



Important Press Conferences

1965

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto



Reproduced in PDF Format

By

Sani Hussain Panhwar

Member Sindh Council, PPP

**IMPORTANT
PRESS
CONFERENCES**

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

1965

Reproduced in PDF format
By

Sani H. Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP

CONTENTS

	Page
1. ADDRESS TO THE PRESS CONFERENCE HELD AT NEW YORK ON SEPTEMBER 29, 1965	4
2. ADDRESS TO THE PRESS CONFERENCE HELD AT RAWALPIND ON OCTOBER 5, 1965	9
3. ADDRESS TO THE PRESS CONFERENCE HELD AT NEW YORK ON NOVEMBER 5, 1965	19

Address to the Press conference held at New York on September 29, 1965.

GOOD MORNING, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

Thank you very much for responding to our invitation. It is kind of you to take the trouble. You are aware of the Kashmir dispute. It has lingered on for eighteen years, the Security Council has so many documentations on it, so many resolutions on it, and you are familiar with the whole dispute. You are familiar with our position on the Kashmir dispute and you are aware of India's position on it. In a generation India and Pakistan have gone to war twice on the Kashmir dispute. This is a fundamental matter of principle on which Pakistan cannot surrender. Our position is that the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir is involved and that the right of self-determination in this case is sanctified by an international agreement to which India is a party. All we ask for is the implementation of an international agreement between India and Pakistan on the basis and principle of the right of self-determination which is embodied in that agreement and which is the corner-stone of the United Nations' Charter. I want to make it quite clear that we are not taking a rigid position; we are not taking a dogmatic and an unreasonable position. We are taking a position which is patently fair, which has been endorsed by history and which is the evolution and the greatest phenomenon of our own time—that is the freedom and liberty of people. This is our position, and it is a reasonable one. It is a position to which India was itself a party too, and now it is difficult for the international community to allow India to wriggle out of her own commitments. I do not make a lengthy statement. Once again I want to thank all those countries that have participated in the Security Council's debate, taken all the trouble to try to settle this most important of all disputes that affects the continent of Asia. I am leaving tonight for Pakistan. I would like to thank the Press and every one else for the cooperation and understanding they have shown to a just and righteous cause which a small country like ours is defending against a clear and naked aggression which was inflicted on my country on the 6th of September.

Answers to Questions:

Answering a correspondent's question on the Pak-India relations the Foreign Minister said:

“This. I think, only goes to confirm our position. Our position is this that it is not enough to have a cease-fire. It is not enough to place all our emphasis and all our attention on getting a cease-fire. Cease-fire is only a means to an end. We must grapple with the problem itself, find a solution to the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, otherwise, we had a cease-fire in the past and we had a war again. We can have another cease-fire, may be a cease-fire which brings about some lull, some temporary tranquility, but it will not be the answer to the problem.”

Answering another question on the subject the Foreign Minister said:

“I am not saying that there will be a war because we are not responsible for war. We were a victim of aggression before; we have been a victim of aggression again. How can we say that India will not resort to her habit of committing aggression against us again?”

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

“I am not going to comment on other problems. Our position on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is clear as I said that it is not a rigid or a dogmatic position. We have made our proposal i.e., India and Pakistan should withdraw their troops from the State of Jammu and Kashmir. In making this proposal we are not imposing a liability on India or again on ourselves. We say that Pakistan and India should be in an equal position. Neither we should have an advantage nor should they have an advantage. They should withdraw their troops from the disputed territory and we would be prepared to withdraw our troops from the disputed territory. Then machinery should be formed so that the people of the State are given a free choice to decide their future.”

Answering a further question the Foreign Minister said:

“Pakistan’s soil is not a disputed territory. The territory in dispute is Jammu and Kashmir, and it is in Jammu and Kashmir alone that there should be a peace force to supervise a free and impartial plebiscite.”

Answering a question on the stationing of a U.N. Force in the Jammu and Kashmir State, the Foreign Minister said:

“Oh yes, we will say that for the whole of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. We are willing to vacate our troops from the territory we hold and India should vacate its troops from the territory India holds.”

Answering a question regarding the Kashmir dispute vis-a-vis the United Nations Organization the Foreign Minister said:

“The question is that once before we placed all our hopes and aspirations for future destiny in the hands of the United Nations and for eighteen years the United Nations had this dispute on its lap. Now again there has been a fighting. Our people have made sacrifices and this is the second time that we have been called upon to place our future, our hopes, the hopes of our people in the hands of the Security Council and this is for the second time that we have done it. Now we will give the Security Council a reasonable opportunity—a reasonable opportunity to evolve, a self-executing agreement for the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. And if the Security Council moves forward, if it makes earnest, sincere and courageous efforts to find a solution which affects six hundred million people, we will extend the fullest co-operation to the Security Council and to all others who will assist in finding its lasting solution. But, if, on the other hand, we believe that we are returning to the old times and that once the

cease-fire is brought about, things go back in the way they went back on the previous occasion, then of course we have a right to reconsider our position.”

Answering a question regarding his views on an impartial plebiscite in Kashmir, the Foreign Minister observed:

“I would say that in principle it is essential that both India and Pakistan should not be in a position to affect and influence the decision of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The machinery to replace them can be of the United Nations or any other impartial authority to ensure that a free and fair plebiscite is held.”

Answering a question regarding Pakistan’s co-operation with the Security Council, the Foreign Minister said:

“We have always obeyed the Security Council. We have always been the good boys in this. We have already co-operated with it. So the question of our disobeying does not arise if experience and precedent is any criterion of judging Pakistan’s attitude. And we will extend the fullest co-operation to the Security Council. We will implement all, the entire resolution in its totality and the resolution does not concern that paragraph alone. It is a resolution which has something to say on the substance of the problem. So the resolution is taken into account in its totality. We are prepared to extend our fullest co-operation.”

Answering further questions regarding the withdrawal of troops from Kashmir and the right of self-determination of the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

“In so far as your first question is concerned I think you will agree with me that it would be dangerous to create a vacuum, if we withdrew without a machinery to replace it with an impartial authority to take its place. I would not say that there will be a vacuum for India will fill that vacuum and void as she has done in the past and therefore I think it will not be possible for us to vacate before the machinery that replaces it is in fact on the ground.

“As far as the second question is concerned, I have already made the position clear that in defending the right of self-determination we are not taking a rigid position. Besides, your question is, I think, a little premature, because I cannot comment on the effort that the Security Council made in evolving the proposal. Proposals have to be seen before one can comment on them. But basically the question is that on self-determination we cannot surrender.”

Answering a question regarding the so-called ‘infiltrators’ the Foreign Minister said:

“The question here is that, I think, slanderous charges have been made regarding these irregulars or as some people call them infiltrators. The main thing is that they cannot commit aggression against their own people. It is not conceivable for a people to commit aggression on their own people. These people who have gone to the support of the people of Jammu and Kashmir under Indian occupation, they are Kashmiris. They are none other than the Kashmiris. It is like a Texan going to the support of Texans and then it is regarded as an aggression against Texas or

some one from California supporting people of their own State. So I think that must but be quite clear that these people are Kashmiris. They are indivisible. They cannot be divided from the rest of the people. The control over them is their own principle, their own faith and their own determination to see that peace is restored and that it is an honorable and proper peace.”

Answering another question regarding the so-called infiltrators the Foreign Minister said:
“But the people of Jammu and Kashmir are not chattels for Pakistan to order them. They know their own interests and they know how to safeguard and protect their interests. We have no say in the matter. The question does not arise even hypothetically.”

Answering a question on the role of the United Nations Organization, the Foreign Minister said:

“By moving meaningfully and constructively towards the solution the United Nations would be contributing in bringing down political passions but here we are not concerned with either the passions of Pakistan or India, and if passions were to be the basis of approaching international problems then I doubt if international problems can be solved and the purpose of the United Nations would come into question if passions and prejudices were the way to tackle the future of five million people.”

Answering a question regarding the support of the People’s Republic of China for the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

“The question is that the President referred to the moral support given by all States and on this question the People’s Republic of China took a position on the basis of self-determination and on the basis of the aggression committed against Pakistan.

Now if any country takes that position we do not have to go into the ideological background at that country. We are only concerned with the position that countries take on moral issues and so the question here does not arise of China’s support or of any other country’s support on the basis of ideology but on the basis of the support of that State to the people in the matter, firstly. Secondly, if India creates situations in which she has tensions with all her neighbours, and Pakistan is not the only country with which India has disputes, of course we are the principle target; we are their enemy Number One. But India has disputes with other countries as well. India’s disputes with China which are well-known and India’s disputes with other countries in the region. I do not want to name those countries because it is not for me to speak on their behalf. But you are aware of other problems which India has in the region with so many other countries. Well, now if India creates such situations that some of the neighbours are tempted to take advantage of the situation which India itself creates why Should Pakistan be held responsible for that?”

Answering a question regarding Pakistan's other initiatives the Foreign Minister said:

"We were advised by all our friends that the Security Council and the Secretary-General should be given full opportunity to bring about a settlement. Now this was not a position that Pakistan took, but this is a position that was taken by the President of the United States and by many other friendly countries and it was in response and in deference to their point of view that we reluctantly accepted the cease-fire to give the Security Council its last opportunity. Now, it would be only fair and proper for the Security Council to exhaust all its efforts before we consider other initiatives, otherwise there will be cross-currents and we may find ourselves in a situation in which overlapping efforts are, being made, and we would like to avoid that."

Answering a question regarding the President's visit to the United States, the Foreign Minister said:

"I do not preclude the possibility of a visit by the President to the United States. You are aware of the invitation that he had received from President Johnson but so much depends on the conditions at home, The President of our country is the Chief Executive as well as Supreme Commander and with a dangerous cease-fire and various other conditions at home I cannot say when he will come. But of course the invitation has been accepted in principle and the President would like to come and have a meeting with President Johnson and also if possible to come to the United Nations but I cannot say when that will be possible."

Answering a question regarding the views of the U.S. Secretary of State Mr. Dean Rusk, on the question of plebiscite the Foreign Minister said:

"Confusion on Mr. Rusk is not in our mind but it is in the mind of all discussing and others who write about it. As far as we are concerned he has made a clear statement on plebiscite and we welcome that statement. He speaks not as Mr. Rusk but as Secretary of State of the United States Government,"

Address to the Press conference held at Rawalpindi on October 5, 1965.

GENTLEMEN,

First of all, I would like to make some observations on the Security Council's Resolution of 20th September. Pakistan supports and stands for the full implementation of this Resolution. The Resolution of the United Nations is not to be implemented in part only to the extent that it may suit one or the other party. For it to have true effectiveness, it has to be implemented in full. Pakistan, therefore, is co-operating in every way for the complete implementation of the Resolution, from top to bottom. This means that the military disengagement referred to in the earlier paragraph should take place side by side with the political settlement referred to in paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Resolution. We are prepared to co-operate in bringing about a cease-fire and measures connected with the cease-fire, but simultaneously we expect that the Security Council synchronizes its efforts towards the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute on the basis of the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, as contained in the note of the Government of Pakistan to the Security Council, which was delivered by me to the Council on the 22nd (September) night.

Pakistan in accepting the Resolution of September 20th was not entirely satisfied with it but in the interest of international peace accepted it. I must also admit that the Resolution of the 20th September is an improvement on the previous Resolutions of 4th and 6th September, which were wholly and utterly one-sided. Though the Resolutions only spoke of the return to the *status quo* without pledging a political settlement, the Resolutions of 4th and 6th September did not condemn Indian aggression, and did not re-affirm Security Council's previous resolutions on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Unfortunately, the Security Council and its members, individually or collectively, did not show any anxiety to intervene when India began its series of aggression starting on the 15th of August when it re-occupied the Kargil posts. The Security Council was silent, its members were silent and the Great Powers were silent. Encouraged by the aggression on the 15th of August, India repeated aggression against the cease-fire line in the Tithwal Sector on 26th August, and then in Uri and Punch on 28th August, and Haji Pir Pass on the 30th of August. On the 23rd of August India shelled Awan Sharif, a village well within the international frontier of Pakistan. This train of acts, which were all clear and doubtless acts of aggression, did not provoke any international conscience or any international efforts to bring about peace. It is only when Pakistan acted in self-defense on the 1st or 2nd of September, in taking measures in the Chhumb or Bhimber sector, that the Security Council suddenly woke up to its grave responsibilities, and on the 4th of September passed a resolution calling for a return to the *status quo ante*, without any mention of its previous resolutions, nor any mention of the root cause of the conflict. And as I have said, these were one-sided resolutions. This was a one-sided resolution, repeated by another resolution which was equally one-sided on the 6th of September. And, for the first time in

18 years, the Security Council began to threaten sanctions. Sanctions were threatened on a one-sided resolution, without condemning an aggressor, and without re-affirming or making any reference to the Security Council's past responsibilities and commitments on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This is rather ironical and tragic that for the first time in 18 years of this dispute when India had persistently violated clear and unambiguous resolutions of the Security Council on Jammu and Kashmir, there was no mention of sanctions, there was no word of sanctions, and now when the dice is loaded against the interest of justice and peace, for the first time the Security Council said that the country that does not accept this one-sided resolution, it will impose sanctions against it. The imposition of sanctions, let me tell you, gentlemen, would have had a disastrous effect, not on Pakistan against whom sanctions have already been imposed by the stoppage of military aid and assistance, but it would have had a disastrous effect on the United Nations itself. And as we are interested in this organization, for this reason alone we are very grateful to all the countries that opposed sanctions, particularly to France, because in so doing these countries, and particularly France, rendered assistance to the United Nations and to the cause of International peace. And I will repeat that, as far as my country is concerned, sanctions had already been imposed on us during the height of the war; and these sanctions hurt us badly. We were penalized for fidelity. However, that is a separate question.

Historically speaking, the Resolutions of 1948 and 1949, I would call the Kashmir Resolutions, because those resolutions spoke of the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The resolutions of 4th and 6th September would be clearly "Indian Resolutions," because those resolutions wanted the restoration of the *status quo*, which meant freezing the cease-fire line into international frontier, which has been India's position ever since the Kashmir dispute arose. The Resolution of 20th September can be called a "China Resolution". I hope that the last and final resolution will be a Pakistan Resolution, because the destinies of the people Pakistan and the people of Jammu and Kashmir are indistinguishable, inseparable, and indivisible. Now that we have had a Kashmir Resolution and an Indian Resolution, and a China Resolution, I hope that the Security Council finally gives us what in justice would be a Pakistan Resolution, because that would not be a resolution favorable to Pakistan, but would be a resolution favorable to the cause of peace and in consonance with the dictates of morality.

I have said that the Resolution of 20th September would be called a "China Resolution" merely because the improvement made on the resolutions of 4th and 6th September appears to be motivated by the element of the ultimatum issued by the Chinese Government to the Government of India. It is no use concealing, but this ultimatum shook the foundations of the United Nations and caused the Great Powers great concern. It suddenly lifted them from their inertia, and, at once it brought about a realization in them that it was imperative to bring about permanent peace in the sub-continent and that this could only be done by the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. They saw in flesh and blood, the possibility of a conflagration much beyond the frontiers of India and Pakistan, the far-reaching and irreparable consequence disturbing the present equilibrium in Asia. Now whether there is any connection with India's aggression against Pakistan and China's ultimatum to India is a matter which I will refer to subsequently.

The passing of the resolution of 20th September and the realization found among the great powers for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute has a decisive relevance. Gentlemen, this is the second time in a generation that India and Pakistan have gone to war. This is the second time in a generation that the United Nations has stopped that war with a promise of bringing about a purposeful and lasting peace. We made untold sacrifices in the first war and also now much greater sacrifices were made on this occasion. The United Nations intervened on the previous occasion and the United Nations has intervened again. This is the second time that we are placing our total faith and belief in the United Nations on a question of life and death for Pakistan. Surely, the United Nations cannot be that powerful as to make our sacrifices in vain or that powerless as to be unable to implement its own charter. If the United Nations is powerful enough to interpose, to intervene, arbitrate and bring about peace and stop bloodshed—bloodshed has not been made in vain, bloodshed has been made for a fundamental cause—then it must be powerful enough to implement its own resolutions, its own commitment. Today we believe, the United Nations faces its greatest test and challenge. We will co-operate with it in every way as we have done in the past provided the United Nations means meaningfully to implement the totality of its own resolutions. The Resolution of September 20th has the support of the four great powers in the Security Council. They are bound in a way politically and morally to support these commitments both individually and collectively to implement their promises and pledges which have been publicly made. Indeed not only is the United Nations on test but so are the four great powers who have acted in concert and in co-operation to bring about this resolution and to force it on us. I must make it clear here that we do not want countries to support Pakistan. We do not want nations of the world to oppose India. We have no ill-will towards the people of India. What we actually want is for the nations of the world to be impartial, not to be partial. And if they are truly impartial, if they are truly objective, they will come to the right conclusion and the right judgment. And that right conclusion and right judgments made in impartiality would support Pakistan's cause. It is not that we want blind, passionate, fanatical, religious, subjective support for Pakistan. We want the world to judge the issue on its merit. We want them to determine the pros and cons, the merits and demerits of the issue. We want them to be uninfluenced by external factors. We want them to be uninfluenced by the consideration of relations with India and Pakistan. We want them to judge this matter as a judge judge a matter in a court. In so doing the nations of the world will take the right position, exactly the right position, the correct position, which is the position that Pakistan supports because Pakistan as an ideological, as an Islamic state will not support a wrong position, an immoral position. We support the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We want the world to know whether the right of self-determination is involved or not. If the nations of the world can come to the appreciation that the right of self-determination is involved that is all we expect of them. We want the world to judge whether an international agreement is involved or not. We want them to see and also appreciate and assess the data to conclude whether India and Pakistan have been a party to an international agreement on Kashmir or not. If we have not been a party to that agreement they can take a different position. If India and Pakistan have been a party to an international agreement then they must say that there is an international agreement. In so saying they are not supporting Pakistan or India, they are taking an objective, realistic,

historical position based on data. We want them to judge that the Charter of the United Nations is being violated or not. We want them to see that Pakistan is right or wrong or India is right or wrong. They must assess and determine independently and objectively that the right of self-determination is involved or not, whether an international agreement approving that right of self-determination is involved or not, whether the United Nations Charter is involved or not and we leave it to their sense of justice, we leave it to their sense of morality, we leave it to their sense of sovereign greatness, as a sovereign independent state is to determine, whether Pakistan has taken the right position or the wrong position, whether India has taken the right or wrong position or not. Is that a fair proposition or not. And I cannot in this connection improve on what President Soekarno has said recently. I would like to quote what President Soekarno has said. On a platform of the Indonesian Islamic United Party's 53rd anniversary celebrations on the evening of 13th September, President Soekarno made the following declaration On behalf of the Indonesian people:

“I have deliberately chosen to side with Pakistan in the conflict with India because in this struggle there is justice in the cause which Pakistan is fighting for. This is indeed the correct Islamic course of action and I, from this platform, send my personal appeal to all our brotherly Islamic countries to support Pakistan strongly. Do not be like Malaysia and say we are friends and obliged to both and therefore neutral. There is no neutrality when principle is involved. There is no compromise when truth is there for you to see. I say to those foreign correspondents and diplomats who are present here tonight carry my words and dispatch them to all corners, for truth is here manifest and must be supported”.

This is our position that a principle is involved on which there can be no compromise. The truth is involved on which there can be no compromise. Now it is on the basis of this consideration that we have taken our attitude to the various countries that have taken their position on this grave and fundamental issue of right and wrong to be objectively determined. Where distinction has to be drawn between the aggressor and the aggressed and in taking all these factors in consideration, not because our individual position is involved as a sovereign state but because our position is involved as a country in the comity of nations that Pakistan has decided from now on to sever all relations with Malaysia. This is not because Malaysia has taken a position which can be regarded as anti-Pakistan. This is not the way the Government of Pakistan functions. We have decided to sever relations with Malaysia because that State has taken an immoral position, that state has refused to make a distinction between an aggressor and the aggressed, that state has been blind to the principle of self-determination, that state has chosen to ignore all international agreements and the sanctity of international agreements and of the doctrine of *Pacla Sunt Sarvanda*, that state has violated the solidarity of the Afro-Asian world, that state has undermined the principles of international morality and international justice and it was for that reason that Pakistan has severed all relations with Malaysia. We have re-called our Ambassador from Malaysia and we have given them time to wind up, their diplomatic re presentation and activities in our country.

Now, gentlemen, India has attempted to frustrate the Resolution of the 20th of September which we have accepted in its entirety. This is so because India has acted violently to the

impartial attitude taken by the whole world. Here, I must say because of our relations in the Commonwealth and because of the historical position of the United Kingdom in the sub-continent India has been ungracious and uncharitable to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has not taken a pro-Pakistan position. All that the United Kingdom has done is to re-state and re-affirm its position which it has taken in the last eighteen years along with so many other countries on the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Indeed, no country is more acquainted with the problem of Jammu and Kashmir than the United Kingdom. I do not say this disparagingly, the United Kingdom is responsible for it, not as a deliberate act, but when a great power leaves a country of the size of the sub-continent with partition, there is bound to be aftermath, there is bound to be legacy left behind. In any event, that is a thing of the past. But in condemning the United Kingdom, India should not be unmindful that it has hold over the Gurdaspur District in the Punjab which gave it a link to Jammu and Kashmir. The first Governor-General of India took certain positions in the interest of India. India should not be unmindful of Assam and of the Radcliff Award. India's memory should not be so short as to forget the great services the United Kingdom has rendered to India. I will not say that we have not had our differences with the United Kingdom. On many occasions we differed fundamentally with the United Kingdom, and I dare say that the severing of relations with Malaysia will be commented upon adversely by a section of the United Kingdom Press, the Economist, which is not very economical with its language and which in its beautiful language says ugly things, and it is to say such things on this occasion too, as it has been saying in the past. But these are not the grave issues which affect relations between States. And in relations with countries one has to take the whole history into account, the good and the bad, the advantages and the disadvantages. But it is most unfortunate that India should threaten to leave the Commonwealth, merely because the United Kingdom has taken a historical decision and a correct and impartial decision, that India should threaten to nationalize all interests of the United Kingdom in India. Well, these are empty threat and should not deter the great people of Great Britain because we are also members of the Commonwealth and what is good for the goose is good for the gander and as long as we are members of the Commonwealth, India dare not leave the Commonwealth. Mr. Nehru had great vision and all that we accept. In many ways he was a great man, but he chose to remain in the Commonwealth not because he wanted to make it a multi-racial institution but because of the presence of Pakistan, and it was a much more pragmatic consideration that compelled him to remain in the Commonwealth. So, it is no use for India to try to frighten the two great powers. Recently Prime Minister Shastri has said that India will have to resort to desperate measures if the great powers make an effort to compel a settlement on India. Now, in a way, I am sorry to say, this is biting the hand that feeds you. India is going to resort to desperate measures against the United Kingdom, against France, against the United States of America, against the Soviet Union, if the interest of international peace and justice if in the interest of implementation of international agreement these big powers committed to their pledge, make an effort to bring about a lasting peace for over five hundred million people in this sub-continent and to spare the sub-continent from the agonies of war in future, to spare the sub-continent from being set ablaze in future, to save the flower of our manhood to be decimated and destroyed. If in these attempts the great powers seek to bring peace, India which is so wholly dependent on the grace and on the goodness of the great powers

should no begin to threaten them. Gentlemen, India cannot be permitted to make a success of its isolation. India cannot be permitted to blackmail the world because she is weak. On the one hand, Prime Minister Shastri says, he is so weak that he cannot effect a settlement of Kashmir. I think this is a remarkable and astonishing admission made by the Prime Minister of the largest democracy in the world and of the great secular Asian State which has pretensions to the leadership of the Afro-Asian world and has pretensions to have influence stretching from the Mekong river to the Hindukush mountains, a state, the only state in Asia and Africa, which has dependencies a poor weak state which cannot effect the Kashmir settlement, which has economic problems, which has a tottering polity, which has fissiparous tendencies, which is dependent wholly for its food from abroad and gifts and on the bowls of charity, is, on the one hand weak and cannot effect an honorable and equitable settlement of Kashmir based on its pledge, and, on the other hand, is so strong that it can defy all the great powers, that it defies the four great powers—obviously it is not indulging in flirtation with the fifth one which is the People’s Republic of China use the word ‘flirtation’ advisedly. So, India, in. it isolation so wholly dependent on the great powers benevolence and grace, is now threatening great powers merely because great powers are seeking to act in morality, the country which has dependencies, an Asian country which has not only Jammu and Kashmir under its subjugation but has dependencies in Sikkim and Bhutan—a most anomalous situation and phenomenon of independence in the Afro-Asian countries this tottering polity which is leaderless. Nehru had his weaknesses. Nehru was responsible for the Kashmir dispute, Nehru had his dispute with us, but he did not, like his successors, bring about a desperate situation. He did not at least bring about a forcible integration of the State of Jammu and Kashmir into the Indian Union. He did not seek to reduce to some extent the personality of Jammu and Kashmir into a province of that Union, he did not violate the cease-fire line as his successors, he did not indulge in genocide and throwing out the Kashmiri Muslims to create a belt of safety. He did not heap up one provocation on top of another, at least he did not add tension to tension These successors of Nehru who are myopic, who do not have the love and resolution of Nehru, they have brought about this situation, they have forced a situation on the sub-continent. It is for them to realize that if they continue to press these policies, there will be conflagration again, there will be disaster again. India’s internal weaknesses have nothing to do with the settlement of the Kashmir dispute, as Kashmir is not a part of India and is no concern to India. As a matter of fact India is weak because it is carrying the liability of Jammu and Kashmir. Just as colonial powers realized after the Second World War that they have to abandon their colonies in order to save themselves and save their economy, it is about time that India abandoned her colony of Jammu and Kashmir in order to strengthen herself internally. India would become stronger by relieving itself of the liability of Jammu and Kashmir.

I have already said that India is breaking the cease-fire agreement and violating the Resolution of 20th September. By so doing India seeks to attain by violation of cease-fire what she could not attain on the battle-field. This is an intolerable position and this cannot be permitted. We have protested to the United Nations. We have given our word and as a sovereign State we intend to fulfill our word. But if India continues the provocation, if India seeks in broad day-light to again shatter its promises and pledges and destroy the cease-fire line with the avowed and malicious intent of achieving by this

means what she could not achieve on the battle she will be responsible for the full consequences of her delinquency. It is for the United Nations to take effective measures to prevent India from violating the cease-fire, as again in self-defense Pakistan will have to take appropriate measures within its rights to defend its territory and to uphold the Resolution of 20th September.

Gentlemen, I would take this opportunity to pay my tribute to the Armed Forces of Pakistan. For Pakistan this has been a battle for survival—a country has been made into a nation. A hundred million people have been cemented by their blood and by their valour. We have to fight the monstrous might of India and our Armed Forces and our people fought it heroically and valiantly against overwhelming odds, not because we were born brave, but because our cause is just. We are fighting for a righteous cause, we are fighting against a predatory aggressor and we are fighting for the principle of self-determination. It has been in many ways a war of the young, because Pakistan is a young State and the youth of Pakistan has been involved in this war and our forces, as I have said, have shown exemplary courage, heroism unparalleled in contemporary time. And this is so because our cause is just and we are fighting for the principle and we are fighting for truth and thereby to uphold international morality and international agreement and fighting for the sacred soil of Pakistan which includes Jammu and Kashmir. And in paying tributes to our Armed Forces I cannot but pay tributes to our whole people for it has been a people's war, all our people have fought, the brave Balochs, the gallant people of the Frontier, the Pathans, the people of Sindh from their desert home and the Bengalis on the soil of East Pakistan, and above all, the people of the Punjab. Truly, the Punjab is the sword-arm of the sub-continent. The heroic people of Lahore and Sialkot in particular deserve the nation's gratitude. This has been Dunkirk but in the reverse and I cannot find words sufficient enough to express my feelings for the brave people of Punjab and Sialkot, who stood like steel against the armored, predatory and wanton aggressor. And when I say we will fight for a thousand years, I mean it. It does not mean that we have abandoned because there is a cease-fire. Until the problem of Kashmir and Jammu is settled honorably and according to the wishes of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, Pakistan will wage ceaselessly a war in self-defense. Pakistan will never abandon its right, Pakistan will never surrender its rights, that is what I mean that we shall fight for a thousand years. Our spirit shall never be destroyed. We shall never compromise our honour. We have made pledges to the people of Jammu and Kashmir and history may be rubbed off, but we will not surrender, we will not budge an inch. There will be one round, there will be a second round, there will be a third round, there will be a fourth round, there will be a fifth round, there will be rounds after rounds, but we will have to, one day, vindicate our pledges to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. This is what I mean that we will fight for a thousand years. It does not mean a war; it does not mean a phase. There was a war in 1948, there is a war 1965, but 1948 and 1965 are only comas in the long essay of the nation and we will go on and on relentlessly, resolutely in peace and justice, in self in honour and in truth to continue the struggle till we meet the test and we are bound to succeed in the end. Let me tell you, individuals may go, but we are bound to succeed in the end. I have no doubt in my mind that we must succeed in the end.

How can a righteous cause fail? How can we be an exception? Have we committed some unforgivable sin against God and men that we alone shall be victims of tyranny and oppression and terror and that we alone shall be subject to domination for all times when the rest of the world shall be free. How can Pakistan alone, how can the people of Kashmir alone be an exception to the great forces of principle and freedom that have inspired and spread throughout the world. This cannot be, this is impossible and that is why I say our spirit shall never break. Genocide or no genocide, twenty-one divisions or forty-one divisions, atomic bombs or no atomic bombs, Tshombe or Trombay, whatever it is they can have their Trombays and they can have their Tshombes—but we will succeed in the end, whatever they have. Because ours is a just cause, ours is a righteous cause and we cannot fail, we must not fail. We are Muslims and we are fighters. We are fighters because we are Muslims and we are Muslims because we are fighters. But what do we fight for. We do not fight wars of aggression. We do not, according to the school boys' books, wage wars of sword and fire. We are not infidels and aggressors. We fight, gentlemen, for truth, we fight for peace, we fight for justice, we fight for honour, we fight for self-respect, we fight for sovereignty, we fight for the meek and the weak. And others can tell us, then in that case, Christians are fighters, Hindus are fighters, Communists are fighters. That is all very good. Let us all fight together for common struggle. Let us all fight against oppression. Let us all fight against domination. Let us all fight against tyranny and you as Christians and we as Muslims fight. You as Christians fight and others as Communists fight and where is our contact point, that is the point of our embrace where is our point of confrontation, that is a which is in principle against immorality. At that stage when we embrace and when we confront, we do not ask each other whether you are a Muslim, Christian or Hindu or a Communist. We ask each other that we are fighting for a righteous cause that we are fighting for victims of aggression against an aggressor and whether we are fighting for morality against immorality. That is where civilizations join hands. That is where the forces of morality combine.

That brings me to the charge of collusion with China. I hope the context in which I have said it would already answer what I have said regarding collusion with China. But if we are all fighting for a righteous cause then it makes no difference what your ideology is or what your background is because that is the point of contact, of principles, of morality for the aim of civilization. At that time we do not see each other's labels, we do not see the color of each other's skin, and we do not see that we are black or white. At that time we are all heroic fighters in a common cause. Collusion, gentlemen, is a dirty word. It is a word which applies to criminals. In one stroke, eight hundred million people cannot become criminals. There is no secret agreement between Pakistan and China. Let me repeat that there is no secret agreement between Pakistan and China. There is no covert agreement between Pakistan and China. It is not our fault if India has committed aggression against China. It is not China's fault if India has committed aggression against Pakistan. We are both neighbouring States. Both of us are victims of Indian aggression and chauvinism. If in such a situation India creates problems throughout this region, if India seeks to have disputes with Pakistan, if India seeks to commit aggression against Pakistan, if India seeks to have disputes with China, if India seeks to commit aggression against China, how can any one say that there is collusion between China and Pakistan? All that I can say is that both countries have been victims of aggression. With both

countries India refuse to settle its boundary disputes. Both countries have grievances against India. India has wronged both countries and if in that, on the basis of morality, on the basis of international law, some synchronization takes place as a result of Indian action, as a result of each country pursuing its objective, vital interest independent of the other. I am afraid that cannot be regarded as sinister or a factor of collaboration, If in 1962, Pakistan had taken advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict and done something, would that have established collusion or agreement between Pakistan and China. Merely because in 1962 we chose to be good boys and did not take advantage of it, therefore, there is no collusion. But merely because in the present situation China may have to deal with India, would that be regarded as a secret agreement between China and Pakistan. If China supports the cause against aggression in the Congo, and I will only confine it to the Congo and no where else, so do not misquote me, then would that be collusion between China and Africa? If China has in this situation told India that she should vacate her aggression from Chinese territory, would that be what Pakistan wants? Certainly not, certainly not. And if there is an agreement between China and Pakistan, why should we be afraid to admit it? If we have an agreement, will the heavens fall if we admit it? If we have an agreement to say that in the event of Indian aggression against China and Pakistan, certain common action will be taken. We can say that as a sovereign State, we have a right to do it. We have waged the war against India in self-defense. If we had the right to defend our territory, we have the right to enter into agreements for the defense of our territory. So, if there was an agreement between Pakistan and China we will declare it to the world, but because there is no agreement between Pakistan and China, I can declare it to the world that there is no agreement between Pakistan and China and if India seeks to exploit it, if India wants to take advantage of it, if India wants to hoodwink the world, if India wants to blackmail the world, then that is not our responsibility. I say a thousand times that there is no agreement between Pakistan and China and there is no secret agreement. I say a thousand times that there is no secret agreement, and if there were, I would say a thousand times there is agreement between Pakistan and China. I hope that is clear enough and I hope that will be clear enough for all times. But never use the word 'collusion'. It is a dirty word, not applicable to self-respecting sovereign States. If there is agreement, we will admit as a sovereign State that there is agreement between us. The fact is that there isn't. We have to say that there is no agreement.

Gentlemen, the era of domination has come to an end. The future is one of collaboration and confidence: it is not based on the might and power of the States, it is not based on the acquisition and the stockpiling of atomic and nuclear bombs. It is based on affection, on understanding, on promotion of goodwill. We are now entering the phase of Continental nationalism, which is different but not opposed to our traditional nationalism. That is why we see today the emergence of a European Europe, continental nationals of African Africa, of an Asian Asia and an American America. This is the era of continental nationalism. And as a nation of hundred million people of Pakistan, we have passion for Pakistan, we have beliefs in Pakistan. With all our hearts and with all our faith now that Pakistan will play a great and constructive and massive role in the promotion of continental nationalism which will collaborate with continental nationalism of Asia, of Africa, of Europe and of America.

Sometimes Pakistan is called a truncated State. I have never looked upon Pakistan as a truncated State. I have seen Pakistan as two mighty pillars, pushing against a predatory aggressor and a reactionary, ruthless country, these mighty pillars sandwiching an evil force. That is what Pakistan is. Two mighty pillars, not separated by a thousand miles of Indian territory as the Anglo-Saxon jargon describes Pakistan but two mighty Islamic pillars of peace pressing their weight against a feeble, flippant society, a decadent society. That is Pakistan; Pakistan which will have a role to play for the promotion of peace in Asia and for better understanding in the world. When I talk about continental nationalism and the end of the era of domination, that just as in Eastern Europe and other parts of Europe, when they were subjected to domination and in one form or the other that domination separated Western Europe from Eastern Europe, it created a barren problem, it created a gulf between Eastern and Western Europe, yet because they both suffered from domination it brought Europe closer simultaneously. So our domination in Asia also separated us, but once that domination is lifted, Asia will also come closer. Once the domination of Africa is lifted and it has been lifted, and we will march together because that domination also brought about a sense of unity in Asia and in Africa as much as after the Second World War the separation of Europe brought Europe together. And today we see barriers between Eastern Europe and Western Europe being lifted; we see agreements which are leading to a detente. This is the evolution of our times and we will make our full contribution to it.

Now finally I would like to end on a personal note if you permit me. I have once been to Edinburgh University. In Edinburgh I saw the University. At its portal is written: *"They have said, what say they, let them say."* We have seen a massive canard in a section of the Western press attributing conflicts in the Government of Pakistan, differences of opinion; various rumors are afloat; speculations. I say in answer to all these slanders: *"they have said, what say they; let them say."* The Government of Pakistan is not a banana republic. It does not go on the basis of what one individual does or what one individual says. I may say this and I speak with authority of my President with whom I discussed this matter last night. He said, I authorize you to say that. "I welcome in my Government freedom of expression. I respect freedom of expression. I admire it and there are occasions and times when like all Governments different brands of views are expressed, different interpretations are given, different assessments are made, But they are all made in good faith, they are all made in the interests of the country." It is otherwise why have collective wisdom of the Government. So he says that I welcome these different points of view; I like to hear them; I encourage them but finally when the decisions are taken, they are the decisions of the Government of Pakistan. And I would like to say that in this context, within these qualifications, the Government of Pakistan stands united as a rock for the defense of its country and for the defense of its people to face all dangers grave and great as they may. Our spirit and our powers and our faculties are united and we shall wage the struggle for a thousand years in that spirit without faculty and without power.

Address to the Press conference held at New York on J 5, 1965.

GOOD AFTERNOON, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN

I must admit that I am speaking under a certain amount of disability because I haven't been able to mobilize the entire bureaucracy of Pakistan to have a written text as was submitted by the Indian Foreign Minister in the course of his statement this afternoon to you. However, that is not necessary, not because of any particular ability or talent but because the cause of Pakistan is so just, equitable and fair that it is possible to meet you at short notice to discuss the grave issues that face us.

Briefly, I would like to say that you are aware of all the resolutions that have been recently passed on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute by the Security Council on 4th, 6th, 20th, 27th September and 5th November. During my previous visit to the United Nations, I held a Press Conference and we discussed some of these problems and the resolutions and I went home and returned here for this particular meeting which has finished today. Before I left, if you remember, all of you who attended my Press Conference, I had said that the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir, which has taken India and Pakistan to war twice in a generation and has caused so much trouble, turmoil and misery to the sub-continent, has to be settled on a fair and equitable basis. I think there is a general realization everywhere throughout the world, which you must have witnessed in the United Nations itself, in the Security Council that today when we discussed the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, all members of the Security Council, without exception, mentioned the gravity of the situation, stressing need, to bring a lasting peace and friendship to the people of India and Pakistan who have so many common affinities. The resolution of today culminates a great deal of diplomatic activity. I think that at one stage it was believed that the Security Council would not meet at this juncture to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute so much so that, I am informed reliably, that the Foreign Minister of India was leaving for India just before it was announced that the Security Council would meet to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. So, in the teeth of India's opposition to a meeting of the Security Council, the Security Council met and when the Security Council met, India was not only disappointed but dismayed by the fact that the Security Council was to meet; the Indian Delegation took the extraordinary position of placing conditions for a meeting of the Security Council. Now I want to make it quite clear to you here that Pakistan was never a party to any conditions that India made; we were absolutely unaware of any negotiations that took place between India or any of the Security Council members and we attended the Security Council meeting on the assumption that like all issues which come before the Council, the whole dispute, all the problems, all its implications, all its history would be brought before the Council so that the Council was in a position to determine the situation as it exists. If Pakistan had been a party to any conditions that were imposed by India, I can tell you quite plainly that, we would have abided by these conditions. This is actually a part of the whole problem between Pakistan and India: Whereas Pakistan; when once it makes a commitment, whether that commitment is to

Pakistan's advantage or disadvantage, Pakistan has always fulfilled these commitments and its pledges, because we believe, as a sovereign state, representing a hundred million people, and taking into account not the immediate exigencies and expediencies of the situation but the long range view that it is in the interest of peace. It is in the interest of tradition, to establish cordial relations between neighbours and States and abide by one's commitments. This has been our whole attitude to India and unfortunately we have these disputes because India's attitude has been absolutely to the reverse, in contradistinction to the attitude of Pakistan. India in broad daylight, of its own free will and volition makes agreements, commitments and then tries to wriggle out of them on one pretext or another. This does not apply only to the dispute of Jammu and Kashmir which, of course, is the most fundamental dispute facing India and Pakistan, but a host of other problems and to give another important instance of this attitude, the mentality, the psychosis of India in entering into commitments and thereafter violating them, is the case of Beru-Bari enclave—an important enclave—which was in dispute between India and Pakistan and the Indian Government agreed that that enclave would be transferred to Pakistan and since 1958, on one pretext or the other, the Indian Government has resisted the fulfillment of its commitments, sometimes on constitutional grounds, sometimes on others. But that is beside the point. The main point that I am trying to make here is that if we had been, Pakistan had been a party to any understanding or any commitment whether it was to our interest or not to our interest, whether it was to our advantage or our disadvantage, we would have definitely abided by that commitment but no such commitment was made and no such commitment could have indeed been made, bearing in mind the procedure and the rules and the norms of the United Nation's Charter. However, because as I said, India was surprised and dismayed that a Council meeting was to be held on Jammu and Kashmir, it threatened not to attend this Security Council meeting and we were never informed even subsequently that India had agreed on condition that only the cease-fire and withdrawals would be discussed and I told you that we are completely unaware of this understanding, we are not aware of it in any form and we are not a party to it. But objectively speaking, it would be impossible, it would be against the very purposes of the United Nations Charter that such conditions were to be imposed for the Security Council to meet, and because the Security Council rightly agreed to discuss the whole problem in its totality, the Indian delegation took the extraordinary measure of staging a walk-out from the Security Council. Now explanations are given for the walk-out but in the eventual scrutiny all the developments will show that first of all India did not want a meeting of the Security Council, and secondly, when the Security Council meeting was held India tried to impose a condition and it failed to get the condition to be fulfilled and rightly so, it staged a walk-out. It refused to discuss the Jammu and Kashmir dispute—a dispute which has been before the Security Council for eighteen years and which the whole world knows is a dispute between India and Pakistan—and took the position that Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union and therefore it would refuse to discuss it.

It was India that brought the dispute to the Security Council. It was India that in 1948 brought the Jammu and Kashmir dispute to the Security Council. It is India that has recognized by various means that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute exists, by its repression and genocide in the State of Jammu and Kashmir which has continued

unabatedly, which has its ups and downs and now has reached its apogee in Jammu and Kashmir and yet this is the way it treats its fraternal citizens. If the people of Jammu and Kashmir are an integral and inseparable and inextricable part of India why does India then conduct such repressions, such horrors, and such tyranny? Why does it liquidate people, burn villages? This is not an allegation that I make. Your correspondents, some of whom had the privilege of filtering through into the Iron Curtain which is imposed on Jammu and Kashmir, from New York Times, from German newspapers, from French newspapers, other responsible journalists that have gone there and had seen the repression and horror that is being experienced today by the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Is that the way a civilized nation in the 20th century treats its own citizens? I ask you this question objectively and because this is a pitiful and abominable situation that exists in Jammu and Kashmir, when we have asked the Security Council to send a team of investigation, if it is not the Security Council, any one is free whether it is an official body, or an unofficial body, any humanitarian organization from any part of the world to go and determine for themselves as to what is happening in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and to witness for themselves the repression. In the Security Council meeting I mentioned that a former Finance Minister of India, who was an aspirant for the Prime Ministership of India, Morarji Desai said that he would want to see the whole of Jammu and Kashmir burnt if they want to struggle, for their independence and for their right of self-determination, which was promised to them by India in the Security Council bilaterally and unilaterally. This is like a quotation in a recent book where Hitler said “Is Paris burning?” Naturally Hitler wanted to know that Paris was burning. For Paris is Paris and not a part of the Third Reich. So, as I can understand, why Indian leaders would want to see the Jammu and Kashmir burnt, because Jammu and Kashmir is not a part of India. It is a question of territorial aggrandizement. So these are the hard facts. These are the realities. These are the nightmares which we face in the sub-continent. And we want to put an end to them for all times. It is said that the present rulers of Pakistan are not amenable to a settlement and that the Indian Government would not like to discuss the issue with the present rulers of Pakistan. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute has existence of eighteen years. This regime came to office or Government came to office only seven years ago. But the dispute has existed for eighteen years, and even the Government, of Field Marshal Ayub Khan had made many overtures and taken many initiatives to arrive at a settlement with India. As a matter of fact our Government has arrived at more settlements with the Government of India than any previous Government of Pakistan.

We have settled boundary dispute with India, and a number of other sensitive problems. We have sorted out questions pertaining to the right of the properties of refugees and a host of other problems. It was the Government of Field Marshal Ayub Khan which concluded with the Government of India the Indus Basin Treaty Agreement of 1960. You are aware that it was a very difficult and very complicated problem and it was this Government, this very regime that concluded an agreement with India which goes to rank only second to Jammu and Kashmir in importance of disputes that exist between Pakistan and India. So these are all irrelevant and extraneous considerations. Time and again one reason or another has been advanced to prevent an equitable and honorable settlement of Jammu and Kashmir. In the beginning it was said that Pakistan by entering into military alliances—this was before the regime of Field Marshal Ayub Khan—had brought about a

change in the situation and therefore India could not consider the question of settlement of Jammu and Kashmir dispute because of the foreign policy of Pakistan. We had entered into the CENTO and the SEATO and therefore according to the Indians we had brought war to the doorsteps of India and cold war and as such, India said, the situation had completely changed and therefore India refused to discuss the dispute of Jammu, and Kashmir, and the answer to that is very simple that for the foreign policy of Pakistan why should the people of Jammu and Kashmir suffer? That was what it said in the early days of 1953. Thereafter it was said that the Jammu and Kashmir dispute could not be settled because if that dispute was settled, the Muslims of India would face annihilation. And this war has shown that it is not a religious issue; it is a question of self-determination, because Indians have said that the Muslims of India fought as bravely as any other Indians for their homeland and we appreciate that. We expect them to fight for India but an Indian India. After all, Kashmir is not an Indian India and therefore the question of the religious victimization of Muslims or holding them as hostages, as has been shown, cannot be applicable. Then it is said that it will lead to the disintegration of India. I think this is a preposterous argument that a country like India with four hundred million people—a great Asian country— should take up position an official position, that if a disputed territory—a territory that does not belong to the people of India and which India has said has a right to determine its own future does determine its own future, India should take up the position that this will lead to the disintegration of India.

These are all the express *facto-rational* well worth seeing in the Security Council itself. That they did not want a meeting and when the meeting was held they imposed some unreasonable conditions and when those conditions were not fulfilled they walked out and gave various other extraneous reasons and I see from the statement of India's Foreign Minister that he has in his concluding remarks made some references to what I said. I have and our people and our Government have a deep regard for the people of India We are part of the same sub-continent. We have been living together for centuries and I think the Indian representative and the Indian Government know the unremitting and ceaseless efforts we have made to establish good relations with India and we would expect the people of India to know that we are part of the same sub-continent with them we share many affinities. We have great respect and regard for them and it is not right to say that I will make a central issue, an issue of this provocation. It was a grave provocation even in the spell of the meeting where third secretaries or second secretaries represent a country, representatives don't walk out or interrupt in the midst of a statement that is being made by representatives on such issues, It is first of all a grave provocation and unprecedented provocation. Secondly, I would like to make it quite clear to you that even during the course of hostilities in the midst of this war, we have taken many Initiatives to try and establish contact with the Indian leaders, with the Foreign Minister of India and on a number of occasions I have met him in social contacts and tried to establish contact with him; when the President of the Security Council wanted us to meet for lunch, I said I'll be very honored to discuss anything with him After all we have come to equity with clean hands. Our hands are clean. Therefore we can look at them in the eyes and we are not frightened speaking and discussing the issue of Jammu and Kashmir with the Indian leaders, and I said to the President of the Security Council that without conditions I am prepared to meet and discuss issues that face us so that we can resolve them. Nobody

likes to be faced with disputes and problems and difficulties, we want to put an end to all these disputes and it is our intention to do so, but even when we drew up a line, the Indian Foreign Minister said that he was not prepared to meet the Pakistan Delegation even at the social meeting at lunch which the President of the Security Council, last month, tried to arrange.

So you should take every thing into account. You cannot be held responsible for the frenzied flow of the situation in a grave provocation and if it has happened so much I am very sorry that it has happened so much and I do feel that it has caused them some grievance, I am sorry for it. But these are not the problems which should affect the fundamental dispute, which should affect the question of the future of our sub-continent, which should affect the lives of our children and our children's children which should affect the whole future of our two countries. These are much bigger issues and if they can settle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute by the removal of one or two people, I am personally prepared like Garibaldi to go and retire for all times from public life if it is going to bring about the end of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. But that is not the problem. They have no intention of settling the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and therefore one pretext or another they advance. Now to their belief, the Indian Foreign Minister said, "Well, this resolution today is favorable to India because it takes into account only the question of cease-fire and withdrawal." Well we also want a cease-fire and withdrawal, if cease-fire and withdrawal are necessary to tackle the main problem, to tackle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It is not that we want cease and withdrawal because India is in an advantageous position and we are in a disadvantageous position. This is not the case. Firstly, because we have agreed to the resolution and as I told you once if we make a commitment we abide by that commitment. That is question number one. Question number two: Everyone tells us that cease-fire and withdrawal are essential prerequisites for the determination of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. If that is the case we are prepared to co-operate in every way possible. So it is not that it is a victory or triumph of India because there is a reference to cease-fire and withdrawal but for the two reasons that I have said, that is acceptable to us. You will also recall that this resolution reaffirms the resolution of September 20th in all its parts. The September 20th resolution is a key resolution. It goes to the heart of the problem when it says that it reaffirms "in all its parts;" that should be all its parts including everything which is in the preamble where there is a reference to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and I would like to quote: "*convinced* that an early cessation of hostilities is essential as a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters", (other related matters being related to Kashmir) and then paragraph four which says: "DECIDES to consider as soon as operative, paragraph 1 of the Council's Resolution 210 of 6th September has been implemented, what steps could be taken to assist towards a settlement of the political problem underlying the present conflict, and in the meantime calls the two Governments to utilize all peaceful means including those listed in article 33 of the Charter to this end", and paragraph 5 "REQUESTS the Secretary General to exert every possible effort to give effect to this resolution, to seek a peaceful solution and to report to the Security Council thereon". And this resolution today reaffirms in all its parts the resolution of September 20th which makes a mention in the preamble to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute in paragraph 4 and

paragraph 5. You have heard the statements of all the representatives in the Security Council. All of them addressed themselves to the importance of tackling the basic issue i.e., the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. And Jordan abstained because it believed that this resolution of September 20th did not go far enough. It should have gone further than it has gone. The Soviet Union abstained not because it disagreed with the substance of the resolution but on account of matters not directly connected with the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, on constitutional and financial problems, which are well known and which have a history to them. Mr. Fedorenko in his statement, as soon as he began to speak, mentioned twice that at present the main thing was the cease-fire and withdrawal and that they would have agreed not to abstain, they would have agreed to maintain the unanimity if it had not been for both the constitutional and financial questions over which there was a deadlock. So actually in effect the entire Security Council, all the members, permanent and non-permanent, have really supported this resolution and this resolution talks about cease-fire which is acceptable to us, it talks about withdrawals which is acceptable to us, and it says that these two prerequisites are necessary in order to tackle the main problem, because it says in the operative part that it reaffirms the Resolution of 20th September in all its parts which is a key resolution so we are completely satisfied. And I return home to Pakistan with the satisfaction of knowing that the Security Council cooperated for a just and honorable progress of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and that if they maintain this determination, if we maintain this attitude, if we have the vision to save five hundred million people from a blood-bath, I believe progress will be made for a settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. It is no use for the Indian Government or for the Indian delegation to close its eyes to all these self-evident realities. We are aware of the fact that India did not want a meeting; in the teeth of opposition there was a meeting, there was a reference to the substantive aspects in the speeches clearly and unambiguously by all the members including each and every member and also the resolution, itself is a vindication of a righteous position and when I say that I do not say a pro-Pakistan position but an anti-Indian position. The Jammu and Kashmir dispute is not a question of a romance where someone likes someone and someone dislikes someone. (Laughter from the audience); It is a question of taking up a correct and right position and once you take a correct or right position you are bound to come to the necessary conclusion and I think the Security Council has come to the necessary conclusion.

I am sorry for making a lengthy statement for I thought that before I leave, and I leave this evening, it would be my pleasure and privilege to meet you and acquaint you with the developments that have taken place culminating in the statement.

I thank you.

Answers to Questions

Thereafter a number of questions were asked. Answering questions regarding withdrawal of troops the Foreign Minister said:

“I have told you that our position is that once we accept a position we take it with all its implications.”

Answering a question regarding the so-called “infiltrators” Mr. Bhutto said:

“You see, the Indians unfortunately see an infiltrator behind every bush. That is because they have held that place under suppression. I am not now quoting our sources. You see the New York Times where now school children, university students are in the movement for self-determination. All the accredited leaders of Jammu and Kashmir are behind bars and Sh. Abdullah, you know what is his fate at present. And the fates of other leaders like Farooq that have been arrested. Maulana Mas’oodi, a moderate leader, almost all the leaders of the State are behind bars and it is the movement of the people. You can draw the analogies between the situation in Jammu and Kashmir and the debate that has taken place yesterday on an African complaint and you will see the similarity.”

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

“Yes. Well there is also a contradiction. On the one hand the Indian Government takes the position that there is nothing to discuss at all. That Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India and the contradiction becomes all the more self-evident and exposed when you take into account the history and the background of the situation and what India had said to us ‘You keep your part of Jammu and Kashmir in your occupation, we keep our part of it’. This is their position which they have been saying all this time. And we told them this is not a territorial dispute for us. You cannot demarcate a people but you can demarcate a territory. Our position has been that we cannot take back the situation. We have to take into account what the people want. So the first contradiction here is that on the one hand they say it is a closed chapter; there is nothing to discuss or to debate. And they are told there is something to discuss and debate, then they say, well, the only thing to discuss and debate is to extend the repression and colonialism of India to the other parts of Jammu and Kashmir. Then subsequently they may want certain parts of Nepal also and for the same purpose, of East Pakistan and to an insatiable appetite of chauvinistic power.”

Answering another question regarding the so-called “infiltrators” the Foreign Minister said:

“Infiltrators can only come from outside, cease-fire line is an arbitrary line—the line that divides the people on the Azad Kashmir side and the Jammu and Kashmir side—divides the same people and these people are Kashmiris who have the same blood, same culture, same language, same stock and you cannot infiltrate in your own home. The Kashmiri people are on our side and on the side of territory held by India are people of the same stock, indivisible, inseparable, and indistinguishable. You cannot call them infiltrators. Infiltrators can only come from outside. But these are people who are in their own homes. How can you commit aggression against your own people? You can only liberate your own people.”

Answering another question on the same subject, the Foreign Minister said:

“The question here is that if there is a progressive movement towards the settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, then these armed soldiers would lay down arms because life is precious .to everyone, precious to us Asians as to anyone else. In sheer desperation they have taken up arms and if they feel encouraged that they are moving towards an honorable and just settlement they themselves will feel inclined to lay down their arms.”

Answering a question regarding the alleged training of the “infiltrators” the Foreign Minister said:

“No, there is no such thing as infiltrators being trained but the question is that until and unless the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is settled, there will be tension in the sub-continent and we have to maintain our vigilance. But there is no such thing as training taking place in Pakistan to create trouble or to create difficulties for the Security Council to find a just and honorable settlement. We create no difficulties at all for anyone interested in a just and honorable settlement. On the contrary we will facilitate anyone interested in a just and honorable settlement, at the same time we will maintain our vigilance.”

“We are not training any infiltrators. We don’t have to train infiltrators. Why should we train infiltrators? If people are to fight for a just and honorable cause they will fight throughout the world, anywhere in the world. Do they need to be trained to do that thing? We are not training anyone.”

“All I can say is that we will co-operate in every way to bring about a just and an honorable settlement of the dispute and these freedom-fighters—school children, people in universities—we have no control over them. They are the people of Kashmir who are fighting for their independence and for their freedom and at this rate you will have to withdraw five million people of Jan and Kashmir and leave it completely as if it were a desert. That is not possible. After there is subversion, if there is tyranny in the State, there will be people who will fight subversion and tyranny and if people prefer to fight against suppression and tyranny, we believe that you will appreciate and sympathize with their difficulties and appreciate the sacrifices they are making.

Answering a question regarding the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris the Foreign Minister said:

“As you see, principles are indivisible and that is why Pakistan’s policy is that we believe in self-determination, we believe in the implementation of international agreements, not only for the people of Jammu and Kashmir but wherever those principles are involved. That is why we feel so strongly on the question on any colonial issue, or any other matter which relates to self-determination of people. We cannot compromise on essentials.”

Answering another question the Foreign Minister said:

“I think that is clear from the statements and it is not for India and Pakistan to interpret resolutions. If that was the case, the armed member states, each member

state should vote, and if that was the position then there will be no need for the United Nations Charter and there will be no need for its resolutions. I think from the statements made by members of the Security Council on the 25th of October as well as this morning it is quite clear what is the interpretation.”

Answering an Indian correspondent the Foreign Minister said:

“Oh, I see if it is so, if people have gone to one part of Kashmir, I mean, it is a function, but in between functions, Kashmiris have gone into Kashmir. I’ll not say that actually that position is a correct position. But in between so they cannot commit aggression against their own people; and there are Kashmiris on both sides of the cease-fire line. Eighteen years do not wipe out thousands of years’ history. They do not change the temperament of the people, their character, their life, their culture. They are Kashmiris and eighteen years cannot make a difference in them. They don’t become different people. I said that if that is a function.”

Answering another question on the subject, the Foreign Minister said:

“I have not gone into details of the different issues that have been raised. I have just discussed the principle but each dispute has its own history In the case of Jammu and Kashmir it is not a self-determination in a vacuum. This is a self-determination which has been sanctified by an international agreement between India and Pakistan.”

Answering another question on the Kashmir dispute, the Foreign Minister said:

“No, each dispute has to be discussed on merits but general principals are there and at the same time general principles are subject to international agreements and subject to commitments. General principles that, we believe in self-determination, we believe in decolonization and what I mentioned. But then these can be subject to international agreements, resolutions of the United Nations or any other important consideration.”

Answering another question on the same subject, the Foreign Minister said:

“Not a question of optimism. It is a question of conviction. It is a question of relentlessly and resolutely holding on to principles. It is a question of making sacrifices for the attainment of the objective. And we shall continue in our efforts. Whatever the sacrifices, whatever the liability, we will never abandon the people of Jammu and Kashmir under any circumstances. No question of optimism and we shall continue this for all times,” (mixed voices). If you want to carry on...

No, no, I have got to leave tonight also.... (Laughter) Mixed voices... Pakistan means the “land of the pure” (Laughter.)

THE END