



B. P. P.  
12 JUL 1967

# THE FOREIGN POLICY OF CEYLON

EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENTS

BY

The Late Prime Minister, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike,  
and

Texts of Joint Statements issued by him and  
Visiting Heads of State

493





---

THE  
FOREIGN POLICY  
OF CEYLON



EXTRACTS FROM STATEMENTS

BY

The Late Prime Minister, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike,  
and Texts of Joint Statements issued by him  
and Visiting Heads of State

327.5493

BAN



*First Edition*.....1958  
*Second Edition*.....1959  
(*Revised and enlarged*)  
*Third Edition*.....1961  
(*Revised and enlarged*)

4—J. N. R 16390—10,000 (4/61)



## CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION .. .. .	1
THE PHILOSOPHY OF NEUTRALISM .. .. .	3
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956)</i>	
THE NEW ASIA .. .. .	5
<i>(Address to the U. N. General Assembly, New York, on November 22, 1956)</i>	
“NEUTRALISM NOT COWARDICE” .. .. .	10
<i>(Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956)</i>	
“THIS PERIOD OF TRANSITION” .. .. .	12
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)</i>	
“NO DOUBLE STANDARDS” .. .. .	15
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)</i>	
FOREIGN BASES .. .. .	17
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956 ;</i>	
<i>Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956 ;</i>	
<i>Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)</i>	
“ANOTHER MILESTONE” .. .. .	19
<i>(Speech in Trincomalee, October 15, 1957)</i>	
“OUR INDEPENDENCE IS COMPLETE” .. .. .	21
<i>(Speech at Katunayake Airport, November 1, 1957)</i>	
THE COMMONWEALTH .. .. .	23
<i>(Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956)</i>	
CHINA AND THE U. S. S. R. .. .. .	26
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956)</i>	
THE UNITED NATIONS .. .. .	27
<i>(Address to the U. N. Association, Ceylon Branch, October 24, 1957)</i>	
THE AGE OF THE COMMON MAN .. .. .	38
<i>(Full text of Convocation Address delivered at University of Ceylon, Peradeniya, on November 8, 1957)</i>	

	Page
THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION .. .. .	53
<i>(Address to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, New Delhi, on December 2, 1957)</i>	
THE NEED FOR "TOTAL PEACE" .. .. .	58
<i>(Address to Afro-Asian Women's Conference in Colombo on February 15, 1958)</i>	
CALL FOR AN ASIAN ECONOMIC CONFERENCE .. .. .	65
<i>(Address at Chinese Commodity Exhibition, Colombo, on March 18, 1958 ;</i>	
<i>(Address to Ceylon Chamber of Commerce, March 27, 1958)</i>	
CEYLON AND WEST ASIA .. .. .	70
<i>(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 14, 1958)</i>	
"LIVING TOGETHER AS GOOD NEIGHBOURS" .. .. .	76
<i>(Speech in Colombo on United Nations' Day, October 24, 1958)</i>	
THE ROLE OF YOUTH IN THE EFFORT FOR PEACE .. .. .	85
<i>(Address to the Executive Committee of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, in Colombo on December 9, 1958)</i>	
THE COMMONWEALTH RELATIONSHIP .. .. .	94
<i>(Speech at Luncheon to Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, and Mrs. Diefenbaker in Colombo on November 26, 1958)</i>	
"OPPOSED TO POWER BLOCS" .. .. .	101
<i>(Speech at Reception in Colombo to Marshal Tito, President of the People's Republic of Yugoslavia, and Madame Broz, on January 24, 1959)</i>	
JOINT STATEMENT WITH CHINA .. .. .	103
JOINT STATEMENT WITH INDIA .. .. .	106
JOINT STATEMENT WITH JAPAN .. .. .	111
JOINT STATEMENT WITH INDONESIA .. .. .	113
JOINT STATEMENT WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA .. .. .	115
JOINT STATEMENT WITH YUGOSLAVIA .. .. .	118



## INTRODUCTION

**T**HE April 1956 General Elections, which put the party led by Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike into power, brought about a political change of a far reaching character.

The Prime Minister, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, characterised this change in the following words in the House of Representatives on July 24, 1957 :

*“ There is one fundamental thing that the people of this country have achieved in the last election. For the first time, paradoxical though it may sound, with the existence of over 25 years of manhood and womanhood suffrage, the people’s will prevailed. Those whom they really wished to elect they elected, brushing aside various forms of inducements brought to bear on them in the past successfully, but not on the last occasion. Therefore I feel that our responsibility primarily is not to betray the victory that the people have obtained”.*

The re-orientation of the foreign policy of the country, effected after the Bandaranaike Government came into power, reflects the character of the Government.

The speeches and statements published in this book explain the foreign policy of the Government which has not only secured the British withdrawal from military bases in Trincomalee and Katunayake but also

established friendly diplomatic and trade relations with all countries in the world irrespective of ideological differences.

These statements will also demonstrate how strenuously the late Prime Minister strove for the lessening of international tension, for ending the cold war, for eliminating the danger of nuclear war, and for developing international amity and peace.

# The Philosophy of Neutralism

“I THINK the House will agree with me that the foreign affairs of this country have taken a more positive turn today than before. Earlier, we did not know where we were. There was talk of “non-aligning”, “power blocs”, “preserving an attitude of neutralism”, though, in fact, their (the previous government’s) actions were quite different. We have altered that now.

“What do we mean by this word “neutralism” ? I do not like that word. In this period of world history, when a good many of our Asian countries have once again regained their freedom, and the world itself is in a state of change, is it wrong for us to look about—we do not want to look either to the capitalism of the West or the communism of the East—till we find the precise form of society that we think is most suited to our country ? Is it wrong, in pursuance of that view, that we do not range ourselves on the side of one or the other of those power blocs but would like to be friendly with all ? I say, in this world today of a system which is changing but not yet completely disappeared—where the world is still in doubt in the case of various countries of the world, as to what particular thing it would like to have in place of the old—

in that state of affairs, naturally, various conflicts emerge—ideological conflicts, conflicts arising out of the resurgence of nationalism here, there and everywhere, various types of conflicts in the world ; the wise course to follow obviously is that which is summed up by the rather ugly phrase “ co-existence ”.

“ We have first to make up our minds to avoid any serious danger of a general flare-up of war. The potentialities of some of the weapons that have been discovered are very vaguely known by ordinary laymen. There is in them something more terrible than what even the most imaginative writer can portray. They are so terrible in their results. We therefore want peace and we have to achieve peace under very difficult circumstances today, amidst so many conflicts all over, while preserving fundamentally the things for which we stand. We have to work out some scheme of living and letting others live if we are to prevent humanity from generally going down. That is the minimum—the philosophy of neutralism for which I stand.”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956)*

## The New Asia

“WE gain nothing by undue mutual recriminations and revilings. As a Buddhist, I remember the story of Buddha and the answer he gave to an opponent who came before him and abused him for hours. He listened to him patiently and said : “ My dear friend, if you invite guests to a banquet and the guests do not come, what do you do with the food that is prepared ? ” “ Oh,” was the reply, “ I and my family will consume the food if the guests do not arrive ”. So he said to the man who had abused him : “ You have offered me your abuse. I am not receiving it. You can take it yourself ” . . . .

“ Mutual recriminations and the wounding of one another’s feelings by sharp retorts and angry words will not help us very much.

“ We of Asia who have suffered under imperialistic colonial rule for many centuries are, naturally, extremely sensitive towards anything approaching a resurgence of the spirit of imperialism and colonialism. I hope we are wrong, but we feel strongly that the happenings in Egypt, and perhaps the echo of those happenings in Hungary, are a manifestation once again of a certain

resurgence of the spirit of colonialism, the desire of a strong power to achieve its purposes and to impose its will, even by force, on a weaker power.

“ Many of our countries in Asia have re-emerged into freedom after three or four hundred years of colonial imperialist rule. In this epoch of newly-gained freedom, we find ourselves faced with a dual problem—a problem within a problem. First, there is the problem of converting a colonial society—politically, socially and economically—into a free society, and then there is the problem of effecting that conversion against a background of changing world conditions.

“ The world is in a state of change and flux today. The world is going through one of those rare occasions—they happen at certain intervals—of a changeover from one society to another, from one civilization to another. We are living today, in fact, in a period of transition between two civilisations, the old and the new. During a period like this, all kinds of conflicts arise—ideological, national, economic, political. That has happened in the past, and in the past those conflicts were settled by some nice little war here or there. Today we cannot afford the luxury of war, for we all know what it means.

“ Therefore, the task for us today is a far more difficult one than ever faced mankind before. It is to effect this transition to some form of stable human society, and to do it amid a welter of conflicts, with reasonable

peace and with the avoidance of conflicts that burst out into war, for war is unthinkable today. This is an age when we have to live and let live, when we cannot afford to hate each other so much that we are prepared to sacrifice all mankind in the name of some "ism" or for some other reason. We cannot afford to do that today. Within the limits of honour, of course, and those principles which we hold dear, we have to live and let live.

"That is the philosophy behind the doctrine of co-existence. We have to build up a new society for ourselves, as I have said, which best suits the genius of our country. We should like to get some ideas and some principles from this side, and some from the other, until a coherent form of society is made up that suits our own people in the context of the changing world of today. That is why we do not range ourselves on the side of this Power-bloc or that. That is the philosophy of neutralism. It is not something dishonest. It is not a matter of sitting on the fence to see whether we can get the best of both worlds. It is a position that is inexorably thrust upon us by the circumstances of the case. It is a position that will be of great help in the world situation today, for we do provide a bridge over the gulf between the two opposing factions.

"We are supposed to be the 'uncommitted' nations. I strongly object to that word. We are committed up to the hilt. We are committed to preserve decency in dealings between nations, we are committed to the

cause of justice and freedom as much as anyone is. That, briefly, is our position in Asia. I trust it will not be misunderstood.

“ Sometimes the feeling comes over me, as I am sure it does over many of us, that the fight is not worthwhile—that there is, in fact, no hope for mankind to escape the perplexities, problems, conflicts, hatreds and enmities that seem to be arising all about us. But sometimes when I feel like that, I am fortified by the thought that through the dark fabric of human history there passes one golden thread of unflinching strength and firmness—the unconquered, unconquerable spirit of man. It has manifested itself through the ages in various, diverse, different ways : first of all, the unconquerable spirit of man fighting for bare survival and existence ; later, fighting for various causes—national causes maybe, or the cause of justice, the cause of freedom or the pursuit of truth on the part of the great religious leaders down through history. Today it is needed in the cause of human friendship and of peace.

“ What is peace ? Peace is not merely a negative thing—the absence of one set of people trying to kill another set of people. No doubt the prevention of war is a necessary factor of peace, but peace, believe me, is something much more positive than that, for peace in its true sense means human understanding, human friendship and co-operation out of which, indeed, peace in its true form alone can rise. I look upon the United Nations as the one machine available to mankind



today through which it can express this unconquerable spirit of man in its efforts to achieve that peace, friendship and collaboration.

“ My country is a small one, a weak one and a poor one, but I venture to think that today, particularly in an Organisation such as this, the service that a country can render—that a member can render—is not to be measured alone by the size of that country, its population, its power or its strength. This is an Organisation which expresses itself most effectively by bringing to bear a certain moral force—the collective moral force and decency of human beings. That is a task in which the weak as well as the strong can render a useful service, and I give the Assembly the assurance, on behalf of my country, that as far as we are concerned every endeavour that we can make in all sincerity to assist in the achievement of those noble ideals for which this Organisation stands will always be forthcoming in the fullest measure.”

*(Address to the U. N. General Assembly, New York, on  
November 22, 1956)*

## “Neutralism—not cowardice”

“WE, who have recently regained our freedom, are feeling our way, groping forward, keeping our minds open in many matters and in many ways, in order that we may discover for ourselves that form of society which is best suited to our own need. How does it work? Take the subject of foreign policy. Our attitude, the attitude of my own country, is an attitude of neutralism and is one which some in the West do not understand, perhaps do not wish to understand. It is not a sign of cowardice; it is not a desire to have the best of both worlds. It is something much more than a negative and passive attitude; something very positive. You may remember the saying long ago in Galilee, that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. I feel that every “ism”, whether capitalism, communism, or any other “ism”, has really been made for man and not man for some particular ideology or some particular so-called way of life.

“I am not prepared to sacrifice mankind in the name of any “ism” to condemn man to what is almost inevitable extinction through a process of immense suffering which a new war would involve. We want peace. I do not say peace at any price, but peace as far as it is

possible to obtain peace today in conformity with honour and with justice. That is why, in the pursuit of peace, some of our countries feel that we do not wish to align ourselves with power blocs—power blocs built on mutual fear and suspicion, power blocs which, in the name of defence, find themselves compelled to create a Frankenstein which perhaps they themselves may not ultimately be able to control.

“I do not say that we should not protect ourselves. We must be alert and we must keep our eyes open, but we must not now think in terms of hatred of some particular country, of some particular ideology, of those who belong to some other race, be they coloured or white, for in that way lies madness in the context of those very neat little gadgets which the human brain has evolved for the destruction of its kind. Now I feel that in pursuing this ideal of peace, for us it is best that we do not align ourselves with these military blocs, either of the West or of the East ; that we preserve friendship with all and try perhaps to provide a bridge between the two radically opposed points of view. Neutralism, dynamic neutralism, is in the interest not only of our own countries but of mankind as a whole. I am glad that there is more evidence of understanding, even in countries which, understandably, do not quite appreciate our point of view”.

*(Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956)*

## “This Period of Transition”

“I THINK Hon. Members will agree that on the whole the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country has been satisfactory. I have endeavoured, as Minister of External Affairs, to follow up the policy of this Government myself in this direction. What is that policy? It has been described by various names: “neutral”, “dynamically neutral”, and so on. What, in fact, is that? It is a policy that stems from our understanding of the historical development of civilization, if my Hon. Friends will forgive me for using a somewhat pompous term.

“My Hon. Friends who were here in this House in 1947, will remember that, as Leader of the House, I made a speech, I think on the King’s Speech at that time, when I said that I was very conscious of the fact that we were, in fact, living today between two worlds—the one dying, the other struggling to be born. In other words, we are living in a period of transition. These periods of transition have occurred in the history of mankind before. This civilization has reached its summit and is decaying. It is being superseded by another civilization, and this is a period of transition except that the complexities of the situation and the

conflicts today in the present age of transition are a thousand times greater than they have ever been in the course of the history of mankind.

“ Well, we are then, therefore, in this period of transition with all kinds of conflicts ; political, ideological, religious, economic, national, social, linguistic and so on. Paradoxically, with the existence of those conflicts also there is the urge on the part of people to get together. It is a curious paradox that with the centrifugal influence of these conflicts there is also the over-shadowing centripetal force bringing mankind together. Hence all the international gatherings of various varieties of people we find in the world today. They are centred on two large powers.

“ We know today that we cannot afford war—one of the methods by which these differences were solved in the past. Today we are faced with a more difficult task of dealing with a conflict, the difficulty of being under the necessity of solving these problems at an international level or at a national level. Against that background, we have emerged into freedom. We had our freedom nine years ago. We are faced with the problem of converting a colonial society into a free society and a problem within it of achieving that task in the context of a world which itself is changing. It is a dual task with which most of our Asian countries are faced.

“ In that circumstance, is it a wonder that we do not choose to join this power bloc or the other power

bloc ? We prefer what we call a neutral state which is nothing more than that we like to be friendly with all and like to obtain what is advantageous to our own new society—while following our own way of life—through whatever benefit we can get from East or West, North or South, from everyone, and, at the same time, prevent misunderstanding between two opposing camps which brings us close to another war in which all mankind will perish.

“That is the policy this Government has been following and, in the pursuit of that, it has not sacrificed the friendships it had. It has made a number of new friendships which are very much valued by us. The reputation of Ceylon is not low in world councils. Even in the United Nations we are treated with due regard. We have made trade, cultural and other agreements with a large number of countries of the world. I think, on the whole it may be said that the foreign policy that the Government is following, and of which I am the spokesman, has been followed with reasonable satisfaction to both sides of the House.”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)*

## “No Double Standards”

“IT (neutralism) certainly means this : that in the pursuit of that policy we reserve to ourselves the right of criticizing our friends—and I hope all are our friends—when we feel they have not acted correctly. We shall not incur the charge of having double standards in dealing with questions of this kind nor indeed shall we play to the tune of any one side of powers in trying to get their own back irrespective of the merits of any particular case or other. It is in that spirit that we shall conduct our foreign affairs. It is one that I trust will not be misunderstood by any of our friends whether they are within the Commonwealth or whether they are representatives of any other section.

“This word ‘colonialism’ is another of these terms that has become somewhat nebulous today. The old classic sense of colonialism which still persists but which is fast dying has been superseded apparently by various other direct and indirect forms of what might be called colonialism within inverted commas. Now, what is the definition that today we should attach to this word ‘colonialism’? I diffidently suggest this : the attempt on the part of any powerful country to obtain influence, and to restrict

the freedom of thought and action of a less powerful country by various methods, direct or indirect.

“ I suppose that may be as good a definition of modern colonialism as anything else. We are strongly opposed to any big power trying to bully any small power in the context of such a definition and we shall always express our views which, I trust again, will not be misunderstood in what we consider right or wrong in actions connected with such powers dealing with weaker powers.”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)*



## Foreign Bases

“ I HAVE already dealt with the dangers of infringement of that point of view by the presence of bases in countries, including Ceylon. I have already explained to the House the general position of these bases we are taking over to do with as we like in order to preserve friendly relations between countries in general and others who might, perhaps, tend to be hostile sometimes. Certain facilities will be discussed. In due course that will be done, subject to the over-riding consideration that the control is ours to do what we like, when we like and how we like. . . . ”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956)*

\* \* \*

“ In pursuit of this policy—not motivated by any dislike or hatred of this country, of whose people we have all, my country and myself personally, a high regard—the present Government of Ceylon has expressed its intention that the bases in Ceylon of Britain should cease to exist.

“ As you may know, it is entirely left to us, a matter completely within our discretion, whether we shall permit these bases to continue or not. We have

expressed not merely a wish or desire but a definite intention that the bases shall cease, but we wish to do it in a friendly way and we wish to discuss, as indeed we are doing now, with the British Government the method of doing it without causing dislocation, inconvenience or embarrassment to the British Government, or indeed to ourselves. We are discussing other matters such as certain facilities that the British Government might like to have in our country, but we wish to take this step as it is one which is very fundamental to our thinking. We also wish to do it while preserving the friendship and the close relations which exist, and I hope will continue to exist, between Britain and ourselves.”

*(Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956)*

“THE last remnants of colonialism in this country have been removed ; the bases will no longer exist. On October 15th, this year, the base at Trincomalee will be handed over to Ceylon by the British Government. That will be one more step towards full freedom—the removal of rather stubborn remnants of colonialism. I hope Katunayake too will be taken over. Regarding this transaction, it was carried out in a friendly way, concluded in a friendly way. Hon. Members had the statement which I tabled on the floor of this House.”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, July 24, 1957)*

## “Another Milestone”

THE ceremony today marks another milestone in the long and not uninteresting history of Trincomalee to which briefly but happily His Excellency (the acting U. K. High Commissioner) has just made reference. The relationship between the United Kingdom and Ceylon goes back to a period of over 140 years. It is a somewhat chequered history, but may I say one that, on the whole, can be considered a happy one.

“Nearly ten years ago an important step was taken in the relationship between our two countries when Ceylon demanded and was granted Dominion status, a position of equality in the Commonwealth of Nations and, as His Excellency has mentioned, the Naval Base of Trincomalee which was used during the last war continued to be used thereafter. When my Government assumed office a little over an year ago, in pursuance of our foreign policy, we requested the Government of the United Kingdom to hand over the Naval Base of Trincomalee to us. This step was not taken in a spirit of hostility.

“Our foreign policy which is based on friendship, co-operation with all nations and non-alignment with any of the power blocs of the world, necessitated such

a step if such a policy was in fact to be effective. I am very happy to say that the negotiations which were carried on between us and the Government of the United Kingdom for this purpose were conducted in a spirit of cordiality and in an atmosphere of friendship, and a very satisfactory settlement of this matter in that spirit has been achieved—which is a further tribute to the manner in which those countries which are associated with each other in the Commonwealth of Nations can settle a difference of opinion that may arise between them in a spirit of friendship without impairing that relationship which exists among the members of the Commonwealth of Nations. This further step which was taken will in no way impair friendly relations between the United Kingdom and my own country but indeed will have the effect of strengthening that friendship . . . . .

“ You have witnessed today a simple but I venture to think a very impressive ceremony, a ceremony which will further strengthen the freedom of our country and equally strengthen those bonds of friendship between the United Kingdom and ourselves which we hope as members of the Commonwealth will play a not unimportant part in helping ourselves as well as the world to obtain that understanding, peace and prosperity for which the whole world is yearning today.”

*(Speech at Trincomalee, October 15, 1957)*

## “Our Independence is complete”

“TODAY another landmark in the history of our country has been achieved. As you are aware, the United Kingdom, throughout its connection with dependent territories, has always stated its intention and desire to hand over control of their own affairs to territories over which it ruled. When the history of this period comes to be recorded, one of the outstanding features in such a record will be the dignity, cordiality and friendship and the good grace with which the Government of the U. K. has handed back the control of their own affairs to peoples of far-flung territories over which it ruled earlier.

“The process of handing over, in our case, has proceeded in stages, from the time of the Legislative Council of 1910, until on February 4, 1948, free and independent status was handed to the people of Ceylon. Today our independence is complete.

“When my Government came into power, we had agreed that the two bases should be handed over to Ceylon with certain facilities which would continue for a period not exceeding five years. In pursuance of that decision, two weeks ago at a simple but historic

ceremony, the Trincomalee naval base was handed over to Ceylon. Today we have taken that agreement a step further.

“It is a good sign that these things can be done by friendly arrangement and agreement, and in an atmosphere of dignity. We, as members of the Commonwealth of Nations, discuss among ourselves any problems of importance in an atmosphere of independence and freedom, and are able thereby to add our share in world efforts for the increase of mutual understanding and friendship, for the preservation of peace and the furthering of the cause of happiness and prosperity of us all.”

*(Speech at Katunayake Airport, November 1, 1957)*

## The Commonwealth

“ I HAVE on behalf of my Government informed the Conference (Prime Ministers' Conference) that we intend to take steps to make our country a Republic within the Commonwealth, though this does not stem from any personal hostility. The Queen of England is indeed a very gracious lady. We in our country have no feeling of dislike or hostility either towards Britain or Herself, but we prefer a Republican form of Government which we consider most suited to our country, and the Queen herself is too far away with too few personal contacts to stimulate that feeling of personal attachment which you have for her—a feeling, believe me, that I can understand very well.

“ I said we wished to continue within the Commonwealth. What are my feeling towards the Commonwealth ? I do not think we ought to indulge in mere sloppy sentimentality over the Commonwealth. I have heard it said that there is something indefinable about the Commonwealth which keeps us together, which others do not understand. I do not think we have much to gain by that type of sentimental statement over the Commonwealth. There are, of course, certain obvious advantages of the Commonwealth—belonging

economically to the sterling bloc, the advantage we gain from mutual consultations and discussions on a friendly basis on various problems and so on. But is that all there is to it ? I do feel that there is something more than that that makes the Commonwealth worthwhile. What is it ? Many of us who are in the Commonwealth cannot claim, as some other members can, the hereditary bond of a relationship with Britain. But if we are not bound together by the common bond of belonging to the same stock, we can at least claim to possess something more valuable—a common tradition which the Commonwealth countries share with Britain. If I may call it so—a way of life ; democratic Parliamentary form of Government, independence of the judiciary, an administration free from undue political influence, free from corruption. There is no distinction or discrimination between the State and the citizen.

\*                      \*                      \*

“ All these freedoms, the freedoms of democracy—that valuable tradition—are all possessed by members of the Commonwealth. Other democratic countries outside the Commonwealth do not possess these traditions. In the context of this changing world, I think there is a definite substantial value in that way of life which we all share, whatever may be our race or our other differences of opinion on different subjects. We have these, of course, amongst us. I feel that we ought to make a deliberate effort to foster this way of life, to strengthen it, for in that way alone has the



Commonwealth any chance of surviving for long. Otherwise I can well see the Commonwealth shrinking in the present world situation, shrinking gradually to a few countries bound to Britain by those ties of blood that I mentioned earlier, and the others falling away.

“ I think this is a line of thought that is worthwhile considering. I know, of course, that certain countries may find it difficult to adopt a direct course of action from the angle which I mention, but subject even to these conditions, I think there is great scope for the Commonwealth in the world today. For instance, at the Geneva Conference on Indo-China, Sir Anthony Eden played a most difficult and valuable part when he prevented perhaps a great catastrophe. The world was trembling on the brink of war at that time and it was probably Sir Anthony Eden, assisted by countries such as India, who resolved that problem with some measure of success.

“ I know that there is place for a third force. Not of course, as a military bloc but as a middle way of life between two extremes, on the right and on the left, which I think the Commonwealth is well suited to play, and in which Britain, with her long traditions and service to the world, is well qualified to take the lead if she so wishes.”

*(Address to the Commonwealth Press Association, London, on July 5, 1956)*

< 25 >



## China and the U.S.S.R.

“WE are establishing friendly relations with other countries which have been kept at a distance, apparently for no known reason. The House knows that a mission will proceed towards the end of August consisting of our High Commissioner in England, Sir Claude Corea, my Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Subasinghe), and Mr. Raju Coomaraswamy to Moscow. They will fly from Paris to Moscow on 27th August and, after a stay of a week or ten days, they will fly from Moscow to Peking. We have received very warm invitations from both countries and the visits are to be of a purely preliminary and exploratory nature. There will be no agreements, pacts and so on that they will enter into. The mission will discuss matters with them, explore various possibilities of establishing diplomatic relations in trade, in commerce, see whether in respect of our industries and agriculture their assistance might be obtained, and then come back and report to us. Whereupon, the Cabinet will go into those matters and come to decisions.”

*(Statement in the House of Representatives, August 2, 1956)*

# The United Nations

“IT is only fit and proper that all peoples throughout the world, be they members of the United Nations or those few who are still not members, should bring to mind on an occasion like this the greater ideals of the United Nations, strengthen their own determination to try and achieve them, and to understand those ideals not only in the letter but also in the spirit.

“What is it that I have to tell you today that I have not said on many occasions before, in this association and on the floor of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York? What is it that I can tell you that I have not already said on many occasions on many platforms? Perhaps very little that is new, except to refresh your memory of what the United Nations stands for, how we are trying to achieve its ideals.

“Let us in the first place remember that there is always in human affairs an unfortunate gap between the ideal and the real. Human beings throughout their history have always, from age to age, set before themselves high and noble ideals, but when it comes to a question of the realization of those ideals, then there has been a big gap—an inability to achieve human ideals except perhaps to a very faltering and small extent.

“ But I do not think that the ideal and the real are altogether unconnected with each other, or need be so. Let us, if we must, walk with our heads amongst the stars, but let us also see that our feet are firmly planted on the earth. In that way we can effect a union between the ideal and the real. That is what we are trying to do in the United Nations ; not always successfully, sometimes with failure, sometimes with only partial success, but still something worthwhile.

\* \* \*

“ Let us remember that today we are in fact living in an age of transition with all the factors that are inherent in such a period of transition in human history, but with those factors exaggerated and accentuated as never before in the whole history of mankind. The human race is not new to periods of transition. Civilizations have come and gone. They have reached saturation point. They have decayed, and others have taken their place throughout human history. I am perfectly sure that even those with an elementary knowledge of history will readily grant that.

“ We are living in a similar age today. We are living in a transitional age. But a transitional age of such a revolutionary nature, as I said before, has never occurred to my knowledge in the history of mankind. A civilization is born out of the needs, the human needs, of particular types. It does its service, it reaches, as I say, its saturation point, it decays, and is succeeded by another.

“ Sometimes those changes have come with dramatic suddenness. One can point to Alexander in Persia destroying the entire civilization of the Persian Empire. Sometimes it comes more gradually. The Roman civilization gradually decayed and fell into the darkness of the Middle Ages, until it once again emerged into the dawn of the Renaissance—primarily a Catholic Renaissance—in Europe at that time.

“ The feudal system which we had not so long ago disappeared before the onslaught of the desire for private enterprise, as against feudal monopoly, monopoly in government, monopoly in religion, and, economically, the monopoly in trade. It was succeeded by that society which we know as a capitalist society with all incentives for private enterprise and for the services, no doubt, that at that time it could do. I am utterly convinced that even that civilization is decaying and falling. That is the period of transition we are living in now. But there is this added ingredient. Remember that in the change of human society, scientific discovery often contributed considerable efforts. The so-called industrial revolution, the discovery of power, steampower, power of oil, ushered an entirely new state of society at that time, about two centuries ago. Today the general change, political, ideological and so on, of civilization is further stimulated by what I might call the dawn of the atomic age. Added to political, economic and social changes which are coming on the world, there is the profound revolutionary

change which the new atomic age will bring to the world. I see the countrymen of my good friend, His Excellency the Russian Ambassador (Mr. Vladimir Yakovlev) here, are already adding to the various queer bodies that are careering round in space.

\* \* \*

“ There is the Russian satellite still going round and round. In the meanwhile, our good friends from the United States have also sent up a rocket. I pity the astronomers of the future in their examinations of the skies, having to distinguish between man-made and other satellites. But you are seeing the vistas that are opening out before the human race, terrifying in some of their aspects, fraught with infinite possibilities for good in certain other implications. Surely the most obtuse, the most conservative and reactionary amongst the human race must realize that a change such as the human race has never, at any period of existence, experienced before, is taking place now.

“ What is going to be the fate of the new world. I hesitate as a politician to take on myself the role of a prophet. I have my own view which I shall not inflict on you. But this is the important point on an occasion like this (against the background of thought which I outlined to you) that we must bear in mind.

“ With doubts in human minds, with every kind of conflict, because we have not yet achieved a stable new society, we are all experimenting and trying to

avoid political conflicts, ideological conflicts, economic conflicts, social conflicts, racial conflicts, religious conflicts, and linguistic conflicts, all of which are in this category. Ages like this are fraught with these conflicts. There is another terrifying factor. In the olden days, a nice cosy little war here or there, sometimes went on for years, 20 years, 30 years and so on. People retired into winter quarters, and emerged again in spring or summer to carry on a nice little war against each other. That age is passed.

\* \* \*

“Today we just cannot think in terms of war, because war will mean, as we all know, destruction of all mankind. We have therefore to work out some method to solve for humanity their little differences. We have to rule out war, but ruling out war means, whether it be gun or atomic bomb or sword—if indeed swords may still be used in warfare—we have to substitute human understanding, patience, tolerance, the primary requisites of the United Nations through which we settle our disputes by mutual discussion, no doubt by reasonable and honourable compromises, because we just cannot think today in terms of war. That is the main objective of the United Nations Organisation which was started twelve years ago with 51 members and which now has increased to 82. It represents, more or less, today the whole of mankind with some unfortunate exceptions.

“I cannot understand except on the most petty grounds how one-fifth of the population of the world represented by the People’s Republic of China can on any ground of equity or justice be excluded from this great international organisation. I cannot understand how certain other countries can be excluded. I will come in a moment to some of the reasons. But with those unfortunate exceptions, the United Nations does represent most of the human race today. I said, let us walk with our heads amongst the stars but let us keep our feet also firmly planted on the earth. That is a very good maxim to remember when dealing with organisations like the United Nations. But we know that in the actual circumstances with which we are faced from time to time in dealing with the various difficulties and troublesome problems that come up for discussion in the United Nations, we may fall far short of the summit of that ideal. That is no reason to condemn the United Nations, to say the United Nations may as well wind itself up. That is a counsel of despair and weakness that the circumstances of the case do not warrant.

“On the other hand if we do realistically consider the position of the United Nations, I think we can be amply and reasonably satisfied with the vast range of the achievements of the United Nations within the last twelve years. There is no question whatsoever about it.

“The United Nations as well as its specialized agencies has made an immense contribution at this most



difficult time of human history, where a general body like that is faced with problems that in normal times would never appear. What is the position realistically? I say, thank Providence, for a body like the United Nations Organisation! I say that, after an impartial examination of the achievements of the United Nations on so many occasions. Even if hundred per cent. of what some people expect had not been achieved, it has in fact achieved quite a great deal in the preservation of world peace.

“ We talk of peace but peace is not a negative phrase. Peace is something very positive and peace can arise not by preventing some shooting war here or there. That is only the negative aspect of peace. Peace consists of mutual understanding, of collaboration and co-operation in which atmosphere alone true peace can arise.

\*

\*

\*

“ Now I wish to say something of the atomic bomb. You know, one aspect of the atomic bomb, if I am not being unduly cynical, it is useful. It is a terrible weapon, I admit, but the possession of that terrible weapon by so many of the big powers today, with the clear understanding of the results of the use of it, proves a very powerful deterrent to those who may, in moments of impulse, be tempted to use it. It proves a deterrent, a very important deterrent. I tell you quite frankly that when the atomic bombs were being developed

by the Western world, and we heard of the first atomic explosion by the Soviet Union, I tell you quite frankly I thanked God.

\* \* \*

“With that development, war became less probable and less likely. They all had developed that and they all knew the effects of its use—a Frankenstein that man has set up. I don’t know how far man will succeed in controlling this Frankenstein. There is world opinion growing up against the explosion of various types of atomic bombs which itself is connected with the subject of disarmament. Discussions are proceeding, not very satisfactorily. But this important thing is happening ; world opinion is now growing up. That is one of the chief contributions at the present stage of the United Nations in dealing with the problems that face it—the creation of world opinion.

“Even if the United Nations has not got the power as a body to do this, that, or the other thing, the creation of world opinion itself is a most valuable thing, because that in itself proves a deterrent for certain types of action that otherwise may be taken without any kind of restraint. What is it fundamentally that we must bear in mind ? The United Nations says we are all brothers. Are we indeed all brothers ? Let us be honest with each other. We are very far from that ideal yet. Certainly the atomic bomb will

help us all in becoming brothers ; whether we like to become brothers or not, it would have served a useful purpose.

“ In the meanwhile, make no mistake about it, we are still very far from being brothers. Here, a question of colour, there a question of ideology, somewhere-else another question. We still stand in the way of this noble ideal. Let us at least remember this. This is, of course, a fact, the world is ever coming closer together.

“ We can now travel in twenty-four hours distances which we could not have done in a month a few years ago. The world today is very close together and, even if our altruistic sentiments do not often prevail, fear is the rather important factor, the motivating factor of human conduct. Fear of horrible destruction of each other may tend to bring us together in this noble ideal.

\*

\*

\*

“ We have to realise, whether we like it or not, that we have to live together or perish together. That is the stark fact. We have to live together or die together. That will, perhaps, increase this brotherly feeling too ! We have to live and let live today. We have to understand each other even if we cannot altogether agree with each other. Obviously we cannot always agree with each other, in this matter, that matter, in some other matter.

“Those prime principles of living together are honourably set out in what is known as Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru’s Pancha Seela and was endorsed, with additions, at the Bandung Conference. Next to the Charter of the United Nations that is the most important human document that the world has produced in the last few years.

“Let us try then to adhere to the principles of the United Nations and the Bandung principles, in the interest of pure self preservation, if nothing else. Those of course will prove to be very high ideals and, of course, man has always had high ideals. Why would we not continue to have them? It will be a very good thing really, with a sense of realism too. Let us understand that we must live together whatever our differences are; we must die together; that we have to, even if we don’t agree, preserve friendly relationships with each other, understand other each, and respect each other even though there may be differences of ideology and so on amongst us.

“If we look at it from that angle the only life line of humanity today is the United Nations Organisation —with all its defects.

\*

\*

\*

“Let us therefore bring to our minds those great ideals of the United Nations which are the aspirations and ideals of all mankind. Let us understand the difficulties under which a body like that works against

the background of the analysis which I gave you earlier. Let us realize the considerable work it is doing and that it is capable of doing more. Let us work towards that positive peace to which I referred to earlier, of understanding each other, of realizing that man is above "isms".

"All these "isms" have been made for man, because he does not agree with somebody else; for somebody who thinks differently from others of the same species although he is a fellow man. Let us therefore think in terms of humanity, of mankind as a whole.

"These are not mere words. I experimented recently in my own country in my fundamental belief in human sanity and human good sense. I did so with a considerable amount of success. I believe therefore that by understanding each other, understanding each other's difficulties, we can work out a *modus vivendi* of living and letting live. Until man evolves a stable society, may be in another 20 or 30 years, which will provide for us all, I hope, greater happiness, greater prosperity and greater reality, the brotherliness that has existed in the past should enable the human race to go on its way without destroying it—only man alone can destroy man today—to fulfil those great ideals, whatever may be the religion or other standards of ethics that we all in our own way may possess, to fulfil that high destiny which we can achieve and which we alone may be able to destroy."

(Address to the U. N. Association (Ceylon Branch), October 24, 1957)

## The Age of the Common Man

“I DEEM it indeed a very high honour that the University of Ceylon should have considered me a person deserving of the conferment of the degree that has been conferred on me this afternoon.

“I find that I am enveloped temporarily in a robe of bright red ; whether it is a sign of things to come I don't know !

“I deem it a still greater honour that I have been requested to address this Convocation.

“The Dean of the Faculty of Arts in his citation in introducing me, used about me, as is usual on such occasions, very flattering and complimentary words. I have always thought that citations on occasions of this nature are more calculated to manifest the elegance and eloquence of those introducing the graduands rather than a representation of the unvarnished truth. However, I thank him very much for the nice things he has said about me.

“There is, however, one thing which he said which I do consider important. He stated that more perhaps than any of my predecessors in the high office which I am holding I am called upon to solve many problems

of importance and complexity and on the answers which I find to those problems may depend to a great extent the future of our country. That is something very serious which he said and something that perhaps contains within it the substance of truth.

“I am emboldened therefore on this occasion when I was somewhat perplexed as to the subject on which I should address you, to speak to you on matters of importance to us, to the world in general, and perhaps today to mankind as a whole ; to try and explain to you the background of my thinking on these problems, a background against which I shall be addressing my mind towards the solution of those problems. I am most encouraged in doing so by this very important sentence which I culled from the citation of the Dean of the Faculty of Arts who so very kindly introduced me.

“The present time is spoken of as a new era in human history. I have often wondered to myself why it was so termed. If that is correct, what are the factors that go towards the building of this new era and this new society and how can we, in this troubled period of human history, in this age of change and flux, in our various ways, conduct ourselves to the greater advantage of us all ? I feel that this age is not so much a new age but an age of transition between a state of society, a civilisation which is obviously decaying and dying and a new society, whatever may be its final form, which will replace it. It is therefore essentially an age of

transition, a formative age where a great responsibility rests upon all of us of this generation to think clearly, and correctly in shaping that new civilisation, whatever may be its final form.

\* \* \*

“It has been said of the author Aldous Huxley that he lived between two worlds, the one dead and the other impossible to be born. If I may adopt that epigram to this new era, I would say that indeed we are living today between two worlds, the one dying and the other struggling to be born.

“Changes in human society, changes in civilisation are not an uncommon phenomenon in the history of mankind. Those of you who know some history would readily admit that throughout the existence of the human race, from time to time human beings fashion out some state of society to meet the needs of the time. One civilisation which has its rise performs its functions according to the needs of that period, reaches its zenith, decays and dies, and is superseded by another state of society, another civilisation more suited to the needs of man at that particular period of its history.

“Sometimes such a change comes with almost dramatic rapidity, as for instance the destruction of the Persian civilisation by a few dramatic campaigns of Alexander and the spread thereafter of Greek civilisation throughout the known world. Sometimes it comes much more slowly as happened in the case of Rome. The Roman civilisation decayed through the centuries



till it sank into the twilight of the middle ages and the dawn of the new civilisation, of the renaissance which was particularly a Catholic civilisation. The very last change of this sort to take place was the change from feudalism to the capitalist society as we know it today—a change about which I wish to say just a few words, as it is one that occurred only a few hundred years ago, and is interesting in the light of the change which is taking place today.

\*

\*

\*

“The chief feature of feudalism was monopoly, monopoly of Government in the hands of kings and feudal lords, economic monopoly, monopoly of trade given to such favourites as the kings chose, and monopoly in religion.

“A revolt took place against monopoly by the ideal of individual freedom, of free enterprise based on the profit motive which ushered in the age of capitalism. It exploded in the violence of the French Revolution where the ground had been prepared by such writers as Voltaire and Rousseau, where the burden of feudalism was felt more stringently than in other countries. It was primarily an economic revolt against feudalism in France. It took the form of a religious revolt in Germany with Martin Luther. In England it took the form partly of an economic and partly of a religious revolt.

“This happened not so long ago, only a few hundred years ago. Capitalist society established itself. It

spread through the face of the earth and the search for power, the search for profit took the advanced countries into all the corners of Asia and Africa. It served a valuable purpose ; it reached its saturation point also as all such institutions must do. It is now surely in decay. Here also the process is a slow one. The first world war, the second world war, were manifestations of the cracking of the fabric of this civilisation. The process is not yet over ; it is still proceeding ; that is why I say that this age is particularly an age of transition.

\* \* \*

“There are experiments going on all over the world, experiments in Government ; here a fascist state ; there a communist state ; here a semi-fascist state ; there a semi-communist state and various varieties of democracies ranging from capitalist democracies such as that of the United States to liberal democracies such as that of England to socialist democracies such as those of the countries of northern Europe. Various experiments in the sphere of economic and of social life are taking place and we do not know yet the final shape of the new civilisation. Experiments are going on in various countries in various ways. But there are certain definite trends we can discern. I shall come to that in a moment. Certain definite trends of the new civilisation are manifest. But before that, I wish to draw attention to this fact that we are probably living today in the most important and crucial period of

human history. These periods of change, these periods of transition have taken place as I have stated at various times of history but never before on such an immense scale, with such magnitude, with such overwhelming possibilities for good or evil.

\* \* \*

“Mankind through its history has always felt the urge for improvement, for progress. In the pursuit of that aim he has sometimes succeeded, he has sometimes failed ; immense good has been done ; immense misery has been caused. It is an urge and an aspiration which, as I have said once before on another occasion, is enshrined in the beautiful Greek legend of the Garden of the Hesperides. At the western verge of the world, there is a garden where golden apples grow. It's guarded by the Hesperides, the daughters of the Night and this is the manner of their vigil. Hand in hand they dance round the apple tree.

*And none may taste the golden fruit*

*Till the golden new times come.*

*Many a tree shall spring from shoot*

*Many a flower be withered at root*

*And many a song be dumb*

*Broken and still shall be many a lute*

*Or ere the new times come.*

“The garden of the Hesperides symbolises that eternal aspiration of mankind towards some kind of happiness,

towards some kind of evolution, which has been proceeding in the world throughout its history. I am beginning to feel that after this toil and struggle man is very close now to the portals of the garden of the Hesperides. He is also unfortunately very close to the gates of hell. They are always close to each other.

“As never before, the crisis appears clearly to humanity today. Today we stand at a point of history when man looks down into the uttermost depths of the abyss, when he looks up to the further stars. Which is it to be? Are we all to plunge into a destruction of all humanity? Believe me we are close to that too. We have been on the razor edge of that on more than one occasion in recent years. Or are we to reach up to the stars literally and metaphorically so that man may achieve that high destiny which is his lot and which he alone has the power of preventing himself from achieving?”

“What is it therefore that we must do at this time, all of us in our own way. Here is an age of transition with immense potentialities for good or evil. How are we to achieve the good and to avoid the evil. First let us consider what are the chief trends of this new age. I believe it was an American statesman, strange as it may appear, who stated quite rightly what this new age was.

“Mr. Henry Wallace once said in a very homely phrase that this is the age of the common man. One of the important factors of this new age is a growing emphasis

on the needs of the common man and the need to give everybody an opportunity of living a human life without artificial barriers between himself and his fellows. In various ways, attempts are being made to give effect to that.

“Just as the change-over from feudalism was exploded in France by the French Revolution inspired by the writings of Voltaire and Rousseau, so the new age was ushered in forty years ago by the Russian Revolution inspired by the writings of Marx and Lenin. I am talking to you historically. I am not talking with prejudice for this or against that. I am talking to you objectively of the evolution and growth of the historical process.

“Well there was one answer on one side—may be an extreme answer—to the evils of one age. Here was an extreme answer to the present age ; some method of securing for man in practice those very high ideals of equality and brotherhood and their assertion of the dignity of man through one ideology. Various other countries are also groping for that. We may not like certain aspects of Communism. Even in capitalist America such efforts as those of the late President Franklin Roosevelt, for a new deal and of his successor President Truman, for a fair deal, were also, even in that most capitalist country, groping after a need to give effect to this important factor of the present age, namely to give all men an equal chance and a fair deal.

“There is another important factor. Just as the change-over from feudalism owes a great deal to science, to the Industrial Revolution—Industrial Revolution starting from England played a very important part indeed in the change from feudalism to capitalist society—so today also we have an amazing discovery of science. It is the age of the common man in a political and economic sense.

“Scientifically it is the atomic age. I have often thought that I would like to see some close study and an investigation into the impact on human society and civilization of various scientific discoveries. Regarding the inauguration of the atomic age, the impact of science on society was demonstrated tragically, when the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima. The subsequent development of atomic science has opened up vistas undreamt of before to the human mind. You have examples of that in the recent Satellite, released by the Soviet Union and speeding in the void round the earth. We ought to feel humble that probably the most famous living creature produced on the face of the earth today, is a dog speeding through the empty spaces of the void. The entire universe is opened up to man having opened up the earth for his own use. The possibilities are immense today. As never before we are dreaming dreams that mortals never dared to dream before. Dreams of horror on the one side, wholesale destruction of the human race, of unheard of mutilation and deformity, mental and physical, that may be caused by the effects of atomic fission ; on the other hand,

glorious dreams of such a future as man never contemplated in history before, dreams that seem to be coming true.

“ How are we going to deal with this new age with these tremendous possibilities for good or evil. Surely we must first understand what is happening before we think of what we have to do in the future. We must have an understanding of what indeed is happening in this world today.

“ I have tried as far as my understanding goes to explain to you my conception of this new age. Well, if you grant me that I am substantially correct, I feel the next step is to see how we are going to make the best use of our opportunities, how we are going to prevent our hatreds and dislikes reaching such a point that they explode into violence and war.

\* \* \*

“ The main thing we need today is peace. Formerly in periods like these, these problems were solved by war without any serious repercussions on the human race as a whole. Today we cannot think in terms of war. War will mean the destruction of all mankind. There will be no victors or vanquished ; we will all perish together. Therefore in this age the one most important thing we need is peace.

“ Peace is not a negative thing. Peace does not consist of a mere absence of war. Peace is something much more positive than that. How are we going to achieve peace in the spirit and in the letter ?

“ In the first place, the machinery through which peace can be ensured is important. We have in the Charter of the United Nations the only machinery for ensuring world peace, for the discussion and settlement of disputes peacefully. We have also in Asia, in the declaration which the Asian and African Nations made at Bandung, the enumeration of certain principles which rank, in my opinion, only second to the Charter of the United Nations in securing peace for our region and for the world as a whole.

“ How far that machinery can be used effectively depends on the spirit that actuates us, in the use of the machinery.

\* \* \*

“ What is the spirit that must animate us all today ? I feel that, as never before in our history, we have to recognize the dignity and the brotherhood of man, that we are all one, whatever may be our religion, colour or race or ideology. We are all one today. We cannot permit our dislikes of one another, racial, ideological, linguistic, economic, social or otherwise, to reach the point when we feel that we cannot live together. The whole world is very close together today and, whether we like it or not, either we have to live together or surely we shall perish together.

“ Therefore in pursuing the ideal of peace in its positive aspect let us realize the oneness and dignity of man, that we are all brothers not merely for religious preachers to preach, without being practised, but in fact that we



are so and have to be so whether we like it or not, if we are to live at all.

“ We have to reach the conclusion, maybe through religion, maybe through philosophy, maybe through science, maybe through some political ideology, that mankind is a great brotherhood. It is for us now to realize the great brotherhood of man which has been preached throughout the centuries and seldom practised. We have to practise it now. We are all living things whatever we may believe or not believe in the metaphysical or philosophical sphere. We have such a thing as life and probably on the face of this earth man is the most important living thing. We owe a duty to life and through life to ourselves, to the human race, for a betrayal of that is a sin against the Holy Ghost of which the Great Teacher of Galilee once spoke.

\* \* \*

“ Of course, there are so many paradoxes in this age of transition. One paradox is the need for harmony and also the need for conflict. Conflicts are inherent particularly in times of human history such as this. But we have also above those conflicts, to secure an ultimate harmony, an ultimate reconciliation.

“ Believe me, I have addressed my mind to the task (paradoxical as it may seem) of achieving harmony within conflict. Harmonious conflict is a concept that has a great deal of meaning for me. Conflict is very essential to life. Out of conflict alone does progress come ; but it must be conflict that does not militate

against a harmony above it. I have always felt that it was possible and the people of this country have made it possible now for me to put my theories into practice. I have made efforts recently, I have experimented recently in the ultimate good sense and sanity of mankind. I have experimented with it in this country and, believe me, with considerable success. Those misguided persons who do not agree, have cut very little ice in the effort to stop that attainment of harmony. Harmonization and reconciliation are also necessary therefore for the achievement of peace.

\* \* \*

“In this great task that faces all, an important part can be played, and must be played, by a University. Of all laboratories built by the hand of man, surely the most important laboratory is such an institution as a University, a laboratory of human thought and research, a laboratory turning out men and women qualified to face the great task that particularly faces mankind today. If you ask me what single thing or individual or institution has wielded the greatest influence on me, I would answer without the least hesitation that it was my University—the University of Oxford which I had the honour of attending.

“I do not believe that any other institution has the same influence as a University, because when we come to a University we are able, we are intellectually sufficiently mature, to shape our course for the life that faces us when we leave the University.

< 50 >



“ There are many factors that go to help a University in performing this task. I remember sitting with my fellow students at the feet of Professor Gilbert Murray as he, by the wave of his magic wand, transported us to that age where human beings fought and loved and lived heroically in the fresh dawn of civilisation, the age of Homer. We listened in wrapt attention as Sir Paul Vinogradoff expounded to us the principles and the philosophy of jurisprudence, that law which has made human society possible. I have no doubt that among the Professors and teachers of this University there may be those who to a greater or lesser degree fulfil that position. I remember the various clubs and societies where we met one another and exchanged views, the occasions we met in one another's rooms and till the early hours of the morning discussed to our own satisfaction the affairs of the universe. I remember even in sport which is so important, the Tennis or the Cricket or the Football that we played while the golden evening air rolled down the golden grass of the Christ Church meadows. These are all factors that go to produce a great University and the advantages that a great University can confer on those that pass through it.

\*

\*

\*

“ Our own University of Ceylon is still young. Here on this beautiful site amidst memories of the past and the dust of kings, this University has been established. These are most beautiful buildings. One task alone remains to us, to see that the work that is done in this

University reaches the highest levels that a University can and should achieve. I am sure even if we have not achieved that yet, we will achieve it in the future.

“A large number of graduates today received their degrees at the hands of His Excellency the Governor-General, the Chancellor of the University of Ceylon. They go out into the world, these young men and women, to face this brave new world, indeed it is a brave new world, to face its responsibilities and its difficulties; and to the best of their ability, in this small land of ours, to help not only in achieving for ourselves but for all mankind that peace, prosperity and happiness which man through the ages has sought to gain.

“Mr. Chancellor, I thank you and the authorities of the University for having paid me the great honour of requesting me to deliver the Convocation Address. I have explained to you the pattern of my thinking in dealing with those great problems to which Professor Nadarajah referred. Think for yourselves whether what I have said is correct or not. Free thought is most valuable. Whether you agree with me or not, I hope that we shall be able by the action and interaction of our views on each other, on individuals, nations and ideologies, to produce—in 20 to 25 years, if meanwhile man has not been destroyed—a society where at last man may reach out and pluck the golden apples of happiness for himself.”

*(The above is the full text of the Convocation Address delivered by the Prime Minister at the University of Ceylon, Peradeniya, on Friday, November 8, 1957)*

## The Democratic Tradition

“THE question has been asked and answered by both the President and the Prime Minister of India as to what constitutes the content of democracy and also what are the benefits that this association of nations in the Commonwealth confers. I too would like to add a word or two to what has been said. As the Prime Minister of India stated, there are various interpretations of democracy, various meanings given to that word, particularly of late. But, to me, democracy implies, in fact, an agglomeration of freedoms, individual and collective ; individually, the freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom from arbitrary arrests, freedom of the vote—in short, freedom of human thought. Collectively, the freedoms of democracy which, although always inherent in the concept of modern democracy, were first defined in the Atlantic Charter ; freedom from want, freedom from ignorance, freedom from fear, freedom to choose the Government that the people wish to have. All these freedoms, individual and collective, really go to form that conception of democracy which, I think, we in the Commonwealth accept.

“ The idea of the Commonwealth, this extraordinary association of nations in this manner, is perhaps unique

in the history of national associations. The nations or peoples that were brought together involuntarily by colonization and conquest by Britain gradually developed into the Dominion idea. The Dominions were restricted at the start to those who were bound together by common blood, common traditions. The Statute of Westminster conferred on these Dominions not only equality of status, but complete freedom of action in both internal and external affairs. The Commonwealth has now enlarged its borders to include other peoples with different traditions, of different races, of different ways of thought. One wonders what, then, keeps this Commonwealth together today, or what are, if any, the benefits that this association of nations in this way can confer.

\* \* \*

“ I have thought of these questions myself. There are no legal bonds. Even the one and only legal bond that existed earlier of allegiance to a common Sovereign does not now exist in the case of certain Members of the Commonwealth. There are no formal treaties or agreements, no formal rules whereby a majority decision is binding on the minority ; they are entirely free in internal and external affairs, without any legal bonds whatsoever, without any decisions arrived at which it is attempted to enforce on all Members of the Commonwealth, whether they like it or not. What, then, remains of value in this association ?

“ There are, of course, certain benefits, economic and otherwise, of this association. But I do think that

the most important bond of the Commonwealth today is this, that even if we are not bound today by the crimson thread of a common blood, we certainly are bound together by the golden thread of a common tradition. What is that tradition? I feel, when history sums up the contribution of the British people to civilization and to human welfare, it will say that their chief contribution has been the development of the spirit of democracy, as I have explained it, through the broad forms and machinery which they have devised for the purpose—the parliamentary system of Government.

\* \* \*

“I am not saying that all the forms of the parliamentary democratic system of Government which have been developed in Britain according to the genius of their own people need necessarily continue in those particular forms, either for themselves or for others, in this changing world. But, however the forms may be amended to suit developing conditions, the spirit remains the same. The British idea of free elections, the idea of the independence of the judiciary, the idea of an administration that is efficient and impartial and which is not unduly hampered by interference by the executive, are all ideas that have made valuable contributions to human institutions in the modern world. That, I venture to think, will be the verdict of history on the chief contribution that Britain has made to human welfare.

“We in the Commonwealth—different peoples with different policies internally and externally, sometimes

agreeing with each other, sometimes disagreeing with each other—are still held together by this common tradition. It is a tradition that is well worth preserving. In this age of transition—it is obviously an age of transition in which we are living today—with all kinds of experiments in the world, ideological, political, economic and so on, it is well worth preserving, in a manner that is in keeping with the needs of today, this tradition of democratic parliamentary government which, if we do not share many other concepts, certainly I think it can be said substantially, all members of the Commonwealth do share. It is, in fact, almost a way of life. It is in reality the true middle way today between the extremes that we see both of the right and of the left.

\* \* \*

“The Commonwealth has various meetings. As the Prime Minister of India said, the Prime Ministers meet. The Finance Ministers discussed economic questions recently in Canada and Mont Tremblant. Now, this is an assembly where Members of the Parliaments of the Commonwealth meet to discuss and exchange views regarding many matters of common interest. I think, therefore, it can be said that remaining in the Commonwealth causes no embarrassment to any of us. The fact that we differ from each other need not in the context I mentioned make us sever connections with each other. We still have certain things of common interest that in my opinion can make a valuable contribution in shaping the civilization of this new age. The old civilization is crumbling ; the new is not yet stable.



Various experiments have been tried everywhere. The world has not yet achieved stability. I do think that we can make a valuable contribution by preserving things that are valuable to mankind, things that are valuable to ensure the freedom of the human spirit while still being in line with the requirements and needs of this new age.

“I have great pleasure, as I stated, in associating myself with the Prime Minister of India and the representative of Pakistan in welcoming all the delegates assembled here today. I observe that in your agenda there are many subjects for discussion of a valuable and important nature, and I trust that this conference here in Delhi on this occasion will add to mutual understanding, and thereby also add to what I also feel very strongly about—the need for peaceful co-existence whether it be in the Commonwealth or outside it, which alone can prevent man from proceeding on a course of mutual hatred, the end of which is the destruction of all mankind and of civilization too. We have to live together, or, surely, we shall perish together. We may not agree with each other, but let us at least understand each other and help all mankind to achieve, let us hope, a better, happier and more prosperous life for all of us in this brave new world. I hesitate to use that term, but I use it for I do believe that, with all our difficulties, it is indeed a brave new world.”

*(Address to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference,  
New Delhi, on December 2, 1957)*

## The Need for "Total Peace"

"I DEEM it a great honour that has been paid to me by the request to declare open this very important and even portentuous conference of unofficial women's organizations of Asian-African countries. I believe this idea was mooted at the 1955 session of the All-India Women's Conference, and the five countries that are popularly known as the Colombo Powers—India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma and Indonesia—took upon themselves the task of summoning this conference of women's organizations of the Asian-African countries. I understand that the response to this invitation was most encouraging and I believe that as many as 17 countries are represented here from the region which I have mentioned.

"This conference, as I mentioned, represents the delegates of non-governmental representative women's organizations of the countries of Asia and Africa. The question therefore arises at the outset as to this Asian-African concept that appears to have developed in comparatively recent years. As you are aware, there was a conference at Bandung of the representatives of the Governments of many Asian-African countries—I believe 29 countries assembled at Bandung—and held

interesting and important discussions. There is such a thing as an Asian-African bloc that seems to be functioning satisfactorily with mutual co-operation and collaboration over a large range of subjects at the United Nations.

“And here we have a gathering of representative women of Asian-African countries. Why Asian-African countries? I ask the question whether there are any particularly significant common factors (while of course co-operating with the whole world as we wish to do and have to do) amongst these Asian-African countries. I suppose, by the way in passing, that it is Asian-African or Afro-Asian. Of course, I would like to mention that whichever juxtaposition you choose there is no intention to place either Asia behind Africa or Africa behind Asia. It is just a verbal convenience.

\* \* \*

“What are these common factors? They are two different continents. Countries far flung from one another. They differ in many matters—religious, cultural, political, social and ideological. They differ perhaps from each other in many more matters than Western countries differ from each other. What are then the common factors, or are there any common factors between these countries of Asia and Africa? Obviously there are. I should imagine that the most important common factor is the circumstance that most countries of Asia and Africa have been in one

way or another, directly or indirectly, under some form of foreign influence, foreign rule, foreign dominance—call it colonialism, imperialism or what you like—and that many of these countries have in recent years regained their freedom, and that certain other countries of this region are working towards freedom—that freedom which many of us have regained within this comparatively short period of time.

“ Naturally, this common circumstance must produce certain common sympathies ; certain common problems ; may be at a political level, or an economic level or a social level or a cultural level. Similar problems therefore must arise in all these spheres of human thought and activity amongst the various countries in this region. That, I should think, is the most important common factor that applies to almost all the countries in this region, the Asian-African region, which, therefore, does not make it out of the ordinary for these countries to get together at various levels : governmental, non-governmental, socially, economically, culturally, and so on.

\* \* \*

“ Therefore it is quite right, I feel, that a region like this, without in any way arousing hostility to our brothers and sisters in other parts of the world, and with the sincerest desire and determination, should collaborate and co-operate with them and for certain purposes of our own. But as you are an assembly of women I do not wish to express anything in any

way that might be even construed as patronizing, being a mere man, addressing an assembly of women. But with a certain amount of diffidence I wish to draw attention to one or two points, regarding the fact that this is a conference of women. As you all know, in our region there had been women who in the histories of our countries have played very prominent and very decisive parts in the shaping of the destinies of our countries' freedom. But I suppose it can be said with general accuracy that the women of our region had been somewhat, may I say, backward in playing their due part in the affairs of their countries ; more backward, at least in modern times, than the women in other parts of the world. That is another common factor, namely, the question of the status of women in many countries of our region. This question arises more sharply and acutely for consideration by you than it is, let us say, in many countries in the West, who have earlier fought for and won a greater degree perhaps, generally speaking, of emancipation of women and participation by women, in various spheres of national activity in their countries than women in many countries of our region.

\* \* \*

“ Another point that I wish to make is this. During the last war, a new phrase was coined. The new phrase was this : ‘ Total War ’. In earlier days people made war in a restricted way ; restricted to the soldiers fighting in the field, often to mercenary soldiers performing the task on behalf of this country or the other.

For the first time in the last war this very dynamic phrase was used—'Total War'. What did that mean? It meant that in the struggle that the world was engaged in, all people had to be mobilized in one way or another to play their part—soldiers, civilians, old men, young men and women, old and young. All sections of the population had to take part in the common struggle. Hence the phrase 'Total War'.

\* \* \*

“We have today to wage 'Total Peace' in its own way, and this is more difficult perhaps than waging 'Total War'. We have all in one way or another, to wage 'Total Peace'. Why so? I have no intention whatsoever of making a political speech. Various representatives of countries may have different views or political ideologies. But without doing that there is something we have all to bear in mind. What is the need for this total peace today? That is a question that I wish to answer in a few words. Today, as we all know, there are so many difficulties in the world. We are not living in one of those happy, peaceful periods of history. We are living in a period which, if it is vital and alive, which, if it contains potentialities of great advances for the human race, also possesses possibilities of untold conflict, misery, harm and destruction. I need not expand that point. It is almost a platitude that it is so.

“Therefore, in this world where peace becomes so necessary, not merely desirable but becomes starkly

necessary, not merely for our advance but for the bare survival of the human race, peace occupies a more overshadowing position today in the world than it ever did in the past. The waging of total peace becomes absolutely necessary—not merely desirable—but absolutely necessary for our bare survival.

“What do we mean by the waging of ‘Total Peace’? Peace—if I may repeat what I have said on other occasions and other contexts—is not purely a negative concept, the absence of conflict or war. It is something very positive. In this positive aspect, peace means mutual understanding. Realistically we must accept the position that we cannot all agree with each other. We have never been able to agree with each other. Today particularly we cannot all agree with each other. But today it is necessary for us to understand each other, to appreciate each other’s points of view, to realize our particular difficulties and the context in which these difficulties arise and thereby create peaceful feelings of friendly relations, co-operation and collaboration which are absolutely necessary for the preservation of peace in this negative aspect, i.e., the avoidance of sharp conflict.

\*

\*

\*

“Mutual understanding is necessary today. In order to obtain that we have to wage this total war of peace. It is no use Prime Ministers meeting from time to time at this place or the other, discussing problems at ‘summit’ levels or even at less rarefied levels lower

down. No doubt such a course of action is necessary. But at all levels, in any way, this mutual understanding has to be strengthened and fostered.

“Ladies and gentlemen, I repeat, as I said at the beginning, that we cordially welcome you to our midst. We are a small country, a poor country. We are just a pin head as countries go in this world. But small though we be, our will to peace, our will to collaborate and co-operate with all other countries in our region and the world, to reach human understanding and thereby strengthen world peace, is not second to any country in the world, big or small.

“We hope that your conference would be helpful towards that end. Personally we are very glad to have you all amongst us. I trust that you will enjoy your stay here and I hope that your discussions will prove useful and that you will go away with pleasant memories of your short stay with us, and that the friendly bonds between all of us would strengthen so that we may all work together for human fellowship, peace and comradeship in the world.”

*(Address to Afro-Asian Women's Conference, in Colombo, on February 15, 1958)*



## Call for an Asian Economic Conference

“THE idea has been developing in my mind for sometime that the time has come to pursue one of the important decisions of Bandung in greater detail in the realm of economics. It is my intention, if the countries concerned agree, to suggest the holding of an economic conference, if necessary of all the Bandung powers, perhaps the restriction at the beginning being to Asian countries, for this purpose.

“We are all developing our economies, our national economies, in industries, in agriculture and so on. It strikes me that it may be desirable to consider certain common problems of planning not merely on a national basis now but at least as a beginning, on a regional basis. It is a very important suggestion which I am making. We are developing our industries; we are developing our agriculture for purposes of our local consumption, for purposes of export, but we are doing that in isolation from one another. Certainly I think in Asia it is very desirable to consider at least the outlines of a regional development plan.

“I am only too well aware that there may be national interests that will have to be considered and naturally

given full attention to ; but I certainly think that it is undesirable for us to continue isolated planning without any reference to some regional plan of how each country's industries might fit into the industrial development of another without conflict, and similarly, with regard to agricultural development.

“ Even if full agreement is not possible I think quite a desirable advance can be made by the holding of such a conference. If I may mention one important matter on which a discussion like that would be very useful, it is the question of food in our region. As you know most of us are rice-eating peoples in Asia. The whole problem of the production and distribution of rice to meet our minimum needs is becoming urgent and important today. I am quite sure that the general question of industrial and agricultural planning on some pattern without undue duplication or conflict amongst ourselves will be most useful to us. This question of food will provide a valuable, urgent and necessary item for discussion amongst our countries without delay.

“ I have discussed this matter with our planning authorities here. I have also had the opportunity of having a discussion on this subject with an expert on planning who has been with us, Professor Myrdal of Sweden and he is in full agreement with me that such a conference would be very valuable. It will all the more, I think, have a chance of success because except in a very indirect way we will not be discussing political troubles and difficulties amongst ourselves but

something which is of common interest to us all in the realm of economic development. I intend to pursue this suggestion and address the countries concerned, and if there is a sufficiently satisfactory response I will suggest the holding of such a conference at an early date, if they all agree, in our own country.

“I take this opportunity on this occasion of mentioning this important matter, although not directly concerned with the exhibition, but as one that is indirectly concerned with the development of trade as well as economic development of our countries.”

*(Address at Chinese Commodity Exhibition, Colombo, on March 18, 1958)*

“I WISH to draw your attention to a matter of some importance. That is the suggestion to hold a conference to deal with economic problems of our (Asian) countries in pursuance of certain conferences already held in the past ; the Conference of the Colombo Powers held here, followed by the Bandung Conference in 1954. As you know, it was contemplated at Bandung that another Conference should be held two years thereafter and I believe it was suggested at that time that Cairo should be the venue. For various reasons that Conference had to be postponed, one of the chief reasons being that some of us felt that the time was not opportune to hold a Conference on the lines of Bandung again, owing to certain political troubles. But I now

see that the time is most opportune to hold a Conference to deal with economic questions, not political issues, following the resolution that has already been passed at the Colombo Powers Conference and then at Bandung.

“There are many problems which we can discuss usefully at such a Conference. Take the whole question of food production. The whole question is of one of extreme urgency. The demand is outstripping the supply. That is a question to which we should address our attention most usefully and without undue delay. There are other bodies that deal with problems of this sort, e.g., the ECAFE. But they do so excluding the People’s Republic of China. I do not know how you can discuss these matters without China. And also, if I may say so, while China is excluded, some of the old Imperial powers are members of that body. Let them do what they can ; I wish them well. But the question of the kind I suggest is to consider the production of food, primarily agricultural, tea, rubber, coconut. We are, no doubt, some of the most important producers in this region. We are very much in the hands of the consumers, as the Chairman very rightly mentioned. We are entirely in their hands to the extent that our entire economic life is dependent on the price trend.

“Further, we are all countries which are engaged in economic development, agriculture and industry. I certainly have always felt that isolated economic planning of a country by itself is, perhaps, not likely to be so

fruitful today. I would like to see a certain amount of regional planning, particularly in the industrial sphere. As you know, it is going on. But certainly, I think, to consider a certain degree of regional planning, without conflicting with the needs of national planning—I think the two are not necessarily opposed to each other—without, in any way, having hostility towards any other country, where all are our friends, would be very desirable.

“In passing, I would mention the question of shipping. What are the countries in our region that have any sort of shipping today? To a very small extent, India, Japan. How much we are at the mercy of others! I do feel that a move such as the one I have in mind would be very useful. I am not expecting hundred per cent. success in discussions of this sort, but I would say that a certain amount, say, twenty-five per cent. of value may emerge from these discussions. However, it is my own view, and I intend to pursue it with the others concerned.”

*(Address to the Ceylon Chamber of Commerce, March 27, 1958)*

## Ceylon and West Asia

*A team of five officers from the Ceylon Army left for Lebanon in September 1958 to join the United Nations' Observation Group. The decision to send this team from Ceylon followed a special request made to the Ceylon Ministry of Defence and External Affairs by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Organization.*

*As a background to this decision, we print below the speech made by the Prime Minister in the House of Representatives on August 14, 1958.*

“I feel that the time has come when some permanent—however small—Police Force of the United Nations must be set up. There is no question at all about it. This is not to terrorise small countries or deprive them of their independence, but merely for the purpose of preventing various countries, whatever their reasons may be, from going into other countries, as has happened in this region, first in Suez and then, later on, in Lebanon and Jordan, for the purpose of preserving peace and not for the purpose of conquest or arrangement.

“I think another necessary step is that they must have some machinery ready for their Observation Groups to move quickly into action.

“I should also like to see a much more satisfactory clarification of Article 51. Those two resolutions—the Essentials of Peace Resolution and Peace Through Deeds Resolution—must be read in conjunction with Article 51. Then the present doubt as to whether a country is or is not entitled to intervene by sending their troops in, will, at least to a great extent, be removed, if not removed altogether.

“If these steps are taken, perhaps we would have advanced another important step forward in preventing these situations arising here, there and everywhere, which seems to be arising now a little too often and really endangering the peace of the world. That is the position with regard to the present discussions in the United Nations.

“I do not want to be drawn in here into a discussion of Israel versus her Arab neighbours.

“However that is, I should like just to say this. I was asked some question about our representation in Israel, and here I might say the position is that the previous Government had agreed to diplomatic representation by Israel here, of course, I presume, with the implication of our representation there. When I assumed office the Israeli Government, naturally, very kindly kept on pressing us to find out whether they could send their representative here as the previous Government had decided. Well, Sir, I said, “Yes,

you may do so". Then the question of appointing a representative of ours at Israel arose, and I have just laid it by for further consideration.

"I must say here that I did not come to that decision owing to various pressures that were brought to bear on me. But certainly they were entitled to do it. In fact, a number of Arab countries and Egypt did make certain representations for my consideration and I explained the position to them too. But I think it would be wrong to say that owing to pressure from this country or that—it will not be fair to those countries—that certain action was taken or was not taken. Certainly, they made certain representations to me which received my consideration. That is the position about it.

\* \* \*

"As to the position of Israel in this area, you are all aware no doubt of the long and somewhat unhappy history of those people—the Israelites, the Hebrews, the Jews. Ever since the time when a great religious teacher, whose religion is professed by a very large number of people in the world as well as even by certain Hon. Members of this House, had said that not one stone shall be left on another, and which was so amply borne out when the Roman General Titus sacked and destroyed Jerusalem in the first century A.D., the Jews have been scattered all over the world. How long ago was it? From the 1st century A.D., 1,800 years ago, the Jews ceased to be a nation.



“ It is interesting to note in passing that Titus remarked after his Palestine campaign that the Gods themselves seemed to be on his side in that campaign. It was so complete and so successful that the prophecy was fulfilled. However, they suffered in various countries of the world, in Europe, in England, in Germany, in Russia ; wherever these unfortunate people were, they were subjected to immense sufferings through the ages. We can appreciate, can we not, that such a people would want to say, “ Well, we have at last got a home of our own ”. I mean we understand it.

“ Personally, if you ask me, the much wiser course should have been, with the increasing liberalism in the world, that the Jews, who had in spite of all the sufferings and discrimination against them made such important and valuable contributions, whether in finance or art or music or science or politics, to the countries in which they were settled and of which they had become citizens, should have been absorbed into those countries as citizens of those countries and treated fairly and justly so that they would have been able to make their great contributions to the national lives of those countries. But, however, the Balfour Declaration recognized publicly this sentimental claim of theirs to return to their homeland after nearly 2,000 years. Hence the tears.

“ Now let us understand the position of the Arab countries, too, where their countries are undeveloped, the people ignorant and ill-equipped as most of the

inhabitants are, as to what they feel about this Jewish State established in a narrow, barren strip of land containing about a million and half supported by international Jewry with finance, with the political power wielded in those great countries where the people of their race are still filling important and distinguished places, with brains, with industry, with money and most modern equipment. The Jews feel that this small country is not sufficient for them, for  $1\frac{1}{2}$  million people. At the same time, it must be remembered there are about a million Arabs who are refugees, and we are also making our little contribution to the United Nations Fund that is dealing with these refugees, about a million of them, driven out of their homeland.

\* \* \*

“They feel that this Jewish State planted in this way in their midst would prove of great danger to their independence and their freedom because Israel is bound to expand ; she just cannot help herself. The inevitable and inexorable circumstances of the case would make it necessary for the present Israelites to expand, with the powers they have and their ability, backed by all these international forces. This makes the Arabs fear not unjustifiably that Israel would prove a great danger, if not now, at least 10 years hence or 20 years hence or 30 years hence. That is the Arab point of view which might be given due consideration.

“The Israel point of view is that they have no such intention, in fact, I had the pleasure of having a long

talk with Mrs. Golda Meir, a very charming and able lady, when she was the Foreign Secretary at the United Nations. I told her this is the position but, of course, she said, "Oh, no. We can get on very peacefully if we are only allowed to do so. We have no such intentions", and so on and so forth . . . .

"We have the highest regard or the Jews. Surely, we do not want to treat these unfortunate people as pariahs of the human race. Nobody wants that. They are very able and all honour to them. But this is the position of the newly planted State of Israel. Of course, they were there over 2,000 years ago, it is true, but they have not been there for the last 1,800 years at least. If we look at it in that way, I dread to think how many of us would dare to go back and find out who inhabited this country 2,000 years ago and another country 1,500 years ago and ask, "Have they not got the right to return to their original homeland?" I dread to think what would be the position of many countries in the world."

## “Living together as Good Neighbours”

“TODAY, the United Nations Association of Ceylon is celebrating, as indeed other such associations must be celebrating throughout the world, the 13th anniversary of the foundation of the United Nations Organization.

“The theme which has been selected, I believe, by the World Federation of the United Nations Associations is a very important one—“To live together as good neighbours”. That, indeed, is the main problem of the United Nations Organization as it happens to be the main problem both internationally and nationally in the world today. I, therefore, intend to say something on this theme. It is an excellent theme that has been selected by the Federation of these Associations for world-wide celebrations today—“To live together as good neighbours”.

“Now, the very first thing that strikes one in the situation, both international and national, that faces us all today is a curious paradox : on the one hand there is a certain resurgence of various human conflicts and on the other hand what appears to be a realization of the

need for human unity. Now, this first point that I referred to, the resurgence of various conflicts—religious, national, political, economical, social—some of the conflicts that existed amongst mankind in the past, had been accentuated. Others that did not exist before to a great extent exist today.

\* \* \*

“ Let us examine this. Why is it so ? In the first place there are various factors that have contributed to this increase of conflict on the religious plane. I suppose the emergence of a point of view that does not accept the fundamentals of all religions—the one common factor that belongs to every religion, namely the belief that this life is not the be-all and end-all of things. It is in a sense a preparation, a testing ground for a continuance thereafter, may be some heaven, *nirvana* or some *valhalla*. It may be as some of us think that it is only one link in a long chain extending far into the past, extending far into the future before the final goal is reached. That is a common factor that belongs to all religions ; that this life is not the be-all and end-all of things. There is no doubt that whatever the religion may be, it has stimulated religious feeling of a controversial nature. Take the political sphere. In politics, of course, the emergence of various political theories, totalitarianism of the right, of the left, capitalism and socialism has increased such conflicts in the present age, but whatever has happened in past national conflicts, the revolt

against imperialism and colonialism today has produced and stimulated nationalism throughout the world. Sometimes an undesirable narrow nationalism has been stimulated by the revolt against imperialism and colonialism in the economic sphere. It is so. Many challenges in the economic sphere today have also created conflicts. Thus, both internationally and nationally, we have today aggravated conflicts that existed in the past, with certain new conflicts. At the same time there is a realization that national as well as international unity is desperately necessary for us all today. The existence of various international bodies such as the United Nations, various specialized bodies and various other international organizations—women's associations, youth associations, cultural associations, literary associations and so on—show this.

“ Now then, in dealing with the problem of “ living together as good neighbours ”, we have the paradoxical position of various conflicts side by side with the urgent need to achieve harmony and unity. This indeed is the problem that faces the United Nations as it faces us all, whether it be on the national plane, or the wider international plane.

“ Primarily the objective of the United Nations is the preservation of peace and unity as well as the achievement of living together. Now, how is this objective to be achieved ? Can it be achieved at all ? If so, how can it be achieved ? That is the real problem that faces us all—can it be achieved at all ? Well

now, unless we despair, mankind must accept the position that it can and must be achieved. It is a must. How can it be achieved ?

“The United Nations is one weapon in the fight for achieving it. How must we proceed about that ? In the first place it is mental and psychological. We have to realize, and realize acutely, something which I have said before. I ask your permission to repeat that. Either we have to live together today or surely we shall die together. That is the stark truth of the matter.

\* \* \*

“Either we must work out a way of being able to live together or else it is certain we shall die together. If there is aggravation of human conflicts, if any point is reached in our thinking, when I say that it is not possible for me to live with my good friend, Dr. N. M. Perera (Leader of the Opposition), or my equally good friend, Mr. Dudley Senanayake, either they must die or disappear, which heaven forbid, or I must die and disappear. If the people of the great United States of America think they cannot live in the same world with the people of the Soviet Union or with the people of the People's Republic of China, or the people of the Soviet Union and the people of the People's Republic of China think it is not possible for them to live and occupy the same world with the people of the United States of America, it is a very sad day for us indeed ! For then, we will be on the threshold of a conflict that will destroy us all. But if we do, then nothing can

save us. So the first thing to realize is that, although we may be different in our views, in our ideologies, in our theories of government, we are all human beings striving in our various ways to benefit mankind. Though I may not agree with the other man and he may not agree with me, still we are striving for the same end.

“ You will remember that Christ said on one occasion that “ the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath ”. I have felt all along that all these various ideologies and “ isms ” have been made for man to look at them all as co-operative methods towards the welfare of mankind and let man freely evolve for himself any scheme of thinking, of government, of politics or economics in the interests of mankind.

“ I refuse to hate a man simply because I disagree with him. Mr. Dudley Senanayake and Dr. N. M. Perera can derive relief and consolation from this ! While we agree to disagree with each other we agree to work as fellow human beings. I am sure, in the end, humanity will thrash out some system of co-existence.

\*

\*

\*

“ The Prime Minister of India, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, gave a lead in that regard when he, I believe, was the first to enunciate what is now known as “ Panchaseela ” —the five precepts of good neighbourly conduct. You know them all. I need not repeat them all—respect for each other, non-interference in each other’s internal affairs and friendly collaboration and so on. These



principles were further expanded at Bandung. I am quite satisfied that they really provide for, amidst differences, room for human collaboration.

“The United Nations Organizations has been functioning for 13 years. It has been criticised by many people. It has been praised by others. And what is the real truth of the matter? The United Nations does happen to be the only real weapon we possess for the resolution of national disputes by negotiations without resort to war, for the increasing range of collaboration both through the United Nations and its multifarious specialized Agencies. It is the only weapon we possess. The United Nations has had its successes. It also has had its failures which is inherent in the situation. Surely we do not want to blame the United Nations for this because it is inherent in the present situation.

“Let us see what outstanding successes the United Nations has had since we last met. There was the Suez trouble. You know we were on a razor's edge at that time. We were nearer to a third world war than ever before and I do not think it is over. I say that it is the United Nations resolutions that were passed, and which were accepted by the countries concerned, that prevented a very widespread outbreak of hostilities, for it nearly developed into a third world war. Later there were the troubles that arose in the Middle East, in Europe, Lebanon and Jordan. What happened then? The United Nations

General Assembly discussed this matter for some days and countries that were primarily concerned, the Arab countries, drafted a resolution which all other members of the United Nations unanimously accepted, and that was passed. That is one of the outstanding triumphs of the United Nations. In the first place the parties concerned themselves came to agreement regarding a formula put forward by a resolution and it was accepted by all. Troubles are always there. When one is over another overtakes us. We have some trouble now, in quite a different part of the world in the Far East. Trouble, as you know, going on in the Straits of Taiwan. There too it is our hope, it is our intention, that that too will not be allowed to develop but will have a just and honourable solution. I hope that that solution is not far distant.

\* \* \*

“ Now the United Nations has its difficulties. I would like to see an overhaul of the Charter of the United Nations. As you know, one of the difficulties that arises is an intervention by certain countries in the affairs of other countries on various pleas. That still goes on. Section 51 of the Charter of the United Nations says that countries can intervene if there is aggression, military aggression in any country. That has been further explained in rather a nebulous fashion by two resolutions of the United Nations essential to peace.

“ These resolutions say that a country can intervene if there is some kind of subversion going on in the country direct or encouraged by some foreign country in its own interests. This is very unsatisfactory. I have suggested to our representative at the United Nations that I should like this matter if possible to be put up for clarification. As you know when you have a nebulous definition like that any country can intervene on such grounds in the affairs of another on the grounds that there is subversion going on in the interests of a third party in some country merely to prop up or to support some particular government in that country against the wishes of the bulk of the people of that country. I am not saying that it has happened. It's a possibility that we have to bear in mind. I would like to see a complete overhaul of that particular article of the United Nations and the resolutions that are rooted with it so that the position is clarified beyond doubt. There are also various other amendments that may be required to make the United Nations Organization really effective.

“ Of course there is a fundamental difficulty which is inherent in the United Nations where you get, as indeed the members of the United Nations represent various views, various divergent views. Sometimes strong divergent views are represented by the United Nations. I would like to see a representative of any country, whatever it be, as he stands on the rostrum of the United Nations to feel, first and foremost, that he is

a member of the United Nations and only secondly a representative of his particular country. I would like to see that feeling grow up in the United Nations. The United Nations must begin to develop a personality of its own. I stand for justice, not merely the pressing forward of one point of view alone. I know it is difficult. There must be the feeling that a member of the United Nations acts for the whole world. They are changes that must come in the United Nations, national or international, by our realization that we must live and let live and safeguard legitimate interests. We must live and have self-respect for the other man. The theme chosen is therefore an excellent one. As I stated in the beginning I go back to it at the end. 'To live together as good neighbours.' Let us all try to achieve it. Let us all work towards it. There may be plenty of difficulties but there is nothing beyond the capacity of human ingenuity or human will, if we have a will to consider, all of us, whatever our politics or religion or colour or anything else, as real members of the United Nations, a great brotherhood of man. Then indeed we will be able to make full use of the United Nations. Then mankind will be able to march forward not to the abyss but, literally and metaphorically, to the stars."

*(Speech in Colombo on United Nations Day, October 24, 1958)*

## The Role of Youth in the effort for Peace

“I SHOULD think that when the history of this particular era of human civilization comes to be written at some future date, it will be recognised universally that this is perhaps the most important and significant epoch of human civilization. Whether it be politically, economically or scientifically, vast changes are taking place today throughout the world. Changes which may result in an unforeseen era of prosperity and happiness for mankind or, on the other hand, one that may well lead to great misery and suffering, or even the destruction of mankind.

“Therefore, as in no other period in human history, a very grave responsibility rests on the shoulders of all of us to a greater or lesser extent. We are, all of us, men and women, people of all races, of all ways of thinking, to a greater or lesser extent, trustees for mankind. Now, that is a very serious responsibility and we all have to think, think hard, think clearly, think carefully, as to how that object, the object that is common to us all, of human brotherhood, of friendship, of co-operation, is to be achieved.

“ Now, there are various differences amongst human beings and the human race today. Much more so than ever before. Politically there is the fundamental right of freedom against the previous forces of imperialism and colonialism. Economically there is an ever-growing realisation that every human being has a right to live ; to live with the highest living standard, to live with equal opportunities of service, of work, of leisure and of happiness. Socially there is a right to break down existing prejudices of race, of class, of caste, of religion, of colour and so on. Scientifically, there are the discoveries of the last few years, which have opened out a new vista of existence to mankind. I am referring, of course, to the whole range of atomic discoveries and their potentialitiss for good or for evil.

\* \* \*

“ You will see, therefore, that on the one hand there has been a certain accentuation of differences amongst human beings ; on the other hand, there is a realisation that we must work together. That in some way we must harmonize the differences that exist amongst us with the need to work together as brothers of one family—of the human family. The great problem of the present era is the problem of harmonizing these current differences, while at the same time there is also need for unity above those differences. That is really the problem that faces us all, to a greater or lesser extent. Today, we should make total war on peace. The phrase ‘ total war ’ was used for the

first time in the last War. Total War is war in which not only the Armed Forces, but also all citizens, are involved.

“ I see that you have full approval of the Bandung Resolution, passed at the Bandung Conference three years ago. Those Bandung Resolutions are an extension of that way of life set out by the Prime Minister of India, Pandit Nehru, in what is generally known as Pancha Seela ; a way of being able to live together in peace and friendship, amidst differences. As you know, there have been messages of goodwill that have emanated in the past from Asia, to all mankind ; the messages of the great religious teachers, of the Buddha, Christ, of Prophet Mohamed, of Confucius, of Zoroaster, &c. It is a great consolation to us in Asia to feel that once again we have a message of goodwill to the world at a political level, the message of the Bandung Conference and the Bandung resolutions.

“ It is my hope that the whole world will adopt those resolutions. Indeed, you will have noticed that, quite recently in the United Nations, a resolution has been discussed for the establishment of good neighbourly relations between peoples. I am very glad of this and I trust that they will adopt that as a model. The Resolution is one which we adopted at Bandung three years prior to that, but it provides a good basis. There is, of course, this difference. The difficulty that lies in recreating an ideal to reality.

“Human beings throughout the world have always been idealists with ideals such as equality, personal brotherhood, and so on. The great religions, too, have put forward various high ideals before mankind, but they also will realise that it may not be possible universally to realize those ideals. The Buddha said that those who live according to his teaching, his Dhamma, were few. Christ also said that ‘Many will be called but only a few chosen’. The great religious teachers, therefore, realise that high ideals, noble ideals, it may not be possible to achieve in the mass ; at least to achieve them quickly. The politician’s task, at a lower level, is to translate into practical action for the mass of mankind, as far as possible, such noble ideals. There is a big difference between the theory of an ideal and its practical achievement in fact.

“What we have to do, understanding the weaknesses of human beings, is to keep an ideal before our minds and to work, practically, unswervingly, towards its achievement. The most important ideal to me—the greatest need for mankind today—is the achievement of peace. If I may use the scientific term, there is a ‘pure theory of peace’ and the ‘applied theory of peace’. We also subscribe to the pure theory of peace. At least it is a good thing for us all. It is only when we try to achieve it in practice that certain realities cause difficulty.



“Now, what is the ‘pure theory of peace’? As I have said on more than one occasion, peace is not merely a negative function in the sense of an absence of war, of quite agreeing with each other. There is a positive aspect of peace also which is far more difficult to achieve. The positive aspect of peace is this : that you have to create the atmosphere of peace in the minds of people, that they are all brothers of one family, that they must somehow live together or surely they will die. That is the positive aspect. An important person once said that peace is one and indivisible. I often wondered whether this is only a high sounding phrase or whether it has any meaning. I believe it has an important meaning ; you cannot have peace for one man and conflict for another, peace for one class and conflict for another class. It must be peace for all. It is quite true to say that peace is one and indivisible. Can we or can we not achieve this peace in practice ? That is the problem that faces us all today ; that faces every head of every country. I am one of those who has faith in the human race, so that I believe it can be achieved.

\*

\*

\*

“How can we work towards it in practice ? I know that certain evil qualities of man still persist. We Buddhists believe that all human ills spring from *karma*. All its ingredients go to the conception of *karma*. We are still greedy, we are still stubborn, we are still prejudiced. One race thinks it is superior to the other,

one religion thinks that its faith alone is necessary for salvation and that all others must suffer in some form or other. One set think that they alone are right and all others are wrong. The two main evils are these : greed and fear. How would you overcome these ? It is not easy to root them out. It must be a lengthy process but the achievement of peace in practice must depend upon the rooting out or the reduction of these evil ways of some of mankind. Let us, as we must, walk with our heads in the clouds, but we must also have our feet planted in the earth. How can we do this ? In the first place, we must realize this, that man, after all, is more important than all these 'isms'. We have various 'isms' in this world, each section thinking quite *bona fide* and honestly that its point of view is the correct one. In *karma* we accept the *bona fides* of all. We are all working towards one end, towards the prosperity and happiness of all humanity, at the same time adapting it to the genius and to the metre of our own people.

“ Nationally, we have problems. We have for instance, the problem of different races that inhabit our country. People, different in race, different in religion, and in culture. At the present moment, the only sensible way to deal with such a problem is this : the preservation of the legitimate rights of the majority while extending full justice to the minorities. No doubt when we do that we will move towards the realization of these ideals. We cannot harden our hearts, like

the ostrich who hides his head in the sand, but must understand realities. That we are all human beings transcends differences of views amongst ourselves. So that while respecting each other, understanding each other, without trying to intervene or interfere in each other's way of life, we have to preserve friendship. This is the essence and the substance of the Bandung Resolution. We cannot afford to let our differences rule our lives. When we feel that we cannot live together, it will be a sad day for humanity. We may disagree with each other. That is a minor point. But we have to live together. If we have peace in this world for another 25 years without killing each other or destroying mankind, the human race will then be saved. Meanwhile, we cannot afford to hate each other. That is really the truth of the matter.

\*

\*

\*

“ I see a very hopeful sign. I think that war is further away today than it was, for instance, 10 years ago. But it is a very sad thought that war is further away today because so many countries of humanity possess weapons that can not only destroy another, but destroy all mankind. Today peace is based on fear. Atom bombs, hydrogen bombs, intercontinental bombs ; all that is keeping this peace today. It is a sad thought, but it is true. I see that one of the solutions is disarmament. Very good. We support all that to the full. I am glad to note that opinion in the world is growing in that direction. But there are other things we have to

do beyond the mere banning of some weapon or another. It is a difficult task, but it is a task to which we have to address our minds. But still these things would not depend on the strength of a country ; on the strength of its armament. It depends on the human spirit, the will to peace. We are all one there.

“ In this general effort for peace, the youth of the world can and must take a very important part. After all, what is youth ? How do you define youth ? The easiest method is by age. But that is not the only criterion. An old man may be young in spirit. A young man may be old in spirit. I am now old, but I still wish to think that I am young in spirit. What are the essentials of youth ? Enthusiasm, keenness, the spirit of devotion and dedication, the spirit of sacrifice ; all those are the essential ingredients of youth. Therefore let youth have its full place in the world.

“ Your Federation has many excellent objects. The World Federation of Democratic Youth includes youth organizations from different countries and diverse tendencies, religious beliefs, &c. Your objects as set out are very noble objects. You have carried on your activities for a number of years. You are increasing mutual understanding and the friendship that flows from understanding amongst a number of young members of so many countries in the world—a very noble task. It has all our good wishes and I hope that you will

play a part—an important part may be—in the achievement of that understanding and friendship amongst the peoples of the world which is the object of us all.”

*(Address to the Executive Committee of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, in Colombo, on December 9, 1958)*

# The Commonwealth Relationship

“THIS I believe is the first occasion when the present Prime Minister of Canada has visited Asia. I am sure, on my own recollection of a very brief visit to his country, he must be finding conditions in our countries of Asia very different—much warmer of course, the scenery and human beings and every thing else which he has seen very different to conditions in Canada. In the course of this trip, he has come to us to spend with us an all too brief sojourn. He leaves us tomorrow morning. Our own country is generally said to be, by generous-minded visitors, a very beautiful land. I believe there is a legend in certain quarters that we are the genuine Garden of Eden which fact interestingly survives in such place names as Adam’s Peak, for instance.

\*

\*

\*

“Now, I have some doubts about the truth of this legend of course, though patriotically I should have none, if for no other reason at least for this convincing reason. The first ancestors of the human race, that engaging couple Adam and Eve, are alleged to have been garbed at one time of their career in fig leaves ! Now as we have no fig trees in our country, it throws a genuine doubt, on the possible accuracy of this legend,

unless of course you take our jak leaf to be a substitute for the fig leaf! Rather an inadequate one, don't you think?

“ Now, however may be the possible truth or otherwise of this legend, I think that with greater truth we may say that Canada is probably the home of another Garden. You know the Greek legend of the Garden of the Hesperides where golden apples grow. Canada has all the qualifications to claim to be the site of the Garden of the Hesperides. She has all the prosperity of the golden apple. One of the few countries in the world that has been consistently producing surplus balances—a very happy state of affairs to which we cannot claim to aspire—our deficits seem to be mounting up annually to almost astronomical figures! Canada is also a country with vast potentialities of development. Quite recently they have discovered further potentialities in oil and so on. With a very small population it may well claim to be, therefore, not only for herself and her citizens, but also for the many needy countries of the world such as ourselves, a prolific source of help and assistance, so that, I suppose, one may say if not literally, certainly metaphorically, that Canada can claim to be the home, the veritable home, the Garden of the Hesperides.

“ Now, I have just been looking through some of the assistance we have received from Canada under the Colombo Plan for the last four or five years. I have a rough list of them handed me by my Secretary a

little time ago. I find that it is a sum between sixty and seventy million rupees in the last five years for various important projects. Diesel motors, the fishing industry, rural electrification for Gal Oya Development Valley, Rural Road Reconstruction Scheme—various schemes of this nature for our industries, for our agriculture, for our transport, and so on. Canada has ungrudgingly come to our help and assistance that we value it all the more because we realise that Canada has nothing particular to gain by the assistance she is giving to us and to various other Asian countries. Therefore, this much-used phrase of ‘assistance with strings’, whatever precisely it may mean from country to country, certainly and clearly does not apply to Canada. She has nothing particular to gain for herself except perhaps something that is the most difficult thing to get, that is the friendship, the understanding and goodwill of the countries of Asia and other under-developed countries to which she has extended her assistance in so generous a manner.

\* \* \*

“ May I say that in the few years specially after the last war, in an unobtrusive manner Canada has played a very important part in trying to help the cause of peace in the world today. In the early years after the conclusion of the last world war we found the assistance of Canada most helpful in a number of rather difficult international problems. Well, this tradition Canada is continuing and the present Prime Minister, Mr. Diefenbaker, has come to our country to see things



for himself. I have no doubt that these visits are useful from the leading statesmen of the world ; he can form an opinion for himself regarding the help that his country has been giving us, as well as other Asian countries, and is continuing to give, something of our problems and difficulties, something of our needs.

“ Now, I had an interesting talk with the Prime Minister this morning when I was trying to explain to him some of our problems, our particular angle or view on these problems and also problems of a more general nature. We had a discussion, for instance, on the place of the Commonwealth. Now, as I have always said, we all do share, to a lesser or greater extent, a common tradition. A common tradition of government, common tradition of the place of the judiciary and place of our administration and we try to deal with problems that arise between man and man in the preservation of those decencies of human relations which, I feel is one of the chief assets of the democratic way of life. We have also advantages, economic or otherwise, but surely this is the greatest advantage of all, this Commonwealth relationship. It may be that we may not share the precise view as the means through which the democratic process works, we may not feel that the precisely British form in which that machinery has been worked out may be the best for some of our countries. But by and large, the spirit of democracy and what it means, we do share to a greater extent.

“ Now, economically there are certain advantages no doubt in the Commonwealth relationship. But that can't be the be-all and end-all of economic relationships.

“ It may not be possible to convert the Commonwealth into some self-sufficing economic unit nor indeed would it be wise to do so. But there are various matters in which we can benefit. One such primary method is the Colombo Plan which, as you know, was evolved here in this country at one of these Commonwealth Conferences (held in the time of the previous Government) which has contributed largely to assistance that the Commonwealth countries can render each other. The Colombo Plan has been very useful. We do not deny that for one moment. It is a pleasure to us to feel that it was hatched, if I may use that term, here in Colombo where we are meeting today. But I do feel that economic relations can have various circles of collaboration. Like a stone that is put into a still pool spreads out in growing circles, our relationships in the world today economically or otherwise, should take that form, of Commonwealth relationship, regional relationship, wider international relationships—they must all be concentric circles. In the general co-operation that we need in the world today I feel that although there is obviously a greater effort at economic collaboration there is still not enough recognition and realisation of the need for some wide economic planning. I feel that that this is really necessary for the peace of the world today. It does not consist of mere political

collaboration or discussions on the floor of the Assembly of the United Nations. They are valuable and I don't for one moment minimise the value of such methods, but economically it is very necessary. We cannot have collaboration at political level, international level, without trying to achieve, as far as it is possible, that greater international collaboration at the economic level.

\* \* \*

“ It is no use our pursuing cut-throat economic policies of one country against another country, may be one group against some other group, one region against some other region. I know, of course, the difficulties of getting any kind of extra national economic collaboration but I do say it is very vital and it needs greater concentration than it receives today although there are various agencies of the United Nations and others engaged in economic advancement on an international level. It is still not sufficient. The mission primarily is this. We have to achieve that, if indeed the peace for which we are striving is to become a reality. A good many differences, at present depend so much on economic factors. Here our under-developed countries are on one side, industrially developed countries on the other, some countries which are producers chiefly of primary products, agricultural primary products. Ninety-five per cent. of the economy of our country depends upon three primary agricultural products, tea, rubber and coconut, in that order, so that to develop a plan of economic,

agricultural and industrial advancement, we have to do away, as far as we can, with cut-throat competition, national and international, on the economic level.

“I think it is a problem which you will agree that we all have to replace or eliminate. Not political combinations that exist, such as the Commonwealth combination or regional combination. No. But merely to get those combinations to work within schemes of increasing economic collaboration and planning.

*(Speech at luncheon to Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, Prime Minister of Canada, and Mrs. Diefenbaker, in Colombo, on November 26, 1958)*

## “Opposed to Power Blocs”

“YUGOSLAVIA is one of these countries, like ourselves, which is labelled sometimes as ‘neutralist’, sometimes as ‘uncommitted’. I do not like either of those words, though they are used for convenience. We are not neutralist. We do not adopt a negative attitude. Our attitude is a very positive one in following our different ways of life in non-alignment with power blocs, and therefore, as we think, helping the general cause of world peace and friendship, not in a ‘negative’ or ‘neutral’ sense but in a positive way. I do not like the word ‘uncommitted’. We know of course the meaning the word conveys. But we are very much ‘committed’—we are committed to the hilt—to peace in a positive form, to friendship amongst all nations and to the peace and prosperity and happiness of all mankind. We are committed quite as much as anyone else, perhaps even more so. As I said before, I do not like those two words, though they are of course used popularly. But still our policy is one in which we—Yugoslavia, ourselves, as well as a number of other countries—do not believe that the best interests of peace can be served by belonging to one bloc or the other of the two great power blocs that are in existence today. Nor do we believe—as some people have spread rumour—in any effort to

create a third bloc. For that would indeed be a contradiction. We who are opposed to power blocs have no intention whatsoever of creating a third power bloc or a 'third force', whatever you may like to call it. However, I am certain that the so-called 'uncommitted' countries, in the policies that they follow, can serve a useful purpose in promoting peace and understanding amongst all, and perhaps of helping on occasion to bridge the gulf between the two great power blocs in the world today. We feel that there is a definite role for countries with a general pattern of foreign policy as we possess, to play a useful, perhaps even an important, part in promoting those things in this troubled era, which we are all, in our different ways, striving to achieve."

*(Speech at the reception, in Colombo, to Marshal Tito, President of the People's Republic of Yugoslavia, and Madame Broz, on January 24, 1959)*

## Joint Statement with China

“WE, the Prime Ministers of Ceylon and of the People’s Republic of China, have taken the opportunity, on the occasion of the visit of the Prime Minister of China to Ceylon, to discuss many matters of mutual interest to our two countries. Our talks were full and frank, and conducted in an atmosphere of the greatest cordiality and friendship.

“We re-affirm our adherence to the principles accepted by the Asian-African nations that met in conference at Bandung in 1955 which were an extension of the five principles of international co-existence and co-operation, popularly known as *Pancha Sila*.

“We are of the opinion that active steps should be taken to further the implementation of these principles and that another Asian-African Conference should be convened at the earliest opportune moment for this purpose.

“This is a transitional period of world history. In eras such as this it is not unusual to find divergent outlooks and varying conceptions of society. But we believe that nations can live in peace with each other despite these divergences and different social

systems. World war, or the creation or continuance of conditions leading to the occurrence of such a war, cannot be permitted. International disputes should be settled by mutual understanding and peaceful negotiation. We therefore record our disapproval of antagonistic military blocs, our support of disarmament, and we stress the need for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and the cessation of tests of such weapons.

“ At the same time, it is necessary to strengthen the solidarity of Asian-African nations to oppose, in this area, the aggression and the expansion of the imperialist and colonial forces, that are still trying desperately to thwart the freedom and progress which the peoples of the world are striving to achieve in keeping with the spirit of the new age.

“ With regard to the situation in Egypt and Western Asia, we are of the opinion that the continuance of power politics or the substitution of one power for some other in the name of filling up a so-called vacuum will not help to solve the problems of this area whose people must be free to work out their own destiny in accordance with their own wishes. Only in this way, can a collective peace be ensured and international disputes be settled peacefully in this area.

“ We are deeply distressed by the unfortunate situation that has arisen in the dispute between Pakistan and India in regard to Kashmir. We appeal to both



parties concerned, in their own as well as the wider interests of Asian-African solidarity, to strive further for a peaceful settlement of this problem.

“Our two countries have been bound by ties of friendship for many centuries. While recognizing and respecting differences of outlook that may exist between us, we are determined to strengthen those ties, develop our economic co-operation and cultural exchanges and foster co-operation to our mutual benefit and in the cause of Asian-African solidarity and world peace.”

*(Joint Statement issued on February 5, 1957, by the Prime Minister of the People's Republic of China, Mr. Chou En-lai, and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike)*

## Joint Statement with India

“ON the invitation of the Prime Minister of Ceylon, the Prime Minister of India visited Ceylon from May 17 to 20, 1957, to participate in the Buddha Jayanthi Celebrations in Ceylon.

“The Prime Minister of India visited Anuradhapura on May 18, in the company of the Prime Minister of Ceylon and was privileged to participate in the Buddha Jayanthi Celebrations there. The Prime Minister of India desires to express on his behalf and that of his daughter, his deep appreciation of the hospitality offered to them and of the kind and cordial welcome they have received in Ceylon.

“The Prime Ministers availed themselves of the opportunity of their meeting together to exchange views on international issues and Indo-Ceylon relations. The Prime Ministers feel satisfied that their talks have resulted in further appreciation of each other's views of the problems of their respective countries and helped them in their appraisal of international issues generally and as they concern their two countries. Their talks have once again borne evidence of the great measure of agreement in their approach to the problems of peace and world co-operation and their relations within

the Commonwealth. They have served to clarify further and strengthen their understanding of these problems and the determination of their two countries to continue to adhere to and pursue the principles on which their approach is based.

“They reaffirm their faith in the Five Principles of international relations known as the *Pancha Seela*, which were embodied in and extended by the principles adopted by the Bandung Conference. It is their conviction that the spirit of these principles, if acted upon, affords an opportunity for the establishment of co-operation, understanding and friendship amongst countries, many of which have ideological and other differences. This approach will also lessen the tensions of the world and help to avoid the grave conflicts which threaten the world today.

“The Prime Ministers congratulate the people of Ghana on the attainment of independence and look forward to the people of Malaya also achieving independence. They appreciate the action of the United Kingdom in acceding to the wishes of the peoples of these countries. They trust that the area of freedom will be enlarged and nations still under colonial domination will soon achieve their freedom. They disapprove strongly of every kind of aggression and attempt to re-impose colonialism or imperialism in any form.

“The Prime Ministers express their relief and satisfaction at the opening of the Suez Canal for normal functioning. They view, however, with deep concern

the developments in some parts of Western Asia. The problems of this region can only be solved by the peoples of the countries within that region being left free to work out their own destiny in accordance with their own wishes. Any imposition of an outside authority can only lead to continuing tensions and an intensification of these problems.

“The Prime Ministers recognize the importance of the United Nations as an instrument for securing world peace and, in particular, trust that the basic aims stated in the Charter of the United Nations for security, political freedom, social equality and racial harmony should be the guiding principles of that great organization as well as of the member nations. In order to function effectively, the United Nations must become fully representative of the world community. The failure by the United Nations to recognize the People’s Republic of China is not only opposed to the basic principles of the Charter, but also impairs the utility of the United Nations.

“The Prime Ministers gave their anxious and particular consideration to the present state of the development of nuclear and thermo-nuclear power for forging weapons of mass destruction, and to the ominous catastrophe that threatens humanity if their development and production continued and their use were not prohibited. While, in the event of their use in war, humanity would in all probability face well-nigh total extinction, the Prime Ministers were immediately

concerned about the present and immediate consequences of the harmful and unpredictable effects of radiation on mankind caused by the continuing explosions of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons for test purposes carried out by the Soviet Union, the United States and the United Kingdom.

“ The Prime Ministers regret that, despite the declared intentions of all nations not to embark upon war, and the mounting opinion and anxiety in the world in regard to the growing menace of these tests to the present and future of mankind, the Great Powers concerned have not yet decided to refrain from their hazardous ventures in this field which have already proved injurious to populations in lands near to the location of such tests, dangerously polluted the world’s air and water and threatened the present and future generations with both known and unknown risks and consequences.

“ The Prime Ministers, therefore, make an earnest and urgent appeal for the immediate suspension of these nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions, pending their abandonment. Such suspension would not only limit the dangers that have already arisen and help in easing international tension, but would also lead to an effective consideration of the problem of disarmament.

“ There are certain outstanding problems between India and Ceylon that yet await satisfactory solution. The Prime Ministers feel confident, particularly in

view of the cordial relations that exist between the two countries and their co-operation in so many spheres, that these problems can and should be solved satisfactorily to both countries.

“The Prime Ministers are conscious of the great and wholesome interest aroused in both their countries by their present meeting, which is a token of their existing friendship and of the earnest and widespread desire to promote and strengthen the ties that bind them.

“To this end, the Prime Ministers reaffirm their desire to devote their energies.”

*(Text of a Joint Statement issued on May 20, 1957, by the Prime Minister of India, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike)*

## Joint Statement with Japan

“THE Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, visited Ceylon from the 28th May to the 31st May, 1957, as the guest of the Government of Ceylon. During his stay he took the opportunity of discussing with the Prime Minister of Ceylon matters of mutual interest to their two countries. These discussions were conducted in a spirit of great friendliness and the two Prime Ministers are confident that their meeting will further strengthen the cordial and happy relations that already exist between Ceylon and Japan.

“The Prime Ministers reiterate the desire of their two countries to work together for the peace of the world and they affirm their faith in negotiation based on goodwill and understanding as the only effective means of settling the disputes of nations. They express their belief in the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and they recognise the importance of the United Nations as an instrument for securing the ends of world peace. In expressing this belief they also recall the adherence of their two countries to the principles embodied in the resolution of the Bandung Conference.

“ Among the matters discussed by the Prime Ministers were ways and means of further fostering economic co-operation between their countries. They attach much importance to this subject and they believe that even closer collaboration than now in the fields of economic development and trade and commerce will greatly conduce to the mutual benefit of their two countries.

“ The Prime Ministers agree that effective disarmament is indispensable for peace and they are strongly of the view that, in the interests of the future of all humanity, the nuclear and thermo-nuclear test explosions that are being undertaken by certain nations should be abandoned without delay.

Japan and Ceylon share a common religion, Buddhism, and are linked together by the ties and traditions of a common Buddhist culture. These bonds enable their countries to make a special contribution to the peace and welfare of humanity in the spirit of the Buddha Dhamma and the two Prime Ministers affirm the resolve of their countries to collaborate in this spirit for the common good.”

*(Joint Statement issued on May 31, 1957, by the Prime Minister of Japan, Mr. Nobusuke Kishi, and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike)*



## Joint Statement with Indonesia

“ON the occasion of the visit to Ceylon of the President of the Republic of Indonesia, His Excellency Dr. Soekarno, the President and the Prime Minister of Ceylon took the opportunity of discussing matters of general and mutual interest.

“The President reiterated the sympathy of the Government and the people of Indonesia in the flood disaster that had overtaken Ceylon recently and expressed the willingness of Indonesia to be of assistance to Ceylon at this time of need. The Prime Minister extended the warm thanks of the Government and the people of Ceylon for this kind gesture.

“They were in complete agreement that the friendship between their two countries should be further strengthened in every way possible, particularly in the fields of cultural, trade and economic relations.

“They were agreed that the freedom and sovereignty regained by many countries in Asia and Africa should be protected and safeguarded in the interests of all. They are of the view that colonialism in all its manifestations is an evil which should speedily be brought to an end. In the context of the West Irian dispute, the Prime Minister reiterated the position taken up by Ceylon at the recent session of the United Nations

in regard to the justification of the claims of Indonesia and expressed the hope that this matter will be settled in a peaceful and satisfactory manner without delay.

“They strongly shared the view that existing international tensions were a grave danger to world peace and expressed their conviction that all possible avenues should be explored for the relaxation of such tensions, as for instance by discussions at the highest level at the earliest opportunity on such subjects as disarmament, control of nuclear weapons, &c. Such discussions would not only strengthen world peace, but would be in keeping with the spirit of the resolutions adopted at the Bandung Conference in 1955. They feel that the time at present is propitious for such a meeting.

“They further feel strongly that the admission to the United Nations of the People’s Republic of China, representing as it does such a large percentage of the population of the world, will be another important factor in achieving world stability and peace.

“They reaffirmed their faith in their independent policies and attitude of non-alignment as a positive contribution to the cause of world peace.

“On behalf of the Government and people of Indonesia, the President extended to the Prime Minister and Mrs. Bandaranaike an invitation to visit Indonesia. The Prime Minister accepted this invitation very gladly.”

*(Joint Statement issued on January 24, 1958, by the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Dr. Soekarno, and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike)*

## Joint Statement with Czechoslovakia

“**A**T the invitation of the Government of Ceylon, the Prime Minister of the Czechoslovak Republic, Mr. Viliam Siroky, visited Ceylon in the company of Mr. Vaclav David, Minister of Foreign Affairs, and other officials.

“In the course of this visit, the Prime Minister of Czechoslovak Republic and the Prime Minister of Ceylon discussed the relations between the two countries as well as international matters of mutual interest.

“The Prime Ministers expressed their satisfaction at the manner in which the economic, trade and cultural relations between the two countries have been developing in recent years. They hoped that these relations will develop further in the future to the mutual benefit of both countries.

“The Prime Ministers noted with regret that there still exist peoples who have not yet attained their freedom and independence. In pursuance of the principle of self-determination, they expressed their fullest sympathy and support for the just efforts of

these nations to free themselves from the bonds of colonialism and to achieve the full stature of free sovereign nations.

“The Prime Ministers viewed with anxiety the prevailing tensions in the Middle East. They were firmly of the opinion that the countries in this area should be left to determine their future without any interference and according to their own wishes.

“The Prime Ministers expressed full support of the principles of the United Nations Charter and were convinced that all sovereign States should participate in the activities of the United Nations Organization. They expressed their conviction that China should rightfully be represented in that Organization by the People’s Republic of China.

“The Prime Ministers noted with concern that the disarmament talks which have been held over a number of years have failed to achieve success and that recently the prospects of reaching agreement on this vital problem have further deteriorated.

“The Prime Ministers were strongly of the view that no efforts should be spared to bring about a relaxation of current international tensions.

“The Prime Ministers expressed their anxiety over the stockpiling of atomic and hydrogen weapons and called attention to the fact that in the interests of all nations, it is necessary to prohibit tests of these weapons and thus take the first step towards reaching agreement

on the complete prohibition of their production and use. This would create favourable conditions for the settlement of the problem of disarmament in general.

“They were firmly convinced that the time is now propitious for a meeting, with the least possible delay, of statesmen at the highest level which will settle outstanding international problems in an atmosphere of understanding and co-operation among the nations. They agreed that such a step would be in accord with the spirit of resolutions passed at the Bandung Conference of the Asian-African nations. Experience has shown that friendly relations between nations with different social systems can be developed on the basis of the principles enunciated in those resolutions. The observance of these principles by all nations would undoubtedly help to reduce international tensions and consolidate peace throughout the world.

“The Prime Ministers are convinced that their meeting will strengthen existing friendly relations between the two countries and thus contribute towards the cause of world peace.”

*(Joint Statement issued on February 2, 1958, by the President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia, Mr. Viliam Siroky, and the Prime Minister of Ceylon, Mr. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike)*

## Joint Statement with Yugoslavia

“THE President of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz-Tito, and Madame Broz paid a State Visit to Ceylon at the invitation of the Government of Ceylon from the 21st to the 26th January, 1959.

“President Tito was accompanied by the President of the People’s Assembly of Montenegro, Blazo Jovanovic, Member of the Federal People’s Assembly, Ivan Macek, Member of the Federal Executive Council, Slobodan Penezic, Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Veljko Micunovic and Secretary-General of the President of the Republic, Leo Mates.

“During their stay in Ceylon, President Tito and his associates visited various points of historical and cultural interest and economic projects in Colombo, Kandy and Nuwara Eliya where they met representatives of the administration and of political and public life in Ceylon, and came in contact with many other people as well. President Tito expressed his gratitude for the cordial hospitality and reception tendered him by His Excellency the Governor-General, the Government and the people of Ceylon.

“In the course of the visit, talks were held between Prime Minister S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike and President Tito on current international problems of interest to the two countries and on bilateral relations between Ceylon and Yugoslavia.

“The talks were held in an atmosphere of cordiality, understanding and mutual respect. The exchange of views on international problems was profitable and helpful and there was agreement in regard to the need for increasing co-operation between the two countries, particularly in the economic and cultural sphere.

“In the field of international relations, the Prime Minister and the President of the Republic were in complete agreement on the urgent and vital need to make every possible effort to reduce the prevailing state of tension between nations. They recognize that in the present phase of human civilization there are various differences amongst mankind, political, economic, national, social and otherwise. At the same time they are fully conscious of the fact that the progress, and even the survival, of mankind demands that, transcending these differences, international concord be established on a footing of understanding, co-operation and friendship.

“They are strongly of opinion that the policies of overcoming the contradictions between the existing Power Blocs and non-alignment with such Blocs, i.e., the policy of peaceful co-existence, followed by a

number of countries including their own, have already made and will make in the future a positive contribution to the attainment of this objective.

“ While warmly endorsing the efforts that are being made in the political and diplomatic spheres to secure the cessation of nuclear tests and general disarmament, the Prime Minister and the President wish to emphasize the imperative need to remove those barriers which stand in the way of full and unfettered economic co-operation between nations, irrespective of their ideological and other differences.

“ They accept and re-affirm their faith in the principle of self-determination. They extend their support to all peoples striving for national freedom and independence from colonial rule, as well as for international relations based on equality, in the firm belief that the ending of colonialism will help to ensure international peace and security.

“ These principles are embodied in the United Nations Charter and the Bandung Resolutions, the validity of which they uphold.

“ The Prime Minister and the President re-affirm their adherence to the principles and aims of the United Nations, within the framework of which their countries are promoting fruitful co-operation. It is their belief that experience so far has shown that this world organization, despite the many difficulties it meets



within in its work, is the most suitable forum for the consideration of international problems and achievement of settlements by way of agreement. This role of the United Nations has been further strengthened by the admission of a number of new independent States, especially those in Asia and Africa. They are strongly of the opinion that all nations which are not yet represented should be included in the United Nations if it is to function more successfully and efficiently.

“During the talks, the Prime Minister and the President paid special attention to Ceylonese-Yugoslav relations and measures that could be taken to advance and develop them further. They have noted with satisfaction, especially now that diplomatic relations have been established, that broad possibilities exist for achieving fruitful co-operation along all lines in bilateral relations, which will be also furthered by the present visit of President Tito to Ceylon. They agreed on the need to strengthen the diplomatic relations between these two countries and to raise the status of the respective diplomatic missions to Embassy level.

“They have expressed the readiness of their countries to augment and extend co-operation in various ways in the economic, technical, scientific and cultural fields and to bend their efforts towards increasing the trade between the two countries, for which favourable conditions exist on both sides. For this purpose, a

suitable delegation, at governmental level, from Ceylon will visit Yugoslavia early on the invitation of the President.

“ President Josip Broz-Tito has invited Prime Minister Bandaranaike to visit Yugoslavia. This invitation was accepted.

“ Done at Colombo on this Twenty-fifth day of January, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Fifty-Nine.”

*(Text of the Joint Communique issued by the Prime Minister of Ceylon and the President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia at the end of their talks on January 25, 1959)*





AN INFORMATION DEPARTMENT PUBLICATION

---

PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRESS, CEYLON