

Speeches 1957 - 1965

SPEECHES DELIVERED

by

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO

**Foreign Minister of Pakistan
before the**

**UNITED NATIONS GENERAL
ASSEMBLY AND ITS
COMMITTEES**

1957 - 1965

**Reproduced in PDF Form
By: Sani H. Panhwar
Member Sindh Council, PPP**

Address to the Sixth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 25, 1957

Mr. Chairman,

My delegation has heard most attentively the statements made thus far. The task of defining the concept or motion of aggression is indeed a gargantuan one. We have to face this delicate issue in a spirit of fallability and caution. Sir Francis Bacon began his essay "Of Truth" by saying, "What is truth? Said jesting Pilate, and would not stay for an answer". If Pontius Pilate were confronted with the task facing this Committee, I seriously doubt if the Roman governor would even ask the question.

At its 368th plenary meeting on January 31, 1952, the General Assembly adopted resolution 599 (VI), which states, *inter alia*,

"Considering that, although the existence of the crime of aggression may be inferred from the circumstances peculiar to each particular case it is nevertheless possible and desirable, with a view to ensuring international peace and security and to developing International Criminal Law to define aggression by reference to the elements which constitute it."

This resolution establishes three conclusions:

- (a) that aggression is a crime:
- (b) that the existence of this crime can be inferred from the circumstances peculiar to each particular case without specifically defining the crime of aggression;
- (c) that, notwithstanding this, it is possible and desirable to and to develop international criminal law.

And with this end in view, the question of defining aggression was considered thoroughly at various levels all known to this Committee. However, it is pertinent to observe that the first wave of enthusiasm envisaged in the passage of resolution 599 (VI) was considerably mellowed and dented on a fuller analysis; so that the General Assembly was constrained to take cognizance of the innate catena of complexities by adopting, at its 408th plenary meeting, another resolution, being resolution 688(VII), which stipulate *inter alia*.

"Considering that the discussion of the question of defining aggression at the sixth and seventh session of the General Assembly and in the International Law Commission has revealed the complexity of this question and the need for a detailed study of:

- (a) the various forms of aggression;
- (b) the connection between a definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security;
- (c) the problems raised by the inclusion of a definition of aggression in the Code of Offences against the Peace and Security of Mankind and by its application within the framework of international criminal jurisdiction;
- (d) the effect of a definition of aggression on the exercise of the jurisdiction of the various organs of the United Nations;

Considering that continued and joint efforts shall be made to formulate a generally acceptable definition of aggression, with a view to promoting international peace and security and developing international law, decides to establish a Special Committee of fifteen members and requests the said Special Committee;

- (a) to submit to the General Assembly at its ninth session draft definitions of aggression or draft statements of the notion of aggression;
- (b) to study all the problems referred to above on the assumption of a definition being adopted by a resolution of the General Assembly.”

The concentrated research apparently revealed insurmountable difficulties necessitating the adoption of this second resolution. The first resolution was emphatic in tone and intent. It assumed that a definition of aggression would *ipso facto* ensure international peace and security. The second resolution was more in step with realities of the international situation, in that it sought the exact connection between the definition of aggression and the maintenance of international peace and security. And, therefore, in view of the doubts engendered, the General Assembly requested the first Special Committee to enquire even further into the question.

The deliberations of the first Special Committee necessitated the formation of another Special Committee to co-ordinate the views expressed by state members and to submit to the eleventh session of the General Assembly:

1. a detailed report; and
2. a draft definition of aggression.
- 3.

Among the three proposals submitted for a working plan of the second Special Committee, the Netherlands proposal suggested *inter alia*,

“To determine whether or not the outcome of these discussions warrants the drafting of a definition of aggression and, in case the answer is the affirmative, to draft a definition of aggression.”

This abundantly indicates that even at so late a stage of study, skepticism was apparent in the minds of some of the delegates on whether a definition of aggression was warranted.

It is, therefore, erroneous in my delegation's view to submit that the General Assembly's resolution 599(VI) of January 31, 1952, has irrevocably settled that it is both possible and desirable to define aggression. If that were so the General Assembly would not have formed the Special Committee to consider this case and all its attendant implications at specialized levels. Indeed, the entire *raison d'être* of creating the Special Committees would have become vitiated.

The report of the Special Committee on the question of defining aggression states that about twenty-six representatives considered a definition both possible and desirable but out of this category some representatives declared that they supported the adoption of a "generally acceptable definition" which, in fact, may be interpreted to mean that they opposed the idea of defining aggression, because "a generally acceptable definition" could not be found at the present time. Moreover, even these twenty-six representatives did not form what the report calls "a homogeneous group". They differed in opinion as to the function, the content, and the form of a definition. In other words, they were classified into one group solely on the ground that they agreed in principle to a principle, which carries the art of nebulosity to its apogee.

All this obviously shows that it is fundamentally wrong to hold that the resolution of the General Assembly of January 31, 1952, or any other resolution of that body on the subject has prejudiced the issue to the point where it can be pre-supposed that a definition of aggression is possible and desirable.

In this context, a resolution of the general Assembly is not an irrevocable and an unalterable edict. It is not a judgment of a court of last resort. Hence my delegation firmly believes it is not *ultra vires* of this discussion to consider if a definition of aggression is both possible and desirable.

Before entering into the substance of the issue, please allow me, Mr. Chairman, Sir, to conclude, so to speak, my *obiter dicta* by saying that the most salutary aspect of this discussion is that the "End" or "Objective" of all gathered here is identical. That end is, if I may be permitted to take a slight liberty with the wording of the preamble, to save succeeding generations from the scourge of aggression. All are sedulously seeking to find lasting guarantees for the insurance of perpetual peace. This factor is of considerable significance. It establishes an indissoluble link. This spirit and unity of purpose may well be the most important single factor in the achievement of our aspiration.

On the first day of this debate, the distinguished and eminent Representative of Belgium referred to the miraculous achievements of modern science and fell, if I am correct, that this phenomenal progress is evidence of the

undesirable fact that homo sapiens can attain his objectives if he labors tenaciously and industriously to that end; and that it is imperative to keep our social sciences in rhythm with the development of world movements; else, our concepts and institutions will face the danger of becoming effete. This is true, but it is a double edged argument. If modern man can launch a sputnik, to use the terminology of the successor, into outer space, he can also define aggression. However, if man's ingenuity is limitless and if his resources and capabilities know no frontiers; then he is, and indeed must be ingenious enough not only to define aggression but also to circumvent, subvert, and abuse it. A definition, under these circumstances, would literally mean the presentation of our civilization on a uranium platter to a would-be aggressor, to a twentieth century Gengis Khan or Attila; a would-be world dictator who would most certainly find the means to distort and mutilate the definition for his own wicked and gruesome ambitions.

Let us now examine, if under the present state of International Law's development, it is possible to define aggression. International Law has made tremendous strides since the far flung days of the ancient Greek City States era, and even since the relatively more recent time of Hugo Grotius, From a primitive law, dependent mainly on the sanction of self-help, it has developed into a body of recognized norms. It has institutionalized itself, and at Nurenburg, it asserted itself to that pitch of centralization which made it possible for it to take sanctions against individuals. Nonetheless, in comparison with the highly centralized and galvanized municipal law, it is still in its infancy. It does not have the force monopoly of the international community to enforce effectively all its sanctions. Its efficacy is entirely depended upon the caprice of national sovereignty. In 1935, a decade before the auspicious gathering at San Francisco, that celebrated jurist Hans Kelsen characterized the status of International Law in words which, despite the substantial progress since achieved, to this day remains essentially the same; he said:

“The present state of international law is characterized by the fact that international common law –considered from a technical standpoint –is still in the stage of a primitive system of law, that is to say, it is at a stage from which the legal system of the individual States originally developed. This is a condition of extensive decentralization. There are not –as in a technically developed system of law –central organisms dividing among themselves the functions of making and executing law. The general rules valid for the whole community have not been consciously laid down by a legislator in an exact and regulated procedure, but –as in the beginning of the development of law within the individual State –they have been evolved by custom, that is to say, by the practice of the persons concerned with that law –the members of the community.

“Within the framework of international common law there are no central tribunals whose business it is to apply general rules of law to particular cases. A State injured by another State is the one to decide

whether a violation of international law has taken place, and if the other State denies the breach which is imputed to it, there is, under international common law, no objective procedure by which the dispute can be determined. Thus the State whose rights are impugned itself retaliates at its own discretion for the wrong perpetrated, in its opinion, with the measures of coercion peculiar to international law, war or reprisal.”

I hasten to admit that since 1935, International Law has developed by leaps and bounds. However this notwithstanding, International Law, in marked contradistinction to municipal law, is still decentralized law, and the dichotomy between the two laws is enormous. I am aware of the International Court of Justice’s existence but also of the subjective reservations of the states accepting its jurisdiction. I am aware of the existence of the Security Council and of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security, but I am also aware of article 27(3) of the Charter, an article that looms over all matters of consequence.

My delegation deeply respects the Charter of the United Nations. However, my delegation believes that no disrespect is shown or intended to this august organization if reality is mirrored accurately. Here, my delegation is fortified by the erudite statement of the Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom who, during the course of his brilliant speech on September 24, 1957, in the General Assembly said, and I quote:

“This debate is an appropriate opportunity for frank discussion of the state of the Organization –its achievements, its failures, its strength, its weaknesses, its standing in the world, the hopes for its development in the future.

“The United Nations is not a super-state. It is not a world authority enforcing its law upon the nations. The General Assembly is not a parliament of individually elected members legislating for the world. The United Nations is an instrument of negotiation between Governments. It can blunt the edges of conflict between nations. It can serve diplomacy of reconciliation. Its tendency is to wear away or break down differences and thus help towards solutions. In the Secretary-General’s view, the real limitations upon the actions of the Organization do not derive from the provisions of the Charter or from the system of one vote for one nation irrespective of strength or size. They result from the facts of international life at the present time. The balance of forces in the world sets the limits within which the power of the world organization can develop.”

These words represent reality so completely that even the most devout worshipper of the United Nations must accept them. For, to conceal such self-evident truth is to do an irredeemable disservice to the United Nations and the cause for which it stands.

There is no escape from the fact that International Law at the present moment bows at the altar of national sovereignty. Indeed the Charter itself is a political instrument. It is inevitable, therefore, that any discussion on the question of the definition of aggression must revolve around both political and legal issues, that is, on metajuristic considerations, on factors contaminated by the virus of subjective value judgment. In isolation, and on its own, the attempt to define aggression is, from a pragmatic standpoint, utterly futile.

It is an axiomatic fact that this endeavor cannot possibly be detached from socio-political influences. It gets inevitably recoiled in the web of politics. In these circumstances, are we to have two definitions of aggression, one political, and the other juridical? One based on the foundation of thermo-nuclear strength and the other, an analytical and objective definition, poised rather uncomfortably on the fragile edifice of an international legal tribunal functioning on the sufferance of national sovereignty? If that were to be permitted it would achieve for almost all times the ascendancy of politics over law. It would gravely endanger International Laws' struggle for the realization of its autonomy to enable it to establish permanent international peace through the rule of law; a system we cherish so dearly. Time and again, men of goodwill have solemnly appealed to sovereign states to submit their legal disputes to the International Court of Justice; but in spite of such pleadings, we find states resorting to other measures in the determination of disputes. In the present circumstances, such conduct is not really a matter for alarm or surprise. The Charter itself places the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on a political organ of the United Nations. By virtue of article 94 (2) it places the International Court of Justice under the domain of politics. Article 94(2) states:

“If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.”

In support of my submission I would like to quote from Hans Kelsen's monumental treatise on the law of the United Nations:

“The Statute does not contain a provision guaranteeing the execution of the decision of the Court against a recalcitrant State. Article 94(2) does not impose upon the Security Council the obligation to enforce the judgments of the Court against recalcitrant parties. It provides for a procedure of appeal in case of non-compliance with the judgment of the Court and makes the action of the Security Council to be taken as the result of the procedure dependent upon the council's discretion by authorizing this body to choose between two different actions: Either to make recommendations or to decide upon measures to be taken to give

effect to the judgment of the court. In case the Security Council chooses to make recommendations, it may recommend to comply with the judgment of the Court. But, in making a recommendation under Article 94(2), the Security Council is not bound to conform with the judgment of the Court with which the party concerned did not comply. The Security Council may recommend a solution of the dispute totally different from that decided by the Court. If Article 25 of the Charter is interpreted to apply to recommendations of the Security Council, recourse to the Security Council under Article 94(2) has the effect of an appeal to a higher authority. Even if it is assumed that recommendations made by the Security Council are not binding upon the parties, a recourse under Article 94(2) may have the effect of an appeal. For the Council may consider non-compliance with a recommendation made under Article 94(2), a threat to the peace and take enforcement action under Article 39 against the State which does not comply with the Council's recommendation. That means that the Security Council may enforce its recommendation instead of enforcing the Court's judgment. Article 94(2) confers upon the Security Council the power to substitute its recommendation for the Court's judgment. This means further, that the obligation imposed upon the Members by Article 94(1) and by the Statute of the Court: to comply with the decisions of the Court, may be restricted by application of Article 94(2). By having recourse to the Security Council under Article 94(2), the party places the Court under the control of the Council. Since under the Charter self-help (except in the case of an armed attack as self-defense is prohibited, non-compliance with the Court's judgment may compel the other party to have recourse to the Security Council under Article 94(2). Such recourse may have the effect of transforming a legal dispute, decided by the Court in accordance with existing law, into an issue to be settled anew by the Council according to political principles."

In these circumstances it would be the quintessence of irony to have only a legal definition of aggression, the interpretation of which may not even be determined by a juridical tribunal, and if determined, not enforced by it. A legal definition would acquire empirical utility only when the International Court assumes an exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes without exception and reservation. However, the international community will have to traverse quite a distance to reach this destination. That would be the first effective step to the super-state as it may be called in a legal sense, and not merely in the language of demagogic politics.

It would, therefore, be a melancholy defeat of the object of defining aggression if we were to try it at the present moment, at a time when it is not possible. It would mean the application of double standards to all international issues and the cruel incarceration of law by politics. Hence, my delegation fears that under the existing conditions of International Law, it is not possible to have a legal definition of aggression. It is only possible to have to political definition. Of

course, it can be called legal but in effect, it will have a political connotation, emphasis, and outlook.

Even if my delegation were to concede that a legal definition is possible in a juridical sense, we would still be far away from the solution of the problem. We would immediately encounter a crisis of words, and get involved in an interminable semantic warfare. There would be disagreement on the scope, content, and function of the definition. Should it be in strict conformity with Article 51, or should it be a more comprehensive definition in which the expression "armed attack" as used in Article 51 is merely one form of aggression? Clarification and agreement will also be needed on Article 39 of the Charter, which speaks of "act of aggression". Would an "act of aggression" mean an armed attack only or would it mean aggression direct and indirect, aggression as envisaged by the Soviet draft resolution, in document A/C 6/L/399? A rigid and a limited definition may well defeat the object of defining aggression, and, on the other hand, an all-embracing definition including "aggressive intent", "the notion of indirect aggression", "the notion of economic aggression", "ideological aggression", and other forms of indirect aggression may create an anomalous state of affairs in which aggression may become a regular and normal feature of human conduct and thereby lose its dreadfully abnormal, fearful, and emergent meaning. From an abnormal notion it would be turned into a natural notion. This half-exhausted twentieth century is in the grips of the most dramatic ideological battle. In every part of the world there is a clash of ideas, ideas that cannot be easily controlled or liquidated. In so pregnant a setting ideological aggression can be detected in almost every are of the globe. Normalcy would be characterized by the word aggression if ideological aggression were to form a part of it. However, basically, a definition whether narrow or broad is without an obol of doubt, explosively loaded with far-reaching implications, and is fraught with a host of dangers.

Assuming a definition is possible, is it desirable? A definition's immediate effect would be to stultify and hamper the progressive growth of International Law. In this respect, my delegation noted with approval the distinguished representative of Ceylon's reference to the Law of Torts, when he made his lucid statement during the course of the discussion on the Report of the International Law Commission.

Because of the enormous dichotomy in the degree of centralization, the only branch of Municipal Law that can be profitably compared with International Law is the Law of Torts. Like General International Law, the Law of Torts is in a stage of dynamic growth. If the Law of Torts had been codified at a premature juncture, an irreparable harm would have been done to the province of jurisprudence as a whole. The Tort of Negligence would not have emerged and bloomed to its fullness. Out of the historic judgment of Lord Atkin in *Donohue v. Stevenson* emerged not only a Tort of Negligence but also a philosophy of law establishing beyond all reasonable doubt, the virtue of undefined norms. "The categories of negligence are never closed", said the sagacious law Lord, and so

it truly was; with the result that redress and relief is now readily available to all who suffer and groan physically and financially for the negligence of their fellow citizens. If the Law of Torts had been stultified and cramped within the four walls of a definition, it would not have been possible for thousands of individuals to seek and receive relief according to their due. And certainly it would not have been possible for the distinguished representative of India to extend the Principle of the General Duty of Care to the ambit of International Law and argue, as he rightly did, that the principle enunciated in *Donohue v. Stevenson* imposes a duty of care on every state in its international conduct.

The virtue of undefined legal terms has been well described by an eminent American authority and to summarize the thought of my delegation in this respect, it would perhaps be beneficial to quote an extract from the Supreme Court's decision in *Davidson v. Board of Administrators of the City of New Orleans* (96. U.S. 97 1878 p.103, 104) for in this case the Supreme Court expressed its reluctance to define the exact meaning of the term "Due Process" for much the same reasons that compel us to shy away from a definition of aggression. I now quote the relevant passage: -

"... if, therefore, it were possible to define what it is for a State to deprive a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, in terms which would cover every exercise of power thus forbidden to the State, and exclude those which are not, no more useful construction could be furnished by this or any other court to any part of the fundamental law. But, apart from the imminent risk of a failure to give any definition which would be at once perspicuous, comprehensive and satisfactory, there is wisdom ... in the ascertaining of the intent and application of such an important phrase in the Federal Constitution, by the gradual process of judicial inclusion and exclusion, as the cases presented for decision shall require..."

If it is wise to keep the door open for the development of law in the highly centralized system of Municipal Law by avoiding a priori definitions, how much more wise and beneficial it would be to emulate this policy in the highly decentralized system of International Law. Are we so certain, so dogmatically committed to the belief that the categories of aggression are closed and therefore fit for definition?

Those nurtured in the system of the Common Law have seen through experience the inherent weaknesses of defined terms. It is true that even in countries where the Common Law prevails, the dictates of modern society have compelled to some extent the codification of laws. No effort has, however, been made to codify laws that are in the process of development. The Common Law countries present an excellent opportunity for judging simultaneous and side by side the workings of both codified and uncodified laws in one legal framework. Suffice it to say that codification gives rise to a host of new problems, particularly

those pertaining to interpretation. Most certainly it is no automatic machine that produces the required results on the insertion of the proper coin. At times not infrequent it gives rise to problems far more complicated and difficult than those that existed prior to codification.

Law is a coercive order. This is a characteristic of law recognized from time immemorial. Without the element of force, law is reduced to naught, instead of maintaining order it becomes a part of anarchy. For this very reason it is not infrequently asked if International Law is true law. If International Law possesses the ingredients of coercion, it is true law; if it can take effective remedial and prohibitive sanctions against civil and criminal delicts, it is true law. As the distinguished Representative of Colombia so aptly said, and I quote. "There could be no society without law, and no law without penalties".

Those who regard International Law as true law consider that the most effective and potent sanction of International Law is WAR, both defensive and aggressive. According to the protagonists of this school of thought, the theory of *bellum justum* is an inextricable part of International Law. My delegation does not express any views on the merits of this theory. We only say that it is necessary to reckon with this theory and its manifold implications, if we are to define and declare aggression an international crime. A situation may arise, as has happened so often in the past, calling for the application of this doctrine. The theory of Just War is not confined to the right of self-defense. Aggressive collective action is conceivable. "Counter-war" is the only effective reaction against an unpermitted war. If war is a delict, counter war must be a sanction. The theory of *bellum justum* fell into eclipse during the era of unbridled and unfettered national sovereignty. But, once again, it is reasserting itself in the field of International Law. So argue those who subscribe to this theory. They also say that it forms the basis of many important landmarks in Positive International Law, such as the Peace Treaty of Versailles, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and the Kellogg Pact. It is even traceable in Article 51 of the Charter.

This doctrine creates complications of very great magnitude not so much in the exercise of legitimate self-defense measures but when aggression, technically so-called, becomes necessary or is thought necessary as a sanction of International Law. History is studded with a plethora of cases that blur the line between measures of self-defense and unmitigated aggression. Legitimate exercise of the right of self-defense and aggression are concomitantly interwoven. The latest instance of this is epitomized in the Korean conflict. Each party accused the other of aggression and each claimed that it was exercising the inherent right of self-defense, although aggression was so manifestly clear that the United Nations were able to take peremptory measures.

A situation may arise in which State A accuses State B of organizing or encouraging the organization of armed bands within its territory or of subversive infiltration and on this pretence, in the exercise of its inherent right of self-

defense, attacks and subdues State B. In such an event, the victim may appeal to another state or states, either under treaty obligations or under the rules of General International Law, to come to its rescue. Interference by other states withstanding; the intervention would be a just resort to counter-aggression against State A.

The distinguished Representative of Colombia has stated, as an instance of indirect aggression against France and the United Kingdom, the German attack on Poland in 1939. This may be one interpretation of the chain of events that unleashed the Second World War. The proponents of the doctrine of *bellum justum* would, however interpret the declaration of war by the United Kingdom on Nazi Germany as an act of just aggression against a violator of International Law.

It may be argued that under prevailing conditions, a state cannot abuse its right of self-defense beyond a given limit. The latter part of Article 51 of the Charter would be an effective bar against the abuse. This argument, if advanced, would be found wanting in actual practice. For, in such a contingency, the veto right may have the opposite effect. Instead of preventing action, or counter-action, it would thwart the cessation of hostilities, once hostilities have started in the case of an abused exercise of the right of self-defense.

In view of the possibility of the occurrence of such abuses under the existing conditions of International Law and without a radical amendment or revision of the Charter, is it really desirable to classify aggression as an international crime? A crime forbidding counter-aggression on occasions when civilized nations are bound ethically and legally to fulfill their solemn obligations of individual and collective action against the misdeeds of a naked aggressor, an aggressor who vainly and shamelessly seeks to conceal his aggression behind the façade of the abused right of self-defense. International Law would be relegated to a set of empty norms if its most effective coercive sanction is so circumscribed.

Hence, it is my delegation's concerted view that at this rather critical juncture, it is neither possible nor desirable to define aggression. Furthermore, we believe that we have the machinery, competent, capable, and mobile enough to take appropriate corrective action against aggressive acts, against other breaches of the peace, the threats to the peace, and all other disputes and situations endangering international peace and security, without defining aggression. On the contrary, a definition may quite conceivably act as a barrier against quick and decisive counter-action, and bog down the proceedings of the Security Council by a prolonged and futile discussion on the niceties of interpreting facts. As a definition would inevitably entail a drastic revision and amendment of the Charter, perhaps it may be more opportune to explore the possibility and necessity of a definition at the time when the revision of the Charter comes up for consideration.

My delegation has voiced its apprehensions *vis-à-vis* the possibility and desirability of defining aggression. However, as Pakistan is incontrovertibly dedicated to the cause of peace, it is a fundamental tenet of our policy to approach all issues impartially. My delegation does not harbor any preconceived prejudices. Issues of such paramount importance cannot be tracked in a dogmatic and doctrinaire manner. We have indicated the more apparent, or what may appear to us to be the more apparent, impediments in the path of a definition. But if even one out of this galaxy of jurists is able to dispel our doubts, we are quite prepared to examine sympathetically and objectively the suggestions and proposals made to that effect. Society is composed of far too many imponderables for there to be a finality of decision on such questions.

However, with this qualification my delegation must state categorically that despite the fast changing pattern of human activity, there are certain immutable factors. My delegation is fully aware of the character and function of this committee albeit it cannot be denied that on occasions the terms of reference of the various committees overlap. The question under consideration is not exclusively a legal issue. That it is part legal and part political is an incontestable proposition. If it were strictly a legal issue it would not have caused so much perplexity. By its very nature, it brings to the fore political and even socio-economic problems. But even strictly legal issues involve the legitimate discussion of facts. However, in deference to the apparent sense and feeling of this Committee, my delegation will state in general terms a matter of fundamental concern to my country.

If there is a generally acceptable definition of aggression, if we are to close the categories of aggression, that definition must include economic aggression. In this respect, paragraph 3(a) and (c) of the Soviet draft resolution is not specific enough to dispel the fears of my delegation. If we are to adopt a definition, then that definition must contain a separate article on economic aggression stating clearly and unambiguously that economic aggression or indirect aggression is perpetrated if lower riparian's are deprived of their natural rights in use of rivers which flow through two or more countries. My delegation cannot overstate the importance of this issue.

An armed attack is gruesome and odious because of the damage it inflicts. Hence, everyone agrees that an armed attack is aggression, pure and simple. If more devastating and deadly damage to life and property can be inflicted without an armed attack, without the use of force, by means far more callous and perfidious, then such means must constitute a part of aggression as much as an armed attack.

If there is any interference in the normal and assured supply of irrigation waters, my country would face the threat of total annihilation. It would be the most invidious form of aggression. It would turn green alluvial and fertile fields into a scorching desert. It would create wide-spread famine, frustration, and fear.

It would make it virtually impossible for any authority to control civil strife and bloodshed. Starvation would compel civilized human beings to resort to cannibalism. It would shatter all concepts of decency and morality. This indeed would be the outcome of such an aggression.

This is a situation not peculiar to my country. There are other states that, due to their geographical position and their economic reliance on supply of irrigation waters from an international river must take cognizance of such a form of aggression.

Economic blockade of land-locked countries may, likewise, have similar results and, therefore, my delegation will support the proposal of the distinguished Representative of Afghanistan made in this connection provided there is a generally acceptable definition of aggression and provided on merit, my country's great neighbors recognize our legitimate fears and are prepared to admit that violation of riparian rights can cause as much if not more economic havoc as an economic blockade of a land-locked country. There could be no better demonstration of my delegation's bona fides than this voluntary acceptance of facts based on merits.

I have taxed a great deal of your time and patience but before I close I must appeal to you, my distinguished colleagues, that we must strive tirelessly and continuously for the search of the necessary political equilibrium and adjustments guaranteeing the maintenance of perpetual peace. This is a duty we owe not only to our own war sick generation, but to our progeny. We are impounded by our Charter not only to save ourselves, but also the succeeding generations from the scourge and carnage of war. I have often heard it said that in the event of world conflagration, there will be neither victor nor vanquished. This seems obvious, but even if there is a sham and farcical victory, it will be that of the dying over the dead, and the dying will have the dubious thrill of glory by witnessing the utter demolition of civilization; the destruction of our homes and universities, our centers of art and science, our mosques and temples and churches, our Taj Mahals and Westminster Abbeys; and among the wailing of orphaned infants and crippled widows, the victors will breathe their last breath. So it is our sacred duty to work for a lasting peace and to give a ring of reality and not merely that of hope to the words of an English poet who visualized the day –

“... when the war drums beat no longer and the battle flags are furled, in a Parliament of Man, in a federation of the World...”

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on March 17, 1958

Mr. Chairman,

In the very first speech in the general debate, the distinguished Delegate of Saudi Arabia paid a rich and well merited tribute to your ability, by using one of the exceptions to the Hearsay Rule of the Law of Evidence. If I may be permitted to emulate the renowned jurist from Saudi Arabia, too, would like to draw on the same body of law by urging this Committee to take Judicial Notice of your erudition and eminence. I say this because I most sincerely mean it and not because it is the unwritten law of such conferences to indulge in courteous preliminaries. Nor, indeed, to win your sympathy, for, Sir, my delegation has much too much of faith in your impartiality to sway you by semantics. Having said this, I pray that my delegation, like that of the United Kingdom, has made a really successful bid for your sympathy.

As a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, Pakistan takes particular pride in your election, and as Asians, we feel elated in seeing an Anglo-Saxon Asian in the Chair. My delegation also welcomes the election of the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. Together you form a impressive trinity of scholars.

My delegation would also like to voice its admiration and appreciation for the balanced and empirically constructive draft code on the Law of the Sea. It is the product of a great labor. Each member of the Commission is to be applauded for the individual and collective contribution made towards the accomplishment of this learned and coherent maritime code. Special tribute is, however, due to Professor Francois. We all know that without his painstaking effort, without his juristic wisdom and experience, this draft code would not have been as complete as it is. This document seeks to reflect the realities of the International Community as faithfully as possible. It seeks to strike the cord of compromise by skillfully associating recent trends and developments with the rules of the past, rules that have acquired a character of permanence despite the relentless grind of time and space.

However, my delegation would like to make it abundantly clear that our appreciation of the report does not in any way bind or commit us to the draft articles in their entirety. According to the object of this general debate, my delegation will, at this stage, confine itself, as far as possible, to the enunciation of principle and policy. When a detailed discussion of the articles takes place, my delegation will intervene whenever the3 discussions so warrant.

This report of the International Law Commission is indeed an all embracing one. It covers all aspects of the law pertaining to the sea. In addition

to the vast canvas that has to be covered by this Conference of Plenipotentiaries in so short a period of nine weeks., the General Assembly has, by resolution 1105(XI), called upon us to study the question of free access to the sea of land-locked countries. As it is, the truly germane issues are complicated enough to take up the entire time of this conference. Despite this we have been assigned additional burdens.

It is my delegation's conviction that if we are to achieve some measure of success, we must discipline our deliberations in such a fashion as to tackle only those issues that form the subject matter of the report "*per se*". It is far better and far more constructive to achieve limited and modest results than to dabble in each and every controversial issue without any result.

We have to arrive at solutions to problems that cover the surface of vast oceans and the space beneath and above them, measure the breadth of the sea and examine its freedom, and give attention to the Continental Shelf and the Contiguous Zone. Doctrines and rights relating to Innocent Passage and Hot Pursuit have to be scrutinized. These and a multitude of other crucial aspects of the Law of the Sea have to be considered and, if possible, settled. The verdict of this conference will, without doubt, affect most significantly the conduct of nation-states *vis-à-vis* the sea. Too much is at stake and too many vital interests involved for us to cherish unfettered hope. Nevertheless, hope and faith prompt us to move forward with guarded optimism. We are conscious of the failures of the past but are also poignantly aware of the dictates of this thermo-nuclear age that gives us the ultimatum to either embrace peace with the arms of law, or perish for ever into the graveyard of a world Carthage.

The law on the subject we are called upon to codify is prolific. There is a mass of documentation on it. The International Law Commission has, as a result of its eight years of unremitting labor, collected and correlated all the Law of the Sea in its draft. The document containing the draft articles greatly facilitates our task but much ground has still to be covered to complete the work.

Codification as used in Municipal Law cannot be applied to International Law in its purest context. Only well recognized and settled rules of law are the subject matter of codification. New laws, laws in their embryonic and formative stage, cannot be codified. Such an attempt would be injurious both to the norm itself and the society it seeks to regulate. New rules must be permitted to mellow and mature before they are tabulated into a code. Whereas old and established rules of law are codified, new laws are enacted by legislative organs of the state. Had we gathered here as legislators of a world parliament we could have formulated new rules of law into a statute. International Law being as decentralized as it is, can only give us the mandate to codify existing law, and that too, if we stretch the meaning of the world codification to a point where it all but soaps. If this proposition is accepted, new rules of International Law, as

contemplated in article 13 of the Charter of the United Nations may be recognized but not codified.

During the course of this debate we have heard several eloquent and euphemistic references to the progressive development of International Law. Times have undoubtedly changed. Institutions and values of yore have become effete. Invincible states that controlled the destinies of teeming multitudes are now weak and vulnerable. Those held in bondage are now free, and with that freedom, have changed the path of history. Revolutionary changes, to achieve normalcy, call for revolutionary laws. That the pattern of humanity has undergone a radical change is admitted; only those who are spiritually and culturally barren will deny it. It is also agreed that law must mirror most faithfully the pace of human activity and conduct. However, by its very infinite nature, new law can be created and recognized but not codified until it is fully developed.

Pakistan is deeply concerned with all the Law of the Sea. Each part of this law is so wedded with the other as to form a composite whole. Both wings of Pakistan have fairly large coastlines. Its fisheries are of considerable economic importance, both from the point of view of consumption in the country and of export. Our fisheries industry is developing rapidly and its potential advancement carries a great promise not only for the many citizens directly concerned with this industry but also for the prosperity of the nation as a whole. The wealth of the sea-bed and its subsoil, both of the Territorial Sea and of the Continental Shelf, are being explored by modern techno-logical means. Most important of all, it is the sea that connects East and West Pakistan and through this mighty force of nature we maintain the geographical indivisibility of our state. Perhaps for this reason, the concept of the Freedom of the High Seas has far greater meaning for us than for many other states, including the great maritime powers.

There are two paramount aspects of the Law of the Sea that must be synthesized. In dialectical terms the thesis is the doctrine of Freedom of the High Seas and the antithesis, the Right of the Coastal State to a Territorial Sea. The clash of these two fundamental rules does not only suggest a clash of norms but also a keen and critical rivalry between International Law and National Law, between the sovereignty of states and that of International Law.

Our primary duty is to reconcile this conflict. Each of these important aspects of the Law of the Sea carries with it a set of rights and obligations. The breadth of the Territorial Sea has an immense bearing on the coastal state, indeed it is within its sovereign domain. This view has remained by and large unchallenged since the time of Bartholus. It is indispensable for the security and socio-economic well-being of the coastal state to exercise sovereign rights over its Territorial Sea. This right, though sovereign, is not absolute, No right is absolute, not even the fundamental rights guaranteed in the constitutions of municipal states. The limitations on this right over territorial waters have been mentioned often enough in this debate and do not require repetition. Similarly,

the concept of Freedom of the High Seas permits no one to make the High Seas an arena for anarchy and chaos. The Freedom of the High Seas means that they are open to all nations without discrimination and without let or hindrance.

It is so important a freedom that in 1918 President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed it as the first principle of his fourteen points. Its importance over the years has not diminished. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Mr. Churchill reiterated and re-emphasized this freedom in the Atlantic Charter. Important though this freedom is to all nations, it is not absolute in form or content. For example, ships on the High Seas are subject to the jurisdiction of the flag state, and likewise, piracy and slave trade are subject to international jurisdiction. In recent times some authorities have contended that the Doctrines of the Contiguous Zone and the alleged right to explore without limit the Continental Shelf have made further inroads into this freedom. None can therefore question the truism that neither the sovereign rights of the coastal state over Territorial Waters nor the Freedom of the High Seas are absolute. One can, however, challenge with cogency the degree of legitimate interference with the right over Territorial Waters and with the Freedom of the High Seas.

Numerous interesting arguments have been advanced in favor of and against the three mile rule. The defenders of the classical standard have in the main contended that the three mile limit is the only recognized limit permissible under International Law and that article 3 of the draft code of the International Law Commission confirms this view. The conclusions drawn from article 3 and the commentary thereon are that as long as certain territorial claims are not based on a generally recognized rule of International Law they cannot be valid *erga Cummcs*. Article 38(1) b of the Statute of the International Court of Justice is quoted in support of this contention. These are forceful contentions and my delegation has heard and studied them with care.

My delegation has given equal attention to the arguments advanced against the classical rule. Those who claim a ceiling of twelve miles have sought to rest their contention chiefly on the ground that the maximum limit of twelve miles is the recognized norm of International Law as spelt out in article 3 of the draft code. This clearly indicates that article 3 is subject to conflicting interpretation. I would like to mention that my delegation has also taken cognizance of the views of delegations that have chosen to ignore article 3 altogether and demand an extensive territorial limit stretching to hundreds of miles. They claim that they cannot be bound by those rules of law in the formulation of which they played no part. They thus, have an honest approach to the subject. They reject totally the old norm on the ground that rules formulated way back in 1703 cannot remain valid in the fast changing and dynamic conditions of the present. For them, the three mile rule founded on the range of cannon shot is clearly a relic of the past and therefore cannot find any place in the panoply of modern international affairs. They vehemently denounce the classical rule for the following, amongst other, reasons:

- (1) That when these rules were formulated, they were under colonial domination and had no voice in their creation.
- (2) That for reasons of security the three mile rule must be abandoned.
- (3) That economic needs demand, in the interest of conservation, an extension of the Territorial Sea.
- (4) That regional needs and circumstances require such action.

These are all extremely attractive arguments. But I would like to say, not by way of a rebuttal, but for the purpose of exploring these arguments, that some authorities hold that when a nation is under colonial domination, the 'WILL' of that nation is expressed through and by the country exercising sovereignty over it. They add that only when the nation in question acquires its independence does it become a member of the international community with a distinct and separate personality and that all the rules of International Law existing at the time are binding on it. Should it be opposed to certain rules, it must follow the procedure laid down by International Law for the repeal amendment, and modification of such rules. It cannot unilaterally repudiate them on the ground that it was not a member of the international community at the time when they were formulated. If such a course of action were legally permissible, there would be widespread uncertainty in International Law. There is, however, no need to enter into this controversy. At the time of this conference, the states that hold the aforesaid views are free independent sovereign states. Among others, they have been called upon to pronounce the limit on territorial waters. They are now free, wholly free, to pronounce their verdict in favor of Article 3 as interpreted by them.

Much has been made of the argument that the three mile limit is obsolete and that its raison d'être, the artillery range of the cannon shot, has vanished altogether, and that advances of modern science call for much greater breadth of the Territorial Sea for the protection and security of the states concerned. Whether the three mile rule has its origins in the cannon shot range is, from historical considerations, rather uncertain. Reference to a learned article on this subject in the American Journal of International Law for October, 1954, under the title "The historical origin of the three mile limit" will reveal that the real origin of the three mile rule lies in the principle of the marine league.

The range of artillery increased far beyond three miles in the early phases of the 19th century without affecting the principle of the three mile limit. If, for security reasons alone, the three mile limit was fixed within the range of the cannon shot extensions would have automatically followed in the breadth of the Territorial Sea. But we have seen that while artillery range progressed tremendously, the three mile rule remained unchanged. Furthermore, even when the range of the cannon was well within three miles, and indeed even before that, there were cases in which territorial limits were fixed beyond three miles. For example, in the Middle Ages, the Italian states claimed a Territorial Sea of 100 miles on the basis of Sassoferrato's theory. The three mile rule, therefore, cannot

be condemned and discarded on the ground that its utility from the point of view of security has disappeared. Even if there was some vague historical connection between the three mile limit and the artillery range, that connection was lost many many years ago. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that this relationship has been grossly exaggerated. However if the sole purpose or even the chief purpose of the Territorial Sea is based on the need of defense and security under modern conditions, in this age of intercontinental ballistic missiles, even an extension of 200 miles would be hopelessly inadequate.

Much has also been said on the anachronism of the traditional breadth. I have already stated that we are in full accord with the view that new conditions demand new laws. Albeit, these new rules must, however, stem from recognized norms. In the hierarchy of norms the basically sound and pragmatic norms of Customary International Law form the base of the pyramid. Without this base you cannot have a legal edifice. By all means discard useless and moribund norms but for the sake of progressive development of International Law do not tamper with old, recognized, and highly beneficial laws on the ground that they are old.

Perhaps it may be useful to recall the words of the Representative of the United States of America in the 6th Committee of the 11th session of the General Assembly contained in document A/Conf, 13/19 at page 485, and I quote;

“It is, of course, correct to argue that we should not blindly follow a rule merely because it has persisted for many years. We agree that a law should not be retained because it is old but neither do we believe that a law must be regarded as obsolete and should be abandoned just because it is ancient. On the contrary, there is a strong presumption that a long accepted rule of law has valid and sound reasons for persisting throughout the years. The rules of the world are examples of rules of conduct which have an ancient origin but which continue to have validity in modern times. The Ten Commandments are ancient, but that does not mean that they are obsolete. The teachings of the Koran are old, but that does not make them invalid today. I do not, of course, mean to suggest that the 3 mile rule is on the plane with the laws laid down in the Ten Commandments or in the Koran, or that it is of the same character. But I do strongly urge that those who advocate changing a rule that has been upheld through the years have the very heavy burden of demonstrating that the rule has outlived its usefulness and can no longer be upheld.”

Far be it from me to compare the immutable laws of God with the transitory laws of man. However, I would maintain that ancient laws are not always redundant merely because they are old. The onus of proving their redundancy rests on those who challenge their validity and it is so heavy an onus that it cannot be discharged by mere platitudes.

Extensions in breadth of the Territorial Sea have also been justified on economical grounds. With respect to conservation of fisheries, the Pakistan delegation intends to express its views on the economic problems in the 3rd Committee. Here I will only say that if conservation of fisheries prompts incursions into the Freedom of the High Seas, that object cannot thus be fulfilled, at least in our part of the World. If extensions are made for the purpose of exclusive exploration and exploitation, then, not only is the aim of conservation defeated but also the desire for exploitation. The High Seas are free to all. Every nation large and small, old and new has the right to take the fullest advantage of the resources provided by this freedom. The argument that this freedom is illusory in that only the great maritime powers can take real advantage of it is a defeatist attitude. The life of a nation cannot be measured in terms of decades or generations. Nations that have faith and confidence in their intrinsic strength must have the vision to think of their interests in terms of centuries. After all, what are fifty years or even a hundred in the histories of countries that hold the legacy of civilizations dating back to Mohen-jodaro and Pompeii. If the United States of America could subscribe to the doctrine of the Freedom of the High Seas at a time when she was not able to take full advantage of that freedom, at a time when she was too young to compete with the then great maritime powers, why cannot the other young and virile nations do the same? The United States of America accepted this freedom because it had absolute faith in its manifest destiny. We too have or ought to have faith in our greatness and accept this freedom today although we may not be in a position at present to compete with the more advanced states in the maximum utilization of the Freedom of the High Seas. In this spirit, we accept the concept of the freedom of the High Seas.

It has been contended in certain quarters that regional conditions necessitate the extension of territorial limits. Such a course would, however, defeat the principle of uniformity which is of supreme importance to law. One of the cardinal objects of the rule of law is to maintain equality before the law or the equal subjection of all classes to the established law. The rule of law in this sense excludes the idea of exemptions from the duty of obedience to the law which governs the others. Under the rule of law as opposed to arbitrary power, one rule cannot be prescribed for me and another for you. Therefore, it would be a violation of the rule of law if subjective and arbitrary claims were made as exceptions to the recognized law on the ground of regional requirements.

The proponents of the 12 mile limit and those who claim that the law recognizes a minimum limit of 3 and a maximum of 12 and permits the fixation of territorial limits within this margin have to some extent adopted a fair portion of the arguments of those who base their claims on limitless extension of territorial rights. Hence the apparent objections to the

submissions put forward by those who stand for unlimited extension hold valid for those who claim the breadth of 12 miles and also for those contending that it ranges between 3 and 12 miles. In addition to the common arguments the proponents of this view hold that Article 3 of the draft code of the International Law Commission recognizes a minimum of 3 and a maximum of 12 miles. As I have said earlier, Article 3 is open to conflicting interpretation. This is indeed regrettable as this is the pivotal article of the whole draft.

According to the rules of interpretation a statute is to be expounded "according to the intent of them that made it". If the words are in themselves precise and unambiguous no more is necessary than to expound those words in their natural and ordinary sense but apparently the debates in this Committee and even the discussions in the 6th Committee of the 11th session of the General Assembly indicate that the draft article under consideration has caused some difficulty as to its intention. It is not my delegation's object to criticize the draft of so eminent a body. We merely observe that the interpretation given to Article 3 has not been uniform. In this even it is necessary to draw on external and historical facts to convey the true intentions. Among the external facts one may call to aid the records and proceedings of the discussions that preceded the draft. The record of the International Law Commission seems to indicate that in 1955, the 3 miles rule was implicitly recognized as the only binding rule of International Law, as this rule was the only rule the commission held *erga omnes*.

There are at least two other rules of interpretation that support this submission: -

- (1) the rule of avoidance of some absurdity, repugnance, or inconsistency with the rest of the instrument; and
- (2) the presumption against intending what is inconvenient or unreasonable.

If we interpret Article 3 to mean that it permits a minimum of 3 miles and a maximum of 12, we would be admitting an interpretation that would lead to uncertainty and confusion. It would be repugnant to the very object of law. The prime object of law is to establish certainty and thereby create an orderly regulation of society. If every state is given the license to fluctuate and oscillate at its whim and fancy between 3 and 12 miles. International Law would abound in uncertainty followed by immeasurable inconvenience. Such a procedure would be highly detrimental to all concerned. Its obvious repugnancy is clear from the fact that instead of creating stability it would foster chaos. With each periodical change in the limits of Territorial Waters the Law of the Sea would undergo a drastic change. Such alterations would indubitably have their serious ramifications in each and every aspect of the Law of the Sea with the result that

the entire body of law would be in a state of flux. Frequent changes between 3 and 12 miles would, for instance, affect the Contiguous Zone and the Freedom of the High Seas. So also the fisheries rights. However, even if frequent changes were not permitted or made within this range, it would be nonetheless contrary to the rule of law for it would lead to inequality of opportunity and status before the law. This inconvenience and absurdity must be avoided.

However, in my humble submission, Article 3 does not raise a question of interpretation as it does not propound a legal proposition. It is a bare statement of fact. It restates a factual position and leaves it to this conference to determine the legal position according to the rules of Customary International Law.

Pakistan recognizes the customary rule of International Law to be that of 3 miles. In so doing my delegation does not rest its case on an interpretation of Article 3 or on any other reason advanced hitherto by the supporters of the 3 mile limit. My delegation does not want to go into the rights or wrongs of the cannon shot rule, or into the historical origins of the 3 mile rule. Nor does it want to base its case on geographical considerations. My delegation adheres to the 3 mile rule for one fundamental reason. We view this issue as a clash between National and International Law. Those who want the maximum limit to the Territorial Sea are in fact trespassing on, and even usurping, the rights of International law in that they are making serious inroads into the concept of the Freedom of the Seas. Those who want to exercise the minimum breadth of sovereignty over the seas are actually subordinating municipal interests to those of International Law. The High Seas lie in the exclusive jurisdiction of International Law, whereas the Territorial Waters are in the exclusive jurisdiction of National Law. In order to make a genuine contribution to the progressive development of International Law, my delegation holds that the minimum of 3 miles limit ought to be, and is, the only valid limit legally recognizable by the comity of nations. Herein we have shown our bona fide intentions to uphold the supremacy of International Law. We invite other delegations to make the same contribution to the progressive development of International Law by recognizing this limit.

We do not believe in the policy of grab. In the past imperial powers grabbed as much land as possible. Now that those lands are free they, more than others, should recognize the innate wickedness of this policy by refraining from grabbing large areas of the ocean to satisfy the appetite for appropriation. We do not believe in the concept of a maritime "Lebensraum". We will hold and take what is legitimately ours and not an inch more of anything, be it land, air, sea, or outer space.

My delegation would like to state quite clearly that we do not recognize unilateral declarations purporting to extend Territorial Waters beyond 3 miles. We can never acquiesce in a measure that strikes International Law so squarely in the face. This should be known to all and particularly to those who are situated in our geographical region. Insofar as the Contiguous Zone is concerned, my

delegation is impressed by the proposal that a Contiguous Zone of 12 miles, as recommended by the International Law Commission, be accepted but with the modification that it covers fisheries as well. This proposal is commendable as it endeavors' in a most equitable way to enshrine a compromise between conflicting views. It will therefore receive my delegations most sympathetic consideration.

The distinguished Representative of Panama has proposed that a sub-committee of this committee be established to examine the question of Historic Bays. My delegation has also heard the objections of the United Kingdom delegation to it and considers that the objections have merit. This notwithstanding, if the majority of Latin American countries want such a sub-committee my delegation will make its modest contribution by lending its support to it in the interest of friendship and amity.

A dogmatic approach to the problems affecting the world is repugnant to my delegation. We have come here with an open mind and are anxious to listen and learn. We believe that the last word has not been uttered on this subject and indeed from higher consideration every answer in its turn leads to a new question. Therefore, we are always subject to correction and change if correction and change are really due. God in His infinite wisdom did not arrogate all wisdom to one people or one nation. We can all learn from one another and the more we pool our resources for the common good of mankind, for the progress of the common weal, the more we are likely to benefit. Humanity, irrespective of artificial barriers and unfounded prejudices, is essentially indivisible and the sooner we work with faith and zeal for the greater good of this indivisible human force the better it is not only for humanity as a whole but also for each individual that forms a part of this mighty colossus.

Address to the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on October 28, 1959

Mr. Chairman,

We are carrying into the fourteenth year of the life of the United Nations our discussions on disarmament. Solutions to the problem have so far eluded us. The perfection of nuclear weapons and the development of rockets and satellites, while lending even greater urgency to the problem, have interposed what appear to be insurmountable barriers to its solution.

To these deep frustrations has been added the two year dead-lock on both the procedure and substance of disarmament negotiations, Unmoved by the mortal danger to the human race from the fierce competition in the accumulation of new weapons the great powers have not shown that awareness of time which is of such critical importance in the problem.

It is, therefore, with no small measure of relief that we welcome the break in the double deadlock which makes it possible to discuss the substantive aspects of disarmament in the Ten-Power negotiating committee, set up as a result of the decision of the foreign Ministers of the Four Great Powers.

We note that the Committee will present reports on its work to the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and through it to the General Assembly and the Security Council, in recognition of the ultimate responsibility for general disarmament measures vested in the United Nations by its Charter.

The distinguished Representative of the United Kingdom has suggested that it would be appropriate if the Secretary-General were to appoint a representative at the proceedings of the Ten-Power group. We endorse this suggestion, as it will establish a direct link between the United Nations and the Ten-Power group which was established outside the framework of the organization.

In this context, the Pakistan delegation warmly welcomes the proposal of the distinguished Representative of Greece that the Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, Ambassador Padilla Nervo, should represent the United Nations at the meetings of the Ten-Power Committee. Both by virtue of his personal qualifications and the office he holds, the distinguished Permanent Representative of Mexico would be the most suitable choice for this purpose.

The proposals for general and complete disarmament of all states, outlined to the General Assembly on September 18 by Prime Minister Khrushchev, and the scheme of comprehensive disarmament submitted by the

Foreign Secretary of the United Kingdom, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, a day earlier, promise, in the view of my delegation, the prospect of further loosening of the deadlock which has existed among the great powers, on the substantive aspects of the disarmament question, since the twelfth session of the General Assembly. The two sets of proposals may well open real possibilities of agreement between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union on important measures of disarmament. We feel uplifted by new hopes of significant progress towards the ultimate objective of a disarmed and war-less world –an objective which all nations and all peoples must attain by their collective efforts if they are to escape from the ultimate catastrophe which the arms race portends.

The Pakistan delegation agrees with the distinguished Representative of Argentina that the Soviet and British proposals should be examined in the first instance by the Ten-Power group. We hope that every effort will be made by this body to resolve differences and to evolve an agreed plan embodying the greatest possible measure of controllable disarmament to be implemented in stages. The Members of the United Nations will best be able to evaluate the merits of the stands of the Western Powers and the Soviet Union after the report of the group is transmitted to the Disarmament Commission. At the present time, neither of the two plans has been set forth in such fullness as to enable the First Committee to do more than make observations of a general nature in regard to them, and the views expressed by the parties primarily concerned at this stage.

Even a cursory comparison of the two plans reveals marked progress in the thinking of the two sides, as compared with that reflected in the discussions of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission in 1957. In this respect, the following advances from previous positions must be regarded as significant:

First, the reinstatement of comprehensive disarmament by both sides as the objective of negotiations in the place of partial measures;

Second, the implicit abandonment by the West of its insistence on linking progress in the reduction of armed forces and conventional disarmament to political conditions and to the preliminary solution of certain political problems;

Third, the loosening of the Western ‘package’ proposals making it possible to implement individual measures of disarmament which may be agreed upon without making this dependent upon implementation of other disarmament measures in the whole complex;

Fourth, the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its demand for the renunciation of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons before any start can be made with conventional disarmament;

Fifth, the relegation by the Soviet Union of its demand for the abolition of foreign military bases from priority status to the stage when conventional disarmament is complete. These, we believe, are delimiting forward steps towards the goal of disarmament, whether total or partial.

On the question of an inspection and control system, which must always remain the keystone of the structure, it is not possible at the present moment to say to what degree the respective positions may be expected to converge. The statements of the Soviet representatives on this all important aspect of the problem have been generally construed as implying that a control body is to be established in the third and final phase of disarmament and that complete inspection will be permitted only after major steps in disarmament are already accomplished.

The clarification given by the distinguished Representative of the Soviet Union in his intervention yesterday should dispel our fears that this may in fact be the real thinking of the Soviet Union. He expressed himself in favour of control being commensurate with concrete action on disarmament. We hope we are correct in taking it that the Soviet proposals envisage the effective enforcement of inspection and control over every step of actual disarmament from the first to the last stage. The new emphasis on effective and comprehensive controls, which we find in the Soviet statements, has raised our expectations of a meeting of minds between the great powers on this question which has so far kept them wide apart. Would it be too much to hope that now at last the Soviet Union may be prepared to elaborate, with the same boldness that characterizes its proposals for general and complete disarmament, the responsibilities, functions, rights and powers of the control organ appropriate to each stage of disarmament.

It is only then that all parties will be able to judge whether the controls to be instituted will be real and not illusory.

It will be the task of the Ten-Power Committee to work out comprehensive measures of international inspection and control to be applied to the extent necessary to each phase of an agreed disarmament plan that it may be possible to evolve from the proposals of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd.

We are assured by the Western Powers that they will not take up firm positions in regard to their own proposals without giving time for patient consideration; and that they are prepared to take equal steps together, large or small, toward comprehensive or partial disarmament. The Soviet Union, for its part, has expressed its readiness to consider amendments to its own plan and to discuss other proposals.

This open mindedness augurs well for the forthcoming negotiations. If the spirit of compromise rules the talks, it should not prove an insurmountable task to iron out the differences which remain and integrate the two sets of proposals into a single balanced plan of comprehensive and controlled disarmament, to be implemented by stages in such a manner that at no stage will one side be placed in a situation of relative military advantage over the other—in other words, a plan that would ensure that each step in disarmament will enhance the security of not only of one of the parties, but of all the parties.

As Pakistan is not a member of the Ten-Power group, my delegation would like to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few observations on certain provisions of the Soviet as well as the British proposals.

In respect of the former, my colleague, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Manzur Qadir, stated as follows in his statement to the General Assembly on September 25:

“The record of the disarmament negotiations shows that control system to ensure the complete elimination of stock-piles of nuclear weapons of mass destruction is not yet feasible. If it be true that any kind of inspection which it may be possible to agree upon in this field would leave a margin of error which would expose one side to the risk of evasion by the other, I would seem that the prospects of total disarmament are not nearer than before. In that case, it would be more realistic to proceed to negotiate initially on the basis of comprehensive disarmament outlined to us by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Llyod, last week, The scope of the negotiations could then be enlarged to include complete and general disarmament with the development of techniques to bring the question of hidden nuclear stockpiles within the range of detection and control.”

The United Kingdom plan is based upon the principle that measures of conventional and nuclear disarmament must be related and proceed hand in hand so that when nuclear disarmament deprives the West of its nuclear deterrent, the Soviet Union may not retain its heavy preponderance in conventional armaments. None can take exception to the principle that disarmament measures, whether conventional or nuclear, should be so carried out as not to upset the present military balance between the great powers.

The fact, however, that the Khrushchev proposals do not contemplate restrictions on nuclear arms in the first and second stages and concentrate on the reduction and liquidation of armed forces and conventional armaments should not in the view of my delegation, detract from their merits or be regarded as conflicting with the basic principle of maintaining intact the balance of power while disarmament is taking place. If the side which has the advantage in conventional armaments is willing to forego it, without making this conditional upon the other party giving up its superiority in nuclear weapons, surely such a proposal can in no manner have the effect of altering the balance of strength to the disadvantage of the other party.

For this reason, we consider that the constructive elements in the Khrushchev proposals for the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments should not be lost sight of. They may well hold out the prospect of a substantial measure of real disarmament in the near future.

It was with this hope in mind that the Pakistan Foreign Minister expressed himself as follows on this aspect disarmament in his statement of September 25:

“.....We would venture to suggest that the Ten-Power Committee should make every effort to reach agreement on the reduction of the armed forces and conventional armaments of the great powers and also give consideration to the convening of a special session of the General Assembly within two years to effect a reduction of the standing armies and armaments of all other member states to appropriate levels.”

The Pakistan delegation hopes that the Ten-Power Committee will give consideration to the convening of such a conference.

It was the stand of the Western Powers in the negotiations in 1957 that conventional disarmament cannot be limited in the later stages to the four principal powers, but that other essential states should also accept reduced levels for their forces and armaments We believe that while the relaxation of this position should facilitate the forth coming negotiations between the great powers, the principle of limitation of armed forces and armaments must be made universally applicable so as to include the great as well as the small powers by means of a multilateral convention, which would also ensure that the security of all states parties is thereby not impaired but enhanced in relation to one another.

In regard to the four-year period within which general and complete disarmament is to be carried out, we doubt whether it would be realistic, in the light of past experience, to expect that this kind of disarmament can be carried out in the manner of a crash programme. When, in the case of such peripheral issues as the discontinuance of testing, a whole year has not proved sufficient for the conclusion of an agreement, is it not too much to hope that all those formidable difficulties that lie at the heart of the central problem can be resolved within a period of 4 years. If the Soviet Union can demonstrate its ability to conclude an agreement on the discontinuance of testing before the end of the present session of the General Assembly, our skepticism will yield to rising expectations of attaining the objective of total disarmament within this time limit.

The economic burden of raising military expenditures, in consequence of the arms race, bears heavily on all the peoples of the world. It is having the result of increasing taxes and reducing the percentages of national budgets devoted to health, education and social welfare. Even the two colossi among the great armed Powers must recognize that the inexorable necessity to develop and maintain competing weapons-systems to ensure the operational maturity of one of them at any given moment, and also the means of defense against them ultimately, must lead to mutual bankruptcy and exhaustion.

For many of the smaller nations, the cost of their military establishments is becoming prohibitive, draining away 50 to 60 percent of their annual revenues.

A reduction of armaments is the only hope which these countries have of economic viability and especially those among them which are underdeveloped. They cannot reduce their armaments unless corresponding reductions are made in the military strengths of their neighbors. They do not possess nuclear weapons. For them, therefore, meaningful disarmament connotes a general and universal reduction of conventional armaments so as to release enough of their own economic and financial resources for the purpose of attaining a rate of growth which will carry them forward from their present stage of low productivity to that of the "take off" when economic development tends to become self-generating.

The present rate of flow of foreign assistance from all sources, governmental, private as well as from the international agencies, is inadequate to carry the under-developed countries to this critical stage. The incidence of this assistance is to a large extent purely compensatory, as the terms of trade have moved steeply against underdeveloped countries, mainly because of the fall and fluctuations in the prices of primary commodities. Given their present military expenditures, it would require 3 to 4 times the current rate of annual foreign assistance over the period of a decade to enable them to achieve self-sustaining economics.

Unless general, multilateral and enforceable disarmament is accomplished, the under-developed countries will not acquire the means from either domestic or foreign sources to meet the challenge of the revolution of rising aspirations of their poverty-stricken peoples.

The distinguished Representative of the United States, Mr. Cabot Lodge, has rightly pointed out that if all nations lay down their arms, there must be institutions to preserve international peace and security and promote the rule of law.

A number of delegations have spoken on the means of dealing with the new situation that would emerge following the adoption of a plan of comprehensive disarmament. Among them, the distinguished Representatives of Argentina, Italy, Japan, Netherlands and Greece have made constructive suggestions to prevent aggression, protect small states, safeguard against violations of a disarmament treaty, strengthen the machinery of peaceful settlement of disputes and the International Court of Justice and for these ends, to study the political, legal and constitutional issues concerning the organization of the international community in a world without arms.

The Pakistan delegation welcomes and supports the proposals of the United States that the Disarmament Commission should study the three questions which it has formulated to enable us to meet the challenge of what we hope will be a new era in international relations.

Pakistan has always been a staunch supporter of the concept of an international police force to preserve world peace and security. We have also on several occasions urged that the charter machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes should be strengthened and the scope of compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court enlarged to make our organization a more effective instrument for the attainment of its purposes.

What we are seeking to do on the question of disarmament is without precedent in human history.

“New relationships of forces are reshaping the world. The search is for methods by which nations can accommodate themselves to living with each other in the new and more dangerous world. The achievement of this peaceful accommodation presently is more difficult than the conquest of space.”

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Address to the Second Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on November 11, 1959.

Mr. Chairman,

May I begin by congratulating our distinguished Under Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs, Mr. Philippe de Seynes, for his extremely lucid and penetrating appraisal of the problem of economic development of the under-developed countries.

My delegation has also read with deep interest the report presented by the Secretary-General to the Economic and Social Council, analyzing the various suggestions and proposals made in the United Nations economic bodies during the recent years on topics relating to economic development, such as primary commodities and international commodity trade, the development of resources industrialization, technical assistance, financing, etc. I may say that we find ourselves in general agreement, both with the analysis and the conclusions of the Secretary-General, as well as with the recommendations made by the Economic and Social Council to intensify development efforts.

Mr. Chairman, all these statements and analyses, all the conclusions and recommendations serve to highlight the following broad features of the situation:

- (a) the vast magnitude and complexity of the problem;
- (b) the close inter-dependence of the developed and the under-developed countries in this context; and
- (c) the urgency of finding appropriate solutions to these problems.

I do not propose to embark upon a detailed survey of the factors which go to make up what is undoubtedly a depressing picture of the present economic situation and the even gloomier long-term prospects of under-developed countries. Other speakers before me have no doubt adequately dealt with the subject. Moreover, I understand that this Committee is working against time. I would, therefore, confine myself to a few observations emphasizing the urgency of finding solutions to our problems.

Mr. Chairman, no one who has taken a moderately intelligent interest in the contemporary history of the post-war years can fail to recognize the vital role that the under-developed countries have come to play in the complex of international relations. This importance is not due only to the fact that an overwhelmingly large percentage of the world's population lives in these areas, nor even because they form the majority of membership in this great world organization, but mainly because they represent enormous "Power vacuums". When rival economic systems are advertising their wares, these vast populations stand fascinated and expectant at the threshold of a glorious tomorrow, but they also

stand extremely perplexed. In this posture, one false step from any one of them and the world could be plunged into devastating conflict.

It is true that at present the statesmen of the leading nations are striving to bring about a relaxation of tension by limiting armaments. This must not, however, be allowed to fall us into a false sense of security, for, disarmament, even if it should be achieved, will not by itself remove the deeper causes of war. One of the root causes of war is the economic disequilibrium in the world. We think that as long as these dangerous vacuums of power, these yawning chasms of grinding poverty, ill-health and ignorance remain unabridged, all hopes of a lasting peace in our times must prove chimerical. And, be it noted that while these negotiations go on, time will not be standing still in the under-developed countries. If things do not go forward, they must go backwards; such is the inexorable law of life. Strong and compelling pressures are constantly building up within these countries for better or for worse, pressures which will not be resisted for long. During the last 18 months, a number of regimes in Asia and Africa, including that in my country, have been swept away because they were not able to respond effectively to these pressures. The weak and fumbling regimes have been replaced by politically strong and stable ones which appear to be well equipped for setting the course of these countries on the right track. For example, my country's government has, within a very short period of time, launched a number of far-reaching programmes of reform and has already succeeded in reshaping the pattern of our internal political, economic and social life. We are determined to overcome all obstacles in our way to progress so far as it lies in our power. But there are things which do not lie in our power. Among them the most important are the international economic forces. They are beyond our control and yet they have a most powerful impact on the lives of each one of us. If these economic forces continue to act unfavorably, people in these countries may well begin asking themselves the question; "What next?" And who, Mr. Chairman, can answer it today.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us look at these problems a little more closely. A basic problem of economic development of the underdeveloped countries is that of finding adequate investment. The rate of domestic savings is too low and even what there is, is swallowed up by the enormous rate of population increase. The introduction of measures to control growth of population in itself requires considerable investment in raising educational as well as general standards of living. Here we come face to face with one of the several vicious circles with which our problem is hemmed in. To break it we need international assistance and, indeed, this has been forthcoming in generous measure, both bilaterally and multi-laterally. Nevertheless, the problem still remains. The role of the United Nations is to devise effective measures to combat whatever may be obstructing the realization of our aims.

As my delegation sees it, the central problem of under-developed countries can be examined in three different aspects, as, indeed, it has been in

the past. First, we must ask ourselves if the means at present available to finance economic development are sufficient, and, if not, to find out more effective ways and means of increasing international flow of private and public capital to under-developed countries. Secondly, there is the question of adequacy or otherwise of means to make available the necessary measure of technical assistance to these countries in order to raise the low level of the skills of the population. Lastly, there is the paradoxical problem created by the dependence of under-developed countries on exports of primary commodities, the prices of which have not only fallen but fluctuated widely, while the prices of industrial manufactures have continued to rise steadily.

With regard to the availability of finance, Mr. Chairman, my delegation is happy to note that a new multilateral organization, the International Development Association, is being brought into being shortly as an adjunct of the International Bank. We believe that this new institution with its programme of "soft" loans will fill a much needed place in the existing pattern of international assistance programmes. It is, however, too early to form any definite assessment of its scope of activities. Judging from the initial proposed capital it seems that the loans to be given by the International development Association would go only part of the way in meeting the needs of the under-developed countries. For this reason my delegation feels that there is still a place for a United Nation Capital Development Fund, the creation of which we have always supported. Apart from certain inherent psychological advantages that a universal Fund of this kind, operated under the aegis of the United Nations, possesses, my delegation feels that it would enable those nations to make their contribution to international economic co-operation which, for reasons of policy or scruple, do not find themselves able to participate in the newly formed International Development Association.

The situation of the flow of private international investment into the under-developed countries remains unsatisfactory despite the fact that most of the countries concerned have considerably liberalized their fiscal and industrial policies to make them more attractive to foreign investors. My own country, for example, has provided several new incentives and facilities for foreign investors. One of the important concessions is that participation of local capital in any fixed proportion is no longer insisted upon. Bilateral agreements for avoidance of double income-tax have been concluded with many countries. The mining industry has been granted a special tax relief. An Investment Promotion Bureau has been set up by the Central Government with branches in both the Provinces for providing the fullest possible information and assistance to foreign investors.

My delegation is also pleased to note that in the last few years significant progress has been made in the sphere of rendering technical assistance to the under-developed countries, both as regards the availability of funds and the improvements of institutional machinery for international action. It is needless to stress how desperately the under-developed countries stand in need of

industrialization. Whatever brings this objective nearer to realization is worthy of our whole-hearted support. The recently created United Nations Special Fund has been rightly described as “a strategic break-through of incomparable significance” for economic development. It has an important role to play, especially in infra-structure improvements and in building up the capacity for absorption for capital in the under-developed countries. Equally gratifying has been the role played in the last few years by the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance. It must, however, be stated that the availability of funds for both the Special Fund and Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance falls short of the minimum needs.

This, Mr. Chairman, brings me to the last and in the view of my delegation, the most important aspect of all, namely, that relating to the instability of commodity prices. For, upon a satisfactory solution of this problem depends our most reliable and effective instrument of economic development, namely, the capacity of the under-developed countries themselves to contribute to their own development. No lasting success can be achieved in the field of economic growth unless and until, as the report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has pointed out, the under-developed countries are enabled to mobilize their own capital resources. In any case, we cannot go on relying indefinitely upon international assistance as a permanent feature of our economic life.

The capacity of the under-developed countries to contribute to their own development depends largely on their export earnings as the plant and machinery and the technical facilities required for the purpose of development have to be imported from industrialized countries. The under-developed countries have, under the present circumstances, to rely on the sale of their primary commodities for their export earnings. It is a matter of considerable concern to us that the returns on the sale abroad of primary commodities have diminished very considerably over the last several years. This fact has been brought out emphatically in almost every survey of world economic conditions. I shall limit myself to inviting attention, by way of illustration, to the fact that the fall in the price index of primary commodities in the course of one single year from mid-1957 to mid-1958 has reduced export earnings of the under-developed countries by about 8% representing a loss in their import capacity equivalent to about six years' loans to them by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development at the 1956-57 levels. It may also be pertinent to mention here that in the case of my own country, the total financial aid which we have received from different sources up until now, has been less than half of the total loss which we have suffered on account of the fall in the price of our primary commodities.

The situation created by the wide-spread decline in the price of primary commodities has been aggravated by a rise in the price of manufactured goods thus reducing still further the ability of the under-developed countries to procure the means of their economic progress. This again is a phenomenon well

recognized in all economic appraisals. Every under developed country must have felt the frustrating consequences of the combination of these two vital economic factors on their efforts to improve the standards of their people. In Pakistan, the purchasing power of the export value of our primary commodities is today a little less than 50% of what it was in 1948 and 1949.

May I, Mr. Chairman add that the future as one can see it today does not hold prospects of any improvement in the present situation. All trends indicate that the cost of manufactured goods in the industrialized countries will, mainly because of the wage increases and other social benefits, continue to rise, that the manufacture of substitutes will continue to reduce the demand for primary commodities and that the demand of the under-developed countries for manufactured goods, in order to increase their production of primary commodities and industrial products in keeping with the increase in population, will continue to rise. These premises cannot but lead to the widening of the gap between the standards of living of the people of the under-developed countries and those of the industrialized countries. The extremity of such consequences can be judged from the estimate that even today, no less than 1,362 million inhabitants out of a total of 1,800 million, living in under-developed countries, have a per capita income of \$8 per month as compared to the \$9 per day in the highly industrialized countries.

It is gratifying to observe that the acuteness and magnitude of the problem has been well appreciated by the various bodies dealing with economic problems under the aegis of the United Nations. The Commission on International Commodity Trade and the Interim Co-coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements have undertaken studies on the subject. Recommendations have been made that the industrialized countries should abolish import duties on primary commodities and do away with all protective measures and import restrictions with regard to primary commodities. My delegation fully supports these recommendations. It has been suggested that the best approach to solve the problem is by way of dealing with each commodity separately and through bilateral agreements between exporting and importing countries. The setting up of buffer stocks has also been considered as a measure conducive to stabilization of prices. These are no doubt useful suggestions but experience has shown that, by themselves, these measures cannot provide the answer to the rapidly deteriorating situation confronting us.

In the opinion of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, it is essential that the problem must be faced in its entirety and with a sense of urgency that the circumstances call for. A thorough analysis should be made of the causes that affect the return to the producer of primary commodities. Remedial measures would necessarily have to be of a short term and a long term character. It will be essential to introduce, with the minimum loss of time, a diversification in the production of under-developed countries. The achievement of this end calls for considerable foreign exchange resources to be available to those countries.

While we search for long-term solutions, it is of the greatest importance that we should find immediate means of enabling the under-developed countries to sustain their economic progress at some reasonable level. Such resources are, as I have brought out earlier, being depleted by the adverse balance in terms of trade of the under-developed countries. My delegation is of the view that the serious situation facing us demands the creation of a Compensatory Fund to counter-balance the short-fall in the earnings of the primary producers *vis-à-vis* the industrial countries. We visualize that disbursements from such a fund would be limited to extreme fluctuations of prices so as not to disturb the ordinary pattern of international trade with its normal margins of fluctuations. Necessary precautions will also need to be incorporated in the rules of administration of the fund to ensure that the scheme of compensation does not encourage un-economic production in countries exporting primary commodities.

May I add that the proposal now made is not altogether a new one. It only seeks to give definite shape to an idea which has been examined and supported by economic experts. The committee of five experts appointed by the Secretary-General under General Assembly Resolution 623 (vii) to consider Commodity Trade and Economic Development gave careful thought to the possibility of introducing automatic financial compensation schemes to correct extraordinary fluctuations in terms of trade. They considered that there were merits, but also difficulties and shortcomings in such a scheme and recommended finally, and I quote –“However, should nations prove unable to agree on their arrangements for moderating either the excessive fluctuations of prices and incomes or the ill consequences of these fluctuations, then they might do well to take a second look at automatic compensatory schemes.” Mr. Chairman my delegation is convinced that the ill consequences of the fluctuations have reached a degree which calls for the immediate consideration of the compensatory scheme.

We find that this specific aspect of the problem has also been brought up in the discussions of the 7th Session of the Commission on International Commodity Trade. The report of the Session states and I quote –“ The Commission agreed to consider at its 8th Session international measures designed to compensate for fluctuations in foreign exchange receipts from the export of primary commodities, in this connection the Commission recommends that the International Monetary Fund be invited to inform the Commission about its policies and procedures as they bear on the subject under consideration.”

My delegation is of the view that the consideration of a compensatory fund of the nature proposed calls for urgent examination by a committee of experts in consultation with the countries producing primary commodities and those which are the principal importers of such commodities. Further, the association of the International Monetary Fund and the Food and Agriculture Organization with the examination of this problem would, we feel, be invaluable and should be secured. The Committee should be required to submit its report in time for discussion at the next session of the General Assembly.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, may I say how fully my delegation subscribes to the views expressed by our distinguished Secretary-General in the statement he made on July 6, 1959, before the Economic and Social Council on the problem of commodity instability. I quote: “while I recognize the acute difficulties in this field. I cannot help wondering whether we have really exhausted all our intellectual and moral resources in trying to find a more broadly based solution to the problem than has thus far emerged. It is, perhaps, at least worth considering whether a new approach might be made towards some such solution.....For the longer run ahead, are we sure that there is a sufficient awareness of the problems and frustrations which are building up progressively in the under-developed countries as their peoples grow more and more conscious of the fact that time is slipping away from them? Can we rest content with the fact that all the efforts of recent years –and I do not under-estimate them –have still not sufficed prevent to the gap between rich and poor countries from continuing to increase. There is a widespread feeling in the under-developed countries of the need for some new breakthrough on the road to economic development” unquote.

I submit that the proposal formulated by my delegation is in line with this thinking and I commend it for your acceptance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Address to the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 29, 1960

Mr. President,

Your election to preside over this historic session bears eloquent testimony to your eminence among the representatives to the United Nations. It is recognition of your personal merits and acknowledged experience in the affairs of the organization.

Sir, to use the language of hyperbole, may I say, in the words of a Persian poet, that stars looking from the firmament into this Assembly might feel a little envious of the scintillating galaxy gathered here. The great men, who have come from the East and the West, personify the might and the majesty of the countries they represent. They are here today with a single purpose; to find a solution to the problems of this troubled world; and while they are here mankind waits in breathless suspense. Some of them are armed with the awesome power of life and death over the human race, but we believe that they have come to the United Nations in quest to find means of living together in peace with one another in a world free from fear and free from want.

This year and this session will remain famous in history because of the presence of many African nations, who have won freedom and have been admitted to the United Nations. That great continent which was called dark but on which the light of freedom now shines, is free to bring its youth and its vigor to the service of its peoples. For many generations, the African were held in bondage. Today they are free, and are here with us as equals to discuss and resolve the problems facing humanity.

May I mention here that I have been instructed by President Mohammad Ayub Khan to extend to our African comrades his warm personal greetings. Now that the chains of political subjection, theirs and ours, have been broken, we look forward sincerely to close relations with the African states. Despite the long distances between us, there are historical ties of faith and culture between the teeming peoples of Africa and Pakistan. These bonds transcend distances and differences of custom and language.

Sir, we have gathered here from all parts of the world –all seeking one paramount objective –PEACE. We had hoped that the great nations of the world, who have conquered space, would teach us here to conquer our passions and our vanities so that we may live in peace without fear. Though but a few days have passed since we came full of hope, we already witness disillusionment. We had thought that it was a manifestation of the new strength of the United Nations that great nations, who among themselves commanded the strength to destroy, had come here to ensure peace. But to our dismay, we find that this great house

of peace, to which are committed the aspirations of all nations, has itself become a target of attack. This can only bring disappointment to us all, who look to the United Nations as the instrument which man has forged to control his ambitions and his anger.

The course of world affairs over the last decade has demonstrated the fact that while at critical times the great powers dispense with the United Nations in both aggravating and easing their tensions, it is the smaller countries, the defenseless ones, that stand in dire need of this organization in order to shield themselves from the dangers of power politics and in moderating the policies of the great powers.

Mr. President, it has been said of great historical figures that they wade across the world to make an epoch, bless, confuse or appal.

What kind of epoch are we about to make? Have we come here to bless or to appal?

The peoples of the world live under a perpetual terror of annihilation. In a matter of minutes, cities can be destroyed and the countryside laid waste by means which neither the imagination nor the cruelty of Attila or of Genghiz Khan could have conceived. We do not believe that any of the nuclear powers at present would deliberately launch a war of extermination. But the possibilities of miscalculation, mistake or accident, which may unleash such a calamity cannot be precluded. For 15 years the great powers have talked of disarmament, but with what result? Not a single division has been disbanded nor a single tank destroyed by agreement. There has been some reduction of armed forces and presumably of some armaments. But these reductions have taken place by unilateral action, not by agreement. There is, therefore, nothing to prevent their unilateral increase.

In securing the peace of the world through disarmament, undoubtedly the end is more important than the means. Barely 12 months ago, we discussed disarmament in this assembly in an atmosphere radiating with hope. But, unfortunately, the summit conference which followed it failed and the storms which gathered there overtook the Ten-Nation Committee.

Despite a measure of rapprochement between the two sides in the negotiations in the Ten-Nation Committee, the objective of general and complete disarmament remains distant so long as fundamental differences between them are not resolved. Two of the main difficulties relate to inspection measures. The first pertains to control –not control over what is to be reduced, on which agreement in principle has been reached –but over the verification of armed forces and armaments either before or after reduction in each stage. The second relates to the technical difficulties of ensuring by inspection that no undeclared stocks of nuclear weapons are concealed.

It is admitted on both sides that such hidden stockpiles cannot be discovered by any means now known to either side. We note the Soviet contention that with the implementation of general and complete disarmament, the difficulties of control, including verification of undeclared stockpiles will disappear because all means of delivering them to their targets will have been eliminated. We need a fuller and a more convincing explanation of this thesis before it can be accepted as an adequate answer to the formidable difficulties which have supervened in the way of the total elimination of nuclear weapons under effective international control.

The Pakistan delegation welcomes the pledge the Chairman of the Council of Minister of the U.S.S.R., in his statement last Friday, to resume negotiations with the Western Powers who have been waiting for this positive response since last June. We note that the document circulated by the Soviet delegation entitled "Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" revises in one important respect the Soviet plan of June 2. It is now proposed that the armed forces and conventional armaments, of the United States and of the Soviet Union, should be reduced in the first stage to a figure of 1.7 million and of the other states to fixed levels. Conventional armaments thus released are to be destroyed and military expenditures of states to be correspondingly reduced.

It is the view of my delegation that if obstacles to general and complete disarmament cannot be eliminated immediately, there is no reason why some partial disarmament measures should not be undertaken now. A specific task of the General Assembly at this session should be to bring about an agreement in principle between the East and the West on the reduction in the levels of the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union to a figure between 2.5 and 1.7 million as well as the reduction of conventional armaments to related levels and the eliminations of stocks thus released. This agreement in principle should be followed by negotiations to fix the levels of forces and armaments of the other great powers. If this should come to pass, the prospect of a real measure of immediate world—wide disarmament under international control will unfold itself.

In addition to a real measure of conventional disarmament, the respective proposals of the Western and the Eastern powers encourage us to believe that other initial measures are also possible in the immediate future.

It cannot be expected that all these intricate questions of substance can be resolved by the General Assembly. That is why a negotiating committee was established by the Foreign Ministers of the four great powers in September 1959. Many distinguished representatives have referred to the constitution of this committee. At present it has 5 members each, from the Western and Eastern powers. It has been suggested that the committee be expanded to include other

interest as well. We agree to all this, but in our view, what is more important is the immediate resumption of negotiations.

May I, at this stage, Mr. President, touch upon a related question. It is a matter of regret that despite two years of negotiations, no agreement has been reached to halt test explosions of nuclear and thermo nuclear weapons. We would appeal to the parties concerned, with all the emphasis at our command, that they reach immediate agreement to stop such tests in order that the present uncertain voluntary moratorium is replaced by a mandatory prohibition under effective international control.

In a search for general and complete disarmament, it is not possible to ignore a study of the United Nations Organization with a view to determining how its machinery can best be developed in support of disarmament. If general and complete disarmament is achieved, the special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, as reflected in Article 27, Paragraph 3 of the Charter pertaining to the right of veto, will have withered away. The principle of sovereign equality of all states, large and small, will then be freed from the anomaly and contradiction imposed by the power of veto.

We have always been in favor of restricting the use of the right of veto as far as possible, as it is against the spirit of the Charter. We are, therefore, constrained to express our regret that at a time when its elimination is being foreseen, suggestions should be made to extend its scope to the administrative agency of the United Nations.

The Charter of the United Nations supplements the rules of general international law. By outlawing war, the use or threat of force, and enjoining the settlement of disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the principles of justice and international law, the Charter establishes its supremacy. The International Law Commission, in the report of its second session, enunciated the proposition that in the light of the rules of general international law read together with the provisions of the Charter, the sovereignty of a state is subject to the supremacy of international law. In their actual international conduct however, many member states of this organization have shown themselves unwilling to strengthen the rule of law by failing to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Pakistan, this year, has submitted a revised declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court to include all cases, other than those which under international law fall essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of a state. It has thereby surrendered its sovereign right to determine for itself whether or not a particular matter is essentially within its domestic jurisdiction and has solemnly declared in advance that, should such a question arise, it would be content to accept a determination made in accordance with the rules of

international law. Pakistan has thus demonstrated in tangible terms its willingness to subordinate its sovereignty to the supremacy of international law.

Under conditions of general and complete disarmament, the supremacy of international law must be proclaimed an imperative of international conduct. Looking towards this evolution in international life, the time has come to pursue with a greater sense of urgency, the task of codification of international law and its progressive development, envisaged in Article 13, Paragraph 1(a) of the Charter. Thought must also be given to the need to amend the statute of the International Court of Justice to extend the scope of its jurisdiction to all matters to be provided for in a treaty on general and complete disarmament and to make Article 36 relating to the declaration on compulsory jurisdiction, applicable to all legal disputes arising from the treaty for the duration of its validity.

The economic development of under-developed countries poses a challenge of the highest magnitude to all the nations of the world. Both, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev, expressed great solicitude for the welfare and economic progress of these countries. And we, the people of the under-developed countries, note this with profound satisfaction.

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. referred to the economic development of the Central Asian Republics. We are conscious of the great development which, in the course of the last 40 years, has placed the U.S.S.R. in the forefront of scientific and technological progress. The countries of Asia, too, have tirelessly endeavored within their limited resources to improve the conditions of their peoples.

Despite our meager resources, the pace of our development has been significant and this represents, by and large, the voluntary sacrifices of our people. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union cited a few statistics relating to some under-developed countries, including my own, to highlight the contrast in the economic progress between the Central Asian Republics and their neighboring countries. For example, he mentioned the low rate of electric generation per capita as an illustration of our primitive economy. It is true that the position is as suggested by the statistics. The only point that I may mention is that the present generation of power in Pakistan is more than 700% of what it was when we became independent a few years ago. In the same context, I would like to repeat that despite our limitations, and our meager resources, we have achieved substantial progress.

Since independence, our industrial production has risen by approximately 400% and during the last two years by about 70%. But, by far the most, significant change brought about in the wake of the revolution in October, 1958, has been the radical land reforms, which have not only brought about social justice and the promise of better future for the tillers of the soil who constitute 85% of our population, but have also changed the pattern of our society. They

have given a sense of self-respect and dignity to our masses who before this revolutionary change were crushed under the burden of an iniquitous and effect social system. These are great changes and our people see before them the dawn of a better life. Their energies have been mobilized for the good of the common weal.

My country has received generous aid from the United States of America. We have made good use of this assistance and there is in evidence a considerable degree of improvement in the infrastructure of our economy on which to base our future development. We acknowledge with gratitude this assistance; but at the same time, we have been a victim, like many other under-developed countries, of the harsh and unrelenting interplay of international market forces. During the last many years, the terms of trade have moved progressively against the primary producing countries. In fact, the position is that we have lost much more in trade than we have gained by aid. There is no co-ordination of policies amongst the primary producers, and they suffer from their disjointed state. On the other hand, much of Europe, for instance, is becoming increasingly a closed community, which gives it great economic and commercial advantage. The future is grim indeed for the under-developed countries, for their dependence on foreign aid is likely to increase rather than diminish in the immediate future. This deterioration, in the economic conditions of African, Asian and Latin-American countries, which depend so heavily and so exclusively on the export of a few primary commodities, is a subject which should become of paramount importance to the Secretariat.

During the 15 years of the existence of the United Nations, the economic and social picture of the world has become increasingly a study in contrast. The appalling poverty and misery of some parts of the world stand out in sharp outline against the abundance and opulence of other parts of this same world. An average annual income in the under-developed countries of approximately \$120 per person is to be contrasted with an average income in the more advanced countries of \$800 per capita. According to another estimate, the majority of the inhabitants of the under-developed countries subsists on an income of only \$8 per month as against \$9 per day in the most highly developed countries.

There are two aspects of this difference in the standards of living which are of crucial importance to the world today. Firstly, that the disparity is not only great but growing; and secondly, that the peoples of the under-developed countries, living so long at levels of bare survival, are no longer prepared to accept such conditions of life as immutable. A revolution of rising expectations is sweeping through these countries. Fatalism and resignation have given way to expectation and demand.

The under-developed countries are in a predicament. Despite all the sacrifices and austerity of which their peoples are capable, the march forward is only nominal because of the simultaneous slide-back of trade. It was hoped that

their political emancipation would lead to economic development. But, unfortunately, so far the odds have been heavily against them. I have already mentioned the change in the terms of trade against the under-developed countries which means in effect that the improvement in the standards of living of the manufacturing countries has in a large measure taken place at the cost of starving people of the backward nations. Would it not be an act of historic justice if some restitution were made in the present for the wealth which flowed in the past from these countries to enrich the economics of those which are now so industrially advanced?

Mr. President, I have gone into some detail about economic matters only because they pose serious problems for a large part of humanity.

To sum up briefly, our position is; because of the declining terms of trade all that we are able to do despite our best efforts and sacrifices is to reduce the pace of retrogression. Unless this decline producing countries will always have to depend on foreign assistance even to maintain their present level of living.

Turning to political problems, may I say, Mr. President that the situation in the Congo continues to cause concern to all of us. The threat of unilateral intervention by the great powers in the countries of Africa and the consequent danger to peace in the African continent has not been removed. If Africa is to be saved from becoming an arena of conflict between the East and the East, it is imperative for the United Nations to play a positive and impartial role. We believe that as far as possible the Secretary-General has endeavored to scrupulously comply with the spirit and the letter of the resolutions of the Security Council. However, considering the magnitude and the complexity of the task and the speed with which the United Nations operation had to be launched, Mr. Hammarskjöld and his associates must be considered to have faithfully carried out their difficult mandate in accordance with the basic principles endorsed by the Security Council. The Pakistan delegation recognizes that the Secretary-General's mission is an extremely delicate one and has not been made any easier by the internal confusion in the Republic of the Congo. Therefore, we take this opportunity reaffirming our confidence in the Secretary-General's integrity. It would appear to my delegation that at present the main problem in the Congo is the prevalence of internal strife which is unhappily preventing the restoration of normal conditions. The resolution adopted at the emergency session does envisage the appointment of an Advisory Committee on the Congo in consultation with the Secretary-General, consisting of Asian-African representatives for the purpose of conciliation between the parties to the political and constitutional conflicts. In the furtherance of this objective, the African states must of necessity play a leading role. Thus the mandate given to the Secretary-General can well be supplemented by the good offices of the African states in the solution of the internal problems of the Republic of the Congo. Whatever might have been the changes in the situation and the conflicts of interest, it was the general expectation that United Nations operation would crystallize the positive

role that the organization could play in strengthening the independence of emerging nations against external pressures.

Mr. President, my delegation believes that the isolation of the African continent from the East-West conflict must be ensured by the Africans themselves and supplemented by the assistance of the United Nations whenever necessary. It cannot be done by the United Nations alone because the organization itself is often a center of this conflict. It may not always be capable of adequately filling a vacuum. Therefore, the principal action on the African scene must be the Africans themselves, and in our opinion they are capable of answering their own destiny. That great continent is pulsating with a new life and a new force. It is in transition from the old to the new. Colonial empires are being succeeded by community of sovereign states, conscious of their solidarity and determined to give Africa its rightful place in the comity of nations. We have heard in this hall the voices of free Africa and seen the passion in African hearts for peace and justice and their determination to exclude outside interference in the affairs of their continent.

Mr. President, it is a matter of sorrow that great nations and statesmen should not see the logical sequence of events as they must ensure. Events carry with them the seeds of consequences and like nemesis, they are inexorable. Prejudice and chauvinism make men myopic. In this world of turmoil and conflict, the heart of humanity is yet with the peoples struggling for freedom and equality. One may delay the deliverance of a people but then, nature extorts a high price for it, as in the Congo. It may also do so in the Union of South Africa where racial discrimination is rampant. As one who is aware of liberal political thought, I am appalled that in a country which claims to be civilized and Christian, human beings should be denied basic human rights because of their race and color.

The Sharpsville disturbances underline the serious nature of the situation prevailing in the Union of South Africa. They made it very plain that unless the situation improves, conditions would deteriorate to an explosive point. The General Assembly has adopted resolutions for many years asking the Union Government to cease and desist from its discriminatory racial policy. The South African government has so far ignored the appeal to reason. In a continent which is now free and in the midst of peoples determined to make good their claim to equality, South Africa cannot remain isolated. To attempt to do so is to oppose the march of history. The future generations of South Africa may have to pay a very heavy price for the resentment and rancor that the apartheid policy of that country is creating around her.

Mr. President, nothing in this world is quite perfect and it would be futile to expect perfection in an organization which combines the attributes and characteristics of almost all the nations of the world. Looking at the performance of the United Nations from the darker side, one would be inclined to stress the failures, the unsettled problems, the unattained objectives, the Lopes unfulfilled,

the promises unrealized. There are catenas of them, but life must be measured not only by failures but also by accomplishments. We can mention grave failures where peoples have been denied their rights because political expediency has prevailed over the conscience of nations. I shall not dilate on them, for, despite their tragic remembrance, we still have faith that right must prevail and the United Nations must succeed. In this context, amongst the other vital unresolved issues, I have Algeria in mind –that strife-torn land where the blood of patriots still flows in their fight for freedom. Is it not an irony of fate that that struggle should have to be won against a nation which through history has been identified with liberty and equality?

At the opening of the General Assembly last year, we welcomed the declaration of President de Gaulle recognizing the right of self-determination for the people of Algeria. We regret that no significant development has since taken place which would translate that inalienable right into a reality. At one time there appeared a prospect of a rapprochement between Algeria and France, but the preliminary talks to arrange the pourparlers have failed. Let me declare here that the sympathies of the people of Pakistan are with the valiant sons of Algeria, fighting heroically for their freedom. At, at time when so many countries on the continent of Africa are taking their place in this Assembly, it is with great sorrow that we note the absence of Algeria. We appeal for a new effort on the part of the parties concerned to settle this human problem by peaceful means. If we succeed, a tragic chapter will close in history, and to the brave people of Algeria will be brought peace and the freedom and dignity for which they have fought so long and so well.

Another problem which haunts the conscience of nations is the negation of justice to that part of the Arab nation which comprises the population of Palestine. The failure to solve the Palestine question has kept the Middle East for all these years on the verge of conflagration. It has been suggested that the tension in the Middle East should be removed by the dictates of realism. In the view of my delegation the only realistic approach in this case is to recognize the human rights of a million Arab refugees who have been uprooted from their homes. Unless the resolutions of the General Assembly on this question are implemented, no arrangements to enforce peace in the Middle East by outside powers are likely to be effective or lasting.

The solution of the problems to which I have referred is, without doubt, difficult and seemingly insurmountable. But they have to be solved and solved by peaceful means. The principle of the peaceful settlement of international disputes is a cardinal feature of the foreign policy of Pakistan. Only a few days ago, our firm faith in peaceful procedures was indicated when we resolved our dispute with India over the distribution of the waters of the Indus Basin. This dispute, which had defied solution for almost as many years as the existence of Pakistan, has ended by the signing of the Indus Waters Treaty. The conclusion of this Treaty demonstrates the triumph of the procedures of peaceful settlement. We

are hopeful, Mr. President, that this initiative for peace will be extended now to the only grave issue still outstanding between India and Pakistan, namely the Kashmir Question. It is our most earnest hope that this noble precedent will give rise to a new spirit in the relations between Pakistan and India, and lead to a settlement of this problem of problems of our vast region.

Mr. President, we have always believed that every people and every nation must be permitted to live according to its own way of life, which reflects its accumulated national heritage. In fact it represents an accretion of history. We, the 90 million people of Pakistan, claim to pattern our lives on the precepts of Islam. After all our turmoil's and tribulations we now have a leader in whom the people of our country have reposed their hopes and their faith. He firmly believes in promoting fraternal relations between the peoples of Asia and Africa, and to that end he has directed his efforts in a most positive and constructive way. Under his inspiring leadership Pakistan is engaged in a great political experiment known as "Basic Democracies". The objective of this political system is to foster and encourage the creative urges of our people.

The system of Basic Democracies is an attempt to evolve a political framework related to the conditions in the country, in conformity with our requirements and suited to the genius of our people. The system enables the people of Pakistan to be associated in the activities of government through their elected representatives at every level of the administration beginning from the village and culminating at the center of the highest functions of the state. Our objective in Pakistan is not to imitate systems of policy which have evolved in the altogether different historical circumstances of other countries. Our aim is to institute a system which would be rooted in the experience of our own people and would enable them to reorient their whole outlook regarding their collective welfare. We believe that our system of Basic Democracies is the answer to our needs and perhaps a guideline for other peoples placed in situations similar to us.

Mr. President, it has been said that hope builds sooner than knowledge destroys, and thus, despite the many buffets of fortune and the fluctuations in international relations, mankind has subsisted on hope, hope for a world free from humiliating poverty and degrading fear. The progress of science has opened majestic vistas of new worlds. That, while there is the infinity of space to be explored and conquered, those in whose hands lies the knowledge and the means to do so, are engaged in internecine struggle, creates new fears every day. The problem of poverty remains unsolved. There are hundreds of millions of men from birth to the grave who live an existence of privation and insecurity. May we not hope that these problems may be dealt with as the primary ones and that the phantom of armed conflicts and nuclear annihilation will be exercised from the world so- beautiful and full of such great opportunities of happiness.

The Charter enjoins us not only to save ourselves but also succeeding generation from the carnage³ of war. It has often been said that in the event of a world conflagration, there will be neither victor nor vanquished. This seems obvious but even if there be a sham victor, his victory will be that of the dying over the dead, his thrill, the dubious one of a glory in the utter demolition of civilization, the destruction of its culture, of its universities, of its institutions for art and science, of its mosques and temples and churches. It will be in this scene that the victor too shall pass into nothingness.

We have the opportunity, and the means to avert this catastrophe and to realize mankind's dream of progress towards a future unbelievable at the present time. Shall we also have the will and the courage? We have the means because we are now told that according to the correct interpretation of Marxism-Leninism war between the two social systems is not inevitable. But those who witness the arms race between the East and the West cannot but be burdened by the fear that unless it is immediately halted and the trend reversed, war is inevitable. A race in armaments has never ushered peace. It has ever brought the sword. To one who can contemplate the terrestrial scene, with deep insight into the march of history, it would seem that a blind fate is moving us towards self-destruction. Is it that an imminent and blind will rules our affairs, driving us to inevitable doom? May it be given to the great men who take part in this Assembly, to prove that it is otherwise, that mankind does have a freedom of choice and that peace and war in this age of glorious opportunity and mortal peril are not predetermined but hinge upon the exercise of man's free will and his determination to avert the ultimate tragedy.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Address to the Second Committee of the Fifteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on October 14, 1960.

Mr. Chairman,

May I first of all offer to you the congratulations of my delegation on your election as the Chairman of this Committee. We are confident that under your wise guidance this Committee will be able to maintain, if not enhance, its past record of constructive achievement. We also extend our good wishes to Mr. Rao and to Mr. Ahmad on their election as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

My delegation has listened with great interest to the statement made before this Committee by the Under-Secretary for Economic and Social Affairs. Mr. De Seynes has drawn attention to the most striking feature of the current world economic situation, the wide and continuing discrepancy in the rate and trend of economic development between the industrialized and the under-developed countries. The value of the net national product at factor cost of 16 developed countries stands, as of this year, nearly 300% higher than share of about 60 other countries and territories. This situation is reflected in the wide, and what is more tragic, a growing difference in the standards of living of the peoples inhabiting different parts of this same world. The 100 under-developed countries and territories, comprising about 2/3rds of the total population of the globe, have an average annual per capita income of approximately \$ 120. The average is less than \$ 70 in my own country, as in several others. What these figures signify in terms of human needs can be realized only if we place them in the perspective of the average per capita income of the more fortunate countries—more than \$ 2,000 in the United States, \$ 875 in Britain and the Scandinavian countries, and \$ 550 in the USSR.

These differences, Mr. Chairman, tell a story of human misery which the world of today can no longer afford to ignore. Modern communications have reduced distance to proximity: lands which were once distant have become virtual neighbors. No country can now live in isolation or insulate itself against the tensions and forces that originate in the rest of the world.

The fact that the world has become one, not only in terms of distance, but also in the dissemination of ideas, has had several consequences. For one thing, the peoples of the under-developed countries no longer accept poverty as a part of inexorable destiny. On one hand they have reached the very edges of starvation; on the other they are today exposed to the ideas and aspirations of peoples who live in the more developed countries. New vistas have opened up before them giving shape to their suppressed longings. The age of despair imposed on them for so long by colonial rule and domination has given way to an age of expectation and demand. This phenomenon presents a unique

opportunity and a great danger. It could be harnessed to the accomplishment of the great constructive tasks that face less developed countries. On the other hand, if the economic gulf between the advanced and the under-developed countries keeps steadily widening as at present, the resultant frustrations could only heighten world tensions. We are living in times when conflict, ideologies, - economic no less than political –are competing for the allegiance of man. It is a matter of concern to us that the challenge implicit in this situation, so pregnant with peril has not as yet received that wide understanding and acceptance which is its due.

The growing oneness of the world has also made it abundantly clear that there is no fundamental conflict or dichotomy between the economic development of the under developed countries and the prosperity and well being of the industrialized countries. One is essentially a function of the other. The context of economic growth provides the most effective and consistent framework for the harmonization of economic policies. The development of the backward areas of the world would undoubtedly raise the levels of living everywhere, increase demand, develop trade, and in general help the international economy to reach a higher level. The so-called structural changes in industry, of which we have heard so much recently, have already been completed in most of the Western countries. In fact, the imports of the under-developed countries have consistently exceeded their exports since the end of the Korean War, and they have almost all been forced to draw heavily on their external reserves. These reserves were at best but small and, if a balance at a higher level is to be achieved, the resources and, therefore, the productive capacity of the under-developed countries must be raised in proportion.

The Ministerial level meetings of the Economic and Social Council held last summer in Geneva have served to emphasize the economic interdependence of the world. What is essential, in the opinion of my delegation, is the promotion of a sense of international responsibility for raising the levels of living in under-developed countries, and the adoption of a global approach to the problems of economic growth and dynamics. Without the development of such responsibility, the substance of the problem of economic development must continue to elude us.

The central problem of economic development is the provision of adequate investment capital to the under-developed countries. There is a feeling in the advanced countries that the less developed countries do not make sufficient effort to mobilize their own idle resources by internal measures. In the industrialized countries the process of capital formation is almost automatic as a result of adequate savings, but in the almost stagnant economies of the under-developed countries, the margin between income and consumption is so low as to make the capacity for savings practically non-existent. In Pakistan, in spite of compulsory savings measures, popularization of savings institutions, expansion of banking facilities, and the provision of varied incentives in the tax structure for

investment from profits, the rate of savings which we have been able to generate has fallen far short of development needs. In order to prevent the slowing down of development programmes, Pakistan has also attempted to encourage the import to capital goods at the cost of restricting drastically imports of consumer goods and other necessities of life. These steps have been taken because we are fully aware of the need for self-help in economic development. It must be realized, however, that if economic development on the desired level and with the desired speed is to be financed entirely from domestic resource, the economic and political structure of an under-developed country is exposed to stresses and strains which might make orderly progress of any kind impossible.

A substantial contribution of foreign capital is needed to create conditions which would enable the under-developed countries to break through the "vicious circle of poverty" and sustain a sufficient pace of development to reach the "take off" stage. My delegation is happy to note that in the last few years a certain degree of progress has been achieved in this direction, both as regards the availability of funds and the improvement of institutional machinery for international action. The United Nations Special Fund has been described as "a strategic break-through of incomparable significance" for economic development. It has an important role to play in the building of infra-structure and in increasing the capacity for absorption of capital in the under-developed countries. Equally gratifying has been the recent establishment of the International Development Association. A considerable sum of money has thereby been added to the stream of funds available for developmental purposes. If the Association comes to enjoy, as we hope it will, a certain degree of flexibility, which would allow it to take into account the specific situations of different countries in negotiating terms of loans, it would undoubtedly give a new life to the international credit system.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation have continued to afford the under-developed countries invaluable assistance in finding loan capital for their development. Since 1957-58 such loans have averaged a figure of about \$700 million annually as compared to an annual rate of \$400 million in earlier years. The loans have been utilized to finance the development of mineral resources, improvements in transportation systems, and general economic, including agricultural, development. Over the years the bank has come to occupy a position of great prestige in the international financial community which enables it to perform many subsidiary functions of great value to the developing countries. I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to express here our deep appreciation of the role played by the International Bank in the settlement of the Indus Water question. The signing of the Indo-Pakistan Canal Water Treaty last month in Karachi is an event of historic importance for which the World Bank deserves much credit. The Treaty is likely to have a profound effect on the economic development of the entire Sub-continent. We appreciate also the plan evolved by the bank for financing the massive expenditures involved, and are grateful to the

friendly governments which have so generously committed their resources and, thereby, contributed towards the final settlement.

While emphasizing the importance of international assistance in the matter of financing and providing other assistance to the developing countries, we do not wish to minimize, or in any way under-rate, the valuable contribution which bilateral assistance and regional arrangements, such as the Colombo Plan, have rendered. In the case of Pakistan, for instance, the contribution made by the Colombo Plan in initiating and sustaining development in such basic fields as agriculture, health and social welfare services, labor and public administration, can hardly be over-emphasized. Similarly, of the total of approximately \$1-1/2 billion that Pakistan has received in foreign assistance during the past decade, no less than one billion dollars has come through bilateral assistance from the United States.

The situation in respect of the flow of international private investment to the under-developed countries has also improved to certain extent,. Both capital-exporting and recipient countries have adopted a number of measures designed to increase the total flow of funds to the low-income economies. My own country, for example, has provided several new incentives and facilities for foreign investors, such as, repatriation of profits without restriction, liberal tax holidays, compensation guarantees, relief from double taxation, special concessions to specified industries and so on. An Investment Promotion Bureau has been established to provide the fullest possible information and assistance to foreign investors. The Bureau is charge with receiving all applications for the establishment of new industrial concerns involving foreign investment, disseminating information regarding investment opportunities in Pakistan, and assisting foreign and local investors in obtaining import licences, land, building materials, power, water, railway sidings, technical help and any other facility for which the co-operation of the central or provincial governments or statutory bodies is necessary.

The fact, however, remains, Mr. Chairman, that the total of funds available to the under-developed countries at present, estimated to be about \$4 billion per year, is pitifully inadequate to their needs. We have, as I have noted earlier, about 100 countries and territories with an average per capita income of \$120 per year. The total of capital available to them through domestic savings and international investments makes possible an annual rate of increase in their national incomes of about 3%. Correcting this figure against the average rate of population growth, we are left with an annual net increase in national income of only 1%. This means in the case of Pakistan, for example, a net increase in personal living standards of about 70 cents per person. This is far too low and unacceptable.

In view of this situation, it is a matter of regret to my delegation that the response of member countries, particularly the developed countries, to General

Assembly resolution 1424(XIV), sponsored by 47 nations and adopted by 67 votes to none with 15 abstentions last year, has not been very encouraging. The resolution called upon member states to reappraise their position as regards extending material support for the early establishment of a United Nations Capital Development Fund. In our opinion, Mr. Chairman, the eventual establishment of such an organization first conceived of as UNEDA, then as SUNFED, and now finally as a U.N. Capital Development Fund, is imperative, and in the long run, inevitable. It has been argued that with the recent inauguration of the International Development Association, the efforts towards the establishment of multilateral agency have come to their final fruition, and alternatively, that since the totality of funds available for international public investment is in any case necessarily limited, it is unrealistic to plan for an additional financing machinery at the present, when, the resources of most potential contributors are fully committed to the financing of the I.D.A. We do not agree with this point of views. The recent up-swing in world economic activity has undoubtedly brought forward new capital resources, as shown by the fact that they have been found for bilateral and multilateral action outside the United Nations. In this situation, we believe that the I.D.A and a SUNFED- type fund could very profitably “co-exist” and supplement each other. Although the I.D.A would undoubtedly increase the total of funds available to the under-developed countries, it would only partly meet their total requirements not only in quantity, but also as to the type of financing required. Moreover, a truly multilateral United Nations agency, such as the proposed fund, has the basic advantage that it enables those nations to make a contribution to international economic co-operation which, for reasons of policy or scruple, do not find themselves able at the moment to participate in the International Development Association.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would venture to make a suggestion. As you are aware, in the last few years numbers of under-developed countries have produced Five Year and other long term plans for their economic development. Pakistan has inaugurated its Second Five Year Plan in the course of this year; India will be launching its third. Several more are likely to follow. The plans are, in effect, the formulation of long term policies for economic growth. Such formulations are necessary in order to achieve the maximum, if not the optimum, utilization of limited resources. Nor are such programmes for economic growth, provided they are sufficiently pragmatic and flexible, incompatible with conditions permitting full scope to private initiative.

The emergences of such long-term projections have made a broadening of institutional arrangements for international co-operation necessary. The need is on two levels: financing of the programmes and their co-ordination.

A common characteristic of most of the plans for economic development is their urgent need for financial assistance. Pakistan's Second Five year Plan envisages a total expenditure of U.S. \$3,990 million. The plan is proposed to be financed to the extent of U.S. \$2,310 million from internal resources and U.S.

\$1,680 million from foreign assistance. The successful implementation of the plan depends essentially upon the inflow of foreign capital in the shape of multilateral and bilateral assistance and private foreign capital.

The available institutional machinery for international co-operation is not geared to meet either the amount or the nature of these requirements. The loans of the International Bank, for instance, have in the past, with some exceptions, been for the financing of specific projects, and the maturities of these loans have been largely determined by the type of project rather than by the overall conditions of the economy. What is needed are loans for the support of development programmes as a whole, or for certain parts of the programme, and an extension of the period of repayment of the loans. The policy of linking loans to specific projects is inadequate in other respects also. It often leads to unintended distortions in favor of basic utilities and large schemes to the neglect of activities which have a more immediate impact on production; agricultural development schemes and social service projects usually remain under-financed.

Co-ordination of the new development plans is likely to be as important a task as their financing. There is an immediate need for expert advice, collection and collation of data, development of techniques for medium and long term plans, and above all, for harmonization of policies. What is needed is the establishment of a consultative machinery for the co-ordination of development plans on a regional basis. It is necessary for a new international body to perform in respect of development plans the functions which the U.N. special fund performs in respect of individual projects.

It is the view of my delegation, Mr. Chairman, that a United Nations Capital Development Fund, conceived in terms of the new plans for development, could fulfill both the needs which we have described, namely, the need for financing and the need for co-ordination. The rapidly deteriorating economic situation of the under-developed countries makes the early establishment of such a body a matter of high priority. It would be regrettable, indeed, if the question of financing of economic development it placed on the agenda of the General Assembly, from year to year, merely as a salve to the United Nations' conscience. The time has come to break new ground and mark a departure from the established patterns of thinking. I would remind the distinguished representatives present here that these development plans embody almost the last hope and chance for the peoples of the under-developed countries, and the success or failure of these plans will be of decisive importance to all of us.

There is one other aspect of the situation. Mr. Chairman, to which I would like to draw attention. I refer to the fall in the price-index of primary commodities in recent years and the consequent change in the terms of trade against the under-developed countries. The fall in the price level of primary commodities has been such that the loss suffered by the under-developed countries is in some

cases greater than the total of international aid and assistance received by them so far. Even the present up-swing in world economic activity has failed to bring about a corresponding rise in commodity prices. While the quantum of commodity trade rose by 10% in 1959, the over-all commodity price level fell by 2% as compared to 1958 and by 8% as compared to 1957. In fact, the terms of trade of primary commodities in relation to manufactures has at the moment reached its lowest level since 1950. This has meant, in effect, a drastic reduction in the flow of capital resources available for programmes of economic development.

It is against this background of inadequate financial resources that the movement of commodity prices is to be viewed. In this context, it will be a tragic mistake, Mr. Chairman, to regard the price movements in the commodity market as simply exercises in the interplay of impersonal market forces. Price movements in the commodity market affect the most reliable and effective instrument of economic development, namely, the capacity of the under developed countries to contribute to their own development. No lasting success can be achieved in the field of economic growth unless and until, as a recent report of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development has pointed out, the under-developed countries are enabled to mobilize their own resources. The capacity of the under-developed countries to contribute to their own development depends largely on their export earnings as the plant and machinery and the technical facilities required for the purpose of development have to be imported from industrialized countries. The under-developed countries have, under the present circumstances, to rely on the sale of their primary commodities for their export earnings.

The question is essentially one of the totality of funds available for economic development. Strains on the balance of payment of a primary producing country develop from two sources: strains which arise from the development programmes of the country, and strains which arise from the fall in its export earnings. As regards the first set of strains, it will be seen that there is a constructive element in them. Such strains in fact could be regarded as a measure of dynamic policy, and although it is possible, especially in theory, to rationalize or reduce them, a certain degree of pressure from them is inevitable. The second set of strains arising from the fall in export earnings in the nature of an additional, unwelcome, and depressive burden. As things are at present, this additional burden is seriously affecting the development plans of the under-developed countries, and bringing to nought international co-operation, in all its manifold manifestations, directed to this end.

Apart from the continuing fall in prices, the commodity market has also been subject to excessive short term fluctuations, such fluctuation have tended to disrupt economic planning to discourage initiative and to threaten foreign exchange reserves. Developing countries are unable to foresee what their foreign exchange earnings are likely to be for a given period. A very slight shift in

the economic forces operating in the industrialized countries is sufficient to reduce radically the purchasing power of the primary exporting countries and to bring to nothing any long term formulations which they might have made in respect of their economic and social growth.

In The long run the most fruitful approach to commodity problems would undoubtedly seem to lie in the creation of demand for primary commodities in the under-developed countries themselves. This process of transforming the exporters of primary commodities into their users, is, however, the very process of economic development, which is predicated on the maintenance of a steady level of export earnings. In the short run there are several lines of enquiry which could with advantage be pursued. It will be extremely interesting, for instance, to have an assessment of the possibility of using compensatory financing measures to off-set fluctuations in the export income of primary producing countries. A group of experts is being appointed for this purpose in terms of General Assembly Resolution 1423 (XIV), which my delegation had the honor to sponsor last year. We await the report of the group of experts with considerable interest. Similarly, the implications and possibilities for an extension of commodity agreements and the economic consequences of the establishment of international buffer stocks need to be very carefully examined.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words on the subject of land reforms. Land reforms, which entail, in effect, the transformation of the agrarian structure of a country, is an essential facet of the process of economic development, and it is a pity that not enough attention has so far been paid to it in the consideration of international economic and social policies. We welcome the inclusion of this item in the agenda, and we hope that it will lead to a detailed and constructive discussion in this committee, which may find expression in the report of the Secretary-General called for in terms of General Assembly resolution 1426 (XIV).

The land reforms which have been recently introduced in Pakistan constitute a landmark in the field of agrarian legislation, and I think it will be appropriate if I present here a few of its salient features.

In January, 1959, President Mohammad Ayub Khan announced sweeping agrarian reforms for West Pakistan. The reforms were sorely needed, 0.1 per cent of the owners held amongst them 15 percent of the land in properties of over 500 acres each, and at the other end of the scale were 65 per cent of the owners together holding just as much land in holdings of less than 5 acres each. A better distribution of land was obviously called for. On the other hand, many of the agricultural holdings were too small to be economic. The government, therefore, appointed a commission to examine the problem and make suitable recommendations. The commission, after very careful study, recommended that a ceiling and a floor should be fixed for agricultural holdings. The ceiling for the ownership of land was fixed at 500 acres for irrigated land and 1,000 acres for

unirrigated land. These recommendations were accepted by the government and another commission has been appointed to implement them. This commission is at work and the land in excess of the ceiling fixed, which has been surrendered by the land owners, is being distributed to cultivating tenants, who are becoming land owners. Adequate compensation is being paid over an extended period for the land which has been taken over from the landlords. This compensation is financed out of the payments to be received from the new land owners over a period of time. As a result of this reform, 6 million acres of land are being distributed to cultivating tenants and nearly one and a half million tenants will become land owners.

In East Pakistan, legislation for land reform, designed to confer ownership rights on tenants and to eliminate intermediaries between the cultivators and the government was enacted as long ago as 1950. The legislation was, however, not effectively implemented. The present government has taken steps to ensure the implementation of this reform in East Pakistan and necessary funds are being provided for the payment of compensation to the previous land owners and other intermediaries. The reforms, which are being implemented with vigor, have already eliminated a state of feudalism which prevailed in certain parts of the country and have provided a greater equality of opportunity and an increased incentive for production. The social and economic benefits of these reforms to the country are expected to be enormous.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Address to the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 19, 1960

Mr. Chairman,

The survival of mankind is a race between disarmament and catastrophe. The race is heading towards a dangerous and accelerating crisis. We face the awesome possibility of a nuclear war. Should it break out, civilization will be in shambles. Ideologies and social systems will be swept away in common ruin.

For fifteen years world leaders have demonstrated a signal lack of political and moral courage to lead the world towards disarmament, to deliver it from the fear of war. They have placed their hopes for peace and security in a nuclear stalemate supported by a continuing race in armaments. Yet, in the present state of technology, an arms race is the most unstable of all forms of security. It is evident to all of us that the present military balance is a precarious one. It is contingent on the capability of either side to keep abreast of the other in the deadly competition for weapons systems of ever increasing destructive power. There can be no assurance that one side may not gain a decisive, even though transitory, advantage by a break-through in technology. Should this occur, the equilibrium will be upset and the world threatened with the destruction of all the values and systems that man has been able to build for himself and posterity through the blood and toil of a hundred generations.

Many of us here, who represent the smaller nations of the world, take it that the heads of governments of the great armed powers, who have taken an active part in the present session of the General Assembly, came in search of a more permanent and secure basis for peace than that of the present temporary and precarious balance of terror. They have set forth their proposals for general and complete disarmament. It has now fallen to member states of the United Nations, large and small, to give earnest consideration, as specifically requested by the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of August 19, 1960, to the substantive aspects of this question and to the results of the negotiations held in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee in Geneva this year. By doing so, we shall not only be exercising the right, but also discharging the directed responsibility, of the General Assembly under the Charter of the United Nations for achieving disarmament and fortifying the edifice of peace.

It is not the intention of my delegation to enter into a discussion of the technical details of the various plans and principles that are relevant to the present status of the disarmament problem. The Political Committee is not an appropriate body for the consideration of technical matters. We shall, therefore, confine our intervention to the political aspects of the problems. While doing so, we shall be guided by the thought that the issues involved are so fateful for the future of all nations that only an objective and non-partisan approach can do

justice to the treatment of a subject of such importance as disarmament. At the same time, my delegation will not hesitate to express its views as to the merits of the stands taken by the East and by the West in the course of the Geneva negotiations.

The gravity of the situation that the General Assembly has been facing for the past few years and the urgency of finding a solution to the problem of disarmament have been emphasized with such frequency that they dominate our debates. Nevertheless, my delegation considers it necessary to remind once again that, while our efforts to find solutions to the problem have been making little progress, the problem itself has not stood still. The difficulties of control over new weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery are being compounded by the march of science and technology. When the negotiators meet again, their previous work becomes out of date for the rate of technological change is continually out-stripping the pace of negotiations.

It is tragic that the elimination of nuclear weapons should have been so delayed as to evade present attempts to devise techniques of detection. It is no less tragic that time has been lost in reaching agreement on measures to control the missile race in its early stages when it might have been possible to arrest the proliferation of rockets through a ban on testing or through a severe limitation of production, or both. Today measures to control missiles infinitely more complicated.

Likewise, to guard against surprise attack, inspection measures as originally conceived were intended to provide tactical warning. The advent of missiles has made such a quest extremely dubious. The additional warning time may now be so short that the deterrence may well have been weakened.

These somber examples of lost opportunities tell us that there is a critical point in the development of any weapon after which arms control becomes impossible or extremely intricate.

What is the conclusion? Is it not that we must consider it of crucial importance to control new weapons in the very early stages of their development?

We have read with great concern a report in the New York Times of October 12, 1960, of the refinement in Germany and the Netherlands of a technique for the separation of enriched uranium which would make it feasible for any technologically advanced nation to produce atomic weapons without large financial expenditures. This knowledge which is bound to spread will, in a few years, enable many nations to become nuclear powers. If agreements to prohibit, under international control, the test explosions of nuclear weapons and also the prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons, are not reached

without delay, the inevitable advances in science and technology are bound to inject complicating new factors into the problem of atomic arms control.

To these technical difficulties of finding a solution to the disarmament question has now been added a new and formidable political obstacle. Only last year, the Pakistan delegation had expressed its satisfaction that the Western powers, at long last, had implicitly abandoned their insistence on linking progress in disarmament to political conditions and to the preliminary solution of certain political problems. But now, the Soviet Union insists on linking disarmament with far-reaching political and constitutional changes in the basic structure of the United Nations, aimed at modifying the composition of two of its principal organs, namely, the Security Council and the Secretariat.

Mr. Chairman, these facts underscore more forcefully and eloquently than words the dangers of wasting time which only serve to so compound the political and technical difficulties of the disarmament problem as to make them well-nigh insoluble. Time is of the essence, yes Sir, of the essence, if the quest of general and complete disarmament is not to prove a will-o' the -wisp.

It is against this background of urgency, arising from the fact that technology is continually creating new difficulties more rapidly than the ability of negotiators to resolve old ones, that we must review the present status of disarmament negotiations between the Western powers and the Eastern bloc.

The unanimous adoption by the General Assembly at its fourteenth session of resolution 1378 (XIV) on November 20, 1959, revived our hopes that the great powers would make every effort to achieve a constructive solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament, under effective international control, and measures leading towards this goal would be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time.

From a study of the records of the Geneva meetings held from March to June this year, it becomes only too painfully clear that the positions of the East and the West did not come close enough to begin drafting specific provisions of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. During these months, the negotiators did not come to grips with concrete measures either on disarmament or control. They could not even agree as to whether discussion of a specific measure should begin with its disarmament aspect or its control aspect. Negotiations between the two sides were confined to exchanges of views on certain basic principles of disarmament and control on which their respective proposals were based.

This notwithstanding, the Pakistan delegation is not altogether disappointed with the results of the Geneva negotiations. We note that the debates of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee on the proposals of the Western powers on general and complete disarmament of March 16, 1960, and

the proposals by the Soviet Government concerning the basic clauses of a treaty on general and complete disarmament of June 2, 1960, led to a significant measure of rapprochement between the two sides on certain basic principles of which this committee is well aware.

The negotiations were encouraging because of a reconciliation of views of the two sides on these important general principles. In particular, the elaboration in much greater detail of the organization, under effective international control, of phased measures of disarmament to be carried out in stages, and the clarifications given by the Soviet representative of the relevant provisions of the Soviet proposals of June 2, met to a large extent the views of the Western powers in regard to control measures. It is to be noted that the two sides agreed to the chronology of control measures in the following sequence:

- (i) negotiation of disarmament measures and the corresponding control measures, both general and practical;
- (ii) signature of a treaty embodying both kinds of measures;
- (iii) entry into force of the treaty, and, simultaneously, the setting up of the control bodies to implement control measures in step with disarmament measures.

Nevertheless, the positions of the two sides did not entirely converge. The Soviet concessions fell short of willingness to agree to the verification of armed forces and armaments of all types remaining at the disposal of states after reduction. The Eastern powers could give no satisfactory assurance in regard to the inclusion of this "major preliminary", as the French representative called it, within the provisions of a disarmament treaty under international control.

It seems to my delegation to be misleading to characterize any proposal for the verification of armaments remaining at the disposal of states after reductions are carried out as "control of armaments". To our thinking such verification may well become an essential condition of disarmament. The Soviet representative maintained that such matters could not be dealt with in the abstract, but must be solved in a concrete way. We feel that disagreements of this nature require careful examination at a technical level by experts before the General Assembly can be expected to experts itself on the merits of the opposed stands of the two sides.

Major differences could not be reconciled in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee over the question of the time limit for implementing the entire programme of general and complete disarmament and the quantum of reduction of armed forces and armaments, nuclear as well as conventional, appropriate to each of the three stages of the Western proposals of March 16 and the Soviet proposals of June 2, 1960.

Nevertheless, even in these areas, we are happy to observe both sides have shown a certain flexibility of approach. We note that the Eastern powers are ready to relax their stand on the four year time table provided the Western powers agree to fix time limits for each of the three stages of general and complete disarmament and for all of them as a whole.

We also note that the Western powers showed their willingness to fix a reasonable time limit for the implementation of disarmament measures in the first stage, but rejected a time table for the succeeding two stages as impracticable and unrealistic.

On the question of the quantum of reduction of actual armed forces and armaments, conventional and nuclear, appropriate to each of the three stages of disarmament, no real common ground could be established. The Soviet proposals of June 2 contemplated too drastic disarmament in the first two stages, considering the fact that tension between the East and West was rising and deep distrust has permeated their international relations since the Second World War. While the Soviet proposals postponed initial measures of conventional disarmament from the first to the second stage to accommodate the Western powers, they went to the extreme in calling for the complete elimination of all vehicles and means of delivering weapons of mass destruction, the withdrawal of foreign troops, and other such measures as the very first steps in the first stage of a disarmament treaty. Furthermore, the Soviet proposals called for the complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction as the first step in the second stage. The Western powers, on the other hand, have persistently maintained that the final elimination of such weapons and the means of their deliver should be carried out only in the third and last stage of any programme of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

It is not only fear and distrust that interpose themselves as obstacles to the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in an early stage. All of us are only too conscious of the fact that for the last few years, both sides have acknowledged that no known scientific techniques of inspection have yet been evolved to detect stockpiles of nuclear weapons that may be concealed by either side to evade international control. It was for this reason that the approach to the problem of disarmament was shifted by the General Assembly from comprehensive measures to those of a partial nature as set forth in resolution 1148 (XII) of November 14, 1957, until such times as a scientific break-through would make a more effective detection system feasible. The claim implicit in the Khrushchev plan of general and complete disarmament of September 18, 1959, and its subsequent revisions as presented to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee on June, 7 1960, and to the present session of the General Assembly on September 23, 1960, is that in these schemes, the difficulties of control, such as the detection of clandestine stocks of nuclear weapons, will disappear because all means of delivering them to their targets will have been eliminated.

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation is in no position to express any opinion on the validity or otherwise of this claim, and of the Soviet approach to the problem of eliminating all obstacles to the establishment of an effective international control system. This subject bristles with technicalities into which it would be fruitless for my delegation to enter. We do consider, however, that the importance of the problem of control is such as to be of decisive significance to any scheme of general and complete disarmament. It is therefore a question which needs to be referred without delay to experts –scientific, military, and administrative –for their examination and report, if the goal of a disarmed world is to be reached with the shortest possible delay.

In view of the uncertain outlook for an effective system of international control the Pakistan delegation is not surprised that the Western proposals including the United States programme for general and complete disarmament under effective international control of June 27, 1960, (which could not be submitted to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva because it was broken up before this could be done) envisage a too modest measure of disarmament in the earlier stages. In regard to the reluctance of the Western powers to agree to any definite time limit in advance for the implementation of the entire programme of general and complete disarmament, we consider that this question should be examined in the light of the conclusion of experts on the feasibility of devising an effective inspection system to guard against the possibility of concealment of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman, to turn from this retrospective analysis to the prospect before us, the General Assembly is now confronted with a situation in which the principal parties to the disarmament negotiations remain deeply divided in their approach to this most serious of all problems, namely, general and complete disarmament. The Eastern powers have been insisting that the entire range of general and complete disarmament must be negotiated as a whole, from the first stage to the last, before anything concrete can be done about specific disarmament measures. They have shown no disposition to consider any alternative to this global approach such as that suggested by the Western powers to adopt certain partial or initial measures, not in isolation, but as integral parts of continuous programme of general and complete disarmament.

From a comparison of the Western proposals of June 27, 1960, circulated by the United States, and those of the Soviet Union of June 2, 1960, as well as the latter's revised version presented by Chairman Khrushchev to the General Assembly earlier in the present session, it would appear to my delegation that the most hopeful prospects of early implementation of disarmament measures under effective international control as integral parts of a programme of general and complete disarmament, relate to the following:

- One** Cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes and the transfer of agreed quantities of such material from past production to non-weapons uses;
- Two** Prior notification of proposed launching of missiles as an immediate step to reduce the risk of war by accident or miscalculation;
- Three** Appropriate measures to give greater protection against surprise attack as an initial step towards safeguarding the world against such attack;
- Four** The prevention of the wider dissemination of nuclear weapons in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1380 (XIV) of November 20.1959.

Mr. Chairman, my delegation feels that the immediate implementation of the initial steps that I have just mentioned would not by any means militate against the continuance of parallel negotiations between the principal parties on the more substantial and important measures which are central to the proposals for general and complete disarmament. We believe that in the prevailing climate of fear and distrust of motives and intentions between the East and the West, a modest approach would seem to have a better chance of bearing result. Initial agreements on peripheral issues would act as a catalyst in the process of promoting some degree of confidence between the parties and thereby improve the prospects of wider agreements on problems which lie at the heart of general and complete disarmament. If, on the other hand, we reject this approach in the situation confronting us when the two sides have failed to evolve a mutually agreed basis for further negotiations, the process of disarmament is not likely to even get started.

In addition to the above initial steps, the Pakistan delegation ventures to express the opinion that certain other measures relating to the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments could well be added to those that I have enumerated. We feel that greater substance could well be given to the content of the first stag of disarmament in the United States proposal of June 2 without violating the principle of balance between nuclear and conventional measures, and also the basic rule that no country or group of countries shall obtain, at any stage, a significant military advantage over the others, as a result of disarmament. Hence we would appeal to both sides to find a basis for compromise between their respective proposals for the reduction of the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union in the first stage and also for the reduction of conventional armaments to related levels and the elimination of stocks thus released. The Soviet Union now proposes that the armed forces of the two powers should be reduced to 1.7 million each in the first stage. The United States has agreed to this figure in the second stage. Since the Western powers regard the first two stages of their disarmament plans as not so much separate than a single continuing process, would it be too much to expect that an

agreed figure between 2.7 and 1.7 million could be mutually agreed upon by the two sides to achieve a measure of real disarmament at the very outset?

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation has consistently maintained since 1955 that meaningful disarmament to all the member states of the United Nations except, perhaps, top the three nuclear powers connotes the reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments to enable them to reduce their military expenditures and to divert the greater part of their financial resources into productive channels. In particular, the under-developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America which account for two billion people or two thirds of the population of the world, have no foreseeable prospects of being able to raise the living standards of their peoples to decent levels except through the diversion of the resources of the richer nations of the world as well as of their own from armaments to development. Hence the universal importance of a substantial measure of immediate world wide conventional disarmament under effective international control needs no emphasis as an economic measure, quite apart from its intrinsic merit in a disarmament scheme.

It was our great stake in the beneficial economic consequences of disarmament that prompted Pakistan to introduce jointly with Mexico and Costa Rica an amendment to the draft resolution on disarmament in this committee during the tenth session of the General Assembly which is to be found in operative paragraph 3 of resolution 914 (X). This paragraph calls for a study of the proposals originated by the Prime Minister of France for the allocation of funds resulting from disarmament for improving the standards of living throughout the world, and in particular the under-developed countries.

I need not dilate on the need to start some measure of real disarmament without delay, if the great and growing disparities between the rich and the poor nations of the world are not to develop into a new source of international tension. This potential North-South conflict, as it is sometimes called, may, if not prevented in time, add new dangers to those of the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, in endorsing the proposition that general and complete disarmament must start with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control, the Pakistan delegation is by no means suggesting an approach that is reflected in the earlier resolutions of the General Assembly, notably 1148 (XII) of November 14, 1957, adopted at its twelfth session. This resolution shifted the perspective of disarmament from comprehensive to partial measures. What we now submit is that while parallel negotiations take place with the object of concluding a treaty on general and complete disarmament, such disarmament measures as may be immediately capable of implementation like those mentioned by my delegation earlier should not be delayed until complete agreement is reached on the whole complex of measures within the scope of such a treaty.

In the statements that have been made in the course of the general debate, many distinguished statesmen including certain heads of state and government have expressed similar views. My delegation has been impressed by the general consensus which has emerged in favour of negotiations on disarmament measures progressively according to the possibility of their early implementation.

We are well aware that in respect of even these measures much remains to be done in the way of studying the complex technical and administrative aspects of their implementation under effective international control. The time has, therefore, come to appoint panels of technical experts to study and report to an appropriate organ of the United Nations on the intricate and inter-related scientific, technical, and administrative aspects of implementation. In particular, the General Assembly needs to know whether the effectiveness of control will be seriously impaired if verification is restricted to reductions of armed forces and armaments and not extended to what remains at the disposal of states after reductions are carried out. Furthermore, even in regard to measures which do not, strictly speaking, involve reductions, for example, the question of minimizing the possibility of surprise attack, technical military studies need to be resumed from the point at which they were discontinued in the experts conference which suspended its meetings on December 18, 1958. It is the task of technical-military experts to assemble the facts necessary for evaluating the effectiveness of various systems of inspection and observation and to draw the necessary conclusions.

More especially, my delegation considers it absolutely essential for the General Assembly to be given objective and authoritative findings by experts of recognized competence as to the feasibility or otherwise of effective control over the initial measures of disarmament. Only in this way will the Assembly be able to exercise its judgment on the issues involved and play a useful role in finding solutions to the manifold and complex problems of which it is seized in the disarmament field.

In this context, may we be permitted to recall that three years ago, at the twelfth session of the General Assembly, the delegations of Norway and Pakistan sponsored an amendment in this committee, to the twenty-four power joint draft resolution on disarmament, recommending the establishment of groups of technical experts to study inspection systems for disarmament measures on which the five-power sub-committee of the then Disarmament Commission might reach agreement in principle, and to report to the sub-committee within a fixed period. The amendment envisaged that the groups would include not only experts drawn from the major powers, but also from wherever the most qualified persons were available among member states of the organization. The Norway-Pakistan amendment was accepted by the twenty-four sponsors and is to be found in paragraphs 3 and 4 of resolution 1148 (XII). In the thirteenth session, my delegation suggested in this committee that the great powers should extend the

technical approach which had been initiated, earlier in 1958, on the problems of suspension of nuclear weapons tests and the measures to prevent surprise attack, also to the study of the technical problems involved in the possible reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments. Resolution 1252 (XIII) of November 4, 1959, again recommended the technical approach with a view to contributing to a balanced and effectively controlled world-wide system of disarmament.

We regret that the two-year deadlock since 1957, on the procedure and substance of the disarmament negotiations between the great powers represented in the sub-committee prevented the implementation of the General Assembly recommendations in regard to the panels of experts and the technical approach for finding answers to the technical aspects of disarmament.

I now turn to the task before the General Assembly in the present session. The question of disarmament has become one of transcendent importance to humanity,. The peoples of the world are looking to the United Nations to ease the tensions between the East and the West. It is the duty of all member states, but first and foremost of the great powers, to deflect mankind from a course which can only lead to death or at best to an existence of fear and want.

We cannot, we must not believe that they will fail

As yet, there is no reason for Gespair. We believe that both the East and the West are ready to resume their interrupted negotiations. The General Assembly *must*, with all the force of its political and moral authority, *demand, nay insist*, that the two sides undertake further discussions on the proposals for general and complete disarmament under effective international control in order to achieve a constructive solution of this problem within the shortest possible time. The General Assembly must now reinforce the call of the Disarmament Commission in its resolution of August 19, 1960, for the earliest possible continuation of the disarmament negotiations. In our view, neither this nor that great power is morally entitled to make its participation in the disarmament talks conditional on the acceptance of its demands. Such an attitude would be incompatible with its special responsibility under the charter of our organization for the maintenance of world peace.

From the review of the negotiations which took place in Geneva this year, my delegation is persuaded that a start towards the goal of general and complete disarmament should not be held up until complete agreement is reached on the entire range and depth of the measures within its scope. A start must be made even before this stage, and as soon as possible, with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control and are also compatible with the basic principle of balance in order that no country or group of countries will obtain, at any stage, a significant military advantage. We believe

that the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee should give priority to such measures in the performance of its task.

Suggestions have been made to alter the composition of the committee in the expectation that this will yield more profitable results. We for our part are inclined to share the view that the crisis before us is not so much that of procedure as of the substance of the problem of disarmament. Above all, it is a crisis of confidence. Nevertheless, if the general consensus is in favor of enlarging the membership of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee so as to make it more fully representative of the geographical regions of the world and of different shades of political opinion, the Pakistan delegation will, of course, support any suitable proposal to this end. More especially, my delegation would again endorse the suggestion made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada in the Disarmament Commission last August –which we strongly supported in that forum—that the committee might benefit from having a neutral chairman who could regularize the order of business. It gives my delegation particular pleasure to reiterate our view that the distinguished Chairman of the Disarmament Commission, Ambassador Padilla Nervo of Mexico would be the most suitable choice for the important office. His experience and knowledge of negotiations on the subject, his qualities as a conciliator and harmonizer of conflicting opinions in this field and his profound interest in, and concern for disarmament, should with advantage to our organization be enlisted in the service of peace.

While in the context of the task before the General Assembly in the present session my delegation deems it necessary to comment briefly on the suggestion made for a special session of the General Assembly in March or April next year to be attended by heads of states and governments to consider the problem of disarmament and also with regard to the demand for fundamental changes in the structure of certain principal organs of the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, the varieties of disarmament are stubborn facts which cannot be ignored by procedural tactics. They demand respectful recognition. It still remains a fact of international life that no success can be achieved in the field of disarmament unless the great armed powers have the desire and the will to reach agreement. Where these are lacking, nothing positive can be accomplished. The truth of this statement was demonstrated only a few weeks ago, when the General Assembly failed to persuade the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union to resume their interrupted contacts. A special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of disarmament must certainly have its place in the scheme of things when the great powers will have achieved sufficient reconciliation of their conflicting positions to warrant hopes of a constructive outcome from such a meeting. At the present stage, the question is rather premature.

The same must be said of the demand for radical changes in the secretariat of the United Nations. The question of who should command an international peace force in a disarmed world will remain unreal so long as the world refuses to take a single step to disarm.

Mr. Chairman, may I, at this stage of my intervention, ask for your indulgence in extending my observations to the three draft resolutions relating to the subject under discussion which have already been circulated by their sponsors.

Document A/C I/L 251 setting forth the draft resolution on the report of the Disarmament Commission and sponsored by the United Kingdom delegation recommends the appointment of technical, scientific, military, and administrative experts, with instructions to submit a progress report on the systems of inspection and control in relation to disarmament measures which must form an integral part of a programme of general and complete disarmament, including those measures which are capable of early implementation. We welcome this constructive initiative on the part of the United Kingdom which was foreshadowed in the statement of "Prime Minister MacMillan to the General Assembly on September 29, 1960. The step now proposed by the United Kingdom delegation has been long overdue. We note in particular that it calls for a study of the technical feasibility of control to ensure the progressive reduction and elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery including the clandestine storage of nuclear weapons which, as I have said earlier, lie at the heart of the problem of general and complete disarmament. We note further that this draft resolution also calls for a study of the problems of control which have arisen in connection with those measures of disarmament which are capable of early implementation. The United Kingdom proposal is thus in line with the general tenor of the observation that I have made earlier.

There are four features in the United Kingdom proposal which should recommend themselves to this committee. First, political negotiations between the principal parties are not to be delayed until the results of the expert studies have been made available. The Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee will be enabled to proceed with its task simultaneously. Second, the experts will be expected to submit a progress report within a definite time limit, six months, in order to ensure that the talks are not prolonged indefinitely. Third, the experts must submit their progress report to the Disarmament Commission. This provision is a significant forward step towards bringing back disarmament discussions within the framework of the United Nations. At the same time, it will provide the commission with an opportunity of playing a much more active role in the future than it has been able to do in the past. Lastly, the entire exercise on the subject of inspection and control has been placed in its proper proportion and perspective by instructing the experts to confine their examination to the scientific, technical, and administrative aspects of control. It is thus acknowledged

that technical talks are no substitute for political negotiations which alone can ensure agreement between the East and the West on the disarmament problem.

The Pakistan Delegation will vote in favor of the United Kingdom draft resolution, A/C I/L 251.

There are two other draft resolutions before the Political Committee, namely, that of the Soviet Union –A/C I/L 249 and the one sponsored by three Western powers-Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States-A/C I/L 250.

If the two draft resolutions are studied together, it will be seen that the positions of the two sides have come somewhat closer together, notably in regard to the principle of specified time limits for the implementation of disarmament measures. Both the draft proposals attempt a definition of the goal of general and complete disarmament in terms which, in spite of commissions and omissions, are very similar,. Nevertheless, on closer scrutiny, the differences of approach to the common goal which I pointed out earlier still persist. The emphasis in the Soviet draft is definitely on the conclusion of a treaty which will include the entire range of programme of general and complete disarmament. The Western powers on the other hand stress a start towards this goal with those measures which are capable of early implementation under effective international control.

In regard to the general principles which should guide negotiations between the two sides the two drafts have much in common, but important differences remain. In particular, it is very clear that the disagreement in the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee over the extension of verification to armed forces and armaments remaining at the disposal of states is brought out sharply in the Western draft resolution. There are also other differences. The Soviet draft would have the General Assembly recognize a change in the structure of the United Nations as necessary to create confidence in the correct use of international armed forces when general and complete disarmament becomes an accomplished fact. Furthermore, the Soviet proposal would throw open participation in the international control organization and the international armed forces to all states. On the other hand, the Western draft conceives of them within the framework of the organization.

We consider the power western draft resolution as being in accord with the substance of our views on the present status of the disarmament question as set forth by me earlier.

Mr. Chairman, the Pakistan delegation would regard it as a happy augury to the success of the disarmament negotiations if the East and the West would evolve a common text between themselves of a joint draft resolution as they did last year to enable the General Assembly to follow the precedent of adopting it unanimously.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of disarmament has been discussed by the United Nations for fifteen years. All this time, the various principal and subsidiary organs in which the subject has been dealt with have concerned themselves exclusively with its political and military aspects. They have given no thought to its economic and social consequences. And yet the national and international impact of disarmament may be of such dimensions as to revolutionize the world economic situation.

A substantial reduction of military expenditures is bound to set in motion changes in the domestic economies of states and in international economic relations. For example, in respect of the former nations disbanding their armed forces and halting the production of weapons and implements of war will be faced with the problem of maintaining demand at its former level by mobilizing in time the alternative public and private expenditures which theoretically could replace defense expenditures. The under-developed countries may have to bear even greater economic burden from a decline in the demand for their raw materials. Compensatory measures in the form of tax reductions and international economic development would become imperative to bolster national and world economics. There will also rise the transfer problem of absorbing human and material resources released from a war economy into a system of stable peace. The scope and nature of this problem may be quite different in countries enjoying a free economy than in those under central planning systems. Its difficulties would be greater for some countries which maintain large forces in relation to their resources than for those which devote a much smaller percentage of their national product for military purposes. These are some of the economic problems that are merely indicative of the economic impact of disarmament. They pose questions vital to national and international economic life. Yet their study has been neglected for fifteen years.

There are also other important reasons why a scientific and objective analysis of the economic and social consequences of disarmament is both urgent and imperative. Widespread fear exists in many nations lest a reversal of the arms race may lead to a world wide economic crisis. These fears influence in varying degrees the public policies of the governments of the world and impede the growth of public opinion in favor of disarmament. Such fears need to be dispelled if the full support of the peoples of the world is to be mobilized in the crusade to prevent a nuclear holocaust. Disarmament, like peace, must begin in the minds of men.

The Pakistan delegation firmly believes that the time is ripe for a comprehensive study of the economic and social consequences of disarmament for the world. We have reached a stage in disarmament negotiations when we dare to propose time-limits for implementing measures of partial or complete disarmament. The Pakistan delegation, for one, would repulse the thought that such proposals may not have been introduced with serious intentions. Is it not

then timely to devote some thinking to a subject of the most vital importance to the well-being of all the peoples of the world?

The study that we have in mind is not to be confused with the suggestions made in the past in connection with the flow of savings to the under-developed countries for purposes of economic development in the event of disarmament. In as far as these savings are concerned; a study project on their best utilization should await definite information as to the size and time of availability of these funds if it is not to be based on purely hypothetical calculations.

The suggestion which my delegation would like to make must be viewed in a larger perspective. It is of greater scope and depth. It relate not to the economic development of under-developed countries as a result of disarmament but to the economic adjustment of all countries to disarmament. It does not ask for a blueprint but only for broad conclusions. The study must examine whether fears of an economic depression from a reversal of the arms race are or are not justified.

A task of this nature can best be undertaken by the secretariat of the United Nations. So far as we are aware, no comprehensive systematic study exists on the subject of economic adjustments to he impact of disarmament. Its compilation by the United Nations would meet an urgent need of governments and non-governmental organizations throughout the world. The imprimatur o the organization would command wide acceptance of its findings.

In carrying out this task the secretariat will no doubt seek and enlist the active co-operation of governments on which it must necessarily depend for much of the required information and data pertaining to military expenditures and to industries and projects connected with defence. It may engage the services of consultants of recognized competence and representative of the main schools of economic thought.

The Pakistan delegation is fully conscious of the fact that the resources of the secretariat, both in terms of personnel and services, are fully stretched by the existing work programmes to which it is committed, and even more so by the emergency operation in the Congo. But the task which we have suggested is one of vital importance and urgency. It must, therefore, be executed as a matter of priority, with the assurance, if needed of the necessary budgetary support.

Address to the Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on September 30, 1963 (afternoon session)

Mr. President,

It is my privilege to convey to you the warmest congratulations of the delegation of Pakistan on your unanimous election to the high office of President of the eighteenth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. Beyond the formal ties of diplomatic relations between your great country and mine lie the intangible bonds of shared attitudes and aspirations which constitute a firm basis of friendship between Pakistan and Venezuela and the vast continent to which your country belongs. I am confident that under your wise and skilful guidance this Assembly, which is meeting in a time of hope and expectation, will advance mankind toward the fulfillment of the ideals for which this organization was established. These ideals revolve around one central purpose; the attainment and preservation of world peace.

Peace alone can ensure human survival and progress. Such peace as the world enjoys today is precarious and uncertain, maintained only by the knowledge that nuclear war will end not in victory but in mutual annihilation. Yet the great powers hold in readiness immense stores of weapons and engines of destruction which serve only to increase tension and mutual suspicion. The first necessity, therefore, is to put an immediate end to this dangerous and self-defeating arms race in which the great powers have been engaged for more than a decade. Ever since the end of the Second World War the United Nations have been preoccupied with this fundamental problem.

The decision of the General Assembly adopted three years ago, setting the aim of general and complete disarmament, was an important new development in the search for an enduring peace. However, the subsequent record of the negotiations has not been encouraging. Stockpiles of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery have not ceased to multiply. The Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee which has been dealing with this urgent problem has made little progress. That this should be so is no reflection on the endeavors and the good faith of its members. One has only to study the contributions made by many of them to appreciate the value of the Geneva discussions.

May I state, however, that the non-representation in this forum of certain militarily significant states in the world imparts to its deliberations a degree of unreality. If disarmament is to be general and complete it must obviously be universal. No significant military power, much less a major military power, can be excluded from the scope of its implementation. Nor can it be expected that it

would accept the obligation of a disarmament treaty negotiated without its representation.

The treaty to prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under the water and outer space, comes as a ray of light in a dark horizon. Our children and generations yet unborn have been safeguarded against the future poisoning of the air they breathe, the water they drink and the food they eat.

In the dark ages, when unwanted children were buried alive, the Prophet Muhammad cried out in wrath; "What will you answer when the innocents that you have slain rise before God's judgment seat and ask, 'For what crime were we slain?'".

Let us hope that by this treaty our progeny and succeeding generations will be safeguarded against the agony of a living death. But as a measure of disarmament the test ban treaty is important more for what it promises than for what it has achieved. As has been well said, it is but the first step on a thousand-mile journey. It does not prohibit underground tests, it does not halt the nuclear arms race, much less reverse it.

At the time of adhering to the treaty, the Government of Pakistan expressed the strong hope that the prohibition of testing would be followed soon by agreements to cease underground tests also and to prevent the future spread of nuclear weapons. Unless these and other measures of nuclear disarmament are taken, the test ban treaty, although welcome in itself, may turn out to be of only illusory value in dissipating the fear of nuclear war from the minds of men. My government attaches the highest importance and priority to the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons as a next step in the quest for general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

In this regard, President Mohammad Ayub Khan gave expression to the concern of Pakistan in his address to the seventeenth session of the General Assembly in the following words:

"An aspect of disarmament which is of deep concern to Pakistan is the clear and present danger of the spread of nuclear weapons and the knowledge of their technology to states which do not now possess them. The General Assembly is aware of this danger. Permit me to observe that the mere adoption of resolutions against the dissemination of nuclear weapons and in favor of the establishment of a non-nuclear club, will not remove this danger. Unless the United Nations takes effective and urgent action in this direction, the race in nuclear armaments is bound to overtake other parts of the world in the immediate future."

In the reluctance of some member states to accept the safeguard system devised by the International Atomic Energy Agency, we find cause for grave

concern, particularly when the aversion to agency safeguards is accompanied by the priority plans to produce elements essential to the manufacture of nuclear weapons. Time and again the agency has drawn attention to the increase in the number of countries reaching the stage of nuclear capability and the danger of such capability and the danger of such capability being diverted to war-like purposes. We support the decision of the Governing Board of the International Atomic Energy Agency to recommend extension of its safeguards to nuclear reactors exceeding the capacity of 100 thermal megawatts and to study the question of applying safeguards to equipment. The great merit of international safeguards, as compared to bilateral safeguards, is that, being uninfluenced by political expediencies, they inspire greater world-wide confidence. The objective of an effective system of safeguards should be to insure, by inspection and verification at every stage of the process, from the designing and manufacture of the reactor equipment to the disposal of nuclear material, that atomic power intended for peaceful use will not and cannot be used for other purposes.

While basic differences of both a qualitative as well as quantitative nature continue to persist on the substantive issues of general and complete disarmament and on measures for effective international control, the negotiations in Geneva do seem to my delegation to have opened prospects of limited steps which can be taken immediately. In the past, much controversy existed between the merits of a partial approach to disarmament as against attempts to deal with the problem in a comprehensive manner. We trust that with the conclusion of the test ban treaty, pragmatic good sense will prevail over doctrinaire considerations. My delegation believes that at this stage, the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee could profitably devote itself to the task of reaching agreements on such limited measures as the prevention of surprise attack and the placing in orbit or stationing in outer space of weapons of mass destruction. We welcome, in this connection, the recent agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union for peaceful co-operation in outer space. The United States and the Soviet Union have also indicated their readiness to make mutual concessions in order to facilitate agreements on measures to prevent surprise attack and war by accident. In particular, my delegation welcomes the proposal to establish inspection posts at the main points of concentration and movements of military forces in the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. We hope these limited steps in disarmament, and other measures such as the reduction of military expenditures and the release of an agreed proportion of funds thus saved for the purpose of economic and technical assistance to the developing countries, could be taken in the atmosphere created by the conclusion of the test ban treaty.

As the speakers who have preceded me have pointed out this Assembly meets in an atmosphere of good-will and hope. We are encouraged by the constructive statements addressed to the Assembly by President Kennedy and the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. These statements contain concrete proposals which we hope will provide a basis for serious negotiations among the interested powers and contribute to a further amelioration of the situation. We

see in the test ban treaty a sign and a symbol of the will of the Soviet Union and the Western powers for peaceful co-existence. President Kennedy and Chairman Khrushchev looked into the abyss and stepped back from it. We are told that there is no possibility of co-existence in the ideological field. Nevertheless, as statesmen, they cannot want nuclear war. Their enlightened self-interest demands that they re-establish sanity in the world because the two super states whose destinies they guide must recognize the limits of their power.

The world is asking itself the question: Will the test ban treaty be a turning-point in history? We cannot see past the veil which obscures the future. Dangerous questions are still outstanding. There has been no change as yet in the position of the East and the West on Viet-Nam, Laos, Germany, Berlin and Cuba, even though their frozen positions have somewhat melted. Nevertheless, the world is breathing with relief the new atmosphere of a limited *détente* which is unmistakable. We pray that in culmination of the current trend a mutually acceptable *modus vivendi* may be reached between the great powers.

Apart from the East-West tension, serious problems persist and continue to poison relations among nations. As President Kennedy said here the other day, the cold war is not the only expression of tension in this world and the nuclear race is not the only arms race.

In Africa the death-spasm of colonialism and the obstinate pursuit of the false doctrine of racial superiority kindle the embers of old fears and hates. In the Caribbean, which last year brought the world to the brink of catastrophe, there is yet no peace but only a precarious truce. But it is in Asia, with its stormy history, that peace is perhaps the least secure. This vast and ancient continent, inhabited by more than half of the population of our planet, continues to be the scene of great convulsions which may well change the destiny of mankind. The giant has awakened, still hardly conscious of its strength but capable, as in the past, of setting in motion forces and events that could change the course of world history. From end to end, from the Pacific to the Mediterranean, there is tumult and conflict, Neighbor is set against neighbor, peoples divided by war and diplomacy are made the pawns of forces beyond their control. In Viet-Nam and in Korea, in Laos, in Palestine and in the sub-continent of India and Pakistan, there exist bitter disputes and explosive situations which disturb the tranquility of Asia and the peace of the world. Is it not time to take a new look at the state of this largest of all the continents and to devise an approach that looks beyond the policies of maintaining the *status quo* AND IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RIGHT OF SELF-DETERMINATION OF PEOPLES? For the well-being of the teeming masses of Asia and for the sake of the peace of the world it is imperative to find just solutions to the disputes that divide Asian nations.

Among these disputes the Kashmir question has a dimension and an importance of its own, involving, as it does, the future of 550 million people of Pakistan and India, the largest concentration of population next to the of China,

and more than one-sixth of the human race. Estranged from each other, the two countries must remain the chief source of danger to the stability of the Asian continent. Reconciled, they have it in their power to assure the future of a large segment of mankind.

While this is no occasion for me to attempt a presentation of the Kashmir question in detail, I must yet remind the Assembly that the central issue in the dispute is that of self-determination. Pakistan seeks no other solution than that of the free exercise of this right by the people of Kashmir.

This principle was accepted by both parties to the dispute. Its implementation has been blocked by one party. We now hear it said that India has made no such commitment. We know, of course, that the easiest way to repudiate a commitment is to deny that it was ever made. However, the commitment, the pledge the word of honor are on public record, which may sometimes be forgotten but can never be expunged. Furthermore, the commitment is not of a vague and general nature, made in some pious declaration, but is explicitly embodied in an international agreement as set forth in the two United Nations resolutions which were solemnly accepted by India and Pakistan and which constituted the basis for the cessation of hostilities in Kashmir. Could any commitment be clearer than the very first article of the resolution of January 5, 1949:

“The question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or Pakistan will be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite”?

The pledge, that the future of Kashmir shall be determined in accordance with the will of the people as freely expressed, was given not to the United Nations but directly by India to Pakistan. Again, what could be clearer than the following declaration of the Prime Minister of India in his communication of October 31, 1947, addressed to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

“Our assurance that we shall withdraw our troops from Kashmir as soon as peace and order are restored and leave the decision regarding the future of this state of the people of the state is not merely a promise to your Government but also to the people of Kashmir and to the world”?

Was any international commitment ever more clearly made, so consistently repeated, and yet more willfully dishonored”

Sometimes, rather than deny the commitment, India's representatives contend that there were conditions attached to the commitment which were not fulfilled and that Pakistan did not fulfill those conditions. We have said repeatedly that we are prepared to accept any impartial third-party verdict on this issue. It is

India which makes an allegation and then refuses to submit it to impartial investigation.

Against the background of the assurances that I have quoted. It will not be difficult to appreciate the concern of the Government of Pakistan, and the indignation of our people, when the Prime Minister of India, as in his statement of August 13, 1963, talks of the idea of a plebiscite as being “old and discarded”.

Pakistan seeks no concession but the right of the people of Kashmir to settle their own future. Let me state clearly and unambiguously from this rostrum that we shall not, now or ever, barter away the lights of the people of Kashmir in return of a settlement on the basis of a division of spoils.

The Kashmir dispute remains the basic cause of conflict between Pakistan and India. The other frictions and differences between the two countries are not comparable in magnitude and gravity to this essential issue which impinges on the viability and future of Pakistan itself. We are confident that all the other outstanding problems between us and our neighbor can be settled amicably if only the Kashmir quarrel is settled.

For more than a year relations between Pakistan and India have been further aggravated by the expulsion of tens of thousands of Muslim citizens of India from their homes in the States of Assam and Tripura across the border into East Pakistan. This problem is being discussed by the two governments through diplomatic channels. It is our earnest hope that it will be resolved in accordance with law and the principles of justice.

It is a cardinal principle of the foreign policy of Pakistan to live in peace and friendship with all its neighbors, without exception. With some of them we have had differences. We have been largely successful in composing them. We have concluded boundary agreements with Burma, India, Iran, and the People’s Republic of China which have resolved border disputes on the basis of mutual accommodation and friendship.

No country regrets more deeply than mine the outbreak of the border conflict between its two giant neighbors, China and India. This conflict has been a matter of deep and direct concern to us. Its repercussions have complicated the problem of our own security. We believe that this dispute can be resolved peacefully. A solution by war is inconceivable; it carries the risk of escalating into a much wider conflict. It is therefore with deep apprehension that we view the radical alteration in the delicate military balance of the region by the augmentation of India’s military strength. Our fears of the resulting danger to the security of Pakistan are not purely psychological; they are deeply rooted in history and flow from the evidence of India’s readiness to resort to military force to settle disputes with its neighbors. Similar fears have also been voiced in other countries of the region.

Pakistan bears no ill will to the people of India. With the people of India, the people of Pakistan have shared a common history for nearly thousand years. During this long period they have influenced each other in many ways. These facts are central in our awareness. They inform our policy towards our neighbor. We are ever ready to continue the search for a basis of peaceful and honorable co-existence through an equitable settlement of all our mutual differences, of which by far the most important is Kashmir.

If war and violence are to be banished, then ways must be found to solve international disputes peacefully. The world we live in is passing through a period of transition and conflict. There are disputes between nations, there are struggles against domination, there are problems created by racial discrimination and by the existence of economic imbalances between nations. These are the tribulation of our age. The United Nations was established not to perpetuate privilege, but to ensure that, through peaceful change, a world community might be evolved in which no nation will dominate or rise against another.

The domination of one people by another is no new phenomenon; however, the organized form which it has taken under the system of colonialism is perhaps unique in the history of the world. The most pernicious aspect of colonial rule is that economic exploitation, which is its basic purpose, was sought to be concealed under the notion of the superiority of one race over another whether as reflected in the brutal form of apartheid or in the more subtle doctrine of civilizing nations, holding empire over distant lands for the selfless purpose of training their backward peoples in the arts of life.

The bitter legacy of these ideas will, we hope disappear with the final disappearance of colonialism. In the newly-independent countries of Africa one sees today men of all races working together in mutual respect and to mutual advantage.

In South Africa alone, the doctrine of racial discrimination is proclaimed as the official philosophy of the state. The rulers of that unhappy country, blind to the evidence of their eyes, deaf to the appeals of the world, and ignoring the march of history, have attempted to halt its course. South Africa could become the hope of Africa; its rulers have chosen to make it the shame of the world. For many years mankind has hoped and prayed that good sense and reason would prevail in South Africa over prejudice and folly. Let us pray that the time for hope is not past, for the ordeal which the South African government has imposed upon all its people can result only in a victory for hate and chaos.

But let us not court disaster by the fond hope that the moral pressure of appeals made year after year by this Assembly will deflect the South African government from its fatal course. The interests of the peoples of South Africa, be they white, black or brown, and of the peace and tranquility of Africa and of the

world demand that effective measures be taken to check the inhuman policies of South Africa and to avert disaster.

We welcome the decision of the Security Council calling for an embargo on the sale of any kind of arms to South Africa. We hope that, in their own true interest, all those countries whose close political and commercial links with South Africa place them in a position to put effective pressure on the racist regime will not hesitate too long before doing so. The Pakistan delegation is in full sympathy with the efforts that are being made by the General Assembly and its organs to exert pressures on South Africa to develop a multiracial community in which:

“... the social and legal structures would be dedicated to equality of all before the law, and to the participation of all ethnic groups on an equal footing, in economic, social, cultural and political activities.”

All over the world one sees colonialism giving way to relationship between nations based on equality and mutual respect. It is our earnest hope that the Governments of the United Kingdom and the other Administering Authorities will continue to follow the path of wisdom in granting self-government and independence to the remaining Non-Self-Governing Territories under their administration, in accordance with the aspirations of the peoples concerned.

It is a matter of the deepest regret that Portugal persists in an attitude which is contrary to the trend of history and at variance with Portugal's own great past. When the colonial systems of the other European powers are in the process of total dissolution, it is contrary to the laws of life to expect that Portuguese rule in Africa will not pass away. We pray that the leaders of Portugal, who have set their country against the world, will have the vision to see where lie its true interests in Africa and in the world.

In this context, the General Assembly must take note of a historic event which took place in May of this year. Heads of state of thirty-two African Countries met in Addis Ababa and pledged themselves with remarkable unanimity to take active measures in order to liberate the remaining dependent territories in that continent. The conference adopted a Pan-African charter and established consultative machinery. The Pakistan delegation hails this event as the manifestation of Africa's urge to political unity and the consciousness of a Pan-African community. A historian of antiquity has observed that out of Africa there always comes something new. The nations of Asia, and even those of Europe, which are yet lacking in a similar kind of consciousness of their continents must applaud the peoples of Africa for setting them an example. Pakistan wishes God-speed to free Africa in its search for continental unity.

Eight years ago, in the beautiful city of Bandung, twenty-nine independent states of Asia and Africa met together in the first intercontinental conference of the former subject races in the history of mankind. The Bandung Conference

enunciated ten principles of international conduct, including the elimination of colonialism in all its forms and manifestations, to guide them in their international relations. Since 1955, more than a score of dependent peoples have emerged as independent and sovereign states. My delegation believes that, with their distinctive experience, they have a rich contribution to make to the problems which continue to face the peoples of Asia and Africa. Old disputes persist and new frictions have arisen. The time has come, therefore, to convene a second Asian-African conference to review the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the first and to revitalize and renew its pledges which still remain unfulfilled. We have no doubt that a second conference will not fail to make a valuable contribution to world peace.

The passing of colonialism is only the first step towards the establishment of rational and mutually beneficial economic relations between the nations, essential to the well-being of the world as a whole and to the creation of a true international community. This organization, which has made a significant contribution to the liberation of peoples and nations, faces a great challenge in the economic field. The peace, prosperity, and political stability of the world cannot be assured if poverty, disease, and ignorance continue to afflict two-thirds of mankind.

The division of the world into an affluent North and an impoverished South makes for conditions of imbalance and instability. The main problem of the poor countries is not that they are poor in resources or lacking in enterprise. Their problems arise from the fact that, during the period of colonialism, their economies were only developed to serve as adjuncts to the industry and commerce of the colonial powers. It is only in the last decade or so that, upon attaining independence, these countries have turned their attention to the fullest exploitation and development of their resources.

Industrialization is the way to the economic development of under-developed countries, to their ability to satisfy the demands of growing populations for a better way of life and even to the rationalization of agricultural and raw material production.

The task of economic development can be carried out more speedily if their efforts are supplemented by assistance which is demanded not as atonement for past economic wrongs but flowing from a realization of enlightened self-interest. The prosperity of the affluent countries themselves cannot, in the long run, be separated from the economic development of the poorer countries. The need for a common effort to raise the standard of living of the poorer nations is, of course, recognized and I need not labour the point.

We do not believe that a debate on the respective merits of bilateral or international aid programmes would be productive. The needs of the developing countries for capital, for equipment, and for skills are so great that programmes

of aid from different sources will supplement rather than compete with each other. For this reason my government believes that the aid programmes of the United Nations are not a substitute for aid received bilaterally and that increase in the size and scope of the former, for instance, through the establishment of a United Nations capital development fund, is welcomed, both because it will contribute to the total effort and because it will widen participation in that effort.

From whatever sources it may come, the flow of capital and skill into the under-developed countries make a vital contribution to their development efforts, as it will take many years for the presently under-developed countries to reach the stage of self—sustaining growth. This aid is gratefully received, but the availability of aid should not blind us to the fact that the primary purpose and desire of the under-developed countries is to attain viable economies.

Almost all the under-developed countries are producers of raw materials or agricultural commodities, on the export of which they depend for the import of goods and services to sustain and develop their economic life. The short term fluctuations for which the markets of primary products are notorious impose heavy losses on the primary producing countries and add to the difficulties of economic planning. The problem has been made much worse by what appears to be a secular trend of a fall in the price of raw materials and agricultural commodities in comparison with the prices of manufactures and capital goods. In simple terms, this means that the producer in a highly industrialized country is constantly charging more for what he sells to the farmer in the under-developed country and paying the latter less and less for what he has to offer in exchange.

The problem of stabilizing the terms of trade between the industrialized countries and the producers of agricultural commodities and raw materials, therefore, calls for urgent solution. This might take the form of stabilizing the prices of raw materials and commodities, as has been done in the case of coffee, tin, rubber, and some other products, or a scheme to insure developing countries against losses from heavy falls in the prices of their export commodities. It is no less important that the manufactures of the developing countries should not be excluded from existing or potential markets by tariff walls and cartel-like arrangements.

The forthcoming conference on International Trade and Development, which will be held in Geneva next year, will, we hope, make an important contribution towards finding solutions to these problems. Its success will depend on the attitude taken by the industrialized countries in dealing with the problems of the developing countries. We would expect that their own enlightened self interest will prevail over monopolist tendencies and pressures from groups unable to look beyond short-term advantage.

The United Nations is often criticized for its inadequacies. Pakistan has had its share of disappointment. Nevertheless, seeing the United Nations at work in the Congo and in West Iran, who would deny that this organization is a living force and an influence in the affairs of the world? There are few problems between nations which do not, in one form or another, come under the purview of the activities or interests of the United Nations. Whenever nations have sought the assistance of the organization and have given it their honest cooperation, it has been possible to find mutually satisfactory solutions. Indonesia and the Netherlands gave a striking demonstration last year of their faith in the principles of the United Nations Charter by agreeing to the peaceful settlement with the assistance of the organization, of their protracted and bitter dispute over West Irian. That is only an example of what can be achieved when governments are willing to subordinate considerations of sovereignty and narrow self-interest to the common interest of the peaceful settlement of disputes. We note with deep distress that another source of friction has now arisen in the region, affecting three states with which Pakistan has close and friendly ties. We are confident that the statesmanship of the leaders concerned will make possible peaceful adjustment of the situation.

There are many practical ways in which the structure of the organization can be strengthened and its capacity to act made more effective. A more efficient conduct of the work of the General Assembly, in accordance with the suggestions made in the report of the committee set up to examine the matter, is one of the ways in which that can be done. There is need also to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace, and the first essential in this connection is to find ways of avoiding the sort of difficulty that has been experienced in the financing of the peace-keeping operations in the Congo and the Middle East. We are happy that the Working Group on the Examination of the Administrative and Budgetary Procedures of the United Nations has been kept in being and given the mandate of bringing about the widest possible measure of agreement among all member states on the financing of the peace-keeping operations. We sincerely hope that the Working Group will succeed in its task. There is need also that the composition of the main organs of the United Nations, and in particular the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the Secretariat, should be made more representative of the present nearly universal composition of the United Nations. We cannot but regret that political considerations of an extraneous nature have so far made it impossible for the rightful representatives of China to take their place in the United Nations and thereby make the Organization a truly universal one. We hope that counsels of wisdom will prevail in the end and that considerations of a practical nature, if nothing else, will inspire a more realistic approach to this question than has been the case up to now.

The world has known, in the past, attempts by a single power to impose peace and order in the world. The ancient Persians under the Achaemenians established the first world state in history. Alexander the Great was inspired in

pursuit of his world-wide conquests by the ideal of a universal human community. The writ of Rome ran through many parts of Europe Africa, and Asia,. Surviving the dark ages, the ideal of a universal community was largely realized in Europe under dual supremacy of the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor. In the Islamic world, the Caliphate held together diverse peoples and nations for many centuries in the framework of a universal state. Then came Cenghis Khan and following him Timur, who built their world empires on the ruins of great civilizations which they destroyed. They believed and acted upon the credo that, as there is but one God in Heaven, there must be only one ruler on earth. And until recently the sun never set on regions of the earth subject to Pax Britannica.

During the last few centuries, attempts of European powers to establish world-wide or continental domination have plunged mankind into wars of unparalleled suffering and destruction. In the present historical context, the political evolution of the world is oriented towards an international world order based on the consent and cooperation of equal sovereign states.

Can this experiment succeed? Historians who contemplate the contemporary world scene as spectators of all time and all existence do not seem to believe that it will. They look to the imposition of a world order by the unchallengeable power exercised in combination by the two super-states as the only alternative for mankind to self-destruction. In default of such a combination we are warned that in the foreseeable future a third power may well believe itself to be under the mandate of Heaven to rule the world.

Philosophies such as these are a challenge to our faith in the United Nations. The world organization was conceived as an alternative to world hegemony to the domination of one super-power or more over all others. It is inconceivable that in the era of the United Nations sovereign states will acquiesce in an order imposed by the strength of a great power or even that the shape of the world will be decided by the contest of exclusive ideologies or ways of life. We shall do well to remind ourselves, while we are preoccupied with short-term prospective, of the ultimate goal towards which the United Nations must move, if mankind is to be saved from self destruction and permitted to realize the promise of man's high destiny implicit in his advent.

The Pakistan delegation does not wish to enter into a debate of recrimination and slander. We have done our best, in our own moderate and proper fashion to try to impress upon this audience the importance of the settlement of the dispute on Kashmir as a fundamental problem as a problem that affects the peace and stability of Asia. It is my duty, unfortunately, to take this rostrum again to refute the distortions and allegations that have been made against the Government of Pakistan.

First of all, with your permission, I should like to deal with the question of infiltration – a matter which we consider to be a deliberate policy of eviction of

Indian Muslim citizens from India into Pakistan. I would declare here before you that the question whether these people are being evicted or whether they are infiltrators can be decided by a United Nations inquiry commission, by an international inquiry commission, by a Commonwealth inquiry commission, or by any third-party commission agreed to by India and Pakistan. These are ascertainable facts. It can be ascertained by any inquiry commission whether these unfortunate, helpless people driven by the Indian bayonet into Pakistan are Indians or Pakistanis. That is a verifiable fact, an ascertainable fact. The submission of the Government of Pakistan to the Government of India has been that it should kindly stop this genocide and kindly permit its citizens, who have a right under the Indian constitution to live in peace and tranquility on Indian soil, to determine their own future. However, these people, because they are Muslims because the sin they have committed is to have been born with a different religion, are being deliberately driven from their homes and hearths into Pakistan.

We have again and again appealed to the Government of India to hold a ministerial conference on the subject, to hold a high-level conference on the subject, or to allow an inquiry commission to determine the future of these poor, innocent people driven out of their homes, but so far these appeals have fallen on deaf ears. The Government of India has refused to permit a solution of this human problem. These poor, unfortunate people from the States of Assam and Tripura are being driven out of India into East Pakistan, only because they happen to be born Muslims and although they are Indian citizens and under the Indian constitution have the same protection of equal rights as the other citizens of India. I repeat from this rostrum of the United Nations General Assembly that Pakistan is prepared here and now to accept an international inquiry commission into the matter, a United Nations inquiry commission into the matter, a Commonwealth inquiry commission into the matter or any other third-party commission mutually agreed upon by India and Pakistan, to investigate and determine the future of these poor, unfortunate citizens who are being driven from their homes.

We are told that this is a convenient attempt by the Government of Pakistan to reduce its own population so as to remove the disparity in population between East Pakistan and West Pakistan, in order to enable equal representation in the National Assembly of Pakistan on the basis of parity between West Pakistan and East Pakistan. That is an admission of the fact that there have been elections in Pakistan, that there is a National Assembly in Pakistan that there have been not only one election but three elections in Pakistan as in the great state of India, for Pakistan and India became independent at precisely the same time.

I would now refer to the question of Kashmir. It has been said that the central issue in Kashmir is not that of self-determination but that of the aggression committed by Pakistan in the years 1948 and 1949. That is not a new charge. Indian charges of Pakistan's aggression were heard by the Security

Council and rejected when it decided that the question of Kashmir's accession should be decided by the Kashmiris themselves. That decision was accepted by India. Can India now go back on its acceptance of the United Nations resolutions, which were adopted after a full hearing was given to India's charges? Under what notion of justice can a so-called aggression by Pakistan justify the denial to the Kashmiri people of their natural rights to determine their own future? I should like to quote some of the statements of the Prime Minister of India on the question of a plebiscite in Kashmir. The Prime Minister of India said:

"I should like to make it clear that question of aiding Kashmir in this emergency is not designed in any way to influence the State to accede to India. Our view which we have repeatedly made public is that the question of accession in any disputed territory or State must be decided in accordance with wishes of people and we adhere to this view"

That was stated by Mr. Naehru on October 27, 1947.

The prime Minister of India also said:

"We are anxious not to finalize any thing in a moment of crisis and without the fullest opportunity to be given to the people of Kashmir to have their say. It is for them ultimately to decide.

"And let me make it clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute about the accession of a state to either Domination, the accession must be made by the people of that state³. It is in accordance with this policy that we have added a proviso to the Instrument of Accession of Kashmir."

That was stated by Prime Minister Nehru on November 2, 1947.

The Indian representative in the Security Council said:

"The question of the future status of Kashmir *vis-à-vis* her neighbours and the world at large, and a further question, namely, whether she should withdraw from her accession to India, and either accede to Pakistan or remain independent, with a right to claim admission as a Member of the United Nations –all this we have recognized to be a matter for unfettered decision by the people of Kashmir, after normal life is restored to them."

That was stated in the Security Council on January 15, 1948. The following was stated by the Prime Minister of India:

"... the Government of India not only reaffirms its acceptance of the principle that the question of the continuing accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India shall be decided through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United

Nations, but is anxious that the conditions necessary for such a plebiscite should be created as quickly as possible.”

That was stated by the Prime Minister of India in a letter dated September 11, 1951, addressed to the United Nations representatives. Then again the Prime Minister of India stated:

“We have declared that the fate of Kashmir is ultimately to be decided by the people. That pledge we have given not only to the people of Kashmir but to the world. We will not and cannot back out of it.”

That was stated by Mr. Nehru in a broadcast to the Indian nation on November 2, 1947.

Those are the pledges given by no less a person than the Prime Minister of India to his own people, to the people of Pakistan, and to the world at large, both from his own country and in the Security Council of the United Nations. Now we are told that Pakistan has committed aggression in Kashmir. If Pakistan has committed a wrong against the people of Kashmir, let the people of Kashmir themselves decide whether it is Pakistan that has committed any wrong against them or it is the people and Government of India which has usurped their territory and has committed vandalistic plunder against the people of Kashmir. That is for the Kashmiris themselves to decide. It is not for Pakistan or India to decide whether the Kashmiris want to accede to Pakistan or India.

Pakistan does not want Kashmir. We do not say that Kashmir should automatically become a part of Pakistan. We say that the people of Kashmir, like the people of any part of Asia or Africa, should have the right self-determination, that they should decide their own future in a free and impartial way, in a manner which not only the people of Kashmir want but which the government of both, India and Pakistan, have decided in the United Nations by two resolutions of the Security Council. These two resolutions of the Security Council are now being denied, firstly, on the grounds that this would mean Katangization of India, and that a pluralistic state like India would not like to see the Katangization of its country. Nor would we like to see the break-up of our neighbor. Nobody would like to see the Balkanization of a state. But this is not a question of Katanga or of the Balkanization of India. The Indian Independence Act gave the rulers of the princely states the choice to decide their own future in consultation with the wishes of the people. There is no analogy whatsoever between the Balkanization of a country and the exercise of the right of self-determination given to a people and accepted by the other states and agreed to by the Government of India here and to the world at large.

However, another reason has been advanced: that the conditions have changed. The doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus* has been applied by the government of India to the question of Kashmir. It will be recalled that the doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus*, which has no respect for agreements solemnly

arrived at, which shows contempt for agreements entered into by sovereign states, has usually been advanced by aggressive states, by states like Nazi Germany, which tore up agreements on the pretext that conditions had changed.

Is it for India to be a judge of its own cause? If conditions have really changed, it has to be objectively ascertained by an impartial body. Well, let an impartial body objectively ascertain whether conditions have changed. This is not to be ascertained subjectively at any time on the whim and fancy of the Government of India, which has committed aggression against the people of Jammu and Kashmir but does not permit the people of Jammu and Kashmir to exercise the right of self-determination.

Shaikh Muhammad Abdullah, the great leader of Kashmir, languishes in gaol. For the last ten years, this great leader of the people of Kashmir has been rotting in the gaols of India. In that decade, we have seen many nations become free. A decade is a long period. To have the leader of a people in gaol for ten years is far too long. Men die, children enter into maturity –and during that time this leader has been rotting in gaol, and the conscience of the world has not been aroused by the fact that Shaikh Muhammed Abdullah, the leader of the people of Kashmir, languishes in gaol. The world is so conscious of the voluntary imprisonment of a Cardinal in Hungary that the President of a country has to mention it. When a great leader of Algeria is in gaol for five years, the whole world is aroused. But here is the case of a great leader of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, who has been languishing in gaol for the last ten years-and not a word, not a whisper, is uttered.

The hands of India are soiled with the blood of the people of Kashmir. Let their conscience be clear on this matter. Let them release Shaikh Abdullah. Let them hold a free and impartial plebiscite.

I shall quote from the London Times on the question of Sfaikh Abdullah's detention. The London Times says:

“The trial of Shaikh Abdullah, former Primer Minister of Kashmir, drags on in Jammu, and the hearing of charges of criminal conspiracy is moving more slowly than anybody could have expected –except those who believe that the Government is interested not in a conviction but in continued imprisonment for a man who if released would still be a potent force in Kashmir. The tenth anniversary of the Shaikh's first arrest was two weeks ago and he has been in gaol ever since except for four months in 1958.

“The charges of conspiracy were formulated after his rearrest in 1958 but the trial began only a year ago. Then the defence was hopefully calculating that twelve months would see the prosecution case completed, although it was known that the state would produce about 250 witnesses. In fact, the past year has seen only a tenth of that number of witnesses completing their evidence.

“At the beginning of this year, speaking for himself and his colleagues in the dock (there are 24 accused persons), the Shaikh protested against the ‘unconscionable prolongation’ of the trial. He said that he believed the state had spent about £2,600,000 on the case and that he was unable to meet the mounting costs of defense.

“In June, the senior prosecuting counsel, Mr. N. S. Pande” –not the defense counsel, but the senior prosecuting counsel-“ retired from the case. He said that the money for his fees could be better use3d. The trial, he said, could go on for another five to seven years”

All we ask for in Kashmir is that India honors its pledge. India should stand by its pledge, and no pretext should be advanced to interfere with a humanitarian outcome of this dispute. The people of Kashmir like the people of the rest of Asia and Africa should be permitted to decide their own future according to their own free will.

Whether Pakistan should withdraw its troops, and how many of its troops should be withdrawn, is all that we are willing to submit to any third-party inquiry set up to determine what Pakistan should do and what India should do. In the last fifteen years, we have agreed to all fourteen proposals that have been advanced for the settlement of the Kashmir dispute, and India has rejected all of them.

It has been said that India exercises sovereignty over the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and that this sovereignty is total and complete. It is so total and complete that we had six rounds of negotiations with the Government of India, in which I participated, on the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This is a disputed territory, and it will always remain a disputed territory until justice is done to the people of Kashmir. We shall never agree to a solution which is based on expediency and on brute force. Justice is bound to be done to the people of Kashmir ultimately.

Reference has also been made to India’s conflict with China and our concern over this conflict. We are concerned over this conflict, because it affects two states which are our neighbors. We are also affected by it because, as a result of this boundary conflict. India has tried to magnify the whole conflict so as to receive gratuitous armed assistance from the Western powers. In the last fifteen years, India’s policies, even from this rostrum, have always been directed against Western powers. India has always tried to undermine the interests of the West. And now, all of a sudden, we are accused of a metamorphosis-when they themselves are guilty of the most grotesque form of metamorphosis. In fifteen years, from this rostrum and other platforms, India has time and again accused and indicted the West for its policies-and today it says that Pakistan has shifted its policies. What shift in its policies has Pakistan brought about? We are still

members of the two defense alliances; we still adhere to them. It is India that wants the best of both worlds.

The world has been too kind to India. Time will show that India's inconsistent policies are bound to come to a dead end, because India cannot continue this policy of duplicity indefinitely. We are members of the defense alliances, and we have obligations under the defense alliances from which we have not withdrawn. India, however, claims still to be a non-aligned country, whereas in fact we know that, as a result of the assistance that it is receiving, its policies are being directed and geared in certain ways-for a certain period of time-which are beneficial to the Government of India.

We have been accused of taking advantage of the Sino-Indian conflict. I would ask the Assembly: What Advantage has Pakistan taken of that conflict? When the unfortunate conflict broke out and when the Indian armies were on the run and on the run in such a humiliating fashion-Pakistan could well have taken advantage of the situation. But it was Pakistan that restrained itself; it was Pakistan that exercised remarkable restraint and took no action at all. I doubt if any other state in that situation would have restrained itself as Pakistan did at that time. And yet this has not been appreciated. We have been told that we are taking advantage of the situation. As I have said, we could have taken advantage of the situation, but we did not, because we believe in the peaceful method, in the peaceful solution of international disputes, and not in solutions based on armed conflict.

In the last fifteen years, India has committed aggression no less than five times. That is an enviable record: in the last fifteen years I repeat, India has committed aggression five times to settle its international problems. Yet today Pakistan has been called an aggressor. This is most ironic.

We have been accused of having some sort of extraordinary relations with the People's Republic of China. The People's Republic of China is a neighbor of Pakistan. We have a boundary of some 400 miles with the Peoples Republic of China. We desire good relations with all our neighbors. Is that wrong? Is that a crime? Is it wrong for Pakistan to want to have friendly and harmonious relations with all its neighbors, in the interest of peace in Asia and in the interest of peace in the world? We have good neighborly relations with Nepal. We have good neighborly relations with Ceylon. We have good neighborly relations with Burma. We have resumed relations with Afghanistan. We would like to have good neighborly relations with India as well, if India were willing to base its policies on the dictates of justice and equity and were not prone to commit aggression against Pakistan, which it has repeatedly called its "Enemy No.1". The former Defense Minister of India and other responsible people in India, including statesman, have referred to Pakistan as "India's Enemy No.1" –but last October India came into a clash with the People's Republic of China, and not with Pakistan.

What has been so extraordinary about Pakistan's relations with the People's Republic of China? We have signed a boundary agreement with the People's Republic of China because we have a boundary with the People's Republic of China because we have a boundary with the People's Republic of China. If we had a boundary with Nigeria or with Guatemala, we would sign an agreement with Nigeria or Guatemala. But it so happens that the People's Republic of China has a 400- mile boundary with Pakistan. We signed this agreement as an agreement between two equal sovereign states, in a spirit of compromise and adjustment. But these are not the methods to which India subscribes. India wants things on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. That is why India cannot come to any agreement with any of its neighbors. That is why India wants Pakistan to vacate its illusory aggression. That is why India wants the People's Republic of China to vacate its illusory aggression.

We have very generously been offered a "no-war pact" with India. Now, much has been made of this no-war pact offer to Pakistan. It has just been offered again. I believe. Recently, during his visit to the United States, the President of India proposed that a no-war pact be signed between Pakistan and India and be registered with the United Nations. It is assumed that its registration in the United Nations would give the pact international validity in law and in morality.

May we ask the Government of India this question: What sanctity has been attached by India to the United Nations resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir to which India is a party? The respect shown by the Government of India for the United Nations resolutions on Jammu and Kashmir makes us highly skeptical about that assurance.

Pakistan is a member of the United Nations, and, as a member of the international organization, we are enjoined by the Charter of the United Nations to resolve international disputes by peaceful means. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter are quite clear. Article 2, paragraph 3 states:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

Article 2, paragraph 4 states:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations".

These provisions of the Charter place an obligation on Pakistan and on all other members of the United Nations to settle their international disputes by peaceful means. Are these not, in effect, a no-war declaration? As a member of the United Nations for the last fifteen years, and having resolutely carried out in letter and in spirit the resolutions of the United Nations, and believing that the Government of India also, as a member of the United Nations, is enjoined by this very Charter to settle all disputes by peaceful means, we wonder why, instead of discharging our obligations by deed, we should only repeat in words what we have already so solemnly affirmed between ourselves and before the world organization.

On the eve of the final round of talks, when it was clear that the chances of success were remote, and after making it difficult for the problem to be settled by peaceful means on the basis of honor and equity, India proposed a no-war pact, which in reality means that Pakistan should accept the cease-fire line as a permanent division of Kashmir. If we were to have agreed to a no-war pact, it would have meant that Pakistan agreed to accept the *status quo*. Such settlement can never be described as honorable and equitable. I repeat: Pakistan will not resort to armed conflict at this time or at any time. But we cannot sign on the dotted line on India's dictation.

We are one-third the size of India in every respect—in terms of population and territory, in terms of armed forces, manpower and economic strength. In all respects we are one-third the size of India. Pakistan would never embark on aggression against India, not only because we are a smaller country, but also because it is a cardinal principle of our foreign policy to settle all disputes by peaceful means and through negotiations, in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

From our point of view, it would be repugnant to our interests, to our higher principles to the welfare of our people and to peace and stability in the sub-continent and Asia, to embark on aggression to resolve the Kashmir dispute. We have never taken such action. We were not even tempted to resort to a show of force during India's greatest hour of humiliation and defeat last winter. This is a sufficient demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions. I think that very few countries would have restrained themselves as Pakistan did when India faced this disaster on its frontiers against the People's Republic of China. There can be no better demonstration of Pakistan's peaceful intentions in words and in deeds than the conduct of Pakistan in the last fifteen years.

What, on the other hand, has been the conduct of India? What has been the attitude of India in the settlement of its disputes? India has the rare privilege of being the only modern state which in fifteen years has resorted on less than five times to armed force to settle its international problems.

In this respect, let us consider the statements of the leaders of India. I hope that the Assembly will bear with me when I repeat what has been stated by Indian leaders on the method of settling the Kashmir problem.

The Prime Minister of India said, on January 21, 1962:

“So far as China and Pakistan are concerned, India is determined to vacate their aggression”.

The former Defense Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, stated:

“You are aware that we have not abjured violence in regard to any country who violates our interests”.

The Congress President, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, said:

“We have to liberate the occupied areas in Kashmir. We are postponing the issue but we do not accept the cease-fire line as a permanent solution”.

He expected the people in occupied Kashmir to struggle to rid themselves of the usurper and said that:

“within a short period of time the Government of India will choose the correct time to liberate that part of Kashmir which is under Pakistan’s control”.

These are the remarks of those Indian leaders who have offered Pakistan a no-war pact.

We have good relations with all countries, with all the countries in our region. We have tried to resolve our differences by peaceful means with all countries with whom we have had differences. Pakistan will continue to promote peace in our region and peace in the world. We shall not resort to force. We shall live not only by our words but we shall show that our words can be demonstrated in action. It is for the Indian government to adopt similar policies so that we can live in peace.

Our people live in poverty. We want to wipe out the stigma and the vice of poverty. We would like to see co-operation and good-will between the people of India and the people of Pakistan so that we could harness our resources for the good of our people in the subcontinent, and for the good of people in Asia so that we can march forward towards a better order.

It is not the law of God that only the people of Asia and Africa shall live in poverty. Let us co-operate and let us bring about the best of our talents in order to eradicate the stigma of poverty, but this can only be done if there is justice in the world, if people are willing to accept the principles of equality, if they are willing to settle their disputes by peaceful means. It is of no avail to try to cast any doubts in the minds of our friends. We are steadfast friends. We have remained

steadfast friends with those with whom we have had friendship, and over the last fifteen years Pakistan has demonstrated that it lives by its words and its deeds.

I pledge here, on behalf of the 100 million people of Pakistan, that the right of self-determination, which is a right which India has agreed to give to the people of Kashmir, will be achieved, and that the people of Kashmir will become the recipients of justice, because that is the law of equity and that is the law of fraternity.

Address to the Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1963

The representative of India has stated:

“What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of the unprincipled behavior of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression.”

I am constrained to exercise my right of reply because there can be no doubt of the representative of India's aspersions against my country. May I ask, was China an erstwhile enemy of Pakistan with whom Pakistan has now become friends? If so, I should like the representative of India to produce evidence of Pakistan's enmity with China.

Since the emergence of the People's Republic of China towards the end of 1949, Pakistan has had a correct and friendly relation with that country. We recognized the People's Republic of China in 1950, about the same time as India did, and also the United Kingdom. We voted for the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations in 1950 and in the following years. We became a member of the Manila Treaty-better known as SEATO-in 1945 but, as this was purely a defensive treaty against aggression, our relations with the People's Republic of China continued in their normal course.

In 1956 Prime Minister Chou En-Lai visited Pakistan at the invitation of the Government of Pakistan, and his visit was returned by the Prime Minister of Pakistan as a reciprocal gesture of courtesy and goodwill. In December, 1960, two years before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last October, Pakistan proposed a demarcation of the common border between China's province of Sinkiang and the contiguous areas the defense of which is the responsibility of Pakistan. The People's Republic of China gave a favorable indication of its willingness to negotiate a boundary agreement. The preliminary formalities were completed in May, 1962, and the negotiations themselves commenced in Peking before China and India clashed in the NEFA and the Ladakh frontiers.

Does this record of Pakistan's relations with China establish that the two countries were enemies who became friends only after the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict last year?

The Representative of India, in the same passage, has accused Pakistan, by insinuation, of “seeking strange alliances for collusion in aggression”. May I ask the representative of India to produce evidence of these “strange alliances”? Was she referring perchance to the boundary agreement completed last year or to the trade and air agreement? What evidence is there in India's possession of

this “collusion in aggression”? I have already said that we have entered into no such collusion; if we had, we would have taken advantage of the opportunity to attack India last October when India was engaged in a conflict with China. We did not do so; and yet India, instead of appreciating the peaceful conduct and good neighborly intentions of Pakistan, has accused Pakistan of “collusion in aggression”.

It is clear from the allegation of the representative of India that in its pursuit of domination and hegemony of the Indian Ocean region. India cannot contemplate with equanimity the existence of small independent states on its borders and will not permit them the right to conduct their own affairs internally and externally. Only a few years ago, when the cry of Chini-Hindi Bhai Bhai, which means “China-India, our brothers” was resounding from one corner of India to the other, Pakistan was accused of not being friendly to India’s brother, the People’s Republic of China, and of aligning itself as a member of SEATO against China.

Today, when the relationship between India and China has become unfraternal, Pakistan is accused of having changed its feelings of enmity towards China to those of friendship. This kind of self-reversal is psychologically interesting. It indicates, I fear, a paranoid state. Otherwise, why should India expect its neighboring countries to regulate their own relationships with third countries according to the twists and turns of India’s own relations with them? The fact is that India cannot bring itself to recognize that its neighbors have the right, as equal sovereign states, to make independent judgments and conduct their foreign relations with other countries in the light of their own interests and in the interests of international peace and security. Is this not a covert claim to suzerainty of India over its smaller neighbors and the manifestation of neo-colonialism in its most insidious form?

The representative of India went on to state: “It is noteworthy that such collusion extends to the point where one of the parties describes the naked aggression committed by the other as “illusory” as was done in this Assembly only a few days ago.”

Obviously, the representative of India is referring to my reply to her allegations before this Assembly on September 30. Aggression, as this Assembly is aware, is both a matter of law and a matter of fact. What is the principle of international law that was transgressed in the outbreak of fighting between India and China last October? Is the MacMahon Line a legal line? It is so claimed by the Government of India. It is denied by the People’s Republic of China.

It may also be noted that the legality of the MacMahon Line was also denied by its predecessor government the Republic of China.

Have the Colombo Powers, which have been exercising their good offices to bring about a peaceful adjustment of the situation between India and China, given their verdict on this Indian charge of aggression against China? To the best of our knowledge the judgment, the fact of who committed aggression last October has yet to be established. Surely, India's own word cannot be the final verdict even though India believes that it can do no wrong.

The representative of India also said, with all the authority of her government that she would like to deny categorically my assertion that the central issue in Kashmir is that of self-determination. Let me remind her of the statement of the Prime Minister of India, made on November 25, 1947, in the Indian Constituent Assembly: "The issue in Kashmir is whether violence and naked force shall decide the future or the will of the people."

Does the representative of India deny the statement? The representative of India also referred to the genesis of the Kashmir dispute and alleged that Pakistan is embarrassed by facts relating to its origin. She mentioned the acts of "plunder, arson, rape, and murder" alleged to have been committed by the tribesmen who entered Kashmir through Pakistan territory. But she passed over in complete silence the acts of plunder, arson, rape, and murder committed by the feudal tyrant, the Maharajah of Kashmir, and multiplied a thousand-fold in his campaign of genocide against his own people-the same tyrant from whom India claims to derive sovereignty over Kashmir. Let me cite the report of the London Times of October 10, 1947, that "237,000 Muslims were systematically exterminated, unless they escaped to Pakistan, by the Dogra forces, headed by the Maharajah in person. "

The representative of India gave her own version of the United Nations Commission's resolutions on Kashmir, according to which she tried to fasten on Pakistan the obligation to effect an unconditional and unilateral withdrawal of its military forces from Kashmir. But the essence of these resolutions is that the obligations of withdrawal of forces by the two sides are reciprocal and that the withdrawals should be concurrent. Moreover, these withdrawals had to be governed by the Truce Agreement between the parties. It is India which has consistently refused to co-operate in the formulation of this agreement and the modalities of its implementation. Then it turns around and accuses Pakistan of failure to comply with the United Nations Commission's resolutions.

The representative of India maintains that India's sovereignty over Kashmir is complete and total and cannot be questioned. Not so long ago, we used to hear in these very halls similar reiterations of the unquestionable sovereignty of France over Algeria, and we continue to hear them from Portugal. These "unquestionable" claims have not only been questioned but unsettled by the irrepressible force of the principle of self-determination enunciated by the Charter.

But we find from the statement of the representative of India that India has, as it were procured proof of its claim to sovereignty from the fact of its involvement with China in Ladakh. I confess that it is hard for me to comment on a statement of this kind because the only inference to which it can lead is that India chose to provoke China into conflict so that it might thereby consolidate its title over Kashmir. Then the Indian representative opposes self-determination in the following terms; "It does not, however, apply to the present case, since it is not applicable to a section of a people. It applies to all those territories where, by force of arms or by the vicissitudes of history people are held under an alien power. If the policy of self-determination were to apply to parts of constitutionally created states most of them would be broken up. The plea of self-determination in a plural society could mean nothing but disruption. And may I add that most of the new states in Asia and Africa fall into this category. That is why, I venture to suggest, that United Nations tried so hard to prevent the secession of Katanga on the plea of self-determination."

The representatives will note the attempt made here to denounce self-determination by trying to relate it to the question of Katanga's secession. The Katanga question had nothing to do with self-determination. In fact, the secession of Katanga was aimed at the destruction of the self-determination of the Congolese people. Had Mr. Tshombe consulted the wishes of the population of Katanga, is there any doubt that the majority of the different tribes inhabiting that province would have voted against secession? What he did in fact was to substitute his own arbitrary will, as the Maharajah of Kashmir did, for the people's right of self-determination. We trust that the representative of India will refrain from attempting to establish similarities where none exist.

In regard to the contention that the right of self-determination is not applicable to a section of the people and that if applied to parts of constitutionally created states most of them would be broken up let me remind the representative of India that the people of Kashmir are not a section of the people of India. Nor is Kashmir a part of the constitutionally created state of India. Let me remind the representative of India of the statement of the Prime Minister of India made in the Indian Parliament on March 31, 1955; "Kashmir, while a problem between India and Pakistan, is not a thing to be bandied about between India and Pakistan for it has a soul of its own and an individuality of its own. "

Let me remind the representative of India also of his statement of January 2, 1952: "Kashmir belongs to the Kashmiri people. If they tell us to walk out. I would have no hesitation in quitting Kashmir."

The so-called argument about India being a plural society which should not be disrupted by the application of the principle of self-determination, if logically followed, would give a new lease on life to imperialistic establishments. It would mean that empires should never be dissolved. Then the representative of India referred to the "two-nation" theory on the basis of which British India was

partitioned into India and Pakistan. This was never a theory. It was also a fact embedded in the history of the sub continent for a thousand years and its logical consequence-namely, the Hindus and Muslims are entitled to separate sovereignties in their respective majority areas-was accepted as much by India as by Pakistan.

It did not mean any division of classes of citizenship between Hindus and Moslems either in India or in Pakistan. By bringing it into controversy the Indian leaders are only trying to question the principle of the establishment of Pakistan, thus making it impossible for relations between the two countries ever to be stabilized. This notwithstanding, we welcome the pronouncement of the representative of India in seeking the friendship and co-operation of my country. Pakistan has always demonstrated its sincere willingness to be a partner in the peaceful pursuit of a more prosperous and happier sub-continent. As I said on September 30, it is not the law of nature for our people to live in perpetual poverty. We are willing to share our talents and resources for a better life for our people, for the people of India and the people of Pakistan. What a great and glorious vista can be opened up only when India vacates its aggression in Kashmir and permits the unfortunate people of that strife-ridden region to share and participate in the mutual benefits as a people who have determined their destiny.

Pakistan has sedulously striven by peaceful means to achieve this honorable end. Unfortunately, India persists in holding the people of Kashmir in bondage. Let the chains of incarceration break, free the Kashmiris and have the friendship and good will of Pakistan. In so doing, India would be the greater for it. It would have then truly contributed to a peaceful order in the sub-continent.

Pakistan is one-third the size of India. We would, therefore, welcome from every consideration the complete amelioration of tension and bitterness between us. It has always been Pakistan's effort to establish cordial relations with our neighbors, but in establishing this relationship it is wiser to break the barrier of injustice and aggression that divides us in Kashmir and which India has erected in defiance of the United Nations resolutions and its own solemn pledges.

Co-operation does not flow from words. It is rooted in conduct and in positive action. Let India's words be matched by its actions. Neither India nor the world will find Pakistan faltering in its fullest response to a positive gesture recognizing the norms of justice and equity in the world.

Address to the Plenary Meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on October 11, 1963

It is rather astonishing that the representative of the Government of India should question the right of the delegation of Pakistan to exercise its right of reply. The representative of India opened her statement by saying that the Pakistan delegation did not have this inherent right which is recognized in the Charter, in the rules of procedure, and in the practices of the United Nations. This is the inherent right of every member, and it is a duty which every country owes to its people.

In my general policy statement of September 30 my references to the fundamental dispute and to the question of the deportation of Muslims from the States of Assam and Tripura were brief and, objectively speaking, unprovocative. Kashmir is a matter of fundamental importance to Pakistan. It is the great divider between India and Pakistan. Therefore it was my duty to make reference to that dispute, if disputes are to be settled between states in a peaceful manner and in accordance with the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations. It was the leader of the Indian delegation that chose to enter into a battle of words, into polemics, and made various references to Kashmir and to other matters and also touched upon questions which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan. Therefore it was again my duty to my country and my duty to this body and to the world at large to place the facts—the true facts—on record. The representative of India this afternoon has questioned my right to do so. Herein lies the attitude of the Government of India on disputes and matters that concern it. When it comes to the disputes of other states, India always takes the role of a preacher and admonishes countries that have dispute and tells them how to settle their disputes; but when a dispute affects India it refuses the right to a country that is also a party to the dispute even to mention the dispute or to exercise the right of reply. This is the attitude which unfortunately persists and it does not permit a settlement on the basis of negotiation, on the basis of understanding, and on the basis of mutual accommodation.

So great is India's tradition of interfering in the affairs of other countries that this evening the representative of India said that the Hindu population of Pakistan should have increased by two-and-on-quarter per cent and the fact that this population had not increased by two-and-one-quarter per cent was something equally surprising. The Indian government would now like to tell other states how their population should increase within a given period of time and it wants to interfere in the exercise of the conjugal rights of citizens of another country. I think this shows the Indian government's attitude in interfering in such fundamental issues which are entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of another country. We have 10 million Hindus living in East Pakistan and about a million or so living in West Pakistan. Now we have heard the Government of India tell us that population is not large enough and should increase by two-and-one-quarter

per cent. In acquiescence to the demand of the representative of India. I shall convey this demand of the Government of India to my authorities and we shall try to oblige it in this and any other way in order to bring about mutual accommodation based on a common understanding between states.

The representative of India today and on-September 30 made references also to the system of government that exist in Pakistan and contrasted them with the system of government in India. The representative of India referred to India as a democracy and said that in Pakistan democracy does not exist and that, because democracy does not exist in Pakistan, the people of Kashmir should have no right to self-determination. That is weird logic which we cannot understand. As far as democracy in India is concerned, I am not going to go into that matter in detail, for it is not my concern what form or system of government exists in India. Nor am I going to quote any of the Indian leaders on whether or no democracy exists in India or on whether there is only a form of democracy and in substance a dictatorship there. I will not refer to the patina of evidence in that respect. I will only mention what the President of the Republic of India said on October 1, 1963, as was reported in The New York Times. The President of the Republic of India, that great philosopher, said:

“What we have in India today is not real democracy but only a phony democracy. If we were real democrats-which, I may say, we are not-there would not be so much discontent and ill-will.”

That statement was made by the Head of State of India only a few days ago on the brand of democracy that exists in India.

Then we are told that I protested from this rostrum against the incarceration of that great Kashmiri leader, Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. To justify the imprisonment of Sheikh Abdullah the representative of India said that at one stage or other Pakistan called Sheikh Abdullah a quisling, The question here is not what Pakistan at one stage or other called Sheikh Abdullah. Is Sheikh Abdullah in prison because we called him a quisling? This is a very interesting situation. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the great leader of the people of Kashmir, has been rotting in gaol for the past ten years. It is true that he is having a trial-a trial after a fashion. Here, again, the Indians excel in forms. Both of us have learnt something or other from the British, and in this matter I think the Indians have surpassed us: to maintain the forms of democracy but in substance to have a dictatorship and to have arbitrary authority. Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is undergoing trial, we are told-a trial that has been going on for ten years. In ten years, out of 3,000 witnesses, only 30 witnesses have been examined. It must be a complicated trial, and obviously it will take time for the proceedings to end but when the proceedings will end is something that neither you nor I can contemplate, for the patience of the Indian people is well known in history. This trial will go on indefinitely. Sheikh Abdullah will receive justice,

because so far 30 witnesses have given evidence in a trial where 3,000 witnesses are involved.

I refer to this unjust incarceration of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, not because we wish to interfere in the internal affairs of India; I refer to it because Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah is not an Indian citizen. His nationality has yet to be determined. Therefore I have a right to refer to the imprisonment of Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah. However, the Indian representative, again with a logic which the Indians can best understand, has referred, by way of defence or by way of an answer, to the imprisonment of a Pakistani national, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan. As the latter is a Pakistan national, this is a matter which is entirely within the domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan, and India has no right to make reference to his imprisonment. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan's brother was a Chief Minister of our province recently-right up to 1955. It is not that he has something inherently wrong with him. Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan was against the two-nation theory. He was against the establishment of Pakistan. India has no right to refer to the imprisonment of a man who is not a national of the Indian Government and who does not come from a disputed territory.

Again distortion reached its climax and apogee when we were told a few moments ago that I said that we had held the MacMahltos Line in dispute. One can imagine the justice and the fairness with which India analyses the situation, because I had hardly left the rostrum when this utter distortion took place. I did not say anything of the kind. I said that the Indian government claims the MacMahon Line to be the dividing line between India and China and that this is denied by the People's Republic of China. I said that the dispute arose because the Government of India recognizes it as the legal dividing line between India and China and the People's Republic of China does not recognize it. How did establish in any way that Pakistan has pronounced its opinion on the MacMahon Line?

We were told that India made no reference whatsoever to Kashmir and as India had made no reference to Kashmir, and then it was our bounden duty also to make no reference to Kashmir. It is very convenient for India not to make reference to Kashmir. It is obvious why India would not like to make any reference to Kashmir. It is because India has grabbed Kashmir, because India has been holding Kashmir in bondage, and because India does not want the world to know the facts about Kashmir. India wants no light to be thrown on this ugly problem, whereas it is our duty, a duty that we owe to our people and to the people of Kashmir, to mention the Kashmir problem.

If the people of Kashmir had exercised their right of self-determination and if the matter had been settled, I too would have made no reference to Kashmir. So India has not shown any magnanimity in not making reference to Kashmir. It is understandable why India would not make any reference to Kashmir.

And then we are told that instead of responding to a gesture, we have talked about it and have entered into a dialogue on the subject. Here again today another very invidious accusation was made against Pakistan. It was said, and I quote again—"What grieves us most deeply in this context is the recent tendency of unprincipled behavior, of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression". We are accused here of unprincipled behavior, of making friends of erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression.

These are very serious charges. These are charges which have to be refuted. The representative of India has accused Pakistan of unprincipled behavior, of making friends with erstwhile enemies and of seeking strange alliances for collusion and aggression, and has said that the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, representing his country, has no right to exercise his right of reply.

Now I ask you, Mr. President, if this is to be the conduct of India, if these are the edicts with which the world has to comply, then I am afraid that justice will never truly be achieved.

Other consequences were also embodied in the statement. It must not be forgotten that the Sino-Indian conflict took place on the Ladakh front. Ladakh is a part of Kashmir. There are three subdivisions of Ladakh: Skardu, Kargil, and Ladakh-and fighting took place in Ladakh. Ladakh is a part of Kashmir and Kashmir is a territory held in dispute. With all the consequences flowing out of these sinister charges, we are none the less told by the representative of India that we have no right to exercise our right of reply.

It is not only a question of the exercise of their right of self-determination to which India is a party and has pledged its word, it is not only a question of denying the people of Kashmir their inherent right, but the tragedy has become all the more painful because these poor Kashmiris who have nothing whatsoever to do with the disputes of the giants that are involved in a clash of today became the battlefield of India's clash with China. If the poor people of Kashmir had been allowed to exercise their right of self-determination and if they had determined their destiny by now, they would not be involved in that clash which does not really concern them today, because the Kashmiris are not truly a part of India. They have been made into guinea pigs, because India is waging its war and conflict with the Chinese in Ladakh, which is a part of Kashmir. These peaceful people, who have always known peace and tranquility in their land, have today become the guinea pigs of a conflict which does not concern them in any way. If they had exercised their right of self-determination and had chosen to be a part of Pakistan, they would have lived as peacefully in Pakistan as the rest of the people of Pakistan.

So this adds painfully to the tragedy that is taking place. In this clash of two great giants, this tiny little spot, this beautiful vale of Kashmir has been unnecessarily involved.

We have also been told that the doctrine of *rebus sic stantibus* applies to treaties but not to commitments. Now a treaty is also a commitment. It is the commitment of a state. If we are told that the resolutions of the United Nations can be flouted, that the resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly can be flouted because there is a difference between a treaty and a commitment, this shows grotesque and flagrant contempt for the Charter of the United Nations. It was recently said that Charter or no Charter, when India embarks on its aggression, then whether there is international law or not it is nobody's concern and the world must take what India wants, and there is no international law in that event. It is a terrifying statement that *rebus sic stantibus* means that you can break your word in the United Nations with respect to resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, but that perhaps you cannot break your word with respect to treaties.

So today we have been told that as far as the United Nations is concerned, whether it is the General Assembly or the Security Council, upon which rests the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, commitments made by states do not have to be honoured. How then are we to proceed if the United Nations is no longer a forum for adjudication and settlement of disputes? Commitments are made in the United Nations and confirmed and reiterated by the Prime Minister of a country, and a few years later we are told that these commitments are not honorable commitments and are therefore not pledges which have to be honored. But with respect to treaties perhaps it is a different story.

This places the world in a great state of confusion. This shows an utter lack of respect for the United Nations. This shows that all our efforts to build a better peace through the peaceful role of the United Nations is null and void. This is a matter which causes us grave concern.

It has also been said that Pakistan has not implemented the resolutions of the United Nations. Here we have time and again said that a third party should determine who has and who has not implemented the resolutions. We are still anxious to settle through the United Nations this unfortunate dispute that divides the two countries, or through any other acceptable principle of international law. Is this an unreasonable stand? If we are charged by India with not complying with the resolutions, we say let the United Nations or let an impartial international body determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions. It is India that does not comply with the resolutions and then charges Pakistan with not complying with the resolutions. Why should we not want to comply with the resolutions? We want to see an end to this problem and dispute, because we want to live in peace with them. We are a small country and India is a large

country which has ambitions from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong River. But we are a small country and would like to live in peace with them. We would not like to leave a dispute with them. But justice must be done in order to live in peace with them, and peace can only come through respect for international law and adherence to international obligations and commitments, and not by the dictates of a great power against a small power. The world would be menaced if the great powers or the semi-great powers were to dictate to the small powers. We resent the dictation of the great powers-all of us resent it-and why should Pakistan be an exception in this case? We equally resent this dictation. We do not expect India to determine whether or not we have complied with the resolutions-let the United Nations decide or let an impartial third party decide whether or not Pakistan has complied with them.

Again I make this offer here: let us break the impasse. It is not beyond the scope of ingenuity or the efforts of men to find an honorable and equitable solution of this problem. We were told as far as Tripura is concerned, that an exodus is taking place there, that Pakistan has been avoiding a settlement of the problem, and that at the bilateral negotiations on behalf of Pakistan, conducted by me over there, we refused to accept a settlement of this issue. This also, with due respect, I would say is not the correct position. At those bilateral negotiations we submitted that as Kashmir was the fundamental problem, efforts should be made first to settle Kashmir and then the other issues, because Kashmir is the root of all evil and if that problem were to be settled, then all these symptoms would almost automatically subside. This is not an unreasonable submission. But when we found that the intransigence was as complete as it had been in the past we said: since we cannot make progress on this matter, let us go to the other question and have it at a ministerial level. But again the Government of India refused to have it at the ministerial level, but to have it considered by other officials. But if it is left to the officials, we know what happens; the question drags on *ad infinitum*.

On September 30 I said that Pakistan was willing to accept the adjudication of the United Nations or of an international commission, even a commission composed of Commonwealth countries or any other third-party countries acceptable to both India and Pakistan. On behalf of my government, I again renew that offer, that the question of Tripura can be settled in this fashion because this is the only proper and correct fashion in which it could be settled. We are disappointed and aggrieved that all our efforts to bring about a settlement with our great neighbor have so far been refused by India.

We have accepted every proposal that has been made so far for the settlement of the problem of Kashmir and the other questions. But India does not seek to settle them because India wants to continue its hold and its oppression of Kashmir.

We are told of collusion with China. What collusion? When India was in conflict with China and had to withdraw the bulk of its armed forces for the first time for the Chinese front, Pakistan did, nothing at all, did not lift a finger, did not move a single soldier, did not fire a single bullet. And yet we are told of collusion with China against India. If these gestures of goodwill and neighborliness are to be flouted and not appreciated, where can Pakistan go? What alternative have we got?

In the last decade or so Pakistan has stood for the peaceful settlement of all disputes. We have seen former colonies become independent. In our own small way we have contributed to the efforts to decolonize them. We stand for decolonization. For Morocco, Tunisia, and Algeria it was Pakistan that made every effort to see that there should be justice and decolonization. In the case of Algeria, Pakistan offered recognition at a time when India had not. And the reasons were obvious-because of the Kashmir dispute and because of India's stake in the Security Council where France is a permanent member. France, of course, has always supported the right of self-determination, and for this we are grateful, and we are grateful that that great country and its leader did not change that stand when we accorded recognition to Algeria, even risking perhaps a turn of events. But India did not accord recognition to Algeria because India thought that such a move might have some repercussions in the Security Council.

Pakistan has tried in every way to enhance international peace and security. We have welcomed all countries which have come here and become members of the United Nations through the exercise of the right of self-determination. This is our contribution to the exercise of the right of self-determination for other countries. How can we not be concerned with the right of self-determination?

The people of Kashmir are our blood and therefore we will struggle for this right, and this right is bound to be achieved because it is a right which cannot be denied to the people of Kashmir. Some voices may be silent today on this issue but we know that international opinion will spread concerning this matter and that it will become the concern of the world because it is a grave issue which divides two great powers and holds the people of Kashmir in bondage.

Address to the Nineteenth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on January 22, 1965

Mr. President,

On behalf of the delegation of Pakistan. I take pleasure in extending to you our most sincere congratulations on your election to the high office of the President of this Assembly. Having had the pleasure of knowing you personally for many years, may I also add my personal greetings. I am confident that your conduct of the deliberations of the assembly will add to your reputation and further enhance the good name of your country with which Pakistan enjoys relations of increasing friendliness and co-operation.

It is all too evident that we are passing through a time of severe test for the United Nations, for its efficacy and, indeed, its very existence. The constitutional crisis that has overtaken us has its roots in different conceptions of the role of the United Nations in the minds of the great powers. We all have our ideas on the ideal solution for this crisis. If I do not choose to articulate mine at this stage, it is for the sole reason that the issue is the subject of delicate negotiations at present and I have no wish to try to muddy the waters still more. At the moment, it might not be an excessive hope that the immediate issue of the normalization of the Assembly's proceedings will soon be resolved. But that, of course, will not be the final resolution of the crisis; the deeper problem of the harmonization of our views regarding the functions of the United Nations and its two main organs, the General Assembly and the Security Council, will remain.

I am confident that the Asian, African, and Latin American countries, which have an enormous stake in the existence and vitality of the United Nations, will play a decisive role in that final resolution. They have demonstrated their deep concern and it has, I believe, become apparent that no solution of the problem will be viable unless it has the wholehearted support of the smaller powers that constitute the bulk of the United Nations. It is encouraging to observe that their influence has served to translate the issue from a clash of rigid, legalistic, and doctrinal standpoints to the problem of how the activities of the United Nations can be realistically financed and its constitution worked in such a way that its capacity to keep the peace will not be impaired.

It seems generally accepted that the whole problem of peacekeeping by the United Nations needs to be comprehensively reviewed. When occasion arises, my government will put forth its considered views on the various issues involved. At this stage, it is enough for me to state our basic assumptions. These are;

First, like all peace-loving states, Pakistan needs the United Nations with its capacity enhanced;

Second, this need will not be fulfilled if the United Nations departs radically from the Charter, unless there is agreement on suitable amendments to the Charter;

Third, the international community is confronted at present with problems, immediate and awesome, with which no other organization than the United Nations is equipped to deal;

Fourth, the present crisis will not be finally resolved unless we all candidly take stock of our respective experiences of the working of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and, in so doing, co-ordinate our viewpoints in order to evolve a common approach to its role and intervention in future.

It is enough to consider the international situation as a whole, and the problems and disputes which trouble various parts of the world, to realize the need for a continuous strengthening of the will and the ability of the international community to defend peace and make it possible for the world to work for the progress of its peoples. What is needed, as the United Nations Organization enters the twentieth year of its existence, a year which has been declared as the International Co-operation Year, is a reappraisal of its achievements and its shortcomings and a solemn rededication to its original principles and purposes. The League of Nations was established largely for the purpose of maintaining the *status quo* in Europe. Today, voices are again raised in favour of maintaining a world-wide *status quo* on the basis of something which has been described as the law of the ceasefire line.

Mr. President, the world is today going through a period of upheaval without precedent. It would be a delusion of the most dangerous kind to believe that the world, as it is today, however pleasant it might seem to some, can be maintained on the basis of make-shift solutions and a precariously balanced *status quo*. Around the world are problems that must be solved; racial conflict, remnants of colonialism, nations divided by war or strategy, the human race divided among those who possess wealth beyond the wildest dreams of the alchemists and those for whom their daily crust of bread must fall like manna from heaven. Where, in a world thus divided, shall we draw our ceasefire lines? The United Nations must not be allowed to become the instrument of injustice and inequality. That is the way, not to peace and security, but to the quick sands of expediency and the maze of power politics. If this organization is not to go the way of the League of Nations, it must never lose sight of its very first purpose—to secure settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law.

The tendency of great powers to look at disputes between other nations not on their merits, but on their relation to their own power interests, the inconclusiveness of the proceedings of the Security Council because of this tendency, the complacent assumption that disputes between countries which are not militarily very powerful can easily be frozen, the refusal to make pronouncements on disputes in accordance with principles universally accepted—all these have been responsible for a state of affairs in which disputes not only remain unsolved but are aggravated by the passage of time.

While mankind places its hope on significant progress towards an abiding peace, stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction in the armouries of the great powers, and exactions made on their people by others not so great in their blind quest for acquiring more arms at any cost, constitute in themselves a cause of world tension and a growing threat to peace. In view of this deplorable state of affairs, disarmament acquires added urgency and becomes an important and vital end in itself. The Geneva disarmament talks will soon enter their fifth year. We must pay tribute to the patience of the members of the Geneva Conference, to the spirit of sincerity shown by many of them over the years. The goal of complete and general disarmament unfortunately remains as distant as ever. The partial Test Ban Treaty gives us no reason for complacency as long as we are unable to secure the objective of a total ban on the production, testing, and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. It is hard to see how these complex objectives can be achieved by a body which excludes one nuclear power and is not joined by another. It is essential that a new start should be made, on a realistic basis, to seek the elimination of arms and armaments, particularly those which threaten the very existence of civilization.

The most immediate problem, in this connection, is that of stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons. My country is among those which have urged, year after year, in this Assembly that if the problem of the spread of nuclear weapons is not checked in time and if some firm arrangements are not made to prevent conditions in which a sixth country joins the ranks of nuclear countries, one can be certain that, sooner or later, such a sixth nuclear power will emerge. This will necessarily be followed by yet other countries.

Let me recall here the words spoken by the President of Pakistan in his address to the Seventeenth Session of the General Assembly on September 26, 1962. He said, and I quote:

“Permit me to observe that the mere adoption of resolutions against the dissemination of nuclear weapons and in favour of the establishment of a non-nuclear club will not remove this danger. Unless the United Nations takes effective and urgent action in this direction, the race in nuclear armaments is bound to overtake other parts of the world in the immediate future.

“This imminent peril demands that the General Assembly give urgent consideration to the conclusion of a treaty to outlaw the further spread of nuclear weapons and the knowledge of their manufacture, whether by acquisition from the present nuclear powers or by any other means. The conclusion of such a treaty cannot wait until agreement is reached on other measures of disarmament.”

In the International Atomic Energy Agency, Pakistan has always advocated and supported the strengthening of a system of safeguards against the use of atomic reactors for weapons purposes. With all its inadequacies, the international safeguards system offers some security against the future dissemination of nuclear weapons. We continue to believe that the Agency's system of safeguards should become mandatory and universal and that it should be developed to cover all aspects of nuclear capability. It has to be recognized, however, that matters have now reached a stage when a piecemeal strengthening of the Agency's safeguards and of their application in a haphazard manner will not meet the requirements of the situation. We would urge that an international conference should be called at which all the countries of the world, including those at present not members of the United Nations or not represented in it, should examine this whole question in detail and devise strict arrangements which would make it impossible for non-nuclear powers to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons.

The Pakistan delegation has no doubt that such a measure would arrest the further deterioration of the present situation which threatens the world with a holocaust. It would also open the way to a more realistic attempt to achieve complete and general disarmament on a comprehensive and universal basis.

There has been a noticeable change in the mutual attitude of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. They have both demonstrated a commendable willingness and ability to respond to the changing realities of the world situation. So far progress has perhaps been only symbolic. This needs to be developed so that a trend is established in the direction of a universal detente.

The logic of this consideration applies. With greater urgency, to the situation in South-East Asia.

In the ultimate analysis, such an approach cannot be confined to the political sphere. It is germane to the economic relations of different social systems and of nations in different economic conditions. Indeed, it has to be brought to bear on the economics of the world, where foundations can be laid for a stability in international relations. It is in this precise context that one of the most significant events of our time took place in Geneva last year.

I refer to the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Convening a conference of this size and scope was a major achievement and its

results, notably the Final Act which was adopted unanimously, demonstrated the statesmanship, the understanding, and the spirit of co-operation of both the developed and the developing countries.

This conference represented a landmark; it marked the logical extension of the process of decolonization to the economic sphere. Its stimulus was recognition of the fact that, though the colonial era has passed, the basic structure of international trade still denied the developing countries an equal voice and indeed an equal status in matters affecting their vital economic interests. Pakistan welcomed the conference as a signal that the newly emergent countries will no longer accept an anachronistic world order inherited from the dead colonial past.

The importance of the long-range objectives of the trade and development conference goes far beyond the economic sphere. They touch upon the basic principle of human solidarity. If they are realized, they will mark the extension to the international plane of those regulatory processes which all modern societies accept on the domestic plane in order to ensure stability and an elementary justice in economic relations. Moreover, their realization will be a reliable insurance for peace because the so-called North South problem, if it erupts in a confrontation between the rich and the poor on a global scale, can undermine any fabric of international security. My government feels that the task of reducing, and eventually eliminating, the gulf between the rich and the poor is perhaps the greatest responsibility assumed by the United Nations, and we hope that the collective wisdom of the world community will be equal to the test.

These are global ends and regional action is one of the means to their fulfillment.

We in Pakistan were happy to join the fraternal countries of Iran and Turkey in Regional Co-operation for Development. The heads of state of the three countries launched the enterprise at their meeting in Istanbul in July, 1964, when a wide agreement was reached on greater freedom of communication among the three countries and the exploration of possibilities for creating mass consciousness of their common culture and civilization. This institution, instead of being exclusive, is open to accession by other countries in either all or some sphere of its activities. We hope that it will result in a broader base for our respective economies and in the enrichment of our cultures.

Whatever be the vantage point from which one looks at these regional or continental structures, no one can deny that they serve to bring various people together. By extending the horizons of nations, by inhibiting parochial tendencies, by opening new vistas for the peaceful assertion of economic and political rights, they check a relapse of the world community into those narrow, strident, and exclusive nationalisms which are the sole alternative to the United Nations. As such, they were the cause of the United Nations and lend content to its message.

Mr. President, I would now briefly refer to the situation in Europe. Even though no final settlement of some of the major problems has yet taken place, it is a discernible fact that a measure of political and military equilibrium has been achieved. It would appear that the principal powers have reached a stage at which there is a greater understanding of the nature and extent of the danger of a military confrontation, and they have succeeded in reassuring themselves as to the adequacy of their respective security arrangements. Reassurance and confidence are gradually replacing despondency and fear. This is indeed a significant development. Europe is engaged in an endeavor to acquire a sense of cohesion and to play a distinctive role as a link between the Atlantic and the East.

Before we turn our attention from Europe, I would like to make a few observations about the Cyprus question. It is gratifying that the tragic crisis, which led to so much violence and bloodshed, is now under some control and conditions appear generally favorable for a durable settlement. My purpose in referring to the Cyprus question is to emphasize the need for resolute efforts towards a fair and final solution. Pakistan maintains that in the search for a final settlement, the relevant international agreements which were responsible for the emergence of Cyprus as a sovereign independent state are of paramount importance. It is only on the basis of a just settlement that lasting peace can be brought to the strife-torn island.

Turning now to the continent of Africa we find that, within the span of but a few years, the vibrant African peoples have severed the colonial chains which had held them in bondage for nearly a century. They have forged a continental unity. The emergence of the Organization of African Unity bears witness to the vision and resourcefulness of African nations who have pledged their power to the struggle against the forces of colonialism and the inhuman policies of racial discrimination. Moreover, they have had the foresight to establish a machinery to seek peaceful solutions of inter-African disputes.

The post-independence history of several Afro-Asian countries shows that newly independent countries will have to exercise the greatest vigilance against colonialism and exploitation in its more subtle forms. The situation in the Congo is an example. It is most regrettable that outside intervention has further compounded a difficult problem which can finally be solved only by the Congolese themselves. However, we must give thought to this complex problem and determine to what extent we can assist the Congolese themselves. However, we must give thought to this complex problem and determine to what extent we can assist the Congolese people in their quest for a solution of their problems. It has been our experience that United Nations operations by themselves have not served their intended purpose. It is a matter of regret that, instead of promoting stability, the result of such operations has been unsettling and, in some respects, tragic. If we draw the right lessons from our experience in

dealing with the Congo problem, we must concede that a more practical way of assisting a solution in the Congo would be for the organization to delegate its responsibility to an organization such as the O.A.U. They have a vital stake in the Congo and their efforts would be based on a closer appreciation of the currents and cross-currents that seem to stand in the way of a just and equitable settlement in the Congo. Without rancor or recrimination. I would also submit that the use of non-African elements by the United Nations has been a factor which has been largely counter productive. It is necessary, therefore, that the peaceful objectives of the world community and its collective goodwill should be exercised through the African Community which alone can render meaningful assistance to the people of the Congo. I would venture to suggest that such a delegation of responsibility should also be supported by financial and material contributions to the O.A.U. for the accomplishment of this important objective.

There will be no peace in Africa unless the remaining vestiges of colonialism-in Angola, Mozambique, South West Africa, and Southern Rhodesia-are eliminated and the peoples of these territories are granted the right to determine their own future. We are happy that two more African countries, Malawi and Zambia, achieved independence during the last year. My delegation extends to them, as well as to Malta, a warm welcome as new members of this world organization.

No reference to Africa can be complete without deploring the grave situation in South Africa which threatens, more than ever before, to shatter peace and plunge the continent of Africa into turmoil and bloodshed. The Government of South Africa has not been deflected from its inhuman policies of apartheid and racial discrimination. Instead, it has let loose a reign of terror against the brave freedom fighters and imprisoned thousands of opponents of apartheid. It has thrown a challenge to world opinion and rejected all appeals and peaceful approaches made to it to abandon its policies which violate the principle of equality between man and man.

Mr. President, the problem of South Africa is not a problem of Africa alone. It is not only an anticipation of tragic consequences that compels our attention to it. In this twentieth century, when science and technology are helping the foundation of a single world community in which peoples of different nationalities, of different creeds, and of different races would live in peace and harmony and work for the collective good of mankind as a whole, it is anachronistic and intolerable that, in South Africa, a government should pursue the policy of dividing man from man on the basis of his birth. This is a matter which endangers the birth of an international community. It is not merely a matter of right or wrong but a matter of fact that the South African situation is a burden on the conscience of the human race. It threatens to arouse passions beyond our comprehension. This is no imaginary fear. Mankind's abhorrence of massacre and bloodshed is not a matter of controversy. The South African government must be prevented from plunging headlong into a situation that can only lead to

death and devastation, and that would make nonsense of our endeavor to provide for our children a better world. Such is the nature and magnitude of this problem and it is for this reason that my delegation appeals to all to take individual and collective action against the South African government. The Government of Pakistan has fully implemented the General Assembly resolution of 1962 and imposed a total embargo on trade with South Africa. I would urge sincerely that the major trading partners of South Africa apply economic sanctions against South Africa to demonstrate effectively their condemnation of the policy of apartheid from which the South African government will not otherwise desist.

I would now like to deal with the region of the Indian Ocean. It is in Asia that actual war continues in the swamps and jungles of South Viet Nam. It is here that the threat of a confrontation between the nuclear powers now exists, carrying with it the risk of world-wide conflagration. It is in Asia, too, that secondary arms races are developing, increasing the danger of involvement by the great powers and diverting the resources and energies of the region from the urgent tasks of economic development. If international peace is to be safeguarded and a system of international security established as envisaged in the Charter of the United Nations, then a beginning must be made by seeking a durable settlement in Asia. Such an Asian settlement, to quote an eminent political commentator, must stretch from the Yalu to the Himalayas. It is imperative that a beginning must be made, however daunting the task.

The most dangerous feature of the Asian situation is that one of the principal countries, in fact the country with the largest population in the whole world-the People's Republic of China-is sought to be isolated and quarantined from normal international relations. During the worst phase of the cold war, the line of communications between the Soviet Union and the Western powers was open and a dialogue between them, even if bitter and full of invective, could take place in this organization. But no communication has existed with China. For this reason alone, it should cause no surprise if policies relating to China's place and role in the world should be based on a lack of proper comprehension. It is imperative, therefore, not only for the effectiveness of the United Nations, but for the sake of the very peace of the world, that the People' Republic of China should be brought into the United Nations. Only then can a beginning be made towards regulating the situation in Asia and restoring to that vast and conflict-torn continent the peace and tranquility which its peoples so desperately need. Unless this is done and done speedily, there can be no real progress towards meaningful disarmament. In fact, if the deliberations of the United Nations Organization should not continue to be deprived of the voice of a major world power and country with a population of 700 million people, if the unreality of this situation is to be ended-and indeed it has to be ended-then it is imperative that the People's Republic of China should take its place in our midst in this organization.

Mr. President, in the United Nations Organization rest the hopes and aspirations of mankind for an orderly progress towards peace and prosperity through justice and equality. It has come to embody our collective dedication to this high purpose. It is the duty of every member to bring to this forum a sense of history and a true spirit of the community of man. Much as we would like to dispense with incongruity and discordance, it is also one of our necessary functions that we should point out the dangers that lie in our path. These arise from policies pursued willfully and in deliberation, policies that are contrary to the purposes of the United Nations, and that threaten to frustrate our collective quest for a better world order. It is indeed with the utmost regret that I now proceed to put on record a series of developments in our region which have the most dangerous possibilities, not only for those of us who are directly concerned, but also for those who live beyond our frontiers.

I draw your attention to the policy-makers of India who are determined to create tensions on their borders and produce an artificial situation for the exploitation of international rivalries. They have steadfastly refused to see merit in a policy of justice and equity, which would bring peace to the region and strengthen natural affinities on the basis of honor and goodwill, and thus lay the foundations of a permanent peace, and bring a sense of security to the more than half a billion people of the South Asian subcontinent. The policies being pursued by Indian leaders are fraught with consequences detrimental to the whole world. For historic reason, and because it is the largest of India's South Asian neighbors, Pakistan is the main focus of Indian hostility. But Pakistan is not the only country in the region to have felt the impact of Indian ambitions and chauvinism. India's smaller neighbors have had experience of the way in which India can ride roughshod over the legitimate interests of smaller countries when these happen to conflict with her ambitions. It was not for nothing that Senator Senanayake of Ceylon too might fall under India's domination. Nepal's natural and legitimate interest in promoting closer relations with other countries has been for long impeded by pressures from India. Sikkim has been virtually occupied by Indian forces and in the once peaceful kingdom of Bhutan, India ruthlessly makes use of financial and economic weapons to interfere in the internal affairs of that country.

Blinded by dreams of reviving the imagined glories of the past, India has embarked on a programme to extend her hegemony across the length and breadth of the Indian Ocean from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong. She has thus set her foot on the path of naked militarism and political adventure.

The five year plan of rearmament which India intends to carry out with the assistance of foreign powers will cost the staggering amount of twelve billion dollars.

A vast and fearsome panoply of war is being created in a country whose citizens eke out a life of misery on an average income of 35 cents per day,

deprived of the most elementary amenities of human existence. Twelve billion dollars are to be spent on instruments and symbols of power by a country which, according to the recent statement made in Delhi by the Head of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, must depend on the import of food grains for yet 30 years-the lifetime of a whole generation! And yet factories that might produce fertilizers will spew forth gunpowder. Steel that could be used to manufacture tractors will go instead into tanks.

This well publicized augmentation of arms is proceeding with the proclaimed object of defending India against an alleged threat of invasion by China. It is not my purpose to go into the history of the events that culminated in the hostilities between Indian forces and the forces of the Chinese People's Republic in October, 1962. A good deal has been written on the subject since then which throws light on the assertion that an innocent and unwary India suddenly became victim of an aggressive and expansionist China during those October weeks. It has only to be recalled that a short while before the outbreak of the Sino-Indian conflict, Indian newspapers announced the order by the Indian Prime Minister to the Indian Army to drive out the Chinese from the disputed border regions and the establishment of a special task force under the command of General Kaul to achieve this objective. Be that as it may, the situation that exists on the undefined and disputed border between the People's Republic of China and India is one which needs to be settled. Of course, there is no reason for holding that it cannot be settled peacefully. Similar boundary differences have been amicably settled in all parts of the world and, in this very region, they have been settled between China and its other neighbors, like Afghanistan, Burma, Nepal, and Pakistan. The peculiarity of India's so-called confrontation with the Peoples' Republic of China is that, while the situation on the ground remains quiet, every now and then a clamor is raised that Chinese troops are being concentrated, air space is being violated, incursions are taking place here, there and everywhere, and that India is about to be invaded. On the other hand, with all this picture of impending and imminent catastrophe, the major portion of India's forces continues to remain where they have always been, namely, in Jammu and Kashmir, on India's border with West Pakistan, and all round East Pakistan. Indian military missions come and to in the capitals of obliging great powers seeking supersonic planes, submarines, and tanks, and the like in order to strengthen India's fighting capacity in the mountains of the Himalayas. Can anyone seriously believe that China is preparing to invade India? Were that so, would China be calmly waiting while India augments her strength through a series of five year military plans? Indeed would China in October, 1962, have voluntarily called a cease-fire, withdrawn from parts of the disputed territory into which its troops had advanced, cleaned, oiled, and returned to India the guns left behind by its retreating troops? Even in the perpetration of this gigantic fiction, they give the lie to their own claims by keeping the great bulk of their fighting forces poised against Pakistan and adding submarines to their naval might. The fact is that the one abiding aim of Indian policy is to establish an Indian hegemony over the Indian Ocean region from the Hindu Kush to the Mekong.

A noted spokesman of modern India, Dr. Pannikar, has described the outer limits of the Indian sphere of influence in the following words:

“Our vision has been obscured by an un-Indian wave of pacifism. *Ahimsa* (non-violence) is no doubt a great religious creed, but this is a creed which India rejected when she refused to follow Buddha. The Hindu theory at all times, especially in the period of her historic greatness, was one of active assertion of the right, if necessary through the forces of arms. To the Indian Ocean, we shall have to turn, as our ancestors did, who conquered Socotra long before the Christian era, and established an empire in the Pacific.”

Notwithstanding this open advocacy of a policy of expansion and domination, for a long time the posture of non-alignment served its purpose by enabling India to play off the United States against the Soviet Union. Today the Chinese bogey is being used to project the image of India as a bulwark of security and freedom for Asia and Africa against the so-called Chinese aggression and expansionism. Borrowing the language of the cold war, India now speaks not only of military conflict and invasion, but of a struggle between a Chinese ideology and a so called Indian way of life. This image of selfless devotion to the noble cause of defending freedom and democracy in Asia and Africa does not unfortunately accord with the fact that India has, in the past, made frequent use of force, both military and economic, for the settlement of different with its smaller neighbors. Is it conceivable that a re-armed and militant India will radiate a spirit of peaceful benevolence?

Those powers who are helping to re-arm India in the found hope that India will become an example of stability and democracy are entitled to their illusions. Let us, however, beware of the high sounding platitudes in which India policy is expounded. The reality behind the verbal facade is very different. We get a glimpse of the reality when, after the fall of Mr. Khurshehev and resumption of Sino-Soviet contacts, there was alarm and despondency in India over the stoppage of Soviet military aid. The self-appointed torchbearers of non-alignment now travel under the banner of double alignment and the apostles of peaceful co-existence pin their hopes on the continuation of world tensions!

An idea has now been put forward that, as a result of the Chinese atomic explosion, the non-nuclear powers are facing a new and unforeseen danger. It has been suggested that certain nuclear powers should join together to guarantee non-nuclear powers against nuclear attack. What does this proposal amount to? The Chinese lest cannot be said to have created a new situation for Europe or for Latin America. This leaves the Indian Ocean area, at the center of the land masses of Asia and Africa. It is here evidently that the proposal for a nuclear guarantee made by Prime Minister Shastri in London is intended to have its impact. What in fact is the real nature of this nuclear guarantee? “Umbrella” or “shield”, it really amounts to no more than a lining up against the People’s

Republic of China of the other nuclear powers. This dangerous proposal would turn the Indian Ocean into a cockpit of great power conflict. This is in direct contradiction with the efforts and objective of Asian and African peoples which are persistently directed towards freeing their continents from any nuclear presence and involvement.

Mr. President, my delegation, therefore, views the Indian proposal with serious concern. It would extend a nuclear hegemony into a non-nuclear area and thereby further complicate the already complex problem of disarmament. For Asia in particular, this would represent a misfortune of the greatest magnitude by bringing the entire continent under the perpetual shadow of nuclear weapons and extending the nature and scope of the confrontation between the great powers. If this dangerous proposal were to find support, it would inevitably have the effect of undermining the sovereignty and independence of the countries of Asia and Africa.

My country is a signatory of the Moscow Test Ban Treaty and we have always hoped that conditions will be created under which testing of nuclear weapons in all environments can be stopped and indeed their use and possession outlawed. The answer lies neither in self-righteousness nor in the sort of ingenious opportunism reflected in the plan of a nuclear umbrella. An agreement for the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons can be brought about only if all existing nuclear powers participate in it. If, on the other hand, it is sought to align some of the nuclear powers against others for the benefit of non-nuclear states, or one such state, all the chances of arriving at an urgent, comprehensive agreement will vanish. Even in this respect the Indian proposal strikes at the roots of mankind's urge to restrict, and possibly to eliminate, the proliferation and presence of nuclear weapons. Where we, the nations of Asia and Africa, intend to reduce tensions, India seeks to add tension to tension. Whereas we desperately need disarmament, India embarks upon rearmament. Where we want peaceful settlement of disputes, India seeks to resolve them by force.

What is needed is a fresh and sincere effort at a general settlement which would attack the problem of international security simultaneously on the front of armaments as well as of the settlement of disputes and differences which are a potential threat to peace and likely to lead to a resort of war.

It is imperative that India must be restrained from involving the great powers in an arms race in the region of the Indian Ocean. It is not only in the context of India's contemporary aggressive postures and the record of her recent conduct that Pakistan and other neighboring countries feel alarmed. There are historical reasons why the introduction of an arms race in the area causes serious disquiet. It is a historical fact that the British empire in India was the direct result of conflict and turmoil among the peoples of this area who were helped to wage war against each other by the British East India Company and its

French rivals. The adventures of Clive and Dupleix must not be re-enacted in the twentieth century. This is indeed a matter of serious concern not only for Pakistan and India, but for the whole of Africa and Asia, since it represents a positive danger of outside domination and influence. I do not wish to labor the point, but I would emphasize the need to refrain from military interference in Africa and Asia in the interest of world peace.

If in this connection I refer to Jammu and Kashmir, it is not only because the problem of Kashmir is closest to the heart of Pakistan and because it affects the lives and the well-being of the hundreds of millions of people who inhabit the South Asian subcontinent, nor even because the peace and security of that region are affected by the continuance of this increasingly bitter dispute. I do so because Jammu and Kashmir is, above all, a test of the ability of the United Nations to live up to its own high purposes and to meet the challenge to international order and law by states which will set themselves above the law. Jammu and Kashmir is not the only case in which a member state has flouted the resolutions of the United Nations and persistently refused to honor its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Kashmir is only the most insidious instance of the way in which the very purpose of the United Nations Charter may be defeated by bad faith on the one hand and expediency and power politics on the other.

Members are aware that this problem, which has been before the Security Council now for years, was again considered last year by that body, at the instance of Pakistan. It was the unanimous view of members that both parties should meet in order to reach a just and honorable settlement of the problems that have prevented the solution of the Kashmir dispute for so long. In his summing up of May 18, 1964, the President of the Council, His Excellency Ambassador Seydoux of France, speaking on behalf of the members of the council, addressed the parties as follows: -

Fifth: The members of the Council expressed the hope that the two parties would abstain from any act that might aggravate the situation and that they would take such measures as would re-establish an atmosphere of moderation between the two countries and also peace and harmony among the communities.

Sixth: The members of the Council expressed the hope that in the light of our recent debate, the two countries concerned would resume their contacts as soon as possible in order to resolve by negotiation their differences, in particular their differences related to Jammu and Kashmir.”

Mr. President, Pakistan has at no moment shown any reluctance to hold bilateral talks with India for the settlement of the problem of Kashmir. In the 17 years during which this problem has festered and grown bitter, more than a score of suggestions have been made by eminent mediators and conciliators appointed by the United Nations in order to bring the parties together and to move the

dispute towards a final solution. Each one of these proposals was designed to meet the objections raised by India to the implementation of the United Nations resolutions of Kashmir. But even though every single proposal was accepted by Pakistan, none could be put into effect because of India's refusal to accept any conditions under which the people of Kashmir would be enabled to exercise, in a truly free manner, their right to decide the future affiliation of the state.

On many occasions, we have held bilateral talks with India Pakistan are even today ready to discuss with India the modalities by which the people of Jammu and Kashmir may exercise their right of self-determination. Pakistan is equally prepared to submit to the opinion of the International Court of Justice, or the arbitration of any other agency, by mutual agreement the differences that stand in the way of implementation of the United Nations resolutions on Kashmir. What Pakistan cannot, and shall never, accept is that the people of Kashmir should be deprived of their birthright and be held in bondage under alien rule.

In occupied Kashmir, repression increases as revolt and resentment grow. The meeting of the Plebiscite Front held in November, 1964, at Sopore in occupied Kashmir itself, reaffirmed the determination of the people of Kashmir to continue their struggle until the right of self-determination is achieved and the intruder expelled from their homeland. The Government of India, having failed to silence the voice of the Kashmiris, was obliged to set free Shaikh Abdullah who for long years languished in Indian jails for no other fault than that he had spoken up for the rights of his people.

Today, as the latest Indian puppet postures on behalf of his masters, the Government of India have cast aside all pretensions and are preparing to absorb Jammu and Kashmir into India by imposing upon it the direct rule of the President of India. This latest defiance of obligations is a clear indication of the lack of sincerity which characterizes India's relations with its neighbours and in particular with Pakistan.

Mr. President, India is following a deliberate policy of denial of the right of self-determination not only in the case of Kashmir but in its suppression of the valiant tribesmen of Nagaland. As the whole world is aware, this is not an isolated phenomenon where the Government of India is concerned. This is only a manifestation of an earlier trend which was demonstrated by the fall of India's heavy hand on the people of Hyderabad and Junagadh and by a deliberate and ruthless policy of animosity against Pakistan which the Government of India initiated and followed relentlessly from the birth of Pakistan up to this moment.

I want to declare with all the emphasis at my command that India's attempt to pursue its policies of national chauvinism in flagrant violation of its international commitments and in open contempt of the principle of self-determination, which is an article of faith with nations and with men of good will throughout the world, will and must be frustrated. A dangerous situation is being

created in South and South-East Asia by India's attempt to set herself up as a successor to a colonial regime. This represents an attempt to reverse the entire history of the liberation of peoples from the colonial yoke and their struggle for national independence which has become enshrined in the conscience of our times.

My country has had to contend with the declared ill-will and active hostility of India at every turn and corner. The world at large, however, has yet to recognize the gravity of the situation caused by the deliberate and inhuman policy of evictions by the Government of India and perpetrated on its own people, which has already resulted in the entry into Pakistan of nearly half a million Indian Muslims. For India it is not enough merely to acquire vast quantities of military aid to intimidate her neighbors. She is prepared to use innocent lives even of her own citizens if they can be employed as an instrument of exerting additional pressure. In this case the victims are the Indian Muslims. The callous and inhuman treatment to which these Indian Muslims are being put merely because they follow the same faith as the majority of the people in Pakistan is a blot on the conscience of civilization. The purpose is clearly to half of Pakistan, a part of the country which already has one of the highest densities of population in the whole world.

Ejected from their homes, deprived of their goods and property, and forcibly pushed across the Indian border into East Pakistan on the unfounded charge that they are "Pakistani infiltrators", the evicted Indian Muslims present a spectacle of inhumanity. They are a source of grave tension. The Government of Pakistan has done everything possible to avoid a conflagration. A commission of enquiry headed by a retired Judge of the Dacca High Court was appointed by the Government of Pakistan to examine the national status of these persons. The Government of India was invited to send its representatives to sit on this commission but it refused to do so. The commission examined a large number of evicted families and on the basis of documentary and other evidence, it found that the vast majority of the so-called "Pakistani infiltrators" evicted by India were in fact Indian Muslims who owned properties, earned their livelihood and in many cases had voted in the elections, in India. These findings have been borne out by the Jamaat-I-Ulema-I-Hind, an Indian political organization, and by general Cariappa, former Commander-in-Chief of India, who came to East Pakistan last autumn and personally visited relief camps where the evicted Indian Muslims have been temporarily housed by the Government of East Pakistan. It is indeed a sad commentary on the much vaunted secularism of Indian society and her political institutions that everyone of the persons expelled from India as an alleged infiltrator is a Muslim!

I said here in this Assembly last year that Pakistan was prepared to accept the determination by an impartial tribunal or some other body under international auspices whether or not the persons expelled as infiltrators were really Pakistani citizens as alleged by India or whether they were Indian citizens who have been

tuned out from their ancestral homes, deprived of their means of livelihood and evicted for no other reason than that they practice the religion of Islam. This offer was repeated to the Indian government when the Home minister of India and Pakistan met last year to discuss the question of the treatment of minorities in the two countries and the eviction of Muslims of India. The Government of India turned down this eminently reasonable proposal on the ground that it would infringe on their sovereign right to decide the nationality of their citizens.

Now it is true that the right to determine whether a person is the national of a certain country must rest *prima facie* with that country. In the present case, even if the matter were to be considered in purely legalistic terms, India has no right to determine unilaterally that the persons involved are Pakistanis and then to push them across the border into Pakistan. The matter is not on which ought to be dealt with in these terms.

Eviction of Muslims from India has caused alarm and uncertainty among the 50 million Muslims of India and resentment and bitterness in Pakistan. There are 10 million Hindus in Pakistan. It has been the policy of the Government of Pakistan to make sure that the minorities are enable not only to live in peace and security but to flourish and prosper as honored citizens of the country. It is a matter of the deepest regret to Pakistan that, as a result of the continuing tension between the two countries and the large-scale rioting which took place in various parts of India last year, some disturbances broke out in East Pakistan and a number of Hindus were led by their fears to flee the country. I am happy to say that many of these persons have now returned to Pakistan and many more are returning. Up to the end of last year, more than 50,00 had already returned and been settled in their homes and restored to their properties. There can be no clearer proof of the policy of justice and generosity which the Government of Pakistan is following with regard to the minorities in Pakistan.

By contrast, the fate of the 50 million Muslims and of the other minorities in India is constantly in the balance. It is not only the Hindu revivalist parties who openly advocate an exchange of population between India and Pakistan on religious grounds. Speaking in the West Bengal Legislative Council, the Provincial Chief Minister, Mr. P.C. Sen, stated that the total evacuation of Hindu from East Pakistan over a period of 5 years was possible.

In the context of the complexities of the present international situation, India is pursuing policies which will lead us headlong into an era of darkness and strife. It is our solemn duty to make every possible endeavor to prevent this; and I would like to assure you that Pakistan is determined to spare no effort to resist, and fight against, this threat.

In conclusion, I would remind this great assembly that it is necessary to undertake the task of arresting this rapid deterioration in the interest of world peace. For in the twentieth century, no country stands alone in fighting tyranny.

The Afro-Asian world in particular is conscious of the dangers that might flow from this deplorable situation. It has been our sincere endeavor over the years to seek a settlement with honor and justice and thereby protect not only ourselves but our region.

Mr. President, there are forces in Africa and Asia which are positive and represent the wave of the future. Asia and Africa are no longer passive and sterile, led one way or the other, according to the dictates of great power politics. They have emerged with a distinct personality of their own. Notwithstanding the brief period that has elapsed since their emancipation, they are not only prepared but determined to play their rightful role in shaping and making their fullest contribution to the welfare of the world community. The historic Bandung Conference played a decisive role in giving substance to the Asian-African personality. My delegation considers it a privilege to announce to this forum with full confidence that the forthcoming conference in Algiers will not only be a milestone in our contemporary history. It will herald the birth of a mighty force which will be wielded for the collective good of humanity at large. It will seek to eliminate the last remnants of colonialism from our region. It will be animated by a spirit of dedication to the progress and development of freedom and justice for all without exception. We have faith that the second African-Asian conference will lay the foundation of a new spirit, a new force, resolute and determined to work for the collective aspirations of the entire human race. We are also confident that the countries of Africa and Asia will draw a lesson from history and proceed to take concrete steps against the continuance of inequality and injustice which has bedeviled the history of man from time immemorial.

In making these assertions, my delegation is fully conscious of the fact that this is indeed the rostrum from which such a declaration should be made, as the Asian and African member-states constitute the majority of the United Nations. It is in this understanding, Mr. President, that we appeal to our fellow member-states that they should, without exception, lend their support, and give their blessing, to the second African-Asian conference that has set itself a historic purpose of such significance. In so doing, they will be expressing their own dedication to the high purposes and the lofty ideals of the United Nations Organization.