III

FOREIGN AGGRESSIONS
(to September, 1966)

1. The Chinese Invasion

The relations between Free India and the Communist Government of China were at first quite friendly, but they were disturbed by the Chinese attitude towards Tibet, which was an autonomous State under the suzerainty of China. Free India had friendly relations with Tibet and "had inherited from the British certain old-established rights, including an agent in Lhasa, trade agencies in Gyantse and Yatung, post and telegraph offices on the trade route to Gyantse and a small military escort for their protection". But China invaded Tibet in 1950 and forced her ruler, the Dalai Lama, to accept a treaty (1951) by which the autonomy of Tibet was replaced by full-fledged sovereignty of China. This aroused India's apprehensions about the expansive policy of China as there were over 3,000 kilometres of common border between the two countries. On 20th April, 1954, there was an agreement between India and China by which both accepted Pancha Sheel—Five principles—as the basis of their relations as friendly neighbours. Under this agreement India abandoned all the privileges she had hitherto enjoyed in Tibet as mentioned above. In June, 1954, Chou En-lai, the Chinese Premier, visited India and friendship between India and China seemed to have been firmly established.

There was, however, a rift in the lute when the Chinese published maps including 132,090 square kilometres of Indian territory in the Himalaya region, from Ladakh to the Assam border, as parts of the Chinese dominions. At first they offered various excuses and explanations for this wrongful inclusion of Indian territory in their maps. But the crisis came in 1959 when the Chinese overran Tibet and introduced a veritable reign of terror, in consequence of which the Dalai Lama, the secular and spiritual head of Tibet, and a large number of Tibetans have sought refuge in India. About the same time the Chinese invaded Himalayan regions of India, and, in spite of strong protests and repeated attempts of the Government of India to reach an amicable settlement, the Chinese occupied about 31,000 square kilometres of Indian territory. This aggression of China meant a complete disregard on her part of the Five Principles (Pancha Sheel), to which she had pledged
herself in the Sino-Indian Agreement of 1954, and of the Ten Principles drawn up at the Bandung Conference of Asian-African nations in 1955. But something worse was yet to come. On 20th October, 1962, about 50,000 Chinese troops began a large-scale invasion of Ladakh and NEFA (North-Eastern Frontier Agency), to the north of Assam. The Indian troops fought gallantly, but, being vastly outnumbered, could not offer any effective resistance in NEFA. On 19th November Bomdi La was captured and the whole of Assam lay at the mercy of the Chinese, who had also occupied the portion of Ladakh claimed by them. But on 21st November they declared a unilateral cease-fire and retired to a considerable distance.

This, however, indicated no intention on the part of China to disgorge the gains of aggression. In view of certain discrepancies and contradictions in the so-called cease-fire proposal of China, Prime Minister Nehru wrote to Premier Chou En-lai on 1st December, 1962, commending for his acceptance "the clear and straightforward proposal, namely, at least the restoration of the status quo prior to 8th September, 1962, so that the necessary atmosphere for reverting to peaceful processes may be created".

Anxious to promote world peace and amity, Nehru addressed a communication about Chinese aggression to the Governments of most of the countries of the world and received in return messages of sympathy and support from sixty-three countries. To evolve a peaceful settlement of the conflict six non-aligned countries, namely, Ceylon, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Ghana and the United Arab Republic, met in a conference at Colombo from 10th to the 12th December, 1962, and made some proposals suggesting a via media. After clarification of the proposals by representatives of three countries of the Colombo Conference, the Indian Government accepted these, but China did not, and, in open violation of these proposals, the Chinese established seven civil posts in the western sector and placed stone cairns along the so-called "line of control". All gestures for peace on the part of India were negatived by the uncompromising attitude on the part of the Chinese Government and they have continued to increase their military strength along the Indian border. The Chinese are now in possession of 36,260 square kilometres of Indian territory in Ladakh and 5,180 square kilometres in the North-Eastern Frontier.

Chinese diplomacy has not been marked by a feeling of friendliness towards India. Rather China supplied arms to Pakistan and trained Pakistanî military personnel. She also tried to meddle in the affairs of Nepal and to turn her against India. India, on the contrary, followed peaceful diplomacy. Even after 1962, India supported China's case for membership in the U.N. The Government of India expressed their desire to settle border problems by peaceful means. The Foreign Minister of India stated in the Rajya Sabha on 26th August, 1970: "We do notice a slight change in the attitude of China towards, and propaganda against, her neighbours including India of late, but we have not yet seen any change in the substantive matters
so far as the Chinese stand towards India is concerned. We are always prepared to settle all matters, with our neighbours, including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiations on the basis of respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty, and the non-use of force or threat of force. In the interests of peace there is need to develop friendly relations between the two countries. In July, 1976 India has sent her ambassador to China and China has also sent her ambassador to India.

2. Invasion by Pakistan

The dispute with Pakistan entered a new phase when it was discovered on 5th August, 1965, that quite a large number of Pakistãnis in disguise had infiltrated into Kãshmir. They included regular army personnel and their object was to incite the people of Kãshmir into rebellion against the Government. The object entirely failed, as they received no help or encouragement from the people of Kãshmir. The Indian security forces immediately started mopping up operations, and it was soon found that the number of infiltrators was not less than 3,000 and probably more. They had begun entering into Kãshmir territory long before August and had established secret depots of arms. On 27th August regular Pakistani troops crossed the Cease-Fire Line (CFL) but retired after a heavy clash with Indian forces. On the first day of September, 1965, Pakistan launched a major offensive with two regiments of Patton tanks and Sabre jet-fighters (lent them by the U.S.A. long before for the specific purpose of use in war with China) in the Chamb sector and entered a few miles within the territory of Jammu after crossing the international border between India and Pakistan. India replied to this undeclared warfare on the part of Pakistan by immediately invading Pakistan at several points. The Indian Army destroyed a large number of Patton tanks and not only halted the advance of the Pakistani Army but also advanced within a few miles of Lahore and Sialkot after inflicting severe losses upon the retreating Pakistani forces. There were heavy bombing raids by both sides, but while the Indian Air Force hit only important military bases and installations, the Pakistani Air Force bombarded civil areas and destroyed many civil buildings including a church and a hospital. The question was taken up by the Security Council of U.N.O., which passed a resolution asking both India and Pakistan to cease all hostile operations. In obedience to this resolution there was a cease-fire on both sides on 23rd September and the armies of both India and Pakistan occupied the line which they held on that date. But in spite of a number of observers (military personnel of neutral countries) sent by the Security Council, Pakistan did not cease to make minor violations of the cease-fire agreement against which India lodged strong protest. In order to restore cordial relations between the two countries the Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Mr. Kosygin, arranged
a meeting between the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan, which took place at Tashkent in Russian Turkestan, early in January, 1966. A mutual agreement of peace and friendship between India and Pakistan was signed and it was followed, almost immediately, by the sudden and tragic death of the Indian Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, at 1 a.m. on 11th January, 1966. The loss is so tragic the fact that the subsequent activities of Pakistan do not seem to have been influenced in any way by the Tashkent Agreement or its spirit.

While India was fighting against Pakistan, China, which had been an ally of Pakistan for some time past, concentrated forces on the Himalayan border, and threatened to invade India on the most flimsy grounds. On 17th September, 1965 the Chinese Government sent an ultimatum that if India did not dismantle military installations set up by her beyond the Sikkim-China border within three days she would invade India. India denied having ever set up any such installations, and on the 19th the date of the expiry of the ultimatum was extended by three days. The Chinese evidently planned to invade India while she was engaged with Pakistan, and presumably on account of the cease-fire agreement between India and Pakistan did not proceed to carry out the threatened invasion. The Chinese were busy for some time making heavy concentrations of troops on the Himalayan border and creating a tense situation.

Chinese diplomacy was not marked by feelings of friendliness towards India. Rather they supplied arms to Pakistan and trained Pakistani military personnel. She also tried to meddle in the affairs of Nepal and to mislead Nepal against India. India on the contrary followed peaceful diplomacy. Even after 1962, India supported China’s case for membership in the U.N. The Government of India expressed their desire to settle border problems by peaceful means. The Foreign Minister of India stated in the Rajya Sabha on 26th August, 1970: “We are always prepared to settle all matters with our neighbours, including China, peacefully through bilateral negotiation on the basis of respect for our territorial integrity and sovereignty, and the non-use of force or threat of force.” For the interest of peace there is need for developing friendly relations between the two countries. In 1976 the Government of India decided to send an ambassador to China.
APPENDIX IV

THE EMERGENCE OF BANGLADESH

India’s Prime Minister Mrs Indira Gandhi said in a radio talk on the occasion of the first anniversary of the Tashkent Agreement: “I should like to reaffirm India’s commitment to peace and peaceful methods of settling international differences. Despite the irreversible events of history, the future of the peoples of India and Pakistan demands co-operation. We share so many affinities. Our task is to build a better life for our peoples. Discord will weaken us both and retard our progress. We can prosper only if we live in amity.”

But there was no sincere reciprocation to these sentiments from Pakistan. It continued to propagate feelings of hatred against India. Pakistan participated in the military alliances of the West, allowed her territory to become a sphere for international intrigue, and obtained arms aid from foreign powers. In the international field her policy was that those who opposed India “were her friends”, and she carried on “hate India” and “crush India” campaigns. The logic of these attitudes eventually drove the two countries into armed conflict again in December 1971.

In the meantime, dramatic developments had taken place in the area described as East Pakistan after the partition of India in 1947. The people there were seething with discontent due to West Pakistan’s undue domination over them in all respects—administrative, economic and cultural. The key administrative positions were held by West Pakistanis; in economic and industrial matters the people of East Pakistan were exploited and discriminated against; and attempts were made by the West Pakistan ruling authorities to impose on the people of the eastern part a culture alien to them, and to make Urdu the sole official language ignoring the claims of the people whose mother tongue and vehicle of culture had been Bengali all along. One writer has aptly observed that “in all the aspects of life, the people of West Pakistan have acted towards the people of East Pakistan as if East Pakistan was a colonial possession of West Pakistan”

Pakistan’s soldier-President, Field-Marshal Mohammed Ayub Khan, stepped down and handed over power to the Army Commander-in-Chief,

1Subash C. Kashyap, (ed.), Bangladesh (Background and Perspectives) (New Delhi, 1971), Appendix.

2“Limits of Political Obligation” by Rasheeduddin Khan in ibid.
General Yahya Khan, on 25th March, 1969. In his first radio talk on 26th March, Yahya Khan promised “the establishment of a constitutional government”. The first election in twenty-two years was held in Pakistan on 7th December, 1970 on the basis of adult franchise. The Awami League Party of East Pakistan, under the leadership of Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, was returned with a clear majority winning 160 out of the 162 seats for East Pakistan in the National Assembly, and 288 out of the 300 seats in the East Pakistan Assembly. With the election of 10 women members to it, the Awami League Party came to have 298 seats out of 310 seats.

But the hopes of the people for a representative government were belied as Yahya Khan evaded it on one plea or the other. Led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, the people of East Bengal launched a civil disobedience movement on 8th March, 1971, to press for their constitutional rights. The students played a prominent role in this movement. On 9th March, the East Bengal judges refused to swear in Lt. General Tikka Khan as Governor of that area. For some days Yahya Khan had a series of fruitless talks with Mujibur Rehman. These, writes Anthony Mascarenhas, “were never meant to succeed. The talks were just a stratagem to give Tikka Khan and the army that additional margin of time they needed to bring in reinforcements from the western wing.”

On 25th March, in a ruthless attempt to suppress the East Bengal people’s movement for liberation, Yahya launched a military campaign of the most virulent type. A reign of terror was unleashed. Men, women and children were indiscriminately slaughtered while the women were also dishonoured. In what became a cold-blooded campaign of genocide the intellectuals—academics and professionals—and the flower of youth, the students, were massacred. To escape death and dishonour, a large number of people from East Bengal came to India as refugees and the Government of India took all possible steps to afford them food and shelter. Philanthropic institutions like the Ramakrishna Mission and the Bharat Seva Sangh organized relief works for the refugees. India also did much to evoke international support and sympathy for their plight.

The people of East Bengal remained undaunted. Using whatever tactics they could, including guerilla warfare, they opposed military oppression with remarkable enthusiasm and bravery in their fight for freedom and democracy.

On 28th March, 1971, the liberation army chief, Major Ziauddin Khan,

---

1 Anthony Mascarenhas, The Bangladesh (Delhi, 1971), p. 108.

Anthony Mascarenhas is a journalist and was an eye-witness to the massacre of the people of East Bengal by the Pakistani militarists. He was one of the eight West Pakistani journalists who were taken on a conducted tour of East Bengal by the military administration so that they might report to the people of West Pakistan about “the great job the army was doing”. But he refused to sell his conscience. He said, “either I would write the full story of what I had seen or I would have to stop writing.”
announced the formation of a Bangladesh government. Mujibur Rehman was named the President and Syed Nazrul Islam the Vice-President. As acting President, Syed Nazrul Islam formed a six-member cabinet with the Awami League leader, Tajuddin Ahmed, as the Prime Minister. On 17th April, 1971, Tajuddin Ahmed issued an appeal to the people of the world in which he stated: "Bangladesh is at war. It has been given no choice but to secure its right of self-determination through a national liberation struggle against the colonial oppression of Pakistan...Pakistan is now dead and buried under the mountain of corpses. The hundreds and thousands of people murdered by the army in Bangladesh will be an impenetrable barrier between West Pakistan and the people of Bangladesh...We now appeal to the nations of the world for recognition and assistance both material and mineral in our struggle for nationhood. Every day this is delayed a thousand lives are lost and more of Bangladesh's vital assets are destroyed. In the name of Humanity act now and earn our undying friendship."

The blood-bath perpetrated in East Bengal by the West Pakistani armies shocked the world. For India it was a matter of vital concern. She could not have remained a silent spectator to the massacre of an innocent people whose only fault was that they were claiming "basic human rights". On 31st March, 1971, the Indian Parliament unanimously passed a resolution "expressing its profound sympathy for and solidarity with the people of East Bengal in their struggle for democratic ways of life". It pressed for "immediate cessation of the use of force and the massacre of defenceless people" and called upon all peoples and governments "to take urgent and constructive steps to prevail upon the Government of Pakistan to put an end to the systematic decimation of people which amounted to genocide".

While the brave fighters of the Mukti Bahini in East Bengal were winning victories against the Pakistan army, Pakistan's military junta dragged India into a conflict with her by bombing her border territories without any provocation. The Prime Minister, who was in Calcutta at the time, informed the country of Pakistan's aggression while addressing a mammoth public meeting there on 3rd December, 1971. The President of India announced a few hours after this: "A grave emergency exists whereby the security of India is threatened by external aggression." On 4th December, Pakistan officially declared war on India.

The results of this war were disastrous for Pakistan thanks to the bold and decisive strategies of India's land, air and naval forces. On 6th December, India officially recognized Bangladesh as an independent democratic State and Bhutan followed suit on the 7th. On 16th December, India and Bangladesh entered into an agreement to fight Pakistan under a joint military command. Lt. General Jagjit Singh Aurora became its Chief Commander. Fighting with irresistible determination, the combined forces inflicted crushing defeats on Pakistan troops at various centres. After the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army, General Manekshaw, had sent notes of warning
and appeal to Major General Firman Ali, Commander of the Dacca garrison, Lt. General Niazi, Commander of the Pakistani forces in Bangladesh, and the Pakistani troops surrendered unconditionally to General Aurora at 4.21 p.m. on 16th December at the Dacca Race Course ground. Dacca became the capital of independent Bangladesh. After this complete defeat of the Pakistani forces, Yahya Khan’s position became untenable and he transferred power to Zulfikar Ali Bhutto as President and Chief Martial Law Administrator of Pakistan. Sheikh Mujibur Rehman was released from jail on 22nd December and came to India via London on 10th January, 1972. He was received with the loud acclamations and cheers of a vast crowd at Palam Airport and the greetings of the President and Prime Minister of India.

On 19th March, 1972, the Prime Ministers of India and Bangladesh signed a twenty-five year “Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Peace” in Dacca. As regards the proposed trial of 195 Pakistani prisoners on charges of war crimes, they said in a joint declaration: “Both Prime Ministers hope that these trials will bring the guilty persons to justice and also bring home to the world at large the enormity of the suffering of the people of Bangladesh.” They also referred, in the joint declaration, to the need “to keep the Indian Ocean area free of great power rivalries and military competitions”, declared the two countries “opposition to the establishment of land, air and naval bases, in the area” and demanded that the area be made a nuclear free zone. A cultural co-operation agreement between Bangladesh and India was signed at Dacca on 30th December, 1972, “for promoting and developing the relations and understanding between the two countries in the field of culture, education and academic activities in science and technology”.

Z. A. Bhutto declared his desire to live in peace with India. This has always been India’s aim. So her Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi took the initiative in this matter. Pre-summit talks were arranged at Murree near Rawalpindi in the last week of April, 1972, between the Indian delegation led by Mr. D. P. Dhar, Chairman of the Policy Planning Committee in India’s Ministry of External Affairs, and the Pakistani team headed by Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Secretary-General of Pakistan’s Foreign Affairs Ministry. This was followed by the summit meeting at Simla from 28th June, 1972, as a result of which Mrs. Gandhi and President Bhutto signed an agreement on the night of 2-3 July. According to the terms of this agreement, the two countries decided “to put an end to the conflict and confrontation that have hitherto marred their relations and work for the promotion of a friendly and harmonious relationship and the establishment of a durable peace in the subcontinent, so that both countries may henceforth devote their resources and energies to the pressing task of advancing the welfare of their people.” Both the parties reiterated their faith in the U.N. Charter. They further agreed to resume normal contacts in communications, travel facilities, trade, etc., to disengage their troops and return occupied territory beyond the recognized international borders, and to maintain the status quo in Kashmir and Jammu as on 17th
December, 1971. Both the countries undertook not to take any step to change the actual line of control unilaterally. It was further agreed that differences between India and Pakistan were henceforth to be solved through bilateral negotiations or any other peaceful means agreed upon by both.

The Simla Pact was on the whole well received in India and other countries as “a first step” towards the establishment of friendly relations between Pakistan and India. But some critics in India described it as “a sell-out” and a blunder. President Bhutto said at Rawalpindi that “nobody has won and nobody has lost” by the Agreement and that it was a victory for the “principles of justice and fairplay”.

The agreement reached at Lahore on 7th December, 1972, between General Manekshaw and General Tikka Khan—the Army Chiefs of India and Pakistan—was significant because the Indian view that Thako Chak in Kashmir belonged to India was conceded. Their joint statement mentioned that “the line of control (in Jammu and Kashmir) will commence from the Chhamb sector and end in the Turlock sector in Partapur”. General Manekshaw made some “minor adjustments in the interest of peace and in order to rationalize the line of control”.

However, since the Simla Agreement was concluded, there have been repeated “evasions and ambiguities” in the Pakistan President’s statements regarding the implementation of the terms of the Agreement. Nor has Pakistan taken any concrete steps till now to recognize Bangladesh as a sovereign country which is considered to be an important prerequisite for establishing normalcy in the sub-continent. On 30th November, 1972, the 27th General Assembly Session of the U.N. unanimously approved a 23-nation resolution recommending that the Republic of Bangladesh be admitted to the organization. Though Pakistan did not recognize Bangladesh, it did not get any note of dissent recorded either and this was construed as a de facto recognition of the Dacca regime by Pakistan. However, Bangladesh’s admission was vetoed by China in the Security Council and its application is still pending.

According to the new constitution adopted by it on 16th December, 1972, Bangladesh had its first general election on 7th March, 1973. Before this date, eleven candidates of the ruling Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman had been elected unopposed. The result of the election was overwhelming victory for the Awami League. In the final party positions as they emerged on 11th March the ruling Awami League had 292 seats, the Independents 5, Bangladesh Jatiyo League 1, and the National Socialist Party (Muzaffar Group) 1.

The situation in the sub-continent still remained deadlocked and so, early in April, 1973, India once again took the initiative to find a solution. P. N. Haksar, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s special emissary, went to Dacca and met Sheikh Mujibur Rehman and Dr. Kamal Hossain, the Foreign Minister, to discuss a basis for negotiations with Pakistan. On 12th April,
Dr. Kamal Hossain came to Delhi to finalize details and, on the 17th, India and Bangladesh released a joint declaration. The declaration called upon Pakistan to agree to the “simultaneous repatriation” of civilian internees and prisoners of war—except those required by Bangladesh for trial on “criminal charges”—as also of Bengalis in Pakistan and non-Bengalis in Bangladesh who had declared allegiance to Pakistan. The declaration expressed “regret and concern” at Pakistan’s failure to recognize Bangladesh but reaffirmed that the Governments of India and Bangladesh were ready to find a solution “to all humanitarian problems” without prejudicing their respective positions and hoped that Pakistan would reciprocate accordingly.

Even though the joint Indo-Bangladesh Declaration was hailed throughout the world as a “significant attempt to find a way out of the impasse on the sub-continent”, it did not lead to any immediate improvement in the situation. In its reply, dated 20th April, to the Declaration, Pakistan spoke of “the difficulties inherent in the terms of the Delhi declaration” and stated that it could not recognize “the competence of the authorities in Dacca” to bring to trial any among the prisoners of war on criminal charges. It also expressed the need for consultations with India to clarify some of the implications of the Declaration. However, even while India and Bangladesh were studying its reply, the Pakistan Government rounded up large numbers of Bengali civil servants and military personnel in its service on 6th May and placed them in detention camps. On 11th May, Pakistan began proceedings against India at the International Court of Justice at the Hague in an attempt to prevent India from transferring to Bangladesh the 195 prisoners of war who face trial there. It also requested the Court to issue an interim injunction ordering India not to hand over the prisoners till the case had been finally judged. Furthermore, on 19th May, the Government of Pakistan revived its dispute with India on the question of overflights at the International Civil Aviation Organization.

India’s External Affairs Minister, Swaran Singh, said at Prague on 1st June that “India regards the action of Pakistan as in clear contravention of the Simla Agreement, by which both countries agreed to solve all problems by mutual discussion and not to involve any outside authorities”. He also stated that India did not recognize the competence of the International Court of Justice on the question of the prisoners of war and, consequently, India boycotted the hearings of the Court which began on 4th June.

However, India continued to seek a meeting with Pakistan to solve outstanding problems within the framework of the Indo-Bangladesh Declaration. Indian efforts paid off on 25th June when the President of Pakistan sent a letter agreeing to discuss the package deal embodied in the April Declaration. Pakistan also withdrew its petitions to the World Court and the ICAO and the way was now clear for a meeting between the two sides.

The Prime Minister’s special emissary, Mr. P. N. Haksar, flew to Dacca to consult the Government of Bangladesh and finalize a brief for the coming
talks. On 23rd July, the Indian team, led by Mr. Haksar, arrived in Islamabad and began its meetings with the Pakistani team—led by Mr. Aziz Ahmed, Minister of State for Defence and Foreign Affairs—the next day. After eight days of discussions, the two teams decided to adjourn the talks to "enable all parties to take stock of the situation." Mr. P. N. Haksar again flew to Dacca to hold further discussions with Bangladesh and it was agreed that India would confine its discussions with Pakistan to the three-way repatriation and would raise "no extraneous issue".

On 18th August the two teams reassembled in New Delhi but appeared to make little headway till, in order to avert a deadlock, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi intervened personally in the negotiations. After that, the talks progressed rapidly and, on 28th August, 1973, a comprehensive settlement was reached and an Agreement released simultaneously from Dacca, Delhi and Islamabad.

The Agreement was aimed at "liquidating the great bulk of the humanitarian problem left over by the 1971 conflict" and was made "without prejudice to the respective positions of the parties concerned relating to the case of 195 prisoners of war". It provided for a simultaneous "repatriation of all Pakistani prisoners of war and civilian internees...all Bengalis in Pakistan and all Pakistanis in Bangladesh". The Government of Pakistan agreed "to receive a substantial number of non-Bengalis...stated to have opted for repatriation to Pakistan...from Bangladesh" while Bangladesh was not to hold "trials of the 195 prisoners of war...during the entire period of repatriation".

The repatriations were scheduled to be completed by the end of September, 1973. After that, the Agreement says, "Bangladesh, India and Pakistan will discuss and settle the question of the 195 prisoners of war". If this issue is settled satisfactorily then there would appear to be no real obstacle to Pakistan recognizing Bangladesh as a sovereign, independent State. Perhaps it is not without significance that the August Agreement ended with the following sentence: "The special representative of the Prime Minister of India, having consulted the Government of Bangladesh, has also conveyed the concurrence of the Bangladesh Government in this Agreement."

A beginning was made for the implementation of the Delhi Agreement on 19th September, 1973, when the first batch of stranded Pakistanis in Bangladesh and that of Bengalis in Pakistan were repatriated to their respective countries. The process of normalization of relations among India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, as envisaged in the Simla Agreement, and building up of a durable peace in the sub-continent, has continued through several reconciliation talks and agreements. A "big forward step" was taken when Delhi, Pindi and Dacca signed "a historic agreement" on 9th April, 1974, which provided for more repatriations of the nationals of Bangladesh and Pakistan. India and Pakistan also decided on the same date "to take immediate steps for restoration of Postal and Telecommunication links and
travel facilities as visualized in the Simla Agreement." It is also significant that an Indo-Pakistan Trade Agreement was concluded on 7th December, 1974, removing about ten years' embargo on trade between India and Pakistan. In the same month India and Bangladesh issued a joint communiqué urging Pakistan to take all necessary steps, according to the Simla and Delhi accords, "to help normalize relations among the three countries and to ensure lasting peace in the sub-continent".

According to a Protocol signed in New Delhi on 15th January, 1975, India and Pakistan will resume direct shipping services, suspended since the 1965 conflict, "on the principles of sovereign equality and mutual benefit". India and Pakistan signed a Trade Agreement at Islamabad on 25th January, 1975, for one year, which may be extended further. In 1976 India and Pakistan have shown more conciliatory attitude towards each other. Agreements have been reached for running of air and rail services between the two countries.

After the Islamic Summit at Lahore, Pakistan recognized Bangladesh on 21st February, 1974. The Indo-Bangladesh accord has been reaffirmed. For three days, from 8th to 10th October, 1974, India's Foreign Affairs Minister, Y.B. Chavan, had talks in Dacca with Bangladesh leaders, especially with the Bangladesh Foreign Minister, Dr. Kamal Hossain. A Joint Communiqué at the conclusion of the talks stated that: "India and Bangladesh would work for the continued expansion in scope and extent of the relations between the two countries and to increase their efforts at expanding bilateral economic relations for mutual benefit." The two Foreign Ministers expressed the hope that according to the terms of the Simla and Delhi Agreements, Pakistan would make proper arrangements with Bangladesh on the matters like division of assets and repatriation of Pakistani refugees. These two leaders reiterated the views of their countries that the Indian Ocean should be a zone of peace and "expressed particular concern over the proposed expansion of naval facilities on the Diego Garcia." They reaffirmed their firm faith in the principles of non-alignment and peaceful co-existence. New Trade Agreements were also signed between India and Bangladesh. But Bangladesh has had to face internal troubles for suppression of which the President of Bangladesh proclaimed, on 28th December, 1974, a state of emergency throughout Bangladesh in exercise of the power conferred by clause I of Article 141A of the Constitution of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. A Press Note issued at Dacca on that day said: "Emergency has been proclaimed in the whole of Bangladesh as security and economic life have been threatened by internal disturbances, and during the period the proclamation of emergency is in operation certain articles of the Constitution shall remain suspended as provided in the Constitution."

On 25th January, 1975, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman became the new President of Bangladesh after a change in its Constitution. The President will henceforth be the chief and final authority in matters of administration. The
Chief Minister and his Council will function as an advisory body to help and advise the President in all matters.

By an unfortunate turn of events in Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rehman was assassinated in 1975. Mr. Justice Mohammed resigned the Presidency of Bangladesh on 21st April, 1976 on ground of ill health and nominated Major-General Zia-ur Rahman, Chief of Army Staff and Chief Martial Law Administrator, to succeed him as President. In a broadcast on 30th April, 1976 he summed up his policies in the following nineteen points: (i) To preserve the country’s Independence, integrity and sovereignty at all costs; (ii) to reflect the four fundamental principles of the constitution in all spheres of national life; (iii) to make the nation self-reliant in every possible way; (iv) to ensure the participation of the people at every level of the administration, in development programmes and in the maintenance of order; (v) to strengthen the economy by according top priority to agricultural development; (vi) to ensure that no one went hungry by making the country self-sufficient in food; (vii) to ensure clothing for everyone, by increasing cloth production; (viii) to take all possible measures to ensure that no one remained homeless; (ix) to rid the country of illiteracy; (x) to ensure a minimum level of medical care for everyone; (xi) to give women their rightful place in society and to organize and inspire the young for building the nation; (xii) to give necessary incentives to the private sector for the economic development of the country; (xiii) to improve the workers’ conditions and to develop healthy labour-management relations in the interest of increased production; (xiv) to encourage the spirit of public service and nation-building among government employees and to improve their financial situation; (xv) to check the population explosion; (xvi) to establish friendship with all countries on a basis of equality and especially to strengthen relation with Muslim countries; (xvii) to decentralize the system of administration and develop and strengthen local government; (xviii) to establish a social order based on justice and free from corruption; (xix) to safeguard the rights of all citizens irrespective of religion, colour and sect and to consolidate national unity and solidarity.

Bangladesh and India maintained goodwill and cordiality. Farakka agreement with India on 5th November, 1976 and the border issue were amicably settled. There were Indo-Bangladesh high-level talks at New Delhi which were concluded on 7th April, 1976. Both sides reaffirmed their desire to work for better understanding and for promoting friendly relations. During the recent (December, 1977) Bangladesh delegation to India, under the leadership of its President General Zia-ur Rahman, India impressed upon the Delegation that after the solution of the Farakka and border issues all that India “wanted in return was friendship based on trust and confidence for the creation of which equal treatment of all citizens, irrespective of religion, was imperative”, and that all fear should be removed from the minds of the minority community.
APPENDIX V

RECENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHANGES

The achievement of objects set forth in our Constitution presented stupendous problems. Our democracy was confronted with complex legacies of the long period of alien domination, appalling poverty and unemployment, prevalence of social injustice and inequality, extremely low percentage of education, unproductive economic condition, lack of adequate facilities for industrial and agricultural development and extremely low percentage of literacy among the common men and ignorance of the electorate.

Various measures have been recently introduced by the Union and State Governments to improve the living conditions of the masses and to effect an all-round economic development. In March, 1950, the Government of India set up the Planning Commission to prepare a plan for the "most effective and balanced utilization of the country's resources". The main objective of planning was defined as starting "a process of development which will raise living standards and open out to the people new opportunities for a richer and more varied life". Economic planning was to be considered as "an integral part of the wider process aiming not merely at the development of human faculties and the building up of an institutional framework adequate to the needs and aspirations of the people". Through working of the three Plans there has been noticeable developments in organized industries and minerals, in villages and small industries, in major and medium irrigation, in transport and communications and in social services. Though in certain respects progress was slow due to some unavoidable factors, particularly unfavourable weather conditions, we hope that the deficiencies would be removed to a large extent by faithful implementation of the Fourth Five-Year Plan which aims at "generating a rapid increase in the national product, without imparing social stability". Details of the Fifth Five-Year Plan are under consideration now.

Landlordism or the Zamindari system, which sapped the initiative and enterprise of the Indian peasants, has been liquidated as a result of some Acts passed in different States. Of the territorial magnates, dispossessed of their zamindaris, many have invested capital in industrial and commercial concerns. Some of them of lower rank have been reduced to the status of middle class. We may note in this connection the Bhooedes (land
gift) movement of one of our saint-patriot Acharya Vinobaji. In 1951 he was offered the first land gift in a small village in the Nalgonda district of the Telangana area of the Hyderabad State. It has developed into an All-India Movement in the course of these years. Legislation has been passed in almost all the States to provide for a ceiling on land holdings. But implementation of the laws passed in this respect has been slow, and provisions regarding level of ceilings, transfers and exemption from ceilings vary from State to State.

To help rural development on an extensive scale the Banks have been nationalized. July 19th 1969 is a highly significant landmark in the history of Indian banking. By an Ordinance the President of India nationalized fourteen major Indian private commercial banks. The Banking Companies (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Bill was introduced on 25th July and passed by both Houses of the Parliament on 8th August. The Bill became law on 9th August, when the President gave his assent to it. In a statement on 21st July in Parliament, India’s Prime Minister thus explained the significance of the momentous decision of bank nationalisation: “The banks will now be better placed to serve the farmer and to promote agricultural production and rural development generally. Public ownership will also help curb the use of bank credit for speculative and other unproductive purpose. By severing the link between the major banks and the bigger industrial groups which have so far controlled them, Government believe that the step they have taken will also bring about the right atmosphere for the development of adequate professional management in the banking.” By an Act of the Parliament the Government took over the management of General Insurance Companies in 1971. In May, 1972, the government took over the ownership of 214 coking coal mines and by the Coal Mines (Taking over of Management) Ordinance, promulgated on the 30th January, 1973, the Government “has taken over the entire management of the 464 private non-coking coal mines, pending nationalization of all the private non-coking coal mines with a view to ensuring a rational and co-ordinated development of coal production and promoting optimum utilization of coal resources consistent with the growing requirements of the economy.”

After Independence, Government announced its industrial policy on 6th April, 1948. According to it Industries were divided roughly into four categories: (1) exclusive Government monopoly, (2) Government-controlled sphere, (3) Industries controlled and regulated by Government, (4) Private sphere under general governmental control. Co-ordination between large-scale and small-scale industries was emphasized. Ordinarily as regards capital the major interest in ownership and control was to be in the hands of the Indians.

For certain reasons it became necessary for the Government to assume greater and direct responsibility for industrial undertakings. So the Prime
Minister restated Government’s Industrial Policy in the Parliament on 30th April, 1959 on the following points: new classification of industries, aid to cottage and small-scale industries, balance in industrial development in the different regions, application of co-operative principle in the industrial activities of the private sector and gradual association of workers and technicians with management of industries. Since the Second Five-Year Plan there has been progress in the growth and diversification of Indian industries.

During the recent years there has been an increase in agricultural production due to the use of modern machinery and equipment in cultivation, scientific manuring, extension of irrigation and improved credit facilities. This is expected to produce what is described as the Green Revolution. It has also been thought advisable to introduce co-operative farming.

For training in modern methods of agricultural work the following Agricultural Universities have been established in the country:

Andhra Pradesh Agricultural University
Assam Agricultural University
Haryana Agricultural University
Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vidyalya, Jabalpur
Mahatma Fule Krishi Vidyapith
Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology
Punjab Agricultural University
Punjabrao Krishi Vidyapith, Maharashtra
Rajendra Agricultural University, Bihar
Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University, Pant Nagar
University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangalore

To promote such activities among the student and non-student youth the Ministry of Education was redesignated on 14th February, 1969 as the Ministry of Education and Youth Welfare. The Kothari Commission recommended that: “Some form of Social and national service should be made an integral part of education at all stages.” Inaugurating a seminar at New Delhi on 9th March, 1969, the then Union Education Minister, Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao, announced that the Union Government proposes to draw up an “action-oriented national programme of youth services”. There are the Birla Institute of Technology and Science, Pilani, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi, Gurukul Kangri Vidyavidyalaya, Hardwar, Kashi Vidyapith, Varanasi, Gujarat Vidyapith, Ahmedabad, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay and the Indian School of Mines, Dhanbad.

The Workmen’s Compensation Act was amended in 1959 removing the distinction between an adult and a minor for the purpose of payment of
compensation. The Maternity Benefit Act of 1961 provided for uniform maternity protection. The Employees State Insurance Act, passed in 1948, was amended in 1951. This provides for maternity, disablement, sickness and medical facilities for all workers in factories using power and having twenty persons or more. Provision has also been made for Employees Provident Fund by an Act of 1952 which was subsequently amended in certain respects in 1960, 1962 and 1968.

Attempts have been made during the recent years to ease the situation. According to the Trade Unions Amendment Act of 1948 the employers have to recognize trade unions under the orders of a Labour Court. In December, 1966, the National Labour Commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Mr. P. B. Gajendragadkar. In its Report, which came out in August, 1969, certain salutary recommendations were made to improve the relations between the employers and the employees.

As planning in India aims at the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society importance of co-operation is being emphasized in the Five-Year Plans both for rural development and growth of cottage and small-scale industries and various schemes have been formulated for this.

Since the beginning of planned economic development in our country in 1950-1951 there have been important changes in the "volume and composition" of our foreign trade. There has been also increase in the magnitude of trade. The value of exports during a period of fifteen years rose by 33 per cent and that of imports was more than doubled.

The Janata Government has formulated various plans for widespread development, particularly in the rural areas. On 16th January, 1978, currency notes of the denomination of Rs. 1000, Rs. 5000 and Rs. 10,000 were demonetized by an Ordinance issued by the President.
APPENDIX VI

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH OTHER POWERS

Without identifying herself with any of the blocks in the United Nations, India has played an important role in it. Awakening of the Afro-Asian Nations is a significant feature in the history of the modern world and India has welcomed it in the right spirit. The Asians Relations Conference which met in New Delhi in March-April, 1947 and the Conference of the Colombo Powers (Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan), which was held in April-May 1954, were concrete milestones in the growth of the idea of co-operation and harmony among the Afro-Asian countries. But a highly important landmark in this respect was the Conference held at Bandung in Indonesia (18th to 24th April, 1955). India was one of the sponsoring powers for the Bandung Conference and the most significant decision of this Conference was its Declaration on World Peace and Co-operation.

During the recent years, in spite of the menace of a "Cold War", formation of military alliances and supply of military aid and some grave complications in international politics, India has steadfastly adhered to the policy of non-alignment and to the five principles of Pancha Sheel, namely, mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual non-aggression, mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful co-existence. The Tashkent Declaration of 10th January, 1966, marked the culmination in the mission of peace of India's Prime Minister Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. The Commemorative Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was held from 14th to 24th October, 1970. The Prime Minister of India, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, called upon the United Nations "to strive to bring about an era of international transformation by consent, a new era of justice and peace."

Now there have been more of friendly agreements of India with foreign powers. On 26th October, 1977, Prime Minister Mr. Morarji Desai and the Soviet President Mr. Leonid Brezhnev signed in the Kremlin a joint declaration affirming the desire of the two countries to strengthen co-operation and friendship. The U.S. President Mr. Carter recently visited India. Besides, agreeing on sound peaceful projects, on 3rd January, 1978, U.S.A. and India pedged to work together for a work equitable
economic order "to bring out the eventual elimination of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons and to arrest the danger of proliferation of these weapons". In his address before the Parliament of India, Mr. Carter spoke in high terms of praise about India. "I stand before you", he observed, "in this House, the seat of one of the world's great legislatures, with feelings of profound friendship and respect... India has given her affirmative answer in a thunderous voice—a voice heard around the world. Something momentous happened here last March—not because any particular party won or lost, but rather, I think, because the largest electorate on earth freely and wisely chose its leaders at the polls. In this sense democracy itself was the victor." He referred to the progress of India since her Independence and referred to her difficulties. He pleaded for co-operation also between them to help the cause of international harmony and understanding.

The six-day official visit of British Prime Minister James Callaghan to India in January, 1978, is a significant event in modern Indo-British relation. On 9th January, 1978, Mr. Callaghan invited India to a new era of co-operation between the two countries for facing and solving together the problems of the world. Mr. Callaghan has made two important proposals regarding economic development. Britain is willing, he said, to assist India, Bangladesh and Nepal in exploitation of water resources in the eastern region of the sub-continent. Mr. Callaghan has also professed a kind of British aid that could be "dovetailed into the Indian Government's plan for greater emphasis on rural development".

1. India's Relations with the Soviet Union

The ties of friendship between India and the Soviet Union have gradually become stronger. Nehru selected highly distinguished persons to be India's Ambassadors to the Soviet Union to make the basis of Indo-Soviet friendship strong and firm. They were Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit, who was succeeded by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan and after him came Mr. K. P. S. Menon.

On almost all international issues the Soviet Union has been in agreement with India, and on matters concerning India, the attitude of the Soviet Union has been helpful.¹ On the Kāshmir question, the Soviet Union extended "firm and steady" support to India. An important Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement was concluded on 2nd December, 1953. At the invitation of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru paid a visit to the Soviet Union. At Moscow he held talks with Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, and other members of the Soviet Government on matters of mutual interest to both

the countries and on larger questions of international importance. Both the Prime Ministers issued a Joint Statement on 23rd June, 1955, affirming their profound faith in the five principles of Pancha Sheel, in the need for disarmament and for true co-existence, the essence of which, they stated, was that “States of different social structures can exist side by side in peace and concord and work for the common good.” In response to an invitation extended by the Government of India, Mr. N. A. Bulganin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, Member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and other official representatives of the Soviet Union, visited India in November-December, 1955. Their visit was followed by a Joint Indo-Soviet Statement on 13th December, 1955, in which faith in the five principles of Pancha Sheel was reaffirmed. They declared “anew their faith in the future and their firm resolve to devote their energies to the promotion of peace for the benefit not only of the people of their two countries but of the world as a whole.” They also issued, on the same date, a Joint Communiqué on Economic Relations expressing “the desire of the two countries to develop economic co-operation and expand trade relations”. The U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet passed a Resolution on 23rd December, 1955, on the visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to India, Burma and Afghanistan to approve their activity “as being in full accord with the peace-loving foreign policy of the Soviet Union and as contributing to international peace, friendship and co-operation.”

The succeeding years have been marked by “consolidation and enlargement” of Indo-Soviet friendship. There was another Indo-Soviet Trade Agreement on 16th November, 1958.

A Joint Indo-Soviet Statement was issued on 6th February, 1960, in which both sides “expressed their gratification at the development of the relations between India and the Soviet Union in a spirit of goodwill and friendship as result of their common adherence to the principles of peaceful co-existence and active pursuit of peace.” They “stressed the importance of disarmament as an essential prerequisite to a permanent and lasting peace and to the banishment of the fear of war”. Similar feelings and also satisfaction at the growth of co-operation in economic and cultural spheres were expressed in another Indo-Soviet Statement of 16th February, 1960.

There were “crisis and conflict” from 1962 to 1966 which came to an end by the Tashkent Declaration, which was due largely to the peaceful intervention of the Soviet Union. It has been rightly observed that: “In a way, Tashkent is an epitome of Indo-Soviet friendship—a friendship whose purpose is not to threaten or encircle any nation, but to promote the cause of peace in the world, more particularly in the South Asian region.” The post-Tashkent years (1966-1970) saw further growth of Indo-Soviet friendship.

The Soviet Union showed grave concern over the developments in Bangladesh. On 2nd April, 1971, the Soviet President, Podgorny sent a
message to Yahya Khan strongly protesting against the atrocities perpetrated by Pakistan on the people of Bangladesh. Pakistan paid no heed to this. Soon after a highly significant step was taken by India and the Soviet Union when they concluded the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation which was signed at New Delhi on 9th August, 1971, between the Russian Foreign Minister Andre Gromyko and India's Foreign Minister, Swaran Singh.¹ The most important of the Articles of the Treaty was the Article which runs as follows: "Each High Contracting Party undertaken to abstain from giving any assistance to any third party that engages in an armed conflict with the other party. In the event of either party being subjected to attack or threat thereof, the High Contracting Parties should immediately enter into mutual consultations with a view of eliminating the threat and taking appropriate effective measures to ensure the peace and security of their countries."

There has been also close collaboration between India and the Soviet Union in the economic sphere. With the help of the Soviet Union, India has started some big projects like the steel plants at Bhilai and Bokaro and the heavy electricals plant at Hardwar. Trade between the two countries has been gradually increasing.

In the sphere of culture too Indo-Soviet friendship has produced fruitful results. Studies on Indian subjects are being pursued with great zeal in the educational institutions of the Soviet Union.

In June 1976, India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi who paid an official visit to the Soviet Union for six days and Mr Leonid Brezhnev, the Communist Party Chief of the Soviet Union, signed a Joint Declaration on development of friendship and co-operation. This is a highly significant affair.

2. Indo-Japanese Relations

Relations between India and Japan can be studied under three aspects—political, economic and cultural. So far as the political aspect is concerned, in the period from 1900 to 1922 though the people of India wanted to win Japanese support in their national struggle, the attitude of Japan was pro-British largely because of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902. But there was a change in the attitude of Japan towards India from 1922 to 1933. After the Washington Conference (1922) Japan's pro-British attitude disappeared and Japan did not want to help the British in suppressing the activities of the Indian revolutionaries in Japan led by Rash Beharry Bose, who worked hard there for India's freedom from 1923. But there was deterioration in Indo-Japanese political relations from 1931. During the Sino-Japanese war (1937–1939) India sympathized with China and the Indian National Congress passed several resolutions in favour of China.

During the Second World War, Japan joined the Axis powers. The Pacific War made India vulnerable to Japanese attacks and the overrunning of South-East Asia by the Japanese army generated an anti-Japanese attitude in India. The Indians in South-East Asia formed the Indian National Army (I.N.A.) to effect liberation of India from British domination. Japan first encouraged it but within a few years her policy towards it was not commendable and the relation between Japan and Mohan Singh, Commander-in-Chief of the I.N.A., became strained. So Mohan Singh was arrested and the I.N.A. was dissolved. The I.N.A. was re-established after the arrival of Subhas Chandra Bose at Tokyo on 13th June, 1943. But he was also ultimately disillusioned.

After 1945, the relations between the two countries have been good. The Indo-Japanese Treaty of Peace was concluded in June, 1952. India's Vice-President, Dr. Radhakrishnan, went to Japan on a good-will mission in October, 1956, to develop commercial co-operation and promote cultural exchange between the two countries. In May, 1957, a good-will visit was paid to India by the Japanese Prime Minister N. Kishi. India's Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, visited Japan in the month of October of the same year. The visit to India of Japan's Crown Prince and Princess during December, 1960, strengthened Indo-Japanese friendship. Another Prime Minister of Japan, H. Ikeda, came to New Delhi in 1961. Since 1965 there have been occasional consultative meetings between the two countries, but no definite and spectacular results have come out of these, though there have been discussions on World Peace and Disarmament. India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, visited Japan in June, 1969.

The relation between the two countries in the economic sphere has been very important, and they have concluded several bilateral Trade Agreements. The trade relations between the two countries were suspended during the Second World War. But there has been revival of Trade Agreements after the War.

India and Japan had cultural relations since the days of remote antiquity, largely because of the influence of Buddhism in Japan. During the recent years their cultural relations have expanded, particularly after the signing of the Cultural Agreement of 1956, which has allowed for the exchange of Cultural delegations and scholars.

3: India's Relations with the United States

As one of the biggest world powers, the United States has played a highly important role in modern international affairs. She sympathized with India in her freedom struggle and was firmly in favour of India attaining independence. During one of his early trips to the United States, Jawaharlal Nehru observes:
The United States of America is not an unknown country even in far-off India. And many of us have grown up in admiration of the ideals and objectives which have made this country great. Yet, though we may know the history and something of the culture of our respective countries, what is required is a true understanding and appreciation of each other even when we differ. Out of that understanding grows fruitful co-operation in the pursuit of common ideals.

But unfortunately this has not become possible in the background of complicated world politics of the recent years and relations between India and the United States "have fluctuated heavily over the years". The United States promptly announced assistance to India during the Sino-India conflict. But differences between the two countries continued because of certain factors, one of these being the support and military aid which the United States gave to Pakistan. There was some improvement in mutual understanding when India's Prime Minister Indira Gandhi visited the United States in March, 1966.

The United States have given substantial economic help to India. Upto 1972 India got more than Rs. 3,500 crores as aid from the United States. But this did not help create an atmosphere of perfect good-will. Nixon's attitude to help Pakistan during the reign of terror in East Pakistan caused by Yahya Khan's atrocities and the dubbing of the popular uprising there as a rebellion, and India as the aggressor, made the relations more strained. Indira Gandhi expressed her resentment at this attitude of the United States in a letter addressed to Nixon on 15th December, 1971. But in spite of this, there was no change in Nixon's policy. The relations between India and the United States grew cooler.

Mr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan, after staying in India as United States' Ambassador for about two years, observed in a farewell interview in December, 1974 that Indo-American relations are thin and getting thinner. "We like each other...but there is not much there. We have gone from the stage where we were over-involved in India, to where we now pretend it doesn't exist. In the past, our relations were volatile and unstable, up and down. We've now reached a kind of plateau. We've regressed to a kind of stable perception of one another." But there is growing realization of the need for a frank and clear understanding between the two countries as is evidenced by three-day visit to Delhi of Dr. Kissinger, U.S. Secretary of State. After talks here an Indo-U.S. Joint Communiqué was issued on 30th October 1974, which said:

"The cordial and frank nature of the discussions during the U.S. Secretary of States' visit reflected the desire and interest of both countries in broadening the basis of their relationship and in strengthening the many contacts"

1P. Tharayil, op. cit., p. 179.
and ties between the Indian and American people. During the discussions there was an exchange of views on various aspects of bilateral relations, the situation in South Asia and neighbouring regions and a review of the global situation, including the world economic situation.

To strengthen further the friendly relations between both countries, they agreed to constitute a Joint Commission, which would review Economic and Commercial Co-operation, Scientific and Technological Co-operation, and Education and Cultural Co-operation.

4. India’s Relations with the Arab Countries

There has been friendship between India and Egypt. Nasser’s death on 28th September, 1970, was widely mourned in India.

India's relations with the Arab States have been friendly. During the crisis in West Asia, India extended support to the Arabs. In the Arab-Israel conflict the Government of India consistently supported the cause of the Arabs, though India does not consider Israel to be a foe. The West Asian policy of the Government of India was subject to criticism during and after the war in Bangladesh as none of the Arab States supported Bangladesh and were sympathetic towards Pakistan. In spite of this attitude the Government of India maintained friendly relation with the Arab States and she supported the Arabs during the 1973 war.