

The
Quest
For
Peace

THE QUEST FOR PEACE



Z. A. Bhutto

Selections from Speeches and Writing 1963-65

**Reproduced in pdf form by
Sani H Panwhar
Member Sindh Council PPP**

Preface

This volume comprises some of the speeches and writings of Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto from 1963 to 1965. They are not all on the same theme. But, as the reader will notice, through them runs a common strand of thought. This is reflected in the emphasis on the need for securing world peace, justice in the dealings of States with each other and cooperation, regional and functional, between them. An effort has been made to avoid changes in Mr. Bhutto's language, though in some cases what was pertinent only to the occasion on which a speech was made has been edited away.

The Foreign Minister of Pakistan is a prolific speaker and writer. However, the material selected for this volume is such as has a permanent intellectual quality and not merely transitory political significance. For this reason, it was felt that the Pakistan Institute of International Affairs should, and legitimately could, undertake its publication.

While the chapters that follow do not represent a systematic study of the foreign policy of Pakistan, they do faithfully reflect Mr. Bhutto's thinking about some international matters, thinking so largely shared by the people of this country. That being so, it is sincerely hoped that the book will go a long way in explaining Pakistan's attitudes in world affairs. If it does that, its purpose will have been served.

A.B.A.HALEEM
Pakistan Institute of International Affairs.
Chairman of Council

K. SARWAR HASAN
Secretary
Karachi, 23 December 1965

C O N T E N T S.

I. The Security Council and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes.	- 4 -
II. The Role of the Great Powers.	- 15 -
III. Asian –African Solidarity.	- 20 -
IV. Relations with India.	- 27 -
V. Aid –Art Thou Charity?	- 32 -
VI. Nehru –An Appraisal.	- 44 -
VII. Pakistan and the Muslim World.	- 56 -

I

The Security Council and Peaceful Settlement of Disputes.

The idealistic expectations entertained by the masses of the world at the time of the establishment of the United Nations have not been fulfilled. While this is true of the World Organization as a whole, it is particularly true of the Security Council, which has been torn by dissensions and is, as a result, seized with paralysis. There is a startling contrast between what was expected and what has been achieved. The expectation, in the words of a historian, was that the World Organization would create "a worldwide political and social order in which the common interests of humanity could be seen and served across the barriers of national tradition, racial differences and geographical separation". But what has been our actual experience of the Security Council, the primary political organ of the United Nations? It is subject to pressures of power politics and its deliberations are conditioned by the diplomatic expediciencies of its permanent members. Of course, the United Nations is not a self-sufficient and self-subsisting entity. The late Mr. Dag Hammarskjold himself observed that the capacity of the United Nations to act is, in fact, to a large extent restricted by fundamental national reactions.

Speech at Lincoln's Inn, London, 9 July 1964.

When we are faced with these facts about the role of the United Nations, generally, and of the Security Council, in particular, it is natural that we should reflect on the reasons that have led to the great divergence between promise and performance. Perhaps it is not merely a matter of promise and performance; it is also a question of the divergence between what was visualized in the Charter itself and what has actually happened. Indeed, the contrast we see is between the assumptions of the Charter and the result of experience. The Charter conferred on the Security Council wide powers, linked to a concept of collective security, which was set out in Charter VII. These powers have atrophied through disuse, not because no occasion presented itself on which they could fittingly be used, but because the Council was subject to internal division and, therefore, could not summon the will to use them. The concept of enforcement was integral to the concept of decision by the Security Council. The Council still has potentiality of

decision but, for all practical purposes, it does not appear to have the potentiality of enforcement. Even short of enforcement through coercive measures, other methods are provided for to promote definitive and peaceful settlement of disputes. These methods have not been invoked, with the result that the role of the Security Council has, at best, been of an interim rather than a decisive character. What are the reasons, disclosed by experience, for these limitations on the role of the Security Council?

These reasons fall into different categories. Some could be classified as broadly historical. The assumption, conscious or unconscious, behind the establishment of the Security Council was that of a concert of nations, which would act untidily in removing threats to peace and preventing breaches of peace and acts of aggression. This assumption was based not only on the identity of aims and objects which was wishfully supposed to exist between the Powers that were allies in World War II. Its roots went farther back into history. They went back to colonial times, to the age of European dominance of the world. In that age, despite fierce rivalries amongst Western nations for conquests and over lordship in Asia and Africa, International diplomacy rested on the substratum of a common culture and, by and large, a common world view. It was the subsisting (or lingering) sense of that community, which lay behind the expectation that the permanent members of the Security Council, when faced with a critical situation, would be able to take united action of a preventive or remedial nature. These members had together gone through an ordeal and this experience, it was felt, was so traumatic in its nature and so transforming in its effects as to have established among them a common outlook on international problems. Three of these Powers were the foremost carriers of Western civilization. The fourth Power, Russia, because of its involvement in the War would, it was supposed, feel towards the Western world a pull which would counteract, to some degree, the contrary pulls of its ideology. The fifth Power, China, was considered to be firmly oriented towards the West. The bond appeared to be further strengthened by the fact that these Powers had no territorial ambitions, such as would create a clash of basic interests between them. Perhaps there was a vague, tacit understanding or hope that notwithstanding some clashes, like those in Greece or Turkey or Iran, these Powers would eventually establish their respective spheres of influence, which would remain free from mutual encroachment. On the basis of this and allied expectations, the Charter envisaged the Security Council as a great Power directorate of the United Nations.

This entire complex of presuppositions and assumption has now visibly dissolved because of the forces that have come to the surface and asserted themselves since the Charter was framed. I have not the time to discuss in detail the import and significance of each one of these forces. I shall, therefore, mention them briefly.

First, with the liquidation of colonialism, there have emerged scores of new sovereign States, each with its own national ego, and they now

constitute the majority of the total membership of the United Nations. A direct result of this phenomenon has been the dispersion of the centers of political and economic power. Another outgrowth of it has been the demand for practical recognition of the sovereign equality of all nations and of racial equality. This demand still operates in such a way that, in various situations, there appears a divergence of interest between the erstwhile colonial Powers and the countries of Asia and Africa. Even without such divergence, the psychology of liberation from colonialism breeds a resistance to dictation by the great Powers.

Secondly, the technology of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, which has concentrated overwhelming military power in the hands of two of the permanent members of the Security Council, has diminished the power of the other three and thus radically disturbed the balance, which was supposed to underlay the structure of the Security Council.

Thirdly, the conflict between the Communist and Western Powers has, with the emergence of new independent nations, led to wider alignments than were anticipated at the time of the writing of the Charter. At that time, this conflict appeared to be geographically confined to areas of Central and Eastern Europe, which had been ravaged in World War II and were adjacent to the Soviet Union. Questions relating to these areas were deemed to be subject to negotiation and adjustment between the allies and were expected to be definitely solved through a peace settlement; as such, they were kept outside the purview of the United Nations. Subsequent developments, however, enlarged the area in which this conflict of aims asserted itself. This was dramatically illustrated by the case of the Congo.

I must mention here that we in Pakistan have been made to bear the impact of this conflict between the permanent members. In 1948 the Security Council adopted a resolution which embodied a comprehensive plan for the settlement of the Kashmir question. The Soviet Union permitted the passage of this resolution by abstaining from casting its vote on it. The Soviet Union maintained this posture until 1953, during which period the Council made several attempts, through a United Nations Commission and United Nations Representatives, to move towards a peaceful solution of the problem. In 1954 and 1955 Pakistan entered into certain agreements for mutual defence with the United States and the United Kingdom. That led the Soviet Union to change its policy in respect of the Kashmir question and, from 1957 onwards, the Soviet Union has consistently obstructed the passage of any adequate resolution on that question. Their paralyzing effect on the Security Council of the use of the veto by one of its permanent members was evidenced grotesquely and painfully when in 1962 a draft resolution, which was sponsored by Ireland and supported by seven members and which merely called upon the two parties to the Kashmir dispute to enter into negotiations for its peaceful settlement, was not adopted by the Council. After an exhaustive debate, extending over several months, and all the deliberations, all the conversations behind the scenes, all

the discussions, the Council did and said nothing, It is small wonder that, as a result, there was a revulsion of feeling against the Security Council.

Fourthly, because colonialism and territorial conquest have become outmoded, certain States have sought to discover and tend to use new and subtler means of dominance over others, which is a state of affairs not assumed in the Charter. This tendency has been greatly assisted by the economic and social forces of the contemporary age which have made poorer nations dependent on aid from the richer ones,. In the sphere of ideas, this tendency has been helped by the injection of ideology into the foreign policies of the great Powers and the exertion by them of continuous pressure, which, in many cases, inhibits nations and governments in adopting an independent outlook and attitude. In this sense, the Security Council, because of its central position in the United Nations system and, therefore, in world affairs, serves as an instrument for the advancement of the purposes of the great Powers. There have been cases where certain governments did not hesitate to use their privileged position in the Council as a lever for exerting pressure on a party to a dispute, not for the purpose of advancing a solution of the dispute, but for compelling a change in the foreign policy of that party.

These, in short, are some of the main historical trends, which have made the role of the Security Council different from that which was envisaged in the Charter.

The second category of reasons, which have restricted action by the Security Council, relates to the practices of the Council, which have resulted in a failure to apply, and progressively to develop and refine, the ethical and legal standards laid down in the Charter. Of this I shall cite a few instances.

Article w, Paragraph e, of the Charter places the obligation upon all members to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered." The issue is how to avoid such a view of peace and security being taken by the Council as is inconsistent with justice. This issue, which is crucial to peace, has remained unresolved. While it would be accepted as a truism that only a just order is really secure and peaceful, there is the deplorably facile tendency to separate "international peace and security" from "justice". Evidently, a breach of the peace or a subversion of security, is far more visible than an endangering, or defeat, of justice. The result is a kind of view, which though not formulated as a doctrine, is implicit in confusing peace with the preservation of the status quo. In some cases representatives of smaller member States have pointed out in the General Assembly, and elsewhere, that the upholding of the rule of law does not necessarily mean the preservation of the status quo, for the simple reason that the status quo is not always in conformity with the law. In spite of this obvious fact the representatives of the most powerful States have been promoting what may be called "the law of the ceasefire line." It is one thing

for the Security Council to refuse to change the status quo, where the status quo has persisted for centuries or even decades, and has not been questioned nor involved any threat to the peace. But it is another thing for it to acquiesce, through inaction, in a status quo which is nothing but the result of non-compliance with the decisions or recommendations of the Council itself for the settlement of an international dispute. This tendency has led to the suspicion that the two great Powers, the United States and the USSR, have acquired – no doubt by different processes and for different reasons - a common vested interest in the preservation of the status quo in all areas of the world, except those where their own essential interests are involved and are in conflict. If it comes to pass (and the possibility is not merely conjectural) that, in the Security Council and elsewhere, the combined weight of the Soviet Union and the United States is thrown in favour of maintaining the status quo in various parts of the world, even where justice demands a change in it, the United Nations will become the guardian of a peace that does not redress grievances but suppresses them. It would be a peace seething with resentments, rocked by discontentment and threatened by future explosions.

The ceasefire and armistice lines, drawn under the auspices of the United Nations, are often cited as accomplishments of the Organization. Equally, they mark the failure of the Security Council to do more than put the lid on trouble, rather than bring about definitive settlement of disputes. Ceasefires and armistices do not settle or extinguish disputes; they merely serve to refrigerate them, so to say. They keep them in suspended animation, with the possibility of greater outbursts of violence in the future. If any one doubts the truth of this proposition, he has only to take a look at the situation in Kashmir.

The peace-keeping operations of the United Nations have not really been of a more than an interim character and have, therefore, not succeeded in consolidating international peace and ensuring justice. To say that is not to question the value of those operations or ask that an end be put to them. Their rationale, to quote the words of the Secretary-General, is that they are “instruments of pacification in order to police or keep under impartial scrutiny an over-heated and potentially vital conflict until the temperature could be reduced sufficiently for a solution to be sought.” So far as it goes, this proposition is unimpeachable. However, it does not go far enough. That is no fault of the United Nations. The conception that peace-keeping operations provide the time and the opportunity for counsels of peace and restraint to prevail is meaningful only if these operations are followed by resolute efforts towards achieving a just and final solution of the disputes concerned. If not so accompanied, the conception is vitiated by one of two fallacies. Either it is based on a view of human nature and rationality which, in this sadder century of ours, we have learnt to regard as naïve. Or it is rooted in the subconscious assumption that whatever injustice is involved in an international dispute, that injustice is bound, in course of time, to be acquiesced in by the weaker, the aggrieved party. In the latter case-I need hardly add –it

bespeaks a cynical and heartless attitude towards the life and welfare of the millions of men and women affected by international disputes.

We would do well to examine these two fallacies a little further. To take the first one, the idea that, given time and restraint on violence, nations will come round to settling their disputes, is psychologically unsound, for it assumes that a nation is like an adult individual. A man's anger subsides and, after some time, he recovers his reason and objectivity. But an international dispute, if it involves what one or both parties regard as their essential interests, is not like the eruption of man's anger. Thus it is that a major international dispute, if left unresolved, does not heal itself but worsens and the poison of its ramifications permeates the entire thinking and politics of the nations that are parties to it. As time passes, and no real effort is made to bring about a settlement, the two nations' mutual hostility becomes confirmed, so much so that sometimes even its real point of origin is obscured and it is assumed that their enmity is inherent in the scheme of things. We are saddened to see this happen in the case of the Kashmir dispute and its effect on the relationship between India and Pakistan. There is a tendency in some quarters, in India and elsewhere, to think that hostility between India and Pakistan transcends the Kashmir dispute, so that even if it were resolved, the hostility would remain. This, of course, is a counsel of despair, but it does show the naiveté of the view that the United Nations has no more to do than to police a situation for a time until the parties to it come to a settlement.

Now for the second fallacy. The idea that peace-keeping operations can tranquilize a situation, even without a serious effort being made to bring about a settlement, illustrates the contrast between the notion of security with justice and that of security without justice. If you accept the latter, you will expect acquiescence by a people in injustice. But if you believe in the former, you will regard enforced acquiescence in injustice as no better than injustice itself and you will not countenance it.

I have so far given one example to show that the legal and ethical standards of the Charter have not yet been fully acted upon by the Security Council. Let me now give another example. Article 33 of the Charter lays down that parties to any dispute likely to endanger international peace and security "shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice" and requires the Security Council to call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means. Now, while this Article lists all the possible methods of peaceful settlement, it furnishes no guidance whatsoever as to the order in which they are to be resorted to or how, if one fails, resort to another should logically follow. To say this is not to find fault with the substance of the Article, for it could rightly be argued that, since disputes differ in their nature and circumstances, it would be undesirable to lay down in advance the order in which various methods of settlement should be resorted to. This provision of

the Charter thus sets out what in effect is a kind of theoretical contemplation. But out of it practical procedures could be developed through establishing suitable conventions and usages.

Because of the lack of such conventions, and the absence of such usages, there is, in the Security Council and elsewhere, a tendency to regard negotiation as the best means of pacific settlement. No one would deny that negotiation is the natural first step in any attempt for resolving a dispute, and one cannot imagine a State both wanting peacefully to settle a dispute and refusing to negotiate. But the fact cannot be ignored that negotiation may be to the advantage of one State only and to the disadvantage of the other, as, for example, when of the two States one is a larger or more powerful and the other smaller or weaker. Moreover, account must be taken of what is to happen if negotiations fail or are unduly prolonged, leading to the continuance of the situation which caused the dispute, one of the parties to it benefiting from the prolongation.

Negotiations may fail, and often do, because of a variety of reasons. These include sheer obstinacy, lack of statesmanship in both parties or one of them, a wrong view of one's national interests, rigidities bred by internal political pressures or even personal animosity or vindictiveness or historical prejudice. If you merely call upon the parties to negotiate and then again to negotiate, you furnish no safeguard against these factors bringing about a collapse of the effort towards a peaceful settlement. Further, wittingly or unwittingly, you put a premium upon intransigence in international affairs. Let us take a case in which, as in most disputes except those between the two most powerful States of the present times, one party is in possession of and wishes to hold on to what rightfully belongs to the other party. What the party which is in wrongful possession does is not to reject negotiations, it causes delay in them, and brings into them irrelevant matters, so that the two sides talk at cross purposes. The result is a hardening of the dispute, rather than its relaxation.

It is plain that negotiation cannot be a sure means of peaceful settlement unless there exist other procedures to supplement or follow it. Such procedures can be furnished by suitable conventions which provide that if negotiations do not succeed within a reasonable time –the reasonableness of the time to objectively determined –they would be followed by mediation and the failure of mediation would be followed by a resort to arbitration. We must, of course, concede that an inflexible sequence of procedures would not be appropriate for all kinds of disputes. However, the fact remains that, unless an obdurate party is made to feel that it would eventually have to submit to arbitration, in which case it would have no hand in the shaping of the settlement, it would never let negotiations succeed. It is a startling lacuna in the entire system of pacific settlement of disputes, as hitherto practiced by the Security Council, that apart from negotiation other and firmer methods of settlement are hardly ever invoked.

There is a provision in the American Treaty of Pacific Settlement, signed at Bogota in April 1948, which makes it obligatory for the parties, in case of failure of non-compulsory settlement, to resort to arbitration or judicial settlement. We in Pakistan once recommended a similar convention to our neighbor, India. Such a convention, to be observed by all member States of the United Nations, seems to be the only way to ensure that peace is not degraded and reduced to a series of stalemates. Moreover, it is only through the methods of arbitration and judicial determination that we can remedy the disadvantages of negotiation and make the principle of the sovereign equality of nations a living reality. Nations are not equal in strength or in material and other resources, anymore than individuals are. But they ought to be in the realm of law.

It is well-known that, at present, there is considerable opposition to arbitration and judicial determination in international affairs. This resistance is due to several factors. First, perhaps there still exists some mental reservation regarding the principle of the sovereign equality of States. Secondly, the habit persists of a rough and ready classification of disputes into legal and political. There are political disputes which have legal ingredients. The purely legal issues are capable of being judicially determined by the International court of Justice. Thirdly, there is still resistance to national sovereignty being limited by arbitration or compulsory adjudication, which would not permit a State to have dispute settle on its own terms and at the time of its own choosing. The customary and exaggerated distinction between justifiable disputes needs to be obliterated. Of course, some disputes would be referred to determination by a judicial tribunal, and others would be referred to arbitration by a non-judicial agency selected for the purpose. This would not be a state of affairs incompatible with the Charter, which rejects the idea of "absolute sovereignty."

Over and above these considerations, it is necessary to distinguish between different kinds of international disputes. There are, for example, disputes between States which are militarily the most powerful. These disputes are embedded in a deeper conflict, rooted in the social and cultural movements of history, global in their scope and inter-linked with each other. There is no method available for their resolution, except a continuous dialogue between the parties. They could not possibly be settled by arbitration, except if the arbitral agency were to be an extra-terrestrial one. But there are other disputes which are limited in their scope and historically definable as to their origin and nature. It is a confession of bankruptcy of statesmanship to adopt an attitude of laissez-faire about such disputes and leave them to the parties themselves. Again, there is a variety of disputes in regard to which there exist no agreements which could be invoked for their settlement. It seems that such disputes will become rarer with the growth of precedents and other sources of international law. But there is another kind of disputes which have, in one sense or another, already been the subject of treaties or agreements or resolutions of competent organs of the United Nations. Often enough such disputes relate merely to the interpretation of

these treaties or agreements or resolutions, and the contentious question in them is whether one or the other party has failed to fulfill the obligations placed upon it. Is it not a sad commentary on the entire system of peace keeping as evolved by the United Nations, that it has not been able to arrange for discovering answers to such questions?

I have so far dwelt, first, on the historical factors that seem to have conditioned the role of the Security Council, and secondly, on the current tendencies that have influenced its functioning, its mental hinterland, so to say. If we survey the present situation and try to assess future prospects, the transition, noted by the Secretary-General, "from the concept of collective security as set out in Chapter VII of the Charter to a more realistic idea of peace-keeping in a changing world". Is now an irreversible development. The Charter envisaged that the peace-keeping forces of the United Nations would be organized through the military establishment of the great Powers. This was another aspect of the concept of the United Nations as a concert of great Powers. But its authors did not anticipate, first, lack of unanimity and agreement among these Powers, and, secondly, admission to the United Nations of scores of new independent States, that would constitute the majority of its membership.

As we all know, the experience of the breakdown of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council led to the adoption of the United for Peace Resolution which, shifting the center of gravity, transferred competence in political and security matters from the Council to the General Assembly. The situation in the Middle East in 1956 provided the first occasion on which the General Assembly exercised these new powers. It appeared that the void which had been created by the veto in the Security Council was thus filled through action by the General Assembly. That this has not been an entirely smooth development, and that on account of it we can still be faced with a major controversy, is apparent from the financial crisis, which threatens the very existence of the United Nations. The Soviet Union considers the resolutions of the General Assembly regarding peace-keeping operations as illegal and asserts that the Security Council alone has competence in this field. This is disputed not only by the United States but also by the majority of member States, who concede to the Security Council primary, but not exclusive, competence in peace-keeping.

The United for Peace Resolution, the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice accepted by the General Assembly at its 17th Session, and the actual practice of the United Nations over the years, have confirmed the General Assembly's right to take action to maintain or restore peace. Doubts have been expressed in the West about the wisdom of entrusting these powers to the General Assembly, which is dominated by countries that bear a relatively minor share of the financial burden of peace-keeping. It has been suggested that the major contributors should have more voice in decisions regarding peace-keeping operations and presumably also in their conduct. While in all cases, after the Congo, the trend has been

for operations to be financed through one form or another of voluntary contributions, as in West Iran, Yemen, and Cyprus, it is unlikely that the majority of the member States will agree to any arrangement which would place in the hands of the major contributors a financial veto on the initiation or conduct of peace-keeping operations.

Of late, the Security Council has been more active than in the immediately preceding years. As has been observed by the Secretary General, the Council has "re-emerged recently to resume the key role in dealing with matters affecting peace and security which was allotted to it by the Charter, and the relationship between the Council and the General Assembly would now seem again to be nearer the original concept of the authors of the Charter, although with a major development of the role of the middle and smaller nations in promoting solutions to critical situations." The qualifying phrase at the end of the Secretary-General's remark is significant, and I shall offer some comment on it. Before doing so, however, I must say that one of the main reasons for the recovery of the standing of the Security Council has been a trend towards common position being taken by the United States and the Soviet Union, notwithstanding the difference in the manner in which these positions are expressed by their respective representatives, If this trend should become uniform, and show itself responsive to the demands of peace with justice, there is no doubt that the Security Council would be able to reassert itself as the bearer of primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Unfortunately, we still have strong evidence that the trend is not uniform. In the Kashmir dispute, to which my Government is a party, the Security Council has been balked by the veto of the Soviet Union. In other matters too, the pressures of power politics make themselves felt in the deliberations of the Security Council.

From the point of view of mitigating these pressures and making the Security Council more reflective of the present composition of the United Nations, the development of the role of the middle and smaller nations, referred to by the Secretary-General, assumes vital importance. It is an imperative of peace that the Security Council should have, and be seen to have, a more rational relationship to the world order that has vastly changed since the framing of the United Nations Charter. Its composition should be more realistic. Several measures seem to be necessary to achieve this end. First of all, one of the permanent members, China needs to be represented by the Government which has unquestionably been in full control of the country for the last fourteen years. To have the largest land Power of Asia, which must bear a pivotal responsibility for its peace, represented by those who are no longer competent to represent it and, therefore, lack credentials, is not only anomalous but also impairs the credit and prestige of the Security Council. Secondly, the proposed increase by four of the composition of the Security Council would bring it into a more stable relationship with the general membership of the United Nations. We are all aware of the fears that have been expressed in this regard, namely that the Council would thus become unwieldy or, perhaps, irresponsible. Such fears, it seems to us, are

either unwarranted or merely represent a certain vehemence of tone which sometimes visible in the debates of the General Assembly. Because of the situations discussed, extreme positions do occasionally find expression in the rhetoric of the General Assembly, but they have not affected the nature of the action taken or the resolutions adopted by that body. The fear that an Asian-African majority may steamroller the Council is belied by the fact that it has not steamrolled the Assembly. The resolutions sponsored in the Assembly by this majority have always had the support of a large number of other nations. Thus those resolutions have had behind them a fairly universal, and uncoerced, consensus. As we all know, the Security Council has an informal procedure. Apart from debates in open meetings, members consult one another, adjust their positions and evolve a kind of consensus. This procedure, also applicable to the Assembly, provides checks and balances and introduces an element of moderation into international controversies. There is no reason to think that such procedures will not work with an enlarged membership of the Security Council.

The United Nations, or any organ of it, could be no better and no worse than the nations which compose it would want it to be. From this point of view, the somber thoughts which come into our minds regarding the Organization are not an indictment of it but a reflection of our feeling of concern for the maturity and the sense of justice of the nations of the world taken together.

I have said that there are fears that an expanded United Nation as much as an expanded Security Council might become somewhat irresponsible. Whatever is at the root of these fears, they seem to be unrealistic compared to the fear of the United Nations and the Security Council not rising above the expediencies of Power politics and failing to deliver the goods in terms of justice and security. This fear cannot be allayed by the World Organization itself, or by any of its organs singly. It can be allayed, and the future made more hopeful, only by the more powerful nations, who, in the very nature of things, influence the destiny, not only of their own peoples, but also that of entire mankind. It is they who will demonstrate whether they mean to keep humanity in thrall or beckon it to a more genuine and lasting peace.

II

The Role of the Great Powers

The basic problem which we in Asia and Africa have to face, and I being an Asian would for the present like to confine myself to Asia, is to meet the challenge of independence. We have experimented with political systems imported from abroad, excellent and highly successful in their own environments, but systems which have to be attuned and accommodated to our conditions. Thus one of the greatest challenges which the leadership of Asia faces is to devise political institutions which can efficiently serve the interests of its people, and which are, at the same time, stable and firm and thus capable of making a contribution to international life.

Due to historical reasons, we lack the economic and social infrastructure of development. Our economic and social conditions pose a most serious problem. With our teeming multitudes, limited resources, nascent political institutions and political life not fully ordained, the challenge to Asian leadership is greater than what people in other parts of the world imagine it to be. Leaderships of a normal kind cannot really meet this challenge. This fact deserves to be better understood in the West than it is.

The West, having forsaken its empires in our parts, must now accommodate itself, mentally and psychologically, to the new conditions and the new forces which are emerging in Asia. The physical process of vacating Asia and Africa is a fait accompli. But Western reconciliation to Asian leadership on a basis of equality has not yet come about. Once this is achieved, there should much better understanding between the leadership of Asia and that of the Western world. Such understanding should also effectively help in promoting international peace.

Not infrequently we hear in the West uncharitable criticism of the leaders of Asia and Africa who, in fact, are struggling against overwhelming odds to give a better life to their people. Courageous Asian and African leaders are sometimes referred to in derogatory terms. They never tire of repeating that Lumumba "embezzled" public money when he was employed as a postal official. Instead of making such disparaging remarks about him, why is it not said that here was a man who had the zeal and capacity to organize a political movement and bring new life to his country, which had long been suffering under colonial subjection? Other examples could be cited. Ben Bella is described as an uneducated corporal; Nasser as a scheming colonel. Such an attitude towards Asian and African leaders is far from sensible. What if they were born in poverty? The whole of Asia and Africa are immersed in poverty. In Asian terms, to be rich in the midst of poverty is a

disgrace. Poverty is more than a word. It is a terrible and miserable thing. When we say that we must make a real and determined efforts to wipe out poverty that is sometimes not taken seriously. When we say that political adjustments must be made to deal with poverty, we are not properly understood.

We have to work towards an egalitarian society. Once the people of Asia realize that their leadership is genuinely working towards such a society, they are prepared to make for it all sacrifices. The people of Asia would be willing to see their political rights curtailed if that would help in doing away with the cruel dichotomy between the rich and the poor. When disparity between the rich and the poor grows, upheavals come in its wake. The line between what is regarded as Communist leadership and nationalist leadership gets thin and sometimes blurred. This makes our task all the more difficult.

The problems posed by poverty and the lack of education and other social amenities are the greatest challenge to the leadership of Asia. If to deal with these problems we have to make political adjustments, which are not quite "proper" according to Western standards, the West must not misunderstand us. Indeed, you must try to understand us. The sooner this understanding comes about, the better will it be for cooperation between the West and Asia. We do not want to break our ties with the West. There is no reason for us to do so. We have had associations in the past with the West and have been enriched by them. We should like to gain still further from the West. We should like to take advantage of its experience. With the end of imperialism our relations with the West are becoming less and less unequal.

Gradually, Asian leaders, who had had intimate contacts with the West, are disappearing. A special effort must be made to endow the new leadership, which is now emerging, with opportunities for developing such contacts. We should like to expand our contacts with the Soviet Union, with China and other sectors of the world, but without any cultural imposition or political domination by them. If we could fight and repel domination by the West, we can just as well resist domination by others and that we will do. The great Powers must realize that the era of over lordship and exploitation has come to an end, a complete, total and final end. We want, at long last, after centuries of subjugation, to order our destiny on a basis of equality and friendship with all the Powers of the world.

This does not mean that the great Powers have no longer a role to play in the affairs of Asia and Africa. To suggest that would be unrealistic. The great Powers have indeed a significant role in these continents. But if that role is to be durable and not transitory, it must be one of constructive association and cooperation, such as the sharing of cultural traditions, technical know-how and other knowledge.

What their role in Asia and Africa is to be must be decided by the great Powers themselves,. But it must be without ideological qualifications. In tomorrow's world, if the Soviet Union and China were to make the historical mistakes of the West, then their role too is bound to be transitory one, for we are determined to resist any form of domination.

Now what is the relevance of all this to Pakistan? Having achieved our independence after a hard struggle and having attained, after many crises, political stability, and established institutions which suit our conditions, we feel that we are in a position to reflect our role in international affairs. It is a modest role, commensurate with the modest status of our country. Primarily, we seek to establish good and friendly relations with all our neighbors. I should like to emphasize the word all, which includes India as much as it includes Burma, Nepal, China and Ceylon. With all these countries, except India, we have been successful in establishing the best of relations. We failed in the case of India, largely because of the unfortunate, indeed tragic, dispute over Kashmir,. Moreover, recently there has been the border clash in the Rann of Kutch. It was not of our choosing and we genuinely desire a peaceful settlement about it. Some of our newspapers have been writing about the victory of Pakistan in this clash at Biar Bet. There is, in this conflict no question of victory or defeat. The greatest victory that the people of Pakistan could ever win was the establishment of Pakistan, which was so resolutely opposed both by our former British rulers and the leadership of the all-powerful Congress party. Having achieved that, we want no more victories. Therefore, I do not associate myself with this talk of victory at Biar Bet. We believe in the triumph of reason and peace. The rulers of India should adopt a similar attitude, abandon the tanks and the trenches and sit at the negotiating table with Pakistan and settle this problem. It is capable of settlement, in a spirit of give and take, in the same way as Pakistan has settled its boundary problems with Burma, with Iran, with Afghanistan and with China. But while we wish for a peaceful settlement, we must defend, as best as we can, every inch of our soil, rich or poor, lush or desolate.

I shall now refer to our relations with the great Powers to our North. It has been said in India and elsewhere that there is something sinister in Pakistan's relations with China. Nothing could farther from the truth. Our policy with regard to the People's Republic of China is not of a negative character. It has a positive content. It does not stem from our differences with India. It is of a logical nature. Allow me to explain that.

As I have said, we believe in a policy of peace, particularly between neighbors. We believe in this policy for good reasons. We want to see an end to tensions and to conflicts, so that we can put all our resources and energies into the effort we are making to wipe out poverty, want and misery from our country. We can do that only if there is peace around us. So we have sought peaceful relations with all our neighbors and China is a very important neighbor of ours. We share with China a common frontier, a rugged, difficult frontier, of about 600 miles. You are aware of the difficulties that have arisen

between India and China on account of frontier problems between them. We would not like to be caught in similar difficulties. That is one consideration. The other consideration is that China is a member of the family of Afro-Asian nations. We in Pakistan attach the greatest importance to the awakening and solidarity of the peoples of Asia and Africa. It is sometimes said that this too is a negative approach. But it is not so. It is natural for us to want to unite with those who have had the same experience as ourselves, who face the same problems and challenges, political and economic, as we do. Afro-Asian solidarity has a positive role in international affairs, not in conflict, but in cooperation, with the Western world. Afro-Asian solidarity is not directed against the Western Powers or their interests. Its fulfillment lies in collaboration with the West and the rest of the world. China, being a member of the Afro-Asian community, we wish to have good relations with it.

Further, as a small country, we believe that the United Nations must be strengthened. Today the United Nations is in the doldrums. It is facing an acute financial crisis. Just imagine, an organization like the United Nations, which was brought into being to put an end to conflict and war, to establish the rule of international law, is today in jeopardy, because of financial difficulties. I am not putting it forward as a proposal but the idea occurs to me whether, to put an end to the deadlock in the U.N. the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America might not be able to assume the financial obligations of the more prosperous great Powers.

We believe that the United Nations must be strengthened, and regard it as most urgent. But this cannot be done if a country of 700 million people, a great Power, is excluded from the United Nations, especially in view of the legal position which confers on the five great Powers a special responsibility in the Security Council. In fact the United Nations is incomplete without the participation in it of the People's Republic of China. So long as that is the situation, disputes in South East Asia cannot really be settled, at least not on an equitable and lasting basis, such as we all desire. Nor can there be any hope of achieving true, meaningful and effective disarmament, if from negotiations about if China is excluded, particularly now that China itself has become a nuclear Power. Finally, if there is to be a real understanding, a real détente, between the East and the West, China must be a party to any arrangement for it.

These are quite important considerations which justify Pakistan seeking cooperation and friendship with China. These considerations, it is obvious, are not directed against India or any other country. There is no collusion or any secret understanding between China and Pakistan. Pakistan's position is clear. It continues to be a party to its defense alliances with the West.

Today, no discussion about the great Powers would be complete without a reference to Vietnam. Our position on this problem is well-known.

We believe in a peaceful and negotiated settlement and not in an intensification of the conflict. There should be a settlement, which is equitable and honorable for the people of Vietnam, and not through bringing them to their knees by methods other than peaceful.

That we take this attitude should surprise no one. I have already referred to the great challenges which the people of Asia and Africa face and the great battle in which they are engaged for securing better social and economic conditions. But above all there is the challenge to preserve our self-respect. There is no substitute for self-respect. If improvement in the living conditions of our masses can come only at the cost of our self-respect, then we would rather continue to be poor.

Pakistan has raised objections to the establishment of a so-called nuclear balance. If you are to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons, it is obvious that there must be agreement between those Powers who possess such weapons today, irrespective of their ideologies and irrespective of all political considerations. Efforts must be made for an agreement between all nuclear Powers that there should be no proliferation. The alternative to it is the annihilation of mankind by nuclear weapons. When there were two nuclear Powers, agreement was easier to achieve. When there were three, it became more difficult. Today there are five nuclear Powers. If this number increase, to six and then to seven or eight, it will be still more difficult to reach an agreement. It is, therefore, important to undertake immediately an attempt to expeditiously bring about an agreement between all the present nuclear Powers. But that attempt will be meaningless if certain nuclear Powers guarantee nuclear protection to any non-nuclear State against certain other nuclear Powers. The nuclear Power against whom the guarantees are given to a non-nuclear State will in its turn give similar guarantees to other non-nuclear States and thus seek to balance the situation. To give a hypothetical example, if Britain were to give a nuclear guarantee to Malaysia, then China would be persuaded to give a nuclear guarantee to Indonesia. Thereby the chances of proliferation are increased rather than restricted. You must not forget that the nuclear Powers exercise upon themselves a self-imposed restraint for the simple reason that merely by looking out of a window in New York or London, it becomes apparent what destruction could be caused by reckless nuclear politics.

That consideration does not apply to a non-nuclear State. Non-nuclear countries have not attained that degree of development which the nuclear ones have and have, therefore, less to lose by a nuclear war. Some irresponsible non-nuclear leaders might say, "Well, what if there is a nuclear war? We have only three or four textile mills and the rest of our country is undeveloped; we could build those mills again." The nuclear States have greater stake in preventing destruction, and therefore, a greater responsibility in this matter. If by proliferation, a non-nuclear State acquires nuclear weapons, there will be a greater danger of possible nuclear conflict.

III

Asian-African Solidarity

Among the developments that have taken place in the international sphere after the Second World War, the emergence of solidarity between the countries of Asia and Africa has certainly been a remarkable phenomenon. While meetings at Heads of State or Government level are necessarily occasional, the concept of Asian-African solidarity finds constant expression in concerted action by the Asian-African bloc at the United Nations and in the growing number of organizations and meetings representing the various segments of the populations of the two continents.

As the globe has shrunk through faster communications, regional cooperation has become an accepted means of advancing the political, economic and cultural development of various parts of the world. However, the growth of what may be called the Asian-African movement is a truly striking development, particularly since the two continents do not conform to any known concept of regionalism.

What, one may naturally ask, is the basis of solidarity between the countries of Asia and Africa? The answer to this question is not simple. It depends also upon how one looks at this development.

Address at the Afro-Asian Seminar, Lahore, 11 February 1965

For Western observers, to whom the evolution of Asian-African solidarity may be somewhat disquieting, the only feature these countries appear to have in common is their past and present experience of colonialism. In the countries of the Asian-African fraternity, there are those who envisage the emergence of an "Asian-African group" as an important factor in determining the course of world events. In seeing to analyse the real content of the solidarity among the countries of Asia and Africa, I shall attempt to determine what it has been so far, what it could be and perhaps also what it should be.

The continents of Asia and Africa cover an area of about 28 million square miles, which is 50 per cent of the earth's land surface. The continent of Asia itself has the greatest diversity of geographical features, containing as it does the highest mountains, the deepest depressions, extensive plains, and vast deserts. With its variety of landscape, climates and vegetation, Africa also defies any effort to treat it as a natural unit. Together, the two continents, although they are contiguous, can still less be regarded as a single or homogeneous region from the geographical point of view.

The two continents contain around two-thirds of the population of the world. The peoples of Asia and Africa encompass all the known races of man and profess all the major world religions, most of which originated within the area. Their history does not have any semblance of unity; indeed their social and cultural heritage is characterized by the same diversity as is found in their geographical setting.

Considering this physical and human background of the two continents and their recorded history, this urge towards solidarity among more than two billion people must be regarded as a revolutionary development.

Though the desire for solidarity among the Asian and African countries is rooted in their general experience of colonialism and imperialism, with all the resultant indignities and exploitation, the fundamental characteristic of their community of purpose and thought is its moral content. To be subjected to the interests and ambitions of other Powers violates human dignity and amounts to a recognition of the supremacy of might over right.

When nations emerging from foreign domination get together to safeguard their own independence and to promote the liberation of countries that are still subject to external control, it should not be regarded as merely a negative unity against colonialism. It merits recognition as a positive force, that is, for human dignity and freedom. Needless to say, as long as vestiges of colonialism remain, or peoples are subjected to discrimination or exploitation, the urge to oppose and remove such forcible control or denial of justice must remain. But the concept guiding the aspirations of the peoples of Asia and Africa is positive and moral and has for its goals the consolidation of peace, the establishment of justice, the promotion of welfare and the flowering of culture.

Sometimes it is said cynically that what is called Asian-African solidarity represents no more than a conglomeration of countries that are weak and bitter, and suffer from a hate complex. The view is advanced that with the passage of time this solidarity will wean itself away and disappear. I do not think this is a correct appreciation. Common experience stretching back into the history of a colonial past has brought about an identity of attitudes and approach, which is of a lasting character.

It is also said that these countries are poor; they do not have the material resources to compete with the more prosperous nations of the world. Here again I disagree. I do not think it is correct to say that merely because in a material sense their strength is not commensurate with the strength of the industrialized countries, Asian-African States cannot play a significant role in international affairs. On the contrary, events have shown that the voice of Asia and Africa has become decisive in the councils of the world. It has become decisive in spite of the fact that they are materially backward and suffer from many handicaps. These inherent limitations

notwithstanding, the voice of Asia and Africa is heard and respected throughout the world. The reason is not far to seek. The voice of Asia and Africa is not just the voice of a few Governments, or of a few coteries. It is the voice of the peoples of two vast continents speaking in unison. Inasmuch as it represents their combined will, it is a force, which is formidable and invincible.

The primary and initial motivation of Asian-African solidarity is political and its purpose is to promote the liberation of the countries of Asia and Africa from all the evils of colonial rule. This purpose has been largely achieved, though there are still several countries which remain under foreign domination, including Angola, Mozambique, South-West Africa and others. The free countries of Asia and Africa feel a natural obligation to help remove the remaining vestiges of colonialism and imperialism. They are also justifiably concerned with consolidating their independence and resisting neocolonialism.

Colonialism in its classical and orthodox forms is gradually dying. This is not only due to the struggles of the colonial peoples themselves, but also to the combined endeavors on their behalf of the nations of Asia and Africa. We shall soon see the inevitable total liquidation of colonialism. Nonetheless, the former colonial Powers still have a stake and are trying to retain and exert in various forms their influence in the countries which they formerly ruled. We have to be vigilant against these new forms of domination. In some respects they are more vicious than the old naked and crude hold of one people over another. The people of Asia and Africa must stand united not only to do away with old forms of colonialism but also to safeguard for ever their national independence and territorial integrity from the inroads of new forms of colonialism.

In order that neo-colonialism should flourish, it is necessary that the nations of Asia and Africa should be internally weak and divided amongst themselves. Pressure can best be applied against a people when it is intrinsically weak and divided from others who could give it support. The best way to counteract pressure is to have stability and strength to resist it. That is why foreign influences seek to misguide our peoples in various ways. That is why when there is strong and forceful indigenous leadership in a country, foreign Powers pit themselves against that leadership and make every endeavor to weaken it. I shall desist from giving examples. But where there are leaders who are insipid, weak and ready to serve as tools of foreign Powers, they are aggrandized and described as statesmen with breadth of vision. We do not want that kind of breadth of vision, nor that kind of statesmanship.

In order to liberate themselves, in order to maintain their national sovereignty and territorial integrity, it is necessary for people to make sacrifices and suffer prolonged trial and pain. These experiences help to build the national character and self-respect of a people.

Many things are important in this world. But, for a free people, nothing is more important than their self-respect. That is why the people of Asia and Africa need vigorous, strong and dedicated leadership, in fact masculine leadership.

When we talk of the liquidation of old forms of colonialism and the need to safeguard ourselves against its new forms, we must recognize that a sense of aggrandizement is to be found also in some of the newly independent States of Asia. This too is a form of colonialism against which we must safeguard ourselves. This, to any mind, is at once the most deplorable and the most dangerous form of colonialism, for it strikes against the people of Asia and Africa from within and at their great common cause. If these people, who have won their independence after having themselves gone through fire and suffering, embark on colonial adventures in Asia and Africa, that is not only most unfortunate but also tragic. First, it shows that they have not learnt from their own experience. Secondly, this brand of colonialism destructive of Asian-African solidarity and weakens its moral influence in world affairs.

Objectively speaking, there is no difference whatsoever between India's hold over Kashmir and Portugal's hold over Mozambique and Angola. The people of Angola and Mozambique are groaning under colonial rule; so are the people of Kashmir. Pakistan, on its own initiative, has always been in the forefront of the struggle for the liberation of the people of Angola and Mozambique as well as that of other colonial people, such as those of Southern Rhodesia. This is a matter of fundamental principle with Pakistan. In fact, it is an aspect of our struggle, which cannot be complete, until all the ramparts of colonialism, wherever they be in the world, are liquidated. From that point of view it is incumbent upon the nations of Asia and Africa to support the liberation struggle of the people of Kashmir. You will notice that this support is growing. The People's Republic of China has come out in support of the cause of the people of Kashmir. Likewise the Republic of Indonesia has declared its support for them. Throughout the world, in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe, there is a strong feeling that the people of Kashmir are entitled to freedom as much as any other people. It will be a long struggle, but it is bound to succeed, for in the end justice always prevails.

Last but not the least, the Asian-African countries have a fundamental stake in safeguarding peace, promoting disarmament and general creating conditions under which they can devote their energies to the task of achieving their economic and cultural betterment. This explains their desire to strengthen the United Nations as an instrument of peace and cooperation.

Through their combined effort, Asia and Africa can play a much bigger role in the United Nations. When the Charter of the United Nations was framed, control of the world was, in effect, placed in the hands of five

countries. The Security Council was made the principal organ of the United Nations, the arbiter in all matters relating to war, peace and the settlement of disputes, in fact the arbiter of the fate of mankind. Decisive power in the Security Council was vested in its five permanent members, the so-called great Powers, of whom, on the basis of ideology, the Soviet Union is Communist. But, not one nation of Asia or Africa or Latin America was given a permanent seat on the Security Council, except, China, which at that time was a different China. It was no more than an appendix of the Western Powers. Therefore, they condescended to give it in the Security Council the status of a great Power, with the right of veto. And now when the people of Asia and Africa are demanding greater representation in the Security Council, there is resistance to it from the Powers, who are already its permanent members. This is an aspect of the conflict between the haves and have-nots of the world, the rich nations and the poor nations. This is a challenge to the poor ones of Asia and Africa.

There is general recognition that the liberation of most countries of the two continents being an accomplished fact, the time has come to devote more attention to solving their internal problems and disputes in an equitable and peaceful manner. President Soekarno has made special mention of such disputes and has said: "Asian-African problems shall be solved by Asia-Africa itself in an Asian-African way". All would agree that divergences among the Asian-African countries should not be allowed to affect their solidarity. At the same time, these countries profess certain principles, which should find application in the settlement of their disputes.

The Asian-African nations include large as well as small Powers, and they have to evolve traditions of equal and just relations between themselves, so that local imperialisms do not emerge to replace Western colonialism. Just as the Organization of African Unity has set up machinery for settling African disputes, there is room for a larger Asian-African organization for similar purposes, to supplement the work of the United Nations. The establishment of such an organization must be accompanied by a heightened awareness of the need to conform to principles of international law and justice.

Whether it is apartheid in Africa, violation of the League of Nations mandate in South-West Africa, the independence of Palestine, Mozambique, and Angola or the right to self-determination of the people of Kashmir, the solidarity of the Asian-African people cannot be perfected except on the basis of the recognition of the right to freedom.

Apart from experience of Western colonialism, the other characteristic which most of the Asian-African countries have in common, is their poverty. Their resources are generally either underdeveloped or geared to the economics of former colonial Powers, and their standard of living is the lowest in the world.

Economic exploitation of Asia and Africa by the West has been of the most vicious character. We have ourselves experienced this exploitation in its most repulsive form. The drain on the sub-continent has been so great that, to catch up with the times, we have to make a gigantic effort, for which we must mobilize all available resources. In this effort, we need the cooperation of all the people of Asia and Africa. We also need economic assistance from the industrialized countries of the world. Foreign economic assistance is not given on an entirely altruistic basis. The loans that we get have to be repaid and they have to be repaid from our own resources. There should be no misunderstanding on this score. It is advantageous to the economics of the industrialized countries to give loans to underdeveloped countries. The developed countries, particularly the former colonial Powers, are under a moral obligation to come to the help of the under-developed countries. Thus there should be no qualms on our part in seeking aid from Western or Eastern countries, but it should be without any sense of dependence upon them.

Colonial rule has sapped our vitality,. It has demoralized our people and retarded their growth. Because of it, we find ourselves in a situation of economic dependence. Unless and until the new nations of Asia and Africa are able to liberate themselves from this dependence, they will not be truly and genuinely free. This is the first call of independence in Africa and Asia.

Consequently, while the value of friendly aid from the developed countries and international agencies is universally acknowledged, the ultimate aim of the Asian-African countries must be to build up self-reliance and to be free from the restraints, direct and indirect, that arise from dependence upon others.

The general need for cooperation among the Asian and African countries is everywhere realized. The form and magnitude of such cooperation must necessarily vary according to the conditions of different areas. During the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, seventy-five countries, including most of the Asian-African countries, and some countries of Latin America, evolved a common approach with a view to establishing a favorable equation with the developed countries. The framework of economic consultation and cooperation could be expanded and the more developed countries of Asia and Africa could extend their assistance to others, which might be lagging behind.

Economic cooperation among the Asian-African countries is bound to assume a growing importance. Having attained political independence, the countries of Asia and Africa must co-ordinate their struggle against poverty, disease and illiteracy. A beginning has already been made towards fruitful cooperation through the AFRASEC meetings and there is vast scope for closer collaboration between our economists, planners and technicians, who can learn a great deal from each other's experience.

Just as there is a political problem, which has long been the forefront of our consciousness, and there is an economic problem, the dimensions of which are now being realized, there is also a cultural problem, which we must begin to recognize.

The countries of Asia and Africa are heirs to ancient cultures. Most of them can look back to periods of great achievement in their history, when they not only possessed power and influence, but also made important contribution to the heritage of mankind. As already mentioned, all the great religions of the world originated in these continent and their cultural and intellectual impact is to be seen everywhere. Certain traits, which are described as 'oriental', are attributed to the cultures of Asia and Africa. Notable among them are preoccupation with spiritual and moral values and a genius for artistic expression.

Before the coming of Western colonialism, most of the countries of Asia and Africa had deep-rooted traditions of their own. The development of machine industries in European States enabled them to make inroads into the two continents. Backed by political and economic power, naturally the culture of the imperialist nations acquired prestige in subject countries. In some cases, a policy of deliberately imposing the culture and language of the colonial Power was followed. To participate in Government or business under colonial regimes required adopting the culture of the ruling Power. This was accompanied by neglect and consequent stagnation of indigenous languages and cultural institutions.

After they have attained independence, an important question for the liberate countries of Asia and Africa is; how should they revive and revitalize their native traditions and cultures and to what extent should they retain the languages and customs which they adopted under colonial rule? To some extent the retention of Western languages and institutions is indispensable to keep up with modern technology and research. Yet there are devotees of indigenous to whom all vestiges of Western cultural are totally intolerable.

If we have to find an answer to the problem of the synthesis of the traditional and the modern, it is crucially important for the intellectuals and cultural leaders of the Asian-African countries to maintain and indeed in large there contacts, compare their experiences and learn from each other. The poets, writers and artists of these countries too can make their contribution to our solidarity. Our rich cultural heritage constitutes both a challenge and an inspiration for us to rise to new heights.

IV

Relations with India

Recently, when the President of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, visited the United States, he made a statement to the effect that his country was prepared to conclude with Pakistan a "No War Pact" and to have it registered with the United Nations. A proposal of this nature was first made in 1950 by Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru to the late Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan and it has since been repeated a number of times.

The keenness for a "No War Pact" with Pakistan and for having it registered with the United Nations cannot easily be reconciled with India's attitude towards the Kashmir dispute. If the resolutions of the Security Council, to which India is a party, have in its eyes no moral and legal sanctity, it can have but little respect for a "No War Pact" even if it is registered with the United Nations. Besides, a treaty of this nature would show a lack of faith in the United Nations Charter, which enjoins every member State to resolve its international disputes by peaceful methods.

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

"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".

(Article 2, Paras 3 and 4)

According to Article 33 of the Charter:

"The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice".

Address at Hyderabad, 26 April 1963

This is an obligation which Pakistan and India and, for that matter, all member States, are presumed to have accepted. The ability and willingness to carry out the obligations imposed by the Charter being the condition of the membership of the United Nations, the proposal of India for a "No War Pact" implies that India does not have full faith in the World Organization.

Actually the offer of a "No War Pact" is intended to cover up India's aggression in Kashmir and, denial to its people of the right of self-determination, which is one of the U. N. Charter. A political settlement on the basis of the ceasefire line together with a "No War Pact", which is what India has been insisting upon, aims at enabling India to swallow the part of Kashmir occupied by its armies. The revival of the proposal for a "No War Pact" with India is not without significance. The object is simply to freeze the status quo along the ceasefire line.

If we had agreed, or if we now agree, to a "No War Pact", following it the world would be told that the Government of Pakistan had accepted the ceasefire line as the permanent boundary between India and Pakistan and that the Kashmir dispute had thus been settled. Not that Pakistan would resort to an armed attack on India, or any other country, but no country can forsake its inherent and sovereign right to defend its vital national interests.

In size and economic resources, Pakistan is one-fourth of India, and being the smaller country, cannot think in terms of aggression against a neighbor so much bigger than itself. The settlement of all disputes by peaceful means, and through negotiation, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, is the cardinal principle of the foreign policy of Pakistan. It would be repugnant to its ideals and interests to disturb the peace of the region or to aggravate the tensions that already exist in it. Pakistan refrained from resorting to force or to a show of force even at the time of India's defeat at the hands of the Chinese. History provides few parallels to this situation in which Pakistan resisted the natural temptation of taking advantage of helplessness of India at that time. There could be no more convincing proof of Pakistan's peaceful intentions.

India's record, on the other hand, has been one of total rejection of peaceful procedures. Force and the threat of force have been consistently used by India in dealing with its smaller neighbors. In its attitude towards Pakistan, and towards its other neighbors, India shows nothing but contempt for methods of peaceful settlement of disputes. Responsible leaders of the Government of India, from the Prime Minister and the President of the Congress Party downwards, have time and again threatened to use force

against Pakistan" So far as China and Pakistan are concerned" Pandit Nehru said on 21 January 1962, "India is determined to vacate their aggression". The former Defense Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, declared: "We have not abjured violence in regard to any country that violates our interest" (The Hindustan Times, New Delhi, 6 December 1962). Mr. Menon further assured the workers of the Congress Party that "just as the Goa problem has been solved, the China and Pakistan problems would also be solved" (The Statesman, New Delhi, 26 December 1961). The Congress Party President, Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, said: "We have to liberate the (Pakistan) occupied areas in Kashmir. We are postponing the issue....." But he declared that "within a short period the Government will choose the correct time to liberate that part of Kashmir also as it had done in respect of Goa". (The States, am. New Delhi, 5 January 1962).

It is clear from these statements of the leaders of India that they want a "No War Pact" with Pakistan only to lull our people into a false sense of security. The initiative in making proposals of this kind has generally emanated from aggressor States. Nazi Germany, for instance, concluded such a pact with the USSR before invading it, the well known Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact.

India being in possession of more than two-thirds of Kashmir, and Pakistan having intimate relations with Azad Kashmir, which comprises the rest of the State, the implications of this offer may well be imagined. The "No War Pact" would amount to a condo nation of past Indian aggression and offer no guarantee against future aggression. It would, on the country, provide India with a convenient device for accusing Pakistan of aggression if Pakistan were compelled to resort to arms, purely in self-defense. The "No War Pact" would, therefore, endow India with a sinister instrument to help it in aggressive action against Pakistan.

Against this background of territorial aggrandizement, the augmentation of the strength of India, through external military aid, has a menacing significance, not for Pakistan only, but for the whole region stretching from the Hindukush mountains to the Mekong river. The leaders of India have repeatedly declared that in spite of their conflict with China, Pakistan is India's Enemy Number One. The weapons newly acquired by India can be turned by it against Pakistan and against the other countries of South Asia. These weapons will not be used against the Colossus of the North, for India cannot match China's manpower and resources. Even if it could, it would be at a serious disadvantage in the mountainous terrain of the Sino-Indian border. The smaller countries would, therefore, be the inevitable prey of India's ambitions. This is the natural and genuine fear of Pakistan, which had a foretaste of India's terror at the time of the partition, when untold numbers were massacred in cold blood. The arming of India by the Western Powers is a threat against which Pakistan not only protests, but has the right and duty to protect itself by all the means at its disposal.

The President of India observed, "India will be able to settle the problem only by having strength with which to back her bargaining power". India wants to have a bargaining lever, really against Pakistan, so that India can tell us; "Do you still refuse to settle the Kashmir problem on our terms i.e. on the basis of the partition of the State along the ceasefire line? Consider India's strength. Weight it, and see if you can match it."

The Prime Minister of India, while on a visit to the United States proclaimed before the American people: "Peace is a passion with us." Three days after delivering this message of peace, India's war drums were beating in Goa. The weapons with which India is now being armed may not be used. Their very possession would give India a preponderant position from which to dictate its terms. The arms equilibrium that had been attained, after untold sacrifices made by Pakistan, through denial of even the necessities of life to its people, will now be upset. Material prosperity apart, even the physical security of Pakistan will be imperiled by the recent accretion to the military strength of India.

India is now warning the world of the so-called menace of Communist China, a country with which until recently India had the best of relations. There is no guarantee that the wheel of diplomacy will not turn full circle, for India remains uncommitted. Whereas countries, which are bound by alliances, have undertaken obligations, in India's case, there are none. India retains full freedom to maneuver and to manipulate, and can thus have the best of both the worlds. However, in spite of all the military aid it is getting from the West, India might yet settle its problem with China through negotiation. It is not an insoluble problem. It pertains to border adjustments, and India, through the Colombo Powers, has been seeking to bring about a settlement with Communist China. Once the territorial dispute is settled, the old philosophy of co-existence between the two countries might again prevail.

No wonder that India has been severely critical of Pakistan's boundary agreement with China, for which Pakistan is not to be forgiven and for which the people of Kashmir will continue to be penalized. Indian criticism has been carried to the extent of sensing sinister motives and reading secret clauses in it.

If the agreement had contained more than meets the eye, Pakistan would not have been anxious to seek a settlement with India. The agreement is not a barrier to Indo-Pakistan accord or an obstacle to a Sino-Indian rapprochement. The only way in which India can demonstrate to the world that Pakistan does really have some secret understanding with the People's Republic of China is by agreeing to an honorable and equitable settlement over Kashmir. Test us.

Nothing illustrates the unethical character of the role of India in world affairs better than the neutralist posture which it has assumed. This

neutrality, Dr. Radhkrishnan argued, was actually in the interest of the United States as it enabled India "to talk to the Soviet Union not as a partisan but as a people interested in trying to safeguard the highest canons of justice and telling them that it was their duty to understand and come to a settlement". The whole world, including the United States, knows, or should know, that the motive behind the so-called neutrality is to enable India to draw upon the economic and military resources of both the Powers.

There is a basic contradiction in a country receiving military assistance from both the United States and USSR. No sophistry of words and no political jugglery can ever reconcile the irreconcilable. Sooner or later, sooner rather than later, the Soviet Union itself will realize the fallacy in its policy of supporting India over Kashmir. Kashmir is not, as the world had been told, a settled issue. It is very much a live issue. There were, not long ago, six rounds of negotiations about Kashmir between Pakistan and India. Negotiations do not take place about settled issues. It does not behoove a great Power like the Soviet Union, to adopt a partisan attitude towards a dispute which affects the lives of four million people, the people of Kashmir, and the interests of the hundred million peoples of Pakistan. Whatever the requirements of its international diplomacy, the Soviet Union could not pursue a policy that would alienate Pakistan, a nation with whom it has expressed a desire to live on friendly terms.

I am not going to discuss the merits of the Sino-Indian conflict. It primarily concerns the People's Republic of China and the Government of India. But one cannot overlook the facts that Kashmir is very close to China and that most of Kashmir is under the occupation of India, a country in conflict with China. Thus when fighting flared up between India and China on the Ladakh front, the Kashmir dispute acquire3d a new aspect. Ladakh is a part of Kashmir and contiguous to China. The realization of this vital fact rekindled worldwide interest in the settlement of the Kashmir dispute. There force, while we are not directly concerne3d with the Sino-Indian conflict, we must recognize that it does have a bearing on the Kashmir question. Important emissaries from leading Western Powers rushed to India and Pakistan to make an effort to bring about a settlement of that question. As a result of their endeavors a Joint Communiqué was issued declaring that Indian and Pakistan would enter into direct negotiations, first at the ministerial level and later at the summit level, about Kashmir. We were not entirely optimistic about the outcome of these negotiations, but we agreed to them because we wished to explore every avenue leading to a settlement of the dispute. We did not want that there should be any room for accusing Pakistan of having behaved unreasonably. This was one important consideration. The other consideration was that several friendly countries were of the view that the best way to solve the problem was through direct negotiations and urged us to resort to this procedure. For a number of years we had received suggestions to that effect from diverse quarters. It is true that we had had direct negotiations in the past but they were of a restricted nature. We did not want to create in Asia and Africa the impression that we

were averse to comprehensive direct negotiations. It is well known that Article 33 of the United Nations Charter prescribes pacific settlement of disputes. In agreeing to negotiations, we were acting in the spirit of the Charter.

Furthermore, by hearing each other's point of view, by exhausting all the means of negotiations, we felt that we would be in a much better position to have a correct and indeed a final assessment of the chances of a peaceful settlement. We knew that by entering into these negotiations we would not in any way impair or erode our just stand about Kashmir. For these and other connected reasons, we entered into negotiations with India. As the talks progressed in complete secrecy, rumors and speculations mounted. The public showed some degree of impatience. If there were in the minds of the negotiations on the other side certain considerations in agreeing to direct talks, we were not unmindful of them, just as they were not of our own motivations. We know our neighbors quite well and they know us equally well. For many centuries we have shared a common history and, after partition, our geographical proximity has been and obvious fact. We understood their reasons for entering into the negotiations and saw through every move they have made. We credit them with the same degree of perception. We knew quite well that they would be keen to prolong the talks and they were aware of our anxiety to bring them to speedy conclusions to drag on indefinitely.

Our predominant concern was to safeguard the interests of the people of Kashmir, whose destiny is so closely linked with that of our own people. With this as our major premise, we were prepared to be accommodating and flexible. Of course, we would accept no solution that was not equitable and honorable. There is nothing insurmountable in the way of finding such a solution, provided there is the will and the determination to seek it.

There is a difference between our approach and that of the Government of India. The Indian approach is that this is a dispute only between India and Pakistan and that nobody else is concerned. Our attitude is that while our people are concerned, more so are the unfortunate people of Kashmir, who have been denied the right of self-determination. They are the foremost party in the dispute and the most concerned. India too is concerned. Even more are we, with all our stake and interests. But the party most concerned and the people most involved are the people of Kashmir. If a solution is found between India and Pakistan, but is not acceptable to an overwhelming majority of Kashmiris, that is no solution and neither India nor Pakistan has the right to impose it on them. This is a most important aspect of the issue. Thus the key to peaceful and happy relations between Pakistan and India lies in the latter fulfilling its undertaking to permit the people of Kashmir to exercise their right of self-determination.

V

Aid –Art Thou Charity?

Economic aid is a post-World War II phenomenon. Out of the ashes of that War, a new industrial Europe was created. This was through massive economic assistance given by the United States a country, which, though involved in the War, had escaped its ravages.

The purpose of resuscitating Europe was not so much to build new cathedrals or opera houses in place of those destroyed during the War as to save Europe from Communism. If Communism had succeeded in establishing itself in Western Europe it would assuredly have swept across the Atlantic to the American continent, as does the locust sweep across the Arabian desert to Pakistan, India and Central China.

Aid has a definite purpose and it is not charity. At best it is to save others as well as oneself. Communism has receded from a rehabilitated Western Europe. Perhaps in the same way it can be made to recede from the countries of Asia and Africa.

Europe undoubtedly suffered badly because of the War. Some of the Asian countries were also mauled by it. But Asia and Africa have always faced problems which wars create. There is the eternal poverty, which the people of these two giant continents suffer from generation after generation. Our lands are rich but our people are poor. Disease is our heritage. The wailing of hungry children is heard all over Asia. Beneath the thinnest film of a privileged class lies a miserable mass of sorrowful humanity. Is this by a pre-ordained law the permanent destiny of Asia?

The collective conscience of mankind cannot tolerate for ever such conditions of life for human beings. The call of Asian leadership is to wipe out the stigma of chronic mass poverty. To meet this greatest challenge of our time, all must pull together. For centuries non-Asians progressed from rags to riches on the toil of Asia. The exploitation of the wealth of the Orient by a sunless, spice less and silk less "Atlantic Society" left us barren. Today, the problem is as much their's as it is ours. They must, at least in part, restore to Asia what they have taken from it.

The governments which have given aid to other countries know the value and necessity of following such a policy. They realize that it is an indispensable part of modern diplomacy. Accordingly they call upon their people to make the necessary sacrifice in order to avoid much greater sacrifices. The philosophy of aid and the need for it have been explained by

these governments time and again to their people. And yet there are some who persist in calling it charity.

Recipient countries are grateful for the aid which they receive and in return they give in some form or the other what is more than adequate consideration for it. Unfortunately, to this aspect of the matter scant attention is paid by those who describe aid as charity. It is against the self-respect of a people, even the poorest, to promenade hat in hand before the doorsteps of opulent nations. Indeed, had this not been so and had there been no reciprocity in aid, it is doubtful if there would have been any aid at all.

On 20 August 1961, a letter was published in The Pakistan Times from an American Attorney-at-Law who said:

“Your president came here to get additional hand-outs from our Treasury, and this must be replaced by further taxes upon our people who are already heavily over-burdened. Over half a million dollars have already been given to your country. Now many of our people are unemployed, there is much hunger and want among them, and many are losing their homes because they are unable to continue their payments on them. These bad times are expected to worsen. For the numerous unemployed persons in want here I would petition your people to realize that most citizens here are not the wealthy persons our tax-paid representatives you see appear to be, and I would ask your people for my people to be most considerate in your requests for charity from this country”.

This letter was ably answered by a number of Pakistanis. But the subject needs to be further explored.

People all over the world crave for adequate livelihood, security, freedom, a sense of purpose and achievement. These are basic wants which man has ever been striving for. The extent to which these wants have been fulfilled in a society is the measure of the stage of development attained by it. Nowhere have all these wants been satisfied. There are vast areas of the world where even the most elemental human necessities have not yet been fully provide, where adequate food, clothing, housing and health and education facilities are still lacking.

The people of the under-developed countries have now decided to do something about it. The speed of communications, the multiplication of contacts between the advanced and the under-developed countries, and the contagion of ideas, have created a new yearning in the hearts of these people. The struggle for independence everywhere was linked with the desire for economic improvement.

In a world, which has witnessed all-conquering advances in science and technology, there is no physical reason why hunger and disease should

not be conquered. So far the challenge has not been adequately met. With rising populations, low incomes, low savings, low rate of investment and growth, under-developed countries find themselves caught in the vicious circle of poverty breeding poverty. The disparity between the poor and the affluent continues to widen. But poverty and plenty cannot co-exist much longer.

It goes without saying that the effort for development must in the main be made by a people itself. In this context some radical reforms have recently been introduced in Pakistan. The land reforms have provided new incentives for increased productivity and broadened the economic and social base of political power. An attempt is being made, through Basic Democracies, to diffuse political and social confidence, which is essential for a democratic system of government.

We are doing all we can to overcome the crisis of want. It was not out of cussedness that the President ordered excess land to be distributed among landless peasants-the poverty incarnate of Asia, the symbol of the challenge of our times. But not all our reforms at the national level can provide the final answer to what is really an international problem.

Few people would today subscribe to the mercantilist view, expressed by Colbert, who regarded it harmful to national prosperity that the arts of manufacture "go out of the Kingdom". Industrialisation of underdeveloped countries would stimulate international trade and world prosperity. Experience shows conclusively that countries which are the best producers of manufactures are also the best customers of other countries' manufactures. As within a nation, so in the world community, business grows with the prosperity of customers.

The permanent question is why should America and Europe help to alleviate the poverty of Asia? Is there any obligation on them other than that of preventing the world from falling a prey to Communism? The root of this obligation lies in the history of the not so distant past. There is a direct correlation between the richness of Europe and the poverty of Asia and Africa. Had it not been for the rapine of the riches of Asia and Africa, it is doubtful if Europe would have attained its pinnacle of plenty. The era of imperialism is dead but its record still haunts us. Imperialism's record is the one way plunder which took place in the name of laissez-fair economy.

We refer to the past, but only because those who plan for the future must know something of the past. British colonialism brought us a period of peace and security, roads and railways and some education and health. But the whole pattern was designed to support an alien economy and administration was organized solely to serve alien ends.

To a considerable extent aid is reparation. It is a return to the people of Asia of a part of the wealth taken away from them during the days of

unbridled imperialism. There are, therefore, good moral reasons for the West to give massive, economic assistance to the people of Asia and Africa. On the subject of the moral obligation of the industrialized countries to help the developing countries, which they previously exploited, President Soekarno once said:

“It has been said that all schemes of aid originating in the West are only an attempt to redeem the evils of the past by cash payment in the present, while hoping for a further dividend in the future. It has also been said that they are the present payment of conscience money for past sins, with the hope of absolution in the future.”

The mechanics of imperialist exploitation took diverse forms. In the case of our subcontinent, the period between 1757 and 1815, saw a vast transfer of wealth from this area to England. Orme in his *History of the Military Transactions of the British Nation in Indostan* (1861) describes in the following words the tributes which the British collected after Plassey:

“Never before did the English nation at one time obtain such a prize in solid money; for it amounted (in the mint) to £8,00,000. From real or pretended difficulties, no more was received until the 9th August, when Roydoolub paid 16,55,358 rupees; and on the 30th of the same month he delivered gold, jewels, and cash, amounting to 15,99,737 rupees: the three payments amounted to 1,07,65,737 rupees.” (Vol. II. P.188)

In all, Lord Clive asserted in later years, this initial exaction resulted in some £4 million (£40 million in present day money) being “moved across the exchanges,” as we would say, between India and Britain, by way of both public and private payments, as the direct and immediate result of Plassey. (Strachey in *The End of Empire*, p.33).

This initial tribute was followed by ruthless and systematic pillage of the country. Sardar Pannikar has described the Government of the East India Company during this period as a “robber State”. In order to end the rampant corruption of the Company’s officials. Clive legalized their right to private trade, even though they were its paid servants. Every officer now got his “appropriate” share in an orderly way, strictly according to seniority, e.g., a colonel got £7,000 a year or £70,000 in present day money value, a major £2,000 or £20,000 per year in present day money (Strachey in *The End of Empire*, p.44). Prize money, or just the share in the loot and plunder of conquest, was a powerful incentive to local military commanders to provoke wars with the native rulers of India. The extortion from the Begums of Oudh by Governor General Warren Hastings was but the most nefarious one of its kind.

Such plunder and pillage, dramatic and, therefore, historically more notorious, do not however compare with the unrequited flow of capital from India to Britain which commenced with the assumption of the functions of

Government by the East India Company. After its foundation, the Company found that in order to trade with India, it had to send out means of payment, which it called "investment" without which it could not purchase or finance the production of cottons and silks by native weavers. This "investment" consisted, for the most part, of precious metals, for there were few European goods for which there was a market in our country. It was this export of gold and silver, which made the Company vulnerable to the mercantilist criticism that it was draining Britain of its reserves of precious metals for the sake of importing luxuries. After the conquest of Bengal, the Company ceased to send out any "investment". In other words, the subjugated country as a whole got nothing at all in exchange for its goods. Of course, the individual weavers were paid, but the money to pay them, instead of coming from Britain, was now raised by taxation, primarily in the form of land revenue and salt tax, in the country itself. In a word, the subcontinent as a whole was made to pay for its own exports to Britain. This was an extreme form of exploitation. It is difficult to assess the total amount of this unrequited flow of wealth and capital which went on year after year. Professor Holden Furber in his *Jhon Company at Work* (1948) gives a detailed account of the cargoes on both the outward and the homeward voyages of *The Berrington*, the ship in which Warren Hastings returned to England in 1785. The *Berrington* had carried to India various goods, such as lead, copper, steel, woolen cloth and naval stores, of the value of £27,300. She brought back from India cotton piece-goods, cotton yarn, Indigo, redwood, silk and saltpeter of the value of £119,304. (p.3). If her voyage was typical, as Professor Furber implies that it was, she was evidently transferring on this voyage to Britain an unrequited value of about £90,000. After complex calculations, Professor Furber comes to the conclusion researched, every year nearly £1.8 million (£18 million in present day money) was being transferred unrequited. (p.310). Another researcher, William Digby, in his *Prosperous British India* (1990), calculated that "the drain" or "the tribute" of unrequited value exacted from the subcontinent amounted to £1 billion (£10 billion in present day money) during the whole period from 1757-1815. (p.33).

Apart from the magnitude of these sums, the economic cost to the subcontinent of these unrequited transfers needs to be examined. The Bengal famine of 1770 was the first, but not the worst, of the consequences of British conquest. Handloom weavers were wiped out by the Lancashire power looms. Nearly 80 years after the conquest of Bengal, a reforming Governor General, Lord William Cavendish Bentinck, reported that "the bones of the cotton weavers were bleaching the plains of India."

The economic gains to Britain, on the other hand, were significant. Indian historians, following the pioneering work of Ramesh Chandra Dutt, one of the first Indians to be appointed to the I.C.S., have taken the view that the fruit of the exploitation of India in the latter half of the 18th century and in the 19th century played a major part in providing the initial capital for the contemporary industrial revolution of Britain. Mr. John Strachey, Minister

of War, in the post-War British Labor Government, has endorsed this view in his book, *The End of Empire* (1959):

“...though the notorious ‘drain’ from India was by no means the largest factor in Britain’s pioneer accomplishment of primary industrialization, it played a very real part. That process was, in comparison with present-day developments, a slow one, stretching over more than one century. Nevertheless, at the critical moment, in the mid-eighteenth century, it received the impetus of unrequited imports,” (p. 68).

In the nineteenth century distinctive forms of exploitation through British industrial capital were developed. But that did not mean the discontinuance of the old forms of direct plunder, which continued to be pursued in different fashions.

The “tribute”, as it was openly called by official spokesmen up to the middle of the 19th century, meant the direct removal of millions of pounds of wealth annually to England, either officially as “Home Charges” or through private remitting. Without any recompense, this removal continued throughout the 19th century, and indeed increased with the growth of trade. In the 20th century it grew even more rapidly alongside a relative decline in trade.

The nucleus of British capital investments in the subcontinent was the public debt. By 1900 it had reached the figure of £224 million and by 1913 it rose to £274 million. By 1939 it totaled £884.2 million, divided into £532.4 million (709.9) crores of rupees) of India debt, and £351.8 million of Sterling debt. Thus, in the three quarters of a century of direct British rule, the debt multiplied more than ten times.

This happened through charging to India every conceivable expense that could even remotely, though fantastically, be connected with British rule in the subcontinent. They went to the extent of debiting India with the cost of diplomatic and consular establishments of the United Kingdom in China and Persia, of the War in Abyssinia and part of the maintenance cost of the Mediterranean fleet and the cost of reception in London in honor of the Sultan of Turkey.

British taxes in the subcontinent soared correspondingly with the rise in imperial expenditure. Taxation increased by 50 per cent between 1857 and 1870. The total taxes which the British levied in India rose between 1858-59 and 1876-77 from £36,060,788 to £55,995,785. Expenditure incurred in England, which included the guaranteed interest charges paid to English holders, rose in the same period from £7,466,136 to £13,467,736.

It has been said that trade follows the flag. The immense gain of trading with subjugated nations springs from the fact that it is possible to “sell dear and buy cheap”. Mr. Strachey, in his *The End of Empire*, (pp.151-

2), disputes this proposition, his assumption, which he supports by statistics, being that the terms of trade have actually improved in favor of Britain since she lost her empire.

However, it must be remembered that the gains which an imperial country exacts in the sphere of foreign trade are far more diffused than any simple consideration of the "buy cheap and sell dear" principle would indicate. The possession of subjugated markets abroad enables the establishment at home of industries, professions and trades which would otherwise not have been possible or profitable. The gains and earnings from them constitute a net accretion to the gross national product of the ruling country. Manufactures of armaments and other export goods in Britain had, during the 19th century, an immediate relationship with the empire in India. James Mill has described the British Empire "as a vast system of outdoor relief for the upper classes." Colonial possessions also enable the continuance of industries which have ceased to be low cost producers and would, otherwise, have been blown away by the winds of free trade and competition.

Even in respect of the terms of trade, it is hard to believe that British figures for the period after 1945 tell the whole story. Since the days of the Roman Empire, and even before, political domination has been used for every kind of trading on grossly inequitable terms. Gains are also acquired by simply manipulating the normal processes of international trade rather than by overt acts of exploitation. Who can compute the advantages that were gained by Britain through the terms established by it for its exports as against its imports through its prolonged control of the Indian market?

A classical writer on the subject, Hobson, found that the explanation of imperialism lay in the super-profits which colonial investments generated. From this point of view, colonial investments could be regarded as an effective mechanism for the transfer of wealth to an imperial country from its colonial possessions.

We ourselves, as an independent nation, are trying hard to attract as much foreign investment as possible. How then can we cavil at foreign investments as a mechanism for imperialistic exploitation? The answer to this question is to be sought in the difference which lies in foreign investments, on a basis negotiated between independent countries, and colonial investments of dominate, imperial Power in territories which are under its control.

Even as late as the first decade of the 20th century, attempts to introduce a more progressive policy were discouraged. Lord Morely, then Secretary of State for India, for instance, in his dispatch No.50 of 29 July 1910 supported the view of European traders in India and negated the proposal for the establishment of separate Departments of Industries in the provinces. He also rejected the idea that pioneer industries should be started

or commercial production undertaken by the Madras Government. The managing agency houses, too, exerted themselves in diverting capital towards commercial, rather than industrial uses.

The effect of the wholesale destruction of India manufacturing industries on the economy of the country may well be imagined. In England, the ruin of old handloom weaving was compensated for by the growth of the new machine industry. But in India the ruin of the millions of artisans and craftsmen was not accompanied by the growth of any new forms of industry. During this period as a whole, the export of capital from Britain to India was more than offset many times over by the contrary flow of tribute from India to England. Thus, British capital invested in India was in reality first raised in India through plunder of the Indian people, and then written down as debt from them to Britain, on which they had thenceforward to pay interest.

It does not require much imagination to see the difference between foreign investment as such and colonial investment, the aim of the one being development, that of the other exploitation. The crux of the difference lies not in the taking of investment profits out of the country, but in the distortion of the scope and direction of economic development and the deliberate slowing down of the pace of economic progress. The industrial under-development of India and Pakistan today is the gross cost of British rule and the measure of gain to Britain and its commercial interests.

One fact emerges clearly; the amount needed for the economic development of the currently under-developed, formerly dependent, countries does not bear comparison to the total of wealth which has, over the years, been siphoned from them.

According to a UN study, a total investment of \$8 billion to \$10 billion is necessary for what they describe as initial momentum for economic development in the under-developed areas of the world. If this amount were forthcoming it would have to be spread over one hundred countries and territories, populated by more than 2 billion people. Compare it with the assistance of \$13 billion extended under the Marshall Plan to the small number of Western European countries within a period of two years and a half, the years of the actual flow of aid, for rehabilitating no more than 240 million people. That would make plain the insufficiency of what is being done to provide financial help to the under-developed countries of the world.

The complexities of the problem of maintaining an adequate level of international investment has been highlighted in the last few years by the fall in the prices of primary commodities and the consequent change in the terms of trade to the detriment of the under-developed countries. This, coinciding with a rise in the price of manufactured goods, represents a national loss to the under-developed countries and restricts their import capacity. It may be pertinent to mention here that in the case of Pakistan the total financial aid, which we have received from different sources up till now, has been less than

half of the total loss which we have suffered on account of the fall in the prices of our primary commodities.

The future, as far as one can see it, does not hold out any prospect of improvement in the present situation. Current trends indicate that the cost of manufactured goods in the industrialized countries will, because of the wage increases and other factors, continue to rise and that the manufacture of substitutes will continue to reduce the demand for primary commodities. On the other hand, the demand of the under-developed countries for manufactured goods will continue to rise. These pressures cannot but lead to the widening of the gap between the standards of living in the under-developed countries and those in the industrialized countries. The consequence is that according to estimates, even today, no less than 1,362 million inhabitants out of a total of 2,000 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.

The moral obligation of the richer nations of the world to extend economic assistance to the less fortunate one has been set forth most convincingly by Mr. John Strachey in his *The End of Empire* in the following paragraph:

"To abstain from imperialism is not enough. To turn our backs in well-fed indifference upon the hundreds of millions of striving and suffering men and women whom we once ruled would be as great a crime as to try to continue ruling them against their will. The opposite of imperialism is not isolation in a Little England, prosperous, tidy, smug. If we wish to be as great in the future as in the past, we must work and serve wherever we once ruled and – sometimes –robbed." (p.246).

Perhaps Asia's poverty is not all of colonialism's making; perhaps poverty cannot be wholly eradicated in any system of society. But wherever it is as widespread and as total as it is in Asia and Africa, an alleviation of it would be no mean achievement. We are aware that poverty is to be found also in other parts of the world. It is not that we think that the streets of America are paved with gold or that its citizens are all diamond studded movie stars or oil tycoons. America has its problems of want and unemployment so have the countries of Europe. But the grotesque poverty of Asia cannot be compared with the slums of New York and the backwash of Los Angeles, or the slaughter houses of Upton Sinclair's Chicago. The poverty of Asia is more cruel than that of all the slums of America and Europe put together.

The full magnitude of poverty in any country cannot be sensed by those brought up in it. We can realize the extent of our poverty only when we have been out of our surroundings or when others describe it to us. It was an Englishman, who first made me realize the meaning of poverty. He was Verrier Elwin, an Oxford classical scholar, who is regarded as one of the best

of writers of English prose of our time. His work on anthropology has been described as "among the great modern contributions on the subject of Man". Elwin says:

"We are so used to poverty in India that we often forget what it is. I remember one day a family coming to us in tears, for their but and all they possessed had been destroyed by fire. When I asked how much they wanted to put them on their feet again they said "Four rupees" –the price of a single copy of Brave New World.

That is hunger.

In Bastar State once, a Maria (an aboriginal type) was condemned to death and on the eve of his execution they asked him if there was any luxury he would like. He asked for some chapattis (wheaten bread) and fish curry, made after city style. They gave it to him and he ate half of it with great enjoyment, then wrapped the remainder up in the leaf plate and gave it to the jailor, telling him that his little son was waiting outside the prison door. The boy had never tasted such delicacy, but he should have it now.

That is poverty.

Poverty is to see little children taken from you at the height of their beauty. It is to see your wife age quickly and your mother's back bend below the load of life. It is to be defenseless against the arrogant official, to stand unarmed before the exploiter and the cheat.

Poverty is to stand for hours before the gate of the court of justice and to be refused admission. It is to find officialdom deaf and the great and wealthy blind.

I have seen children fighting over a scanty meal of roasted rat.

I have seen old women pounding wearily at the pitch of the sago palm to make a kind of flour. I have watched men climb trees to get red ants to serve instead of chilies.

Poverty is hunger, frustration, bereavement, futility. There is nothing beautiful about it."

No death is more humiliating than by starvation. We in Asia and Africa have witnessed such death. In the Bengal famine of 1943 3,500,000 people lost their lives through the simple and inexpensive expedient of starvation.

At the time of that famine I was a boy of fifteen, too young to know the full meaning of it. And yet that tragedy has left an unreadable impression on my mind. The more I read about it, the sicker I grow of the implications of poverty.

When Europe suffers, its privileged world feels the suffering in personal terms; when Asia groans, the feeling is not quite just the same. A starving child in a street in Europe arouses deep emotions; a hundred such children in the alleys of Asia are the miserable urchins who form a part of the Asian way of life. American aid to Europe was massive. Aid to Asia is sliced at each stage and given hesitatingly, although two-thirds of humanity lives in Asia. Whatever the motivation behind it, one thing is quite clear: Aid is not charity. If its aim is to rid the world of poverty and misery, then behind it for carrying on that endeavour there must be a singleness of purpose proclaimed in a language which has the same meaning for all. That would leave no room for any one to say that aid is charity. Equally that would leave no room for any one to use aid as a political lever.

VI

Nehru –An Appraisal

The death of Jawaharlal Nehru has been a blow to India in more senses than one. It has released in that country centrifugal forces on an unprecedented scale. How long will the memory of a dead Nehru inspire his countrymen to keep alive a polygot India, that vast land of mysterious and frightening contradictions, darned together by the finest threads?

The threat to India's unity, such as it is, is as old as India itself. That unity has not grown from the soil from natural roots. Oneness was always imposed on India from above, by the Brahmin-Priest or by a King or Emperor. It never filtered down the many layers of Indian life. Largely involuntary, achieved through alien domination, or by the power of a strong national personality, such as Nehru, the unity of India is superficial. It has been maintained in a tenuous, nebulous and uniquely Indian fashion

Under Ashoka, there was significant unity in India. Later it was bound together by the Guptas. Thereafter the country again began to break up. Then came the Muslims who ruled over it for seven hundred years. When their empire eventually declined, India split at the seams. The broken mosaic was once again patched up, this time by the British. The British Crown spread its sovereign authority from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin. When the British withdrew, the subcontinent was divided into two countries, India and Pakistan.

This division did not liquidate the contradictions inherent in what remained India. All the deep differences survived. The divisiveness of India, its warring religions, its regionalism, its different languages and dialects, its caste system, its ancient superstitions, continued to threaten the unity of independent India. The mystical figure of Gandhi strode across the Indian horizon, but his avowed mission to heal the disease of disunity came to an end when he fell to an assassin's bullet. Gandhi bequeathed to Jawaharlal Nehru, his heir, the chronic ailments of India.

Nehru's most challenging task was to consolidate India's unity. For seventeen years he labored to forge a united independent India.

Nehru was aware of the difficult nature of his task. He had to build his edifice of unity on numerous pillars. Among the more important of these were:

- (a) Nehru's own personality,
- (b) Secular democracy,

- (c) The Congress Party,
- (d) Socio-economic objectives embodied in the successive Five Year Plans, and
- (e) Foreign policy.

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's charismatic personality swayed the people of India. He exercised compulsive power over the crowds. People flocked to hear him. Nehru was like opium to them; he drugged them into total submission. The masses, countless simple village folk and poor nameless city dwellers loved Nehru to the point of worship. He enchanted them and from their adoration he drew his strength.

Nehru used many a pulpit to rally the people of India to his call. From the very start of his life as a revolutionary to its end, he traveled widely throughout the length and breadth of India, even to remote villages, to preach to and convert the people to his philosophy. The common people trusted him and from that trust Nehru built his image as a great leader and savant. At his best, he could make them believe any thin.

Nehru was the idol of the young. The youth of India saw in him the vitality of their age. To the intellectual, Nehru was that "peerless knight" who had suffered much for the freedom for India. Conservatives found in Nehru and imperishable link between the past and the present, between tradition and change. Foreigners were fascinated by him. To many of them he was a bridge between the East and the West. With his Harrow and Cambridge background. Nehru was able to establish a refreshing rapport with the finest of Western minds. And because Nehru abandoned Western forms and sat at the feet of Gandhi, he exuded enough of the aroma of Asia to exercise a captivating influence on foreigners.

People of many shades and beliefs, the young and the old, the rustic farmers and the sophisticated populace of the cities, converged at the point called Nehru.

Nehru knew the power of his position and he used it fully. Indeed, few men in India's hoary history have used their power as completely as did Jawaharlal Nehru. He resolved most of his difficult internal and external problems by appealing to the mute masses.

By birth, Nehru was a high-born Hindu. But in his home at Allahbad, this young Brahmin, like the rest of his family, had come under the magnetic influence of Muslim culture. This was largely responsible for, what he called his secular outlook. He did not view with favor the totality of Islamic philosophy and history nor Islam per se. Actually, Nehru viewed with apprehension the virility of Islam. He was in it the germs of Pakistan. Indeed, it was the dynamic character of Islam that inspired the Muslims of India to struggle for the creation of Pakistan.

Environment and education should have made Nehru secular in thought and action. But that was not to be. The rabid caste Hindu suspected him, though without bitterness. Pandit Nehru overcame the dilemma of Hindu-Muslim conflict by treating Hindu interest as identical with Indian interests. To him there was no difference between the two; they were synonymous. By upholding the democratic principle of the will of the majority, which was Hindu, he suppressed the interests of the Muslims, who were in the minority. In actual fact, Nehru betrayed his inner feeling of banal communalism in an extremely effective and polished way.

Nehru was an all round personality. He was a man of learning and genuinely fond of the arts. He encouraged the revival of the theatre and patronized contemporary art and literature. Through the medium of a broad culture, he sought to influence India's unity. It must be said to his credit that despite his heavy preoccupations with affairs of State, he gave sufficient time to the promotion of the fine arts and was responsible for creating a class of functionaries for that purpose.

Pandit Nehru was essentially a vain person and contemptuous of lesser men. His relations with individuals were both realistic and romantic. In some ways, they were as complex as his own mind. Quite often he patronized people according to the exigencies of time and circumstances. The Muslim problem brought him close to men like Rafi Ahmed Qidwai and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad. He showed respect and liking for both of them. They had been his comrades in the freedom movement and he stood by them in the post-independence days. With his opponents Pandit Nehru could be completely ruthless. He dealt with the influential Vallabhbhai Patel with caution. Knowing the power of Patel, he avoided a head on collision with him. But by propping up liberal forces to tarnish the image of the Gujrati leader, he made him appear as an arch reactionary. He thus dealt a blow to Patel's influence. In Tandon's case, Nahru did not resort to such devious methods. He had a direct confrontation with him. As a matter of fact, he precipitated a crisis to wipe out Tandon for all time. He weeded out his opponents without compunction. In this way, he gave the Congress a sense of discipline that should have served to unite India.

Pandit Nehru's attachment to Krishna Menon deserves special mention. For many years, Nehru was prisoner of Krishna Mnon's personality. By sheer force of intellect, Krishna Menon controlled the thoughts of Pandit Nehru. Both men had a certain degree of common interests and approach. Both were intellectuals, brought up in the liberal school of thought. They despised bourgeois values and claimed to be socialists. With both Kashmir had become an obsession. Both of them hated Pakistan. Krishna Menon was the only member of the Indian Cabinet who, like Nehru, had a grasp of world affairs, the only one to whom Nehru could talk on a basis of equality. These were powerful links which Krishna Menon utilized fully. Nehru's attachment to Krishna Menon is to be found in his romanticism. Menon had no roots in

India. He had spent most of his life in England and he had in India no strong ties.

Krishan Menon spoke none of the Indian languages and his mind was at a distance from the people. Under the long patronage of Nehru, Krishna Menon managed to acquire some following, The elite of the Congress party became jealous of Krishna Menon and sought to isolate him, but Nehru held on to him and supported him. Only when forced by international complications, did Nehru reluctantly declutch himself from Krishna Menon and make him leave the Cabinet. But even after Menon had left the Indian Cabinet, he continued to exercise considerable, though fading, influence on Nehru.

In considering Pandit Nehru's relations with individuals, it is necessary to observe his relations with the armed forces and the civil service, There was always something awkward and unnatural about his relations with the army. Nehru was a great charmer but in the presence of military men he would become tense and rigid. He deliberately kept his armed forces heterogeneous and at a distance.

When a dispute arose between his Defense Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, and his Commander-in-Chief, General Kobendera Thimmayya, instead of resolving it amicably, Nehru instantaneously seized upon it to "punish" the General. He engineered the humiliating exit of his Commander-in-Chief and exploited the dispute to further his own ends. In this way, he thought, he was upholding the supremacy of civilian authority and demonstrating his control over the country by making it known that the destiny of India lay in his soft and gentle hands.

During the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict, Nehru paid heavily for his prejudice against the armed forces. In spite of his finesse, he was sufficiently arrogant to be unable to conceal his likes and dislikes. He could hurt as well as charm. He hurt his armed forces badly. His distrust and disdain of them humbled India. By denigrating them, he brought his country to the brink of disaster, and India is still smarting from the wounds then inflicted upon it. Thus Nehru brought about his collapse and made his country face an awesome peril. Clearly, the great Nehru failed to defend his country and thus failed in discharging the fundamental responsibility of a leader. History will find it difficult to wash this stain from the image of Nehru.

In refreshing contrast, Nehru's equation with the well entrenched civil service was more realistic. The Indian Civil Service and other echelons of the permanent services had been cast in the British mould. Their approach was snobbish and aloof. They entertained grandiose notions of their superior position. This class conscious club of bureaucrats wrote their charter in the belief that British dominion had been held together by their prowess and intellect. On the achievement of independence, the civil service, especially the I.C.S., was confident that it would control the new brown masters even

more firmly than it did the white Sahibs. Immediately on India becoming independent, its appetite for power grew menacingly. Amongst the first positive acts of Nehru was to bring this powerful class down to earth. He would have none of its pretensions. Its gloss wore off faster than the of a hard hit cricket ball. On the same principle as that of keeping the armed forces out of politics, Nehru made it clear beyond all doubt that he would not tolerate any interference by the civil service in the political life of India. Nehru exercised such a Caesarian control over these prefects of civil authority that they soon changed their tradition and mentality. He took their measure and cut them to size. And, in the process of time, the civil service clipped its ambitions and activities to the sphere of its own genuine responsibilities. Nehru's success with the civil service was as significant as was his failure with the armed forces.

Pandit Nehru spoke vociferously about secular democracy. But today its future is altogether uncertain. Being alien to the soil of India, secularism has not flowered into the spring time of its new life. Both secularism and democracy are strangers to India, irreconcilable with the hard core of Hindu life, founded on caste and exclusiveness. Nehru gave the impression of shielding these imported ideals with his life, but his attachment to them was not entirely idealistic. It would not be incorrect to say that his secularism was tainted by his approach to the Kashmir question. He exploited it adroitly to retain India's predatory domination over Kashmir.

Nehru declared himself devoutly attached to democratic ideals. He gave independent India a modern constitution and representative political institutions. Instead of following Gandhi's advice to dissolve the Congress Party after independence, Nehru, on the contrary, strengthened it throughout the length and breadth of India. He made it into a mighty machine to face the buffets of political life. He permitted opposition parties of function. Nehru encouraged the intellectuals to criticize, the press to print freely and the princes and politicians to build a cauldron of intrigue. Above all, he led his teeming millions to the polls on no less than three occasions in the most elaborate elections. And yet, during the freedom struggle, in a mood of self-criticism, Nehru once wrote to warn his people that temperamentally he was not suited to spread democracy. When blessed with the opportunity to either make or destroy, Nehru gave India an impressive form of democracy without really strengthening the tissues of its substance. He ruled the Congress Party and the Indian nation with his personal fiat. He was intolerant of a truly effective opposition and, as we have said, contemptuous of lesser men. Nehru was more of a dictator than a democrat, but he retained the façade of democracy with skill. But for the dictator in him, he would not have held Kashmir in bondage, suppressed ruthlessly the Sikh demand for a separate province, crushed the Naga struggle for self-assertion and wiped out popularly elected provincial governments. These are but a few of Nehru's undemocratic acts. The catalogue is painfully long. The fact that secular democracy has a precarious future in India shows how superficial was its application in the lifetime of Nehru himself. The Muslim minority would not

have faced over five hundred purges in less than fifteen years if, under Nehru's direction, secularism had prevailed with the people of India. Shortly before he died, India witnessed one of the most horrifying holocausts of communal carnage. Indeed, communal intolerance was practiced by prominent members of Nehru's own Congress Party.

Nehru undoubtedly advocated secularism and democracy but that commitment has been grossly exaggerated. Instead of being a crusading and an idealistic stance, essentially it was a political contrivance. When weighed in the balance, Pandit Nehru's pillar of secular democracy was insecurely grounded in a weak foundation.

As has been mentioned, another pillar of India's unity was the Congress Party. Nehru joined the Congress movement with an enthusiasm that was unmatched. Millions of Indians formed a part of the great caravan of the Congress led by the frail figure of Gandhi. Nehru's youth, his sharp intellect and cultured ways gave a new color to the Congress and the liberation movement. Nehru carried the flame of freedom in his heart from the very beginning. A flicker of that flame remained in him to the end. Throughout the independence struggle Nehru remained steadfast. Repression did not make him waver. His determination inspired his countrymen. For over forty years Nehru served the Congress Party with zealous devotion. It could have strengthened unity in post-partition India. A few years after freedom was won, the Congress fell into bad ways, but Nehru never lost his faith in the usefulness to that organization, and arrested many of its downward trends. Very often Nehru had to pull the Congress up by the boot strings and restore it to its preponderant position. The Congress was the prima donna of Indian political parties. Nehru allowed other parties to mushroom into the life of India. Knowing that they did not pose a threat to him, he let them exist, but only to consolidate his own position. Instead of absorbing some of them into his organization, he preferred to keep them separate. On occasions, he encouraged them to propagate opinions different from his own and thus demonstrate his inability to implement policies he did not wish to enforce – policies demanded of him by internal and external pressure. He gained greatly from this maneuver.

When Pandit Nehru propounded the thesis that a Kashmir settlement would jeopardize the lives of the fifty million Muslims of India, he allowed fanatical Hindu organizations and their leaders to knife their way to objectives which, to a point, coincided with Nehru's own long-term interests in Kashmir. His fears would not have appeared credibly, if they had not been accompanied by violence perpetrated by proxy.

Even within the Congress Party, Nehru permitted various groups to clash with each other. When his policies required a swing to the right, he would encourage industrialists and men of means. When he thought it necessary to turn to the left, he would push forward the progressives and the

leftists. In this way he managed to keep in his hands the reins of final authority.

Not less dramatic, but perhaps more enduring, was the economic policy of Nehru. As Prime Minister, he headed the Planning Commission and gave his country three Five Year Plans. Nehru drove hard to transform a primeval economy into a modern progressive State.

Nehru's economic policies were fashioned on the concept of a welfare state. Emotionally he was a socialist, but capitalism flourished during his regime. Nehru, the political animal, understood politics thoroughly and understood the relevance of economics to it. His political thinking was close to socialist philosophies and this created in him a vague and romantic notion of life, based on the socialist norms of society. As he was not a specialist in economics, he permitted the experts to "guide" his feelings. This gave India a confused economic pattern, an irrational combination of private and public enterprise.

Thus, although Nehru was impatient of poverty, he chose the slow and patient way to fight it, the road of argument and compromise. For these reasons, among others, in his seventeen years of supreme power, Nehru did not succeed in changing the bullock cart economy of India. But with all the evident handicaps, Indian economy did manage to move ahead. An organized labor force emerged, new factories sprang up all over the country, steel and coal production increased substantially, heavy and medium industries began to contribute to the general growth, communications improved and power spread to the villages, to supplement the benefits of large irrigation dams and canals. There was an all round economic upsurge. Nehru used the powerful pull of economics to weld the country together. He endeavored to make the provinces interdependent and permitted nothing that would lead to economic autarchy in them. Provincial self-sufficiency was suppressed.

Foreign policy was Pandit Nehru's forte. He excelled in this field to the point of dangerous perfection. As the maker of foreign policy, he was novel, aggressive, yet subtle. He claimed to base his policies on intellectual and ethical foundations. In actual fact Nehru's external policies were as amoral as were his internal policies. He projected his characteristic contradictions in this field in the same audacious manner as he did in internal affairs. He tried to harmonize irreconcilables and inevitably he was driven to positions which were utterly awkward.

Nehru made India lofty and the top but allowed it to remain rotten at the bottom, with democratic institutions along side of the dreadful legacy of the caste system and communal and provincial conflicts. Internationally, he gave India the posture of non-alignment, of being the arbiter between the East and the West. In a final analysis, however, he left India friendless and

alone, distrusted by its neighbors and reduced from a giant to a dwarf in the eyes of Asia and Africa.

Nehru's foreign policy falls into two distinct phases. The first phase represented the golden era, which lasted for well over a decade, from 1946 when the Asian Conference was held at New Delhi, to the beginning of the sixties. These were the years in which Nehru fathered the doctrine of non-alignment for the new nations of Asia and Africa. Nehru gave non-alignment respectability and a wide appeal. In the beginning, shortly after independence, Nehru encountered difficulties in converting his people and other nations to non-alignment. Over the years, however, with the emergence of more and more sovereign States in Asia and Africa, with the growing inability of the nuclear Powers to physically confront each other, on account of the fear of mutual annihilation, and with the profound schism in the world of Communism, the advantages of non-alignment began to become apparent.

With the great Powers vying for the allegiance of smaller nations, Nehru was quick to see in it an opportunity for himself. He used it ruthlessly and effectively. Pandit Nehru exploited his foreign policy to unite India and to give his countrymen a sense of self-respect. As India's stock rose internationally, a sense of national pride spread through the country. He launched a lightning diplomatic offensive in the world of Asia and Africa. Nehru pointed the way, and the East and the West listened to him with respect. Collaborating with China, Indonesia and Egypt, India was in the forefront of Asian and African countries.

In the United Nations, India assumed the leadership of the underdeveloped and "have-not" nations. India set the tone and pace of many a crucial debate. Nehru had a role in disarmament negotiations, in bringing peace to South East Asia, in arranging the armistice in Korea, in organizing the cessation of hostilities in the Suez and in the conduct of peace operations in the Congo. He had much to say on the Hungarian revolt and on the developments in Tibet. The United Nations became India's stage. There was a place for India in all important international conferences and undertakings. Nehru's forceful leadership gave India a special sense of aggrandizement, a prestige far beyond its intrinsic worth, and completely out of proportion to the country's real mettle. India's ego reached its apogee.

As an astute student of world affairs, Pandit Nehru established a profitable relationship with the USSR. He sought to bring India close to that country at a time when many nations were fearful of the remotest contact with Communist States. Pandit Nehru suffered from no such misgivings. He had sufficient knowledge of history to visualize the mellowing influence of evolutionary forces. He believed that in the fullness of time the flame of revolution would burn away. He was, therefore, not alarmed by the revolutionary fervor of international communism, nor by its militant doctrine of world domination. More than a decade ago, Mr. Nehru observed that

“Communism has become outdated.” This observation was made at the height of Communism’s monolithic unity and revolutionary fervor. Pandit Nehru’s contact with the USSR was devoid of petty inhibitions. It bore him rich dividends and placed India in a pivotal position between the East and the West: He became the statesman and the sage who had to be heard and whose advice had to be measured by rival forces. In achieving a realistic relationship with the USSR and Eastern Europe, Pandit Nehru perhaps made his most significant contribution in the realm of diplomacy.

Pandit Nehru is also regarded as the statesman who foresaw the merits of a multi-racial and multi-continental Commonwealth of Nations. Here he is credited with more than is warranted. Nehru was compelled to keep India in the Commonwealth chiefly on account of Pakistan’s presence in it. By remaining in the Commonwealth, Nehru’s aim was to neutralize it on Indo-Pakistan disputes, particularly Kashmir. Had it not been for Pakistan, Nehru would have left the Commonwealth no sooner had India gained independence. His submission to that institution was forced on him by national considerations.

Events also conspired to assist Nehru. The Sino-Soviet rift could not have been better timed. The détente between the Soviet Union and the West could not have come at a more opportune moment. The windfall of these advantages notwithstanding, in some cases he badly miscalculated international events and power equations. He came into deadly conflict with the People’s Republic of China and saw the disastrous defeat of the Indian army and the despair of the Indian people. His obsessive intransigence against Pakistan power to be an equally serious blunder.

As India’s external policies lacked the spirit of conciliation and reason, it became more and more difficult for India to resolve its difference with any of its neighbors and to negotiate a settlement of its disputes with them. India chose to settle these disputes exclusively on its own terms. The norms of good conduct became alien to India’s approach to its neighbors. India sought to eclipse their legitimate interests by professing to be a great Power, entrusted by destiny with a mission in the world.

Nehru spoke of peace with passion and yet he obdurately barred the way to the settlement of disputes between his country and its neighbors, be they Pakistan, China or Ceylon. He made no attempt to settle the boundary question with Burma. He interfered in the domestic affairs of Nepal with extraordinary malice. He brought about the final estrangement between India and Indonesia. This one man alone was responsible for the alienation from India of more than 1400 million Asians.

Nehru’s main theme was his hatred of Pakistan, which he preached ceaselessly and bitterly. He made it his life’s mission to isolate Pakistan and to create all manner of difficulties for it. With persistent endeavor he sought to besmear this country as a theocratic and a reactionary State, His extreme

hatred of Pakistan actually served the cause of Pakistan. Before independence, his uncompromising attitude towards the Muslim League had led the Muslims to close their ranks and to snatch Pakistan from the hands of the Congress Party and the British. After independence, Nehru's attempts to isolate and browbeat Pakistan made the people of Pakistan all the more determined to preserve the integrity and independence of their State. Nehru's economic and political war against Pakistan was primarily not grabbed Kashmir, not deployed his armies against East and West Pakistan, not imposed an economic blockade, and not tampered with the waters that were Pakistan's life-blood, Pakistan might not have been able to discover the resourcefulness and strength needed to overcome its stupendous problems. If, at present, Pakistan has acquired political stability and economic buoyancy, to a great extent it is in answer to Nehru's challenge. Pakistan fought back defiantly. Even at the height of India's international prestige, it was Pakistan alone that boldly bore the responsibility for exposing Nehru's pretensions. For many years Pakistan served as a bulwark for India's neighbors and prevented India from extending the talons of its obnoxious caste-ridden hegemony over the area from the Mekong to the Hindukush. Instead of destroying Pakistan, Nehru consolidated the unity of the people of Pakistan. Today Nehru's scheme lie shattered and Pakistan's prestige is rising throughout the world. Asia and Africa are beginning to respect Pakistan's role in international affairs. Pakistan has settled its problems with all its neighbors except with India.

By provoking an armed conflict with the People's Republic of China, Nehru, the author of non-alignment, made a fundamental compromise with his professed principles and, by the time he died, India's foreign policy was in utter confusion. He left his country in an orphaned condition, neither aligned nor non-aligned, with a beggar's bowl in its hands. He witnessed the shambles of his foreign policy from his deathbed.

By having an armed clash with China and subsequently by exaggerating its scope and magnitude; Nehru drove his country into a position of despair. Had he remained composed and not lost his nerve, he might have been able to settle the boundary dispute with China without loss of face and without abandoning a policy that had given India prestige in the world.

Thus, the second phase of India's foreign policy, which began with the Sino-Indian conflict, has been dominated by confusion, lack of confidence and apathy. It is the reversal of the first phase, with all the disadvantages of a tergiversation. For years Nehru had preached to the people of India a set of principles which condemned the West for neo-colonialism and for generating world tensions. Caught up by events that posed a challenge too great for the leadership of India, its people were suddenly informed of the virtues of an entirely new set of principles which were at variance with all that they been told was righteous and good. China, which had, for over ten years, been represented as a great and friendly neighbor, with bonds of unity and

common interests with India, was, all of a sudden, portrayed as its bitterest enemy. Non-alignment was compromised at the base with confusing consequences. From its lofty height of idealism, the foreign policy of India was brought down to dust. Contradictions began to manifest themselves at every step, causing India to sink into an abyss of gloom, a situation which cannot be regarded as commensurate with the stature of a nation of 400 million people. India, which saw for itself the role of a great Power, independent of the East and the West, is at present at the near-mercy of both the Soviet Union and the United States. From the position of a leader of nations, India finds itself thrown into a position of subservience. The great Powers whom India defied a few years ago and who sought its support on almost every major international issue, today hold India by the leash. In less than seventeen years, India has completed the full circle and lost its virility in international affairs. Suddenly, it has become senile.

Nehru exercised a decisive influence both for good and bad. He was an internationalist and an uncompromising nationalist. He preached to the world to lay down arms and to live in peace and brotherhood but, before he died, he converted India into a frightening arsenal and refused to settle disputes with its neighbors.

The accumulation of events weighed too heavily on Nehru that eventually he was overwhelmed by them. The deadly dispute with China, the acrimony with Pakistan, the deterioration of the internal situation, the basic compromise with an independent foreign policy, the release of Sheikh Abdullah and the latter's visit to Pakistan and the announcement that the President of Pakistan was prepared to visit India to discuss Kashmir with the Indian leaders were too much for an ailing and aged Nehru.

Nehru was a contradiction. He sprang out of that greatest of all contradictions called India and that is why Nehru was India. With a burning passion, Nehru used every device to unite India. Being himself a man of contradictions, Nehru used conflicting elements and that was both to his advantage and disadvantage. His supreme ego would not allow him to believe that he was capable of harnessing inherently inconsistent forces to the ultimate disadvantage of India. But he personified the spirit of India. He held the reins of a chariot drawn by many horses pulling in different directions. Pandit Nehru combined the extremes to produce insipid returns. In politics, of which he was a master, his dedication to an ideal was never complete, as was that of a Lenin or a Bismarck. People of all schools of thought sat under his banyan tree, moderates like Shastri, leftists like Krishna Menon and conservatives like Desai. Such a combination of motley and diverse talent made it difficult for India to advance with any clarity of approach or objective. With all the fanfare of Nehru, and his admittedly indefatigable drive, the unity of India jogged along unimpressively.

What then is the final judgment of Nehru? It is too early yet for any such judgment. But the moving finger of history has already written many

lines. Nehru was not a creature of normal conditions. He was the child of the revolutionary epoch which threw up Gandhi, Jinnah, Subbash Bose and Maulana Mohamed Ali. He was a part of that celebrated train. Jawaharlal Nehru was the product of a peculiar age, created by a rare twist of history, and turn of the start. When Nehru was cremated, his people shouted "*Nehru amar haye*". The world joins them. Nehru, with all his faults, his weaknesses, will remain immortal. This is so because the myth and image of Nehru were greater than the man. He committed aggression, alienated his neighbors, suppressed his opponents, made mock convenience of ethics. Yet he has his reputation as the redeemer of 400 million people, who gave them a place in the sun.

Nehru's magic touch is gone. His spell-binding influence over the masses has disappeared. The key to India's unity and greatness has not been handed over to any individual. It has been burnt away with Nehru's dead body.

VII

Pakistan and the Muslim World

An important feature of the foreign policy of Pakistan is its marked emphasis on relations with the world of Islam as a factor in the emancipation and progress of mankind. The nature of this emphasis has passed through several variations. The intensity of belief in and pre-occupation with its objectives have, however, not been impaired.

At the center of the Islamic world, stability and security had given rise to an attitude of the mind akin to unconcern. On the contrary, its frontier regions, which had to struggle against hostile forces, never ceased to feel a deep loyalty to the concept of the unity of *Ummat*. In the spirit of that loyalty, mighty rulers like Mahmud of Ghazni, Iltumish and Balban sought, with the utmost humility, the benediction of the Caliph over their rule in the kingdoms which they had carved out for themselves.

Although the Mughals, who established their empire in 1562, did not acknowledge the Turkish Sultan as Khalifa, that did not prevent them from taking an active interest in Islamic and pan-Islamic affairs.

With the decline of Mughal power, in the eighteenth century, began the era of British ascendancy over India. Politically independent Muslim States on the peripheries of the Islamic world fell one by one before the onslaught of the Western Powers. The Empire of the Mughals was finally liquidated in 1857. By 1886, Russia had conquered the Caucasus and extended its possessions to the frontiers of Iran and Afghanistan, both victims of Anglo-Russian scramble for empires. Malaya, long subject to European intrigues and infiltrations, came under British occupation towards the close of the century. About the same time, the Indonesian Archipelago, a chronic theater of strife between European Powers, succumbed to Dutch colonialism. In the Western confines of the Islamic world, Algeria, Tunisia, Egypt, the Sudan and other territories in Africa, fell one by one to European colonial Powers. By the close of the century, the despoliation of the outlying Muslim countries and peoples was almost complete.

In the sub-continent, the British, from the beginning of their rule, adopted measures which destroyed the economic and cultural life of the Muslims. The Permanent Settlement of Bengal virtually deprived the Muslims of their land holdings. They were also suppressed in Government service, their other main source of livelihood, and in the legal profession. Muslim educational trusts were liquidated. After the abortive War of Independence of 1857, the British subjected the Muslims to repression of the severest kind.

With this experience of the rigors and humiliation of alien rule, the Muslims of India learnt to rise above their internal schisms and to forge a solidarity based on the spirit of the all inclusive brotherhood of Islam.

The Muslim intelligentsia argued that in Islam, political conduct and religion-*siyasal and din*-could not be separated and therefore, Muslims could not attain self-expression save in an Islamic, polity. Historically, separate, and even national, States had always existed within the domain of Islam, but they had always recognized the indivisibility of the Ummat.

Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey strove to gather together all Muslims in the spiritual fold of the Khilafat. His emissaries went forth as far a field as China, Java and Algeria to win the allegiance of their Muslims. The whole Islamic world reverberated with the cry of pan-Islamism. But no Muslim people felt so stirred by its appeal as did the Muslims of the sub-continent. They rallied to the Ottoman cause and made it their own. They denounced their British rulers for policies and actions aimed at undermining and encroaching upon the Ottoman Empire. Pan-Islamism found wide support and the Sultan's name was included in the Friday *Khutba*.

In the first decade of the present century, attacks on Iran by Russia, on Tripoli by Italy and on Turkey by the Balkan allies, roused the Muslim community. Mass meetings were held all over the sub-continent. The Council of the All-India Muslim League denounced Italian aggression; Italian goods were boycotted. Muslim leadership, comprising Maulana Shibli, Allama Muhammad Iqbal, Maulana Mohamed Ali and Maulana Zafar Ali Khan, stirred the Muslims with their poetry, speeches and writings. Students of the great Muslim College at Aligarh opened a relief fund for the sufferers. Large contributions were made to the Red Crescent Fund and a medical mission was sent to tend to the Turks wounded in the Balkan Wars.

In 1914, before Turkey entered the First World War on the side of the Central Powers (Germany and the Austro-Hungarian Empire), there was widespread concern for its fate amongst Indian Muslims. Their pulse-beat was fearlessly reflected in an historic article "The Choice of the Turk" by Maulana Mohamed Ali in his *Comrade*. This article was in reply to a highly provocative editorial of the London Times, threatening the Ottoman Empire with destruction unless the Sultan bowed to the wishes of Britain and its allies. Reminding the British of the acts of treachery committed by them against the Turks and the Egyptians, Maulana Mohamed Ali asked whether it would not be both moral and expedient for the Turks to take by force what had been denied to them as a matter of right. Offering a word of advice to the British Government, he said:

"England must officially repudiate the threats recklessly flung by the *Times* at the Turks, and in fact at the entire Muslim world. England must go to the land of the Sphinx and solve the new riddle of this war in the only way it can be solved.

“It must leave Egypt. Need we say this will win over to her side the Mussalmans of the world better than all the threats of the tactful *Times*”.

This forthright article led to the imprisonment by the British of Maulana Mohamed Ali as well as his brother Maulana Shaukat Ali. The two brothers were released, after the end of the War, in December 1919. Maulana Mohamed Ali led a deputation to Europe to acquaint the victors of the First World War, more especially the British, with the point of view of the Muslims of the subcontinent, which in essence was that Ottoman territories should be left intact, and the Khalifa's authority should remain uncurtailed. The Muslim community felt that weak as the Ottoman Empire had become, it still represented the unity of Islam.

The harsh conditions, which the Treaty of Serves of 1920 sought to impose upon the Turks, further inflamed the sentiments of the Muslims. All their pent up feelings now found an outlet in the Khilafat. This movement did more to shake the foundations of the British Empire in India than any revolutionary effort since the War of Independence of 1857. The gigantic organization of the Khilafat movement, and the sacrifices made by the Muslims in the course of it, provided the pattern for the Pakistan movement, which was to come two decades later. However, after defeating the invading Greeks and challenging the occupation forces of the allies in 1922. Mustafa Kemal Ataturk and his comrades first equated the Khilafat with 'spiritual' as distinct from 'temporal' power and then abolished the institution altogether. They felt that the Muslim countries were not unanimously behind it; nor could they be, while so many of them were subject to foreign rule.

Turkey was now in the grip of a radical upsurge under the leadership of Kemal Ataturk. The Muslims of the subcontinent had already embarked on a painful process of self-analysis and introspection to redefine their political philosophy and aims. The feeling of pride in their past achievements and their future aspirations were given coherent expression by their thinkers and leaders.

Among the first to reinterpret Islamic doctrine had been Syed Ahmad Khan (1812-98). His thesis was that Islam and modern thought were not mutually exclusive. He founded at Aligarh, in 1876, a college in which religious education was combined with the study of modern arts and sciences.

Foremost among those who sought to restate Islamic thought and ethics was Syed Ameer Ali, a distinguished jurist. His book *The Spirit of Islam*, published in 1891, furnished the awakening political consciousness of Muslims with a reasoned basis for self-esteem, such as they needed in their confrontation with the Western world. The most eminent service rendered by Syed Ameer Ali to Islam was his exposition of its doctrine in Western terms

and the interpretation of the teachings of Islam in the light of contemporary social ideals.

The argument that in taking over modern Western learning and science Muslims were really reverting to an old tradition of their civilization was persuasively stated by Allama Muhammad Iqbal (1876-1938). His activist philosophy exerted a powerful influence on his generation of Muslims and contributed to the emergence, in 1947, of Pakistan. In fact, the ideas of Iqbal have exerted a great deal of influence on modern Islam, recapturing its vitality and redefining its content.

In the contemporary period, there was thus a new movement for the stimulation of the Islamic spirit. At the same time significant steps were taken to come to terms with the social, political and scientific requirements of the present day world. It was in this period that the demand for Pakistan was conceived to provide the Muslims of the subcontinent with a homeland of their own, in which they could live according to their own values of life. Representing as it did the fulfillment of an aspiration, ideological as well as political, of a hundred million Muslims Pakistan naturally evinced a deep interest in the welfare of Muslims the world over and concern for their freedom and emancipation.

It was as early as the time of the Khilafat movement that the Muslims of the subcontinent became apprehensive about Zionist designs in regard to the Holy Land. Meetings and demonstration were held to denounce Zionist intrigues and cover British plans for turning Palestine, an Arab territory and a land holy to Muslims, into a home-land for Jews. The support unstintedly extended by Indian Muslims to the cause of the Palestine Arabs was not entirely without effect on the British Government.

When, after Hitler's rise to power in Germany, the flow of Jewish immigrants into Palestine became a flood, an Arab rebellion broke out in it. The Muslims League, under the leadership of the Quaid-I-Azam, denounced expropriation of the indigenous population of Palestine by alien immigrants and called upon the British Government to stop further Jewish immigration and to grant the Arabs full political rights. The British Government appointed a Royal Commission to find a solution for the Palestine problem. The recommendations of the Royal Commission were shelved because of the outbreak of the Second World War. When in August 1947, Pakistan emerged as an independent State, the Palestine situation was nearing the explosion point. Organized illegal immigration had swelled the Jewish population of Palestine to one-third of the total. The Jewish settlers, armed with modern weapons, were ready for war. Powerful political pressure was being exercised by the Zionists in the United States and other Western countries to open Palestine to unlimited Jewish immigration and for the immediate establishment in it of a sovereign Jewish State.

Palestine thus became the first problem in international affairs to engage the attention of the newly independent State of Pakistan. Just as the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate of the League of Nations over Palestine were a violation of British pledges of independence to the Arabs, the proposal to create in it, in the teeth of indigenous opposition, a State for aliens was contrary to International law and the Charter of the United Nations. This was the position taken by Pakistan. One of the first acts of the Head of the new State was to address a forceful letter to President Truman to desist from the "monstrous" attempt to deprive the Arabs of Palestine which had been their homeland for two thousand years.

When the Palestine question came up before the General Assembly, Sir Zafrullah Khan declared that the Pakistan delegation was utterly and uncompromisingly opposed to the creation of a Jewish State in Palestine. Arguing that the proposed scheme of partition was unfair and impractical and if implemented, would lead to strife, Sir Zafrullah urged that the juridical issues involved in the question should be referred to the International Court of Justice. Pakistan, he said, deeply sympathized with the Jews but the proper solution of the problem would be that Jewish refugees should be reintegrated in the European countries from whence they had been driven out. Should this not be possible, Sir Zafrullah pleaded, they should be offered facilities for settlement in the newer and larger countries which had more space and greater resource than had tiny Palestine.

The supporters of the partition scheme, however, were determined to carry it through at all costs. The great Powers resorted to tactics of naked coercion and duress to compel the smaller member States to vote for it. Thus the necessary two-thirds majority was obtained and a resolution adopted by the General Assembly recommending the partition of Palestine and the establishment in it of a Jewish State. This was in November 1947.

Pakistan has remained unswervingly and resolutely unrecoupled to Israel, which was proclaimed as a "State" in May 1948. It has refused to recognize Israel or to have any thing to do with it. Pakistan has continued to take an active interest in all subsequent developments in regard to Palestine and to sponsor resolutions about it on behalf of the Arabs year after year. Invariably, Pakistan has been in the forefront of those defending the principles of justice and international law so cynically violated by the majority of the United Nations in planting a State for alien Jews in the heart of the Arab world.

Recently when the veil of secrecy which had shrouded the German-Israel agreement of 1960 for the supply of war material to Israel was removed. The strong resentment of the Arab countries, whose security had thereby been jeopardized, was fully appreciated in Pakistan. Despite its friendship with West Germany. Pakistan's sympathy was with the Arabs.

The stand of Pakistan on the Palestine question is a typical example of its support to the struggle against colonialism and imperialist domination. The vehemence with which Pakistan continues to voice its opposition to alien occupation of the homeland of the Palestine Arabs exemplifies the spirit of Islam, which enjoins perpetual resistance to inequity and demands the establishment of a world order conditioned by justice and fair play. There are other important characteristics of Islam whose relevance to our contemporary times has been confirmed by no less a person than Arnold Toynbee, and I quote from his book "Civilization on Trial":

"The forces of racial toleration, which at present seem to be fighting a losing battle in a spiritual struggle of immense importance to mankind, might still regain the upper hand if any strong influence militating against race consciousness that has hitherto been held in reserve were now to be thrown into the scales. It is conceivable that the spirit of Islam might be the timely reinforcement which would decide this issue in favor of tolerance and peace."

It is not only the doctrine of Islam nor even its historic association with the revolt of mankind against tyranny and oppression that inspire the leadership of Islamic countries today. It must be remembered that Islam itself has had the worst experience of imperialist domination. Ever since the Middle Ages, starting with the Crusades, the lands of Islam have faced successive invasions by imperialists. From Morocco to Indonesia, the people of Islam have suffered at the hands of every colonial Power of Europe. The British, the French, the Germans, the Dutch and Portuguese have all held down one or another part of the Islamic world.

Islam was born to be a force for the establishment of equality and justice. The opposition to imperialism and colonialism of other forces is at best founded on an apprehension and a doctrinaire conviction, but in Islam it is a part of the religion itself. Thus Islam is committed morally and historically to the struggle against domination and exploitation.

Reference has been made to Pakistan's endeavors in the cause of Palestine. But there are other instances too in which Pakistan has given unflinching support to Muslim peoples struggling to regain their independence and their dignity as free nations.

The question of the future of former Italian colonies of Libya, Italian Somaliland and Eritrea was considered by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its third session in 1949. The First Committee of the General Assembly recommended a solution identical with that previously agreed upon between the three occupying powers, Britain, France and Italy, in the Bevin-Storza Agreement. This solution envisaged a united independent Libya after ten years; in the interim period the territory was to be divided between the three Powers and held in Trusteeship by them.

Pakistan vigorously espoused the cause of the people of these former colonies. Foreign Minister Zafrullah Khan vehemently opposed the Trusteeship plan of the colonial Powers and urged that independence be given to a united Libya. If it was considered that immediate independence was not feasible, argued Sir Zafrullah, Libya should be placed under the direct administration of the Trusteeship Council and prepared for independence in the shortest possible time. This stand of Pakistan in opposition to the Western Powers was vindicated when the General Assembly decided in November 1949 that a united Libya should become independent by January 1952. The General Assembly appointed a U.N. Commission to assist in the transition of Libya to independence. Pakistan was elected a member of this Commission and played an active part in bringing the country into the family of free nations. Libya was admitted to membership of the United Nations on 14 December 1955.

As regards Italian Somaliland. Pakistan put forward a radical solution, suggesting the amalgamation of all Somali areas, namely those formerly under Italian and British rule and those still under French rule, to form an independent Greater Somalia. This proposal of Pakistan resulted in the supersession of the original Western proposal. The General Assembly decided that the former British and Italian colonies in Somaliland be placed under U.N. Trusteeship for a period of ten years, after which it was to become independent. Somalia was admitted to the United Nations on 20 September, 1960.

The freedom movements of the three countries of the Maghreb evoked a deep sense of sympathy in Pakistan. Maghreb leaders, Habib Bourguiba, Allal-Fassi, Mehemed Yazid, Ferhat Abbas and others visited Pakistan and were enthusiastically received. For its part, the Government of Pakistan gave all possible support to the people of North Africa in their struggle for the restoration of their sovereignty and independence. On all the three questions, Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria, Pakistan played a leading role in the United Nations and was frequently chosen by the Asian-African nations as their spokesman.

Pakistan was a member of the Security Council and its representative, Ahmed Shah Bokhari, was its President for the month, when the Tunisian Government, in April, 1953, asked for the consideration of the grave situation that had arisen as a result of French policy in Tunisia. While the Tunisian question was placed on the provisional agenda of the Council, its formal adoption was strongly opposed by France on the ground that Tunisia was a French protectorate and as such Franco-Tunisian relations were a matter essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of France and outside the competence of the United Nations by virtue of Article 2, paragraph (7) of the Charter. Speaking on that occasion, Prof. Bokhari said:

“Today, 10 April, 1953, will go down in the history of the United Nations as the day on which the foundations were laid for the

suppression of free discussion in the United Nations. This would be the first instance in the history of the United Nations in which the mere adoption of an agenda item was opposed so stoutly in the Council, and to death. This will also go down in the history of the United Nations as they day of a very great and lamentable reversal of policy.”

Frustrated in the Security Council, the Asian-African nations, in 1953, brought the matter before the General Assembly. A resolution introduced by Pakistan called for the restoration of civil liberties in Tunisia and for negotiations with a view to enabling the Tunisian people to exercise their right of self-determination. Though supported by most of the African-Asian States, the resolution, because of influential Western opposition to it, was not adopted.

Pakistan continued to strive for the restoration of the sovereign rights of the Tunisian people until this goal was achieved in 1956.

The question of Morocco was analogous to that of Tunisia. The Sultan of Morocco had been coerced into signing the Treaty of Fez of 1912, ceding to France the sovereign right of conducting the foreign relations of Morocco. Invoking provisions of this Treaty, France maintained that, under Article 2(7) of the Charter, relating to domestic jurisdiction, the United Nations was debarred from considering the matter. The question had been inscribed on the agenda of the General Assembly, in 1952, at the instance of African-Asian States. Pakistan being one of them.

In 1953, the African-Asian States requested the President of the Security Council to call an urgent meeting of it to consider the situation arising out of the deposition of Sultan Mohammad V and his imprisonment by the French Government. Despite every effort by Pakistan and Lebanon, which were at that time, members of the Council, the item was not inscribed on the Council's agenda. In the General Assembly, later that year, Sir Zafrullah Khan pleaded the cause of Morocco and denounced the imposition, by imperialist powers on smaller and weaker States, of unequal treaties such as the Treaty of Fez. Thirteen African-Asian nations, Pakistan being one of them, sponsored a draft resolution recommending that martial law be terminated and civil liberties restored in Morocco and that steps be taken to assure its independence within five years. This proposal could not secure the necessary majority.

Again in 1954, Pakistan was one of the fourteen African-Asian States which requested the inclusion of the Moroccan question in the agenda of the ninth session of the General Assembly. In view of impending negotiations between France and Morocco, the consideration of the item was, however, postponed. In 1956 Morocco attained its independence.

Towards the end of 1954, the heroic Algerian people rose in revolt against French colonial rule. The following year, Pakistan, along with some

other African-Asian States, decided in the Bandung Conference to support the Algerian demand for independence and asked for the consideration of the question by the United Nations. France challenged the competence of the General Assembly to discuss the question, again invoking the argument of domestic jurisdiction. The Chairman of the Pakistan Delegation, the late Mr. Mohammed Ali of Bogra, in refuting the French argument said:

“For over a hundred years the rulers of Algeria have pursued a policy of assimilation, to make the native population French in feeling, and thinking, to fit them into the procrustean bed of French civilization and way of life for the greater glory and power of France. But the people of Algeria have stubbornly resisted this policy of assimilation and integration and remain adamantly Algerian, apart in language, religion, culture and way of life from their self-constituted benefactors. Why? Although Algeria is claimed to be as much a part and parcel of France as Brittany or Savoy, yet there is no equality of status between Algeria and the other departments of France. There is no equality in the rights of franchise, political representation, or participation in the Government of the French Republic. The constitutional and juridical situation in Algeria, in law as well as in fact, rests on the principle of national and racial discrimination applied to all fields of life. Therefore, though France claims that Algerians are French citizens under her law, they remain French subject in practice.”

In the following year, Pakistan cosponsored a draft resolution recognizing the right of the people of Algeria to self-determination and inviting the Government of France and the Algerian leaders to enter into immediate negotiations for a cessation of hostilities and for bringing about a peaceful settlement in accordance with the principles of the UN Charter. This draft resolution was not adopted.

When, in 1959, I led the Pakistan Delegation to the General Assembly, we extended our fullest support to the Algerian cause. Pakistan was unanimously requested by the Asian-African Group to be the sole sponsor and mover of a draft resolution on behalf of the Group calling for the recognition of Algeria’s right of self-determination and independence and for negotiations between the Government of France and representatives of the FLN for a peaceful settlement in accordance with the principles of the Charter.

Speaking before the General Assembly, in 1960, I again referred to Algeria, “that strife-torn land where the blood of patriots still flows in their fight for freedom.” I went on, to say:

“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 a 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.”

In August, 1961, Pakistan took the bold step of according formal recognition to the provisional Government of Algeria in exile. This action was hailed not only by Algerians, but by all African. Pakistan took this step despite the risk of its losing French support in the Security Council on the Kashmir question. One must here pay a tribute to President de Gaulle. As a great statesman, he understood that our action was prompted by our respect for the principle of self-determination and not by any ill-will towards France, a country with which Pakistan has always had the best of relations.

Later, in December, 1961, Pakistan moved in the General Assembly, on behalf of thirty-five States, a resolution urging the French Government to redress the grievances of the Algerian prisoners in France and thus make possible the immediate termination of their hunger strike. This resolution was adopted by the General Assembly. The hunger strikes ended and an atmosphere conducive to a Franco-Algerian settlement was thus created. Finally, President de Gaulle conceded independence to Algeria and also set in motion in Africa a gigantic process of decolonization, as a result of which all French African territories emerged as sovereign independent States and were admitted as members of the United Nations. This was a magnificent manifestation of the highest traditions of French liberalism.

Let me now turn to our relations with the Arab countries of the Middle East. Among them, the United Arab Republic occupies a position of pivotal importance, not only because of its size, strategic position and cultural traditions, but also because of the stupendous changes, in its internal life and international status, which have come in the wake of the Nasser revolution. The United Arab Republic plays a pre-eminent role in the affairs of the Arab world. For this reason, and also because of its Islamic orientation. Pakistan has always attached the greatest importance to developing close ties with this country. That being so, it is a matter of profound regrets to us that, from time to time. Pakistan-United Arab Republic relations have been subject to strains and stresses.

As in the pre-Pakistan period, we have always given our support to Egypt in its struggle against imperialism. We backed the Egyptian demand for the evacuation of British occupation forces from the Suez Canal zone and for the negotiation of a new settlement of the problem of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. In this matter, Pakistan was instrumental in promoting the resumption of negotiations between Egypt and the United Kingdom, which had reached a deadlock.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser chose non-alignment as the basis of his foreign policy. Pakistan, on the other hand, concluded in 1954 an agreement with the United States for military aid and later that year joined SEATO. These steps were taken to assure Pakistan's security from the threat of

Indian aggression. A year later, during the premiership of Nuri-as-Said, Iraq concluded with Turkey a pact for cooperation in defense, which came to be known as the Baghdad Pact. Pakistan, along with Iran, acceded to this Pact, Britain also joined it.

This development gave umbrage to Egypt, which regarded the Baghdad Pact as an instrument for dividing the Arab world and bringing back Western imperialism to it. Fears were expressed that Pakistan's Policy of support for the Arabs of Palestine in particular and Arab liberation movements in general would no longer be sustained.

Pakistan soon demonstrated that these fears were totally unfounded. Membership of the Baghdad Pact and SEATO did not inhibit Pakistan from pursuing its traditional policy of supporting the aspirations of the Arabs and the struggle of the people of Asia and Africa against imperialism and colonialism. In fact, Pakistan used the forum provided by the Pacts to urge the causes of fraternal countries.

After the reversal of the United States offer to finance the construction of the Aswan Dam, President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal Company. Pakistan upheld the right of Egypt, as a sovereign State, to nationalize any undertaking within its territorial jurisdiction.

Pakistan's interest in maintaining freedom of navigation through the Canal was direct and immediate. At the time of its nationalization, 56 per cent of Pakistan's exports and 49 per cent of its imports passed through that international waterway. Nevertheless, Pakistan publicly declared that its nationalization by President Nasser was a justifiable act. Pakistan directed its diplomacy to dissuading the British Government from resorting to armed action to impose international control or to attempt to overthrow the Nasser regime.

At the London Conference, which was convened on the initiative of the late John Foster Dulles to consider the situation, Pakistan reaffirmed its position that nationalization of the Suez Canal was in consonance with the sovereign prerogatives of Egypt and that a peaceful solution of the Anglo-French dispute with Egypt should be found through negotiation. The Pakistan delegation also successfully pressed amendments to substantially modify Western proposals. Pakistan was motivated by the desire to avert the imminent threat of Anglo-French invasion of Egypt by keeping open the door for a negotiated settlement and thus to frustrate the designs of those Powers which were determined to serve an ultimatum on President Nasser. Pakistan warned that any attempt to dictate terms to the UAR would be a violation of the Charter of the United Nations. Pakistan also opposed the proposal to set up a Suez Canal Users' Association and suggested that the users should negotiate directly with Egypt. Because of this stand, taken by Pakistan and some other countries, the establishment of the Canal Users' Association was successfully prevented.

When the negotiations with President Nasser, conducted by the Menzies mission failed, and the invasion of Suez took place, the people of Pakistan rose as one man to condemn the aggression by Britain, France and Israel. For weeks, cities and towns all over Pakistan resounded with denunciation of the three Powers and with expressions of sympathy and support for the people of Egypt.

In the United Nations, Pakistan was actively associated with every move to bring about a ceasefire, the withdrawal of the invading forces and the dispatch of a United Nations Emergency Force.

President Nasser was not entirely satisfied with the attitude of Pakistan at the first and second London Conferences. At the time of the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt, President Nasser believed that Pakistan's support to his country could have been more positive and forthright. Because of this belief he did not let the Prime Minister of Pakistan visit Egypt nor agree to the inclusion of a Pakistani contingent in the United Nations Emergency Force. Propaganda against Pakistan as a Baghdad Pact country was intensified.

With the overthrow of the monarchy in Iraq in July 1958 and the withdrawal of that country from the Baghdad Pact, there was a noticeable improvement in the attitude of the United Arab Republic towards Pakistan. After the revolution in Pakistan in October 1958, and the removal from power of politicians against some of whom President Nasser had a sense of grievance, relations between the two countries improved further.

In 1960, the UAR President visited Pakistan and had discussions with President Ayub Khan. This led to a better mutual appreciation of the interests and policies of the two countries. The President of Pakistan paid a return visit to the UAR, where he was given a warm and enthusiastic reception. His speech in Cairo, analyzing the ills of Muslim societies, and his call for a progressive approach to the problems confronting them, made a deep impression throughout the Middle East.

In 1962 and 1963, there was some deterioration in the relations between the United Arab Republic and Pakistan. The former objected to the sale of rifles and ammunition by Pakistan to Saudi Arabia on the ground that these arms were being passed on by the latter to the royalist forces in Yemen, who were fighting against the republican Government and the UAR forces supporting it. The sale of arms to Saudi Arabia was a normal government to government transaction under an agreement entered into in December 1961. Further the Saudi Government denied that it was giving Pakistani weapons to the royalists of Yemen. Nevertheless in deference to the United Arab Republic, Pakistan stopped the sale of weapons to Saudi Arabia, particularly because it had always been Pakistan's policy not to take sides in inter-Arab disputes. In addition to this, Pakistan recognized the new regime in Yemen.

While Pakistanis have a deep fraternal feeling for the United Arab Republic, its delegation in the Security Council, when the Kashmir dispute was discussed in the first half of 1962, adopted an attitude which was most regrettable and disappointing. More recently, the Indo-HAR Agreement of 1964 for collaboration in the production of supersonic planes has aroused Pakistan's concern, for that would facilitate the acquisition by India of greater offensive capacity in the air. Nevertheless, Pakistan continues to seek a closer relationship with the United Arab Republic.

With Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, Yemen and Lebanon, Pakistan has most cordial relations. Neither change of government nor of policy has marred the warmth of these relations. While Pakistan has recognized that a non-aligned policy may suit these countries, they have on their part shown an understanding of the special problems which let Pakistan to join the alliances. It is now generally recognized that Pakistan's membership of CENTO is not against the interests of any the countries of the Middle East, or of any other region, but it has in fact afforded Pakistan further opportunities to project the Arab viewpoint. Iraq's decision in July, 1958 to withdraw from the Baghdad Pact, has little effect on the friendly relations subsisting between Pakistan and Iraq. This again shows that Pakistan's attitude towards Muslim countries is not governed by considerations of policy alone.

President Abdus Salam Arif visited Pakistan in April, 1964. He had fruitful talks with the President of Pakistan. The joint communiqué issued after these talks reaffirmed Iraq's support for an early settlement of the Kashmir dispute in the spirit of Afro-Asian solidarity and in conformity with the Charter and resolutions of the United Nations. The wide measure of accord between Iraq and Pakistan was again demonstrated by the support and understanding which President Arif showed towards Pakistan in its current crisis with India.

Saudi Arabia is the guardian of the Holy Cities of Mecca and Madina. So profound is the attachment of the Muslims of the subcontinent to these cities that to safeguard them, they made during and after the First World War, untold sacrifices. The Khilafat movement, it will be remembered, had as one of its aims the preservation of the Holy Places and the Hedjaz from falling under alien domination.

The bonds between Pakistan and Saudi Arabia are very strong indeed. It is a matter of special satisfaction to Pakistan that it has been able to extend advice and technical assistance to Saudi Arabia in matters of defense and other matters and that Pakistan doctors, engineers, consultants and workers in oil industry are playing their part in that country.

Jordan, the custodian of the Masjid-al-Aqsa, has always occupied a place of special affection in the hearts of Pakistanis and has attracted thousands of them as pilgrims. Pakistan's relations with Jordan have always

been very cordial and a large measure of political cooperation has existed between the two countries. The suggestion made by Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan, when he was Foreign Minister of Pakistan, to convene at Jerusalem a conference of Muslim countries to evolve a policy for united action to counter the menace of Israel is significant of the sympathy of Pakistan for Jordan.

King Hussein paid a state visit to Pakistan in 1955. In a joint communiqué issued after the Pakistan Prime Minister's visit to Jordan in August, 1957, the two countries pledged themselves to cooperate with each other in pursuance of their common interests and policies. In April, 1964 the people-to-people delegation, led by Mir Waiz Mohammad Yusuf of Kashmir, visited Jordan. It was accorded a warm welcome and assured of the full support of the Jordanian Government to the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir.

Damascus has been one of the great power centers of the Muslim world. Pakistan's relations with Syria have always been cordial. When Syria joined the United Arab Republic, Pakistan, consistently with its policy of goodwill and sympathy towards the movement for Arab unity, welcomed the Union. Later, when Syria decided to separate from it, Pakistan took a non-partisan attitude but noted with satisfaction that Arab unity remained the goal of Syrian policy.

Historically, Lebanon has been the meeting place of the empires and civilizations of Asia and Europe. The Lebanese have been a great seafaring and mercantile people. Their ancestors, the Phoenicians, who founded Carthage, are credited with the invention of the alphabet. Contacts between Pakistan and Lebanon have, in recent years, greatly expanded. This has helped in the maintenance of the excellent relations that have always existed between the two countries.

Pakistan did not immediately recognize in 1963 the Revolutionary Government of Yemen. This was because of Pakistan's policy of non-interference in inter-Arab controversies. But since then not only have Pakistan's diplomatic representatives paid visits to the country but Pakistan has also been associated with the UN Observation Mission in Yemen. Pakistan has expressed the hope that peaceful conditions would soon be restored in Yemen and a political settlement acceptable to its people as well as to Saudi Arabia and the UAR would be reached. This would facilitate reforms in Yemen and remove a cause of division in the Arab world.

With the Shaikhdom of Kuwait, Pakistan has established cordial and friendly relations. Pakistan opened a Consulate-General, which has since been raised to the level of an Embassy. A number of visits have been exchanged by ministers of the two countries and there is no doubt that fruitful and mutually advantageous cooperation between them will continue to develop.

South Arabia, which has long been struggling against colonial rule, cannot much longer be denied its legitimate demand for independence. Pakistan has joined with Arab and other Asian-African States in supporting, in the United Nations, resolutions favoring freedom and self-determination for South Arabia.

Pakistan's policy towards the Arab world is to support all measures unanimously accepted by the Arab States, to welcome all manifestations of the unity of the Arab world and to acclaim its economic and social advancement. We regret the transient differences that exist between some Arab States and maintain a strict attitude of non-interference and non-involvement in inter-Arab disputes. Pakistan extends its full and unqualified support to the movement for political, economic and cultural co-operation between Arab States in the interest of their own collective security and welfare and as conducive to solidarity among Muslim countries and Afro-Asian solidarity. This is not merely a matter of policy for Pakistan, but in the heart's desire of every Pakistani.

The emergence of independent nations in Africa opened up a new vista of cooperation between the peoples of this great continent and those of other continents. This is a matter of special gratification for Pakistan, for Africa occupied a very important position in the world of Islam. A large number of the inhabitants of this continent are followers of Islam. Twenty-two out of thirty-five independent African countries have Muslim majority populations. But the importance of Africa in the Muslim world derives not only from the large number of Muslims inhabiting that continent, but also from the notable contribution made by it to the concept of Islamic universality.

Much of Africa has now broken the shackles of alien rule and Muslims of this vigorous continent are freely taking an active interest in the revival of the dynamic values of Islam as a factor in Afro-Asian unity. Sir Ahmadu Bello, the Sarduna of Sokoto and Prime Minister of Northern Nigeria, has carried the torch of Islamic renaissance far and wide. Somalia was the scene of the conference of the World Muslim Congress. Mr. Aden Abdullah Osman, the President of Somalia, has long been known for his interest in this Congress. African delegations are also playing a prominent role in Islamic conferences outside their continent, such as the African-Asian Islamic Conference held in Bandung in March 1965. Pakistan looks forward to developing new ties of friendship with the countries of Africa, thus giving further momentum to Afro-Asian cooperation.

Africa is a continent in revolt, striving for full emancipation from colonial domination. The liberation movement has already achieved impressive results, except in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique and some other areas, where the struggle for freedom continues. The task in Africa now is to consolidate the independence and sovereignty of the newly liberated nations.

Islam is in the forefront of the revolution in Africa. The demand for human dignity, equality and social justice, which is urgent, has found an enthusiastic ally in the proselytizing elements of Islam, which have merged and identified themselves with the revolution. Alien missionaries are fighting a losing battle against the revolutionary tents of Islam, derives strength from its indigenous character and from its unsurpassed record as the greatest moral force against racial discrimination.

It is the universality of the spirit of Islam, its emphasis on brotherhood and equality between man and man, its inherent vitality and vigor, which have led to its fusion with the forces of revolution in Africa. This revolution and Islam's contribution to the emancipation and progress of the African people have a significance not only for the continent of Africa but for the world as a whole.

The future of mankind clearly depends upon its ability to develop bonds of fraternity between people with different racial and cultural backgrounds in different parts of the world. Such a development has so far come only from Islam. For that reason alone the role of Islam in Africa is one of far reaching importance to humanity at large.

From the vibrant scene of resurgent Africa, we come to the ancient civilization of China. Relations between the territories which today constitute Pakistan and China were established at a very early stage of history. Pre-Muslim relations of the subcontinent with the general region of China remained strictly confined to the spiritual field. Such cultural intercourse as is known to have taken place was a corollary to the visits of Chinese Buddhists to their places of pilgrimage in the subcontinent.

With the spread of Islam in the Central Asian region and the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and with the travels of Muslim historians, geographers, explorers and merchants, definite over-land routes between Central Asia and some regions of China were identified. Similarly, Muslim mariners, whose mercantile activities extended to the Malayan Archipelago, came into direct contact with Chinese merchants and a sea-route was established from China to the Mediterranean.

With Halaku (Hulagu) Khan's depredations came the decline of the Abbasid Khilafat. In the resulting anarchy the established over-land trade routes through Iran were closed. This led to the discovery of a transverse route from Kashgar to Gilgit and down the Indus Valley to Debal, present day Thatta, on the Arabian Sea, from where merchandise was trans-shipped to Western lands. The new route brought the subcontinent, especially its western part, into intimate political, cultural, commercial and diplomatic contact with both China and Central Asia.

There is a large Muslim population inhabiting North-West China and its Sinkiang province. Good neighborly relations with the People's Republic of

China have once again enabled Pakistan to revive its historical and cultural links with this important segment of the Chinese people, links which were altogether ruptured during the period of colonial rule in the subcontinent.

The Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union contain a considerable Muslim population. With them, the relations of our people are even more intimate. From this region came the pioneers of Muslim rule in India. Because of past associations, the mere mention of Samarkand and Bukhara evoke romantic feelings about them in our people even to this day. In the wake of independence, a growing awareness of our historical and cultural affinities with Central Asia has made an important contribution to our success in the quest for good neighborliness and friendship with the Soviet Union.

With Iran and Turkey, the foreign policy of Pakistan reflects a continuity of the traditional sense of devotion felt by the Muslims of the subcontinent with those nations. Since independence, Pakistan's relations with them have been further developed and consolidated. Common membership of CENTO was one of the consequences. Pakistan's sympathy and support for Iran and Turkey on all questions involving their rights and interests have been unequivocal.

Reference has already been made to Pakistan's sentiments towards Turkey as reflected in the Khilafat movement. However, our relations with modern Turkey are based on the same spirit of kinship and fellow-feeling which inspired our previous generation to treat the cause of Turkey as its own and to make sacrifices for it. The memory of Kemal Ataturk, the Father of modern Turkey, is venerated in Pakistan as deeply as it is in his own country.

With Iran, our people are bound by innumerable historical, cultural and ethnic links that go back to ancient history. Notwithstanding two centuries of colonial domination, the people of Pakistan have retained the rich heritage of their intimate past association with Iran. Pakistanis have a feeling of identity with the people of Iran, who are in more than once sense the progenitors of the Muslim culture of the subcontinent. This feeling is a living reality. Pakistanis hold the Shahinshah of Iran in high respect and value his personal contribution to the continued development of friendship between his country and our's. The mutual esteem between the Shahinshah and the President of Pakistan is a symbol of the fraternity of our two peoples.

When, in the early fifties, the Government of Iran nationalized its oil industry and terminated the concession of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, Pakistan upheld the sovereign right of Iran to take that action. The boundary between the two countries had remained unsettled during the entire period of British rule. Agreement as to its alignment has now been reached and the boundary demarcated by the experts of the two countries working in cordial cooperation.

At an historic meeting between the Heads of States of Iran, Pakistan and Turkey, held in Istanbul in July 1964, an agreement was reached between the three countries for establishing Regional Cooperation for Development. The initiative taken in this matter by the President of Pakistan was indeed symbolic of the nature of contemporary Muslim renaissance. Notwithstanding the many problems facing each of the three countries, they decided to launch a supranational organization, which has been acclaimed as a development of great future significance.

When the Cyprus question was discussed in the United Nations General Assembly in 1954 and in the following year, the Pakistan delegation supported the historical and legal claims of Turkey in respect of that island. In 1957, in regard to the Greek delegations' resolution that Cyprus be granted the right of self-determination, the Pakistan delegation pointed out that the resolution had been so drafted as to imperil the human rights and legitimate aspirations of Turkish Cypriots. In 1960, under the Treaty of Zurich, Cyprus achieved independence guaranteed by Turkey, Greece and the United Kingdom. The right of Turkey to intervene in the event of a violation of the Constitution of Cyprus, which formed an integral part of the Treaty, was specifically recognized.

Expressing the concern of the Government and people of Pakistan about the serious situation which had developed in Cyprus, on 27 December 1963, I said:

"The Agreements which brought about the settlement of the problem of Cyprus have to be respected, as they are solemn international commitments.

"We are with Turkey in her moment of crisis and whatever cooperation may be needed from Pakistan will be extended in the fullest measure."

With Afghanistan, we have ethnic, historical and linguistic links. These go back to the dawn of history, to the time of the southward movement of the Aryans, more than three thousand years ago.

It was expected that upon the emergence of Pakistan as an independent State, Afghanistan would develop with it close friendly ties. However, there were barriers of isolation which had been created in the region during the era of colonial rule. In the early stages, there were, in the relations between the two countries, un-mistakable signs of reserve and suspicion on the part of Afghanistan. Pakistan, nevertheless, always maintained that the two countries had far too much in common to permit any problem to permanently mar the natural development of close and good neighborly relations between them. In fact, objectively speaking, with no other country has Afghanistan or Pakistan so much in common as with each other.

Recent developments, however, indicate an encouraging trend. The cordial meeting between Kin Zahir Shah and President Ayub Khan in June 1964 set the tone for further improvement of relations of which the Transit Trade Agreement, concluded in February 1965, is a clear manifestation. It may be mentioned here that the Agreement provides for Afghanistan such facilities and liberal terms as are among the best in the world. It is in striking contrast to the Transit Trade Agreement between India and Nepal, which after placing every conceivable difficulty in the way of that land-locked Kingdom, provides it only with limited facilities.

The history of Pakistan's relations with Indonesia is also conditioned by the traditional sympathy of the Muslims of this subcontinent for their brethren in other countries. The people of Indonesia in their struggle for freedom had all the support of Pakistan. Pakistanis in Indonesia fought side by side with Indonesians in the latter's war of liberation. Pakistan, an infant State, as it was in those days, extended its wholehearted support to their cause both in the United Nations and outside it, and rejoiced in their success and the establishment of the independent Republic of Indonesia. In its subsequent struggle over West Iran, Indonesia had the full backing of Pakistan, which sent a sizeable contingent of troops to assist the United Nations in its task of supervising the transfer of the territory from Dutch to Indonesian control.

There has been quite significant economic cooperation between the two countries, which have the largest Muslim populations in the world. In the development of even closer relations between them, an historic event took place, when at a Conference held in Karachi in March 1965, "IPECC" (Indonesia-Pakistan Economic and Cultural Cooperation) was established. This provided for RCT-type cooperation to maximize trade between the two countries and promote joint ventures in industry and cooperation in communications. It also provided for the development of cultural contacts to further strengthen the ties between the two peoples.

Cooperation between Pakistan and Indonesia has been significant in various fields, particularly in international affairs. They were both among the co-sponsors of the first African-Asian Conference, which adopted the historic Bandung principles, now recognized as the universal norm of conduct in international affairs.

The exchange of State visits between the President of Pakistan and the president of Indonesia were occasions for important discussions between the two leaders, which resulted in an even closer mutual understanding. Recognizing the right of self-determination of all peoples, Indonesia has given its fullest support to Pakistan in regard to the Kashmir dispute.

The feeling of brotherhood that the people of Pakistan have for their co-religionists has been an important factor in its relations with South East Asia in general. Even before the independence of Malaya, there was

considerable contact between the leaders of Pakistan and Malaya. In 1955, Tunku Abdur Rahman, while on his way to London for independence talks, broke journey at Karachi and had consultations with the Pakistan Prime Minister. Needless to say that Pakistan extended its wholehearted support to Malaya's demand for independence. Pakistan also made an important contribution to the work of the Reid Commission, which in 1957 drew up the Constitution of Malaya. There were exchanges of visits, the most notable of which was the visit to Pakistan of the Paramount Ruler of Malay in December 1961 and that of Prime Minister Tunku Abdur Rahman in October 1962.

With the formation of Malaysia, difficulties arose and these have yet to be resolved. In September 1963, President Ayub Khan wrote to the Heads of Government of Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, expressing his concern about those difficulties. Again in April 1964, the President offered to the three parties facilities for their meeting in Pakistan, should they desire to do so. The President also placed his good offices at their disposal. In July 1964, the President made a statement in London, expressing the hope that Indonesia and Malaysia would continue to strive for an amicable settlement.

While Pakistan was anxious to maintain friendly relations with Malaysia, the latter, it turned out, was not. In September 1965, India launched, without any provocation, a full-scale invasion of Pakistan. The case was debated in the Security Council. Of which Malaysia was then a member. The Malaysian delegate, Mr. Ramani, not only did not support Pakistan, as was expected, but gave unqualified support to India's untenable stand and went out of his way to attack the very existence of Pakistan as a State. It was hoped that the Malaysian Government would disown the position taken and the statements made by Mr. Ramani. But far from doing so, it upheld them. This was clear evidence of hostility towards Pakistan. Consequent upon that, no alternative was left for Pakistan but to break off diplomatic relations with Malaysia, which it did in October 1965. Needless to say the people of Pakistan are still well wishers of their Malaysian brethren.

Pakistan's policy towards Muslim countries is not based on any desire for gain or appreciation. It is based on more fundamental considerations. As has been shown, even before the inception of the Pakistan movement, the leaders of Muslim renaissance in the sub-continent had identified themselves with the greater cause of the awakening of the Islamic world as a whole.

While Pakistanis share in the joys and sorrows of Muslim peoples all over the world, it is the welfare of the Muslims of India that is closest to their hearts. This is only natural, because the Muslims of Pakistan and India have the same heritage and history and were but one community until 1947, when independence came to the two countries. It is for this reason that Pakistan has always been deeply concerned with the problems of the fifty million Muslims of India.

The creation of a separate State, comprising the Muslim majority areas of the subcontinent, was designed to enable the two nations to live separately, so that friction and strife that marred the relations between Muslims and Hindus should be eliminated. With the partition of the subcontinent on the basis of the two nation's theory, the minorities in both these nations would, it was hoped, be able to lead a life free from fear and intimidation, which had become their lot in the persistent conflict between the two communities.

However, the holocaust let loose at the time of partition, in 1947, was a clear indication that the fate of Muslims in India was uncertain. Although, under the Liaquat-Nehru Agreement of 1950, the Governments of India and Pakistan pledged themselves to ensure to their respective minorities complete equality of citizenship and full security in respect of life, culture, property and personal freedom, the position of Muslims in India has gone from bad to worse. There have been in India, since 1950 more than 550 anti-Muslim riots. Hardly has any festival of the Muslims passed without their community being subjected to attacks of communal frenzy in one part of India or another. The existence of the Muslims as a distinct cultural group is in peril, despite India's protestations of secularism. Books of Indian history, now written in India, go so far as to completely ignore the vast contribution, which the Muslims made to the culture and civilization of India. The aim of the majority community may be judged from a statement of the President of the Hindu Mahasabha. He said:

"Methods have to be devised whereby this element, that is the Muslims, can be merged with the flow of national life in the country, which is nothing other than Hindu."

A number of other Hindu leaders have voiced similar sinister intentions towards the Muslim population of India.

As if political, economic and cultural disintegration of the Muslims community was not enough, certain elements of the majority community in India have launched an organized campaign of genocide of Muslims. Treating the Muslims as hostages in the political vendetta against Pakistan, Indian authorities have done little to protect the lives of innocent Muslims of whom thousands have been massacred in the oft-recurring communal riots. Selig Harrison, a keen observer of the contemporary Indian scene, writing in the reputed American journal *Foreign Affairs* of January 1965, said that in India secularism was dead. He added:

"The traditionalist tone in social patterns has a political parallel in the slow stirrings of a coarse-grain nationalism which is frankly, even belligerently, Hindu in its inspiration.... It is not enough that a unified State with a Hindu majority –clearly dominant over a Muslim minority, now reduced to 11 per cent –has been established at long last in the Indian subcontinent...."

On our eastern frontiers, India has launched a most callous drive against its Muslim citizens, forcing them to leave their homes and seek shelter in East Pakistan. Half a million helpless Muslims from India have so far taken refuge in East Pakistan. This makes a cruel fraud of India's secularism. By using Indian Muslims in this ruthless and diabolic fashion, as human pawns, India hopes to score against Pakistan. Such utter lack of respect for civilized standards is a challenge to the conscience of mankind. India thinks that through these forcible evictions, it will gain on two fronts i.e. eliminate the fifty million Muslims from India and at the same time bring crushing pressure to bear on Pakistan. India does not stop to think that long before it reaches either of these goals, it would have succeeded in bringing about its own disintegration. Callousness begets callousness. India will court disaster at the hands of human indignation against barbarian practices. The present leadership of India which metes out such unjust and inhuman treatment to one section of its people can retain neither the loyalty nor the support of its other sections for any length of time.

The Muslim minority of India is faced with an ordeal and a threat which should evoke the concern of all people who respect human rights. The minority problem in India is not a political but a human problem. All that Pakistan is anxious to secure for the Muslims of India is that they should be delivered from the threat to their lives, their culture and their possessions and that they should have in actual fact the equality of citizenship promised in the Indian Constitution, on whose secular character India prides itself.

Pakistan has repeatedly appealed to India to stop the persecution of Muslims and to protect their elementary human rights. Pakistan has also brought the matter to the attention of the United Nations with a view to stirring the conscience of the world about it. World opinion, particularly public opinion in the Muslim countries, should bestir itself and exert pressure in this matter on the Government of India.

Under International Law and the Charter of the United Nations, respect for human rights is a universal duty and its denial to any people, regardless of its race or religion, is a matter of legitimate concern to all States, individually and collectively. Needless to say that it is in India's own larger interests that the fifty million Indians, who are Muslims, should be allowed to live in safety instead of being sacrificed on the altar of bigotry.

The Muslims of India have given much and sacrificed much for Muslims everywhere. Is it too much to hope that they in their turn will not be abandoned by the Muslim World.?

The injustice which the people of Kashmir have had to suffer at the hands of India presents to the world of Islam its greatest challenge. If Islam is to be a force to uphold the just causes of suffering humanity, the

beginning must be made in Kashmir. It is here that contemporary Islam faces its severest trial.

India remains in illegal occupation of Kashmir in flagrant violation of its international commitments. The people of Kashmir continue to be denied their right of self-determination and to suffer under the heel of Indian colonial domination. They continue to be deprived of their fundamental human right to decide their own destiny. A reign of terror has been let loose in the Valley to crush the spirit of the valiant fighters for its freedom. Indian forces show no mercy as they impose their tyranny on the unarmed and helpless Muslims of Kashmir. The Kashmiri leaders rot in Indian Jails, but the struggle continues, and will continue.

There is gratifying evidence that the reawakening Muslim peoples are not unmindful of their obligations. After two centuries of stagnation and apathy, the resurgent Muslim world is asserting itself in world affairs. The most recent demonstration was witnessed at the African-Asian Muslim People Conference held at Jakarta in March 1965. Representatives from thirty-three countries took part in this Conference, the first of its kind. The Conference stressed the need for collaboration amongst Muslim countries and people for protecting their interest, promoting their welfare and safeguarding their security. At this Conference, President Soekarno in an inspiring address exhorted Muslims to safeguard their freedom through progress and to rebuild a prosperous and better world for themselves.

Taken collectively the countries of the Muslim world today, spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific; differ in their forms of government, and in their economic and social systems. Their national interests, as dictated by geopolitical and historical factors, need to be harmonized.

Let us examine the concept of nationalism in Islam and see if it is at variance with the universal brotherhood of man as preached by Islam. Islam overflowed the confines of Arabia and, with irresistible force, reached the far corners of the civilized world of that time. But at no time in the history of Islam did any central authority control all its far flung domains. Nevertheless, the spirit of Islam acted as a positive unifying force. Islam has thus clearly demonstrated the reconciliation of nationalism with internationalism.

The future of the Islamic world is beginning to take shape. The Arab States come together periodically at the summit level. So do the Maghreb States, the RCD and the IPECC countries. In their totality, the growing contacts between Muslim nations constitute a force of considerable significance. What needs to be done is to enlarge the existing scope of such contacts through multilateral meetings of the Heads of States and Governments. If this is done, it is capable of giving a powerful impetus to the renaissance of Islam in the twentieth century.

The Muslims of the subcontinent have played their part in that renaissance. From the pan-Islamic attitudes of the concluding phases of the Khilafat period, there has been a rapid evolution. Modern revivalists such as Syed Ahmed Khan and Syed Ameer Ali and activists like Allama Iqbal have led us to the present phase. The contemporary role of Islam is consistent with that which it played in the struggle of mankind against tyranny, until it was itself weakened by schisms and decay and fell in the face of imperialist onslaughts. The spirit of Islam is now finding its natural expression in its association with the call for the establishment of a new world order based on equality, justice and fraternity.

As a result of the revolutionary discoveries of science and technology, new dimensions are being added to human experience. The present only provides a glimpse of the dynamism which will be the hallmark of our world of tomorrow. Citizens of the future will need an atmosphere of absolute equality and social justice. To achieve these conditions our generation must make a monumental effort and prepare for physical and intellectual discipline of the highest order. In a broad sense our endeavor has already begun. But it would need to be supported and given direction. The egalitarian principles of Islam would need to be practiced and manifested. The intelligentsia of the Muslim world would do well to establish its own clearing house of new ideas and fresh interpretations of known values. National leaders would need to have a high degree of awareness of movements not only within Islam, but in the entire needs which, in their turn, would have to take into account the realities of the international situation as a whole.

Without setting our sights too high, we can hope to see the gradual evolution of regional institutions, such as RCD and IPECC, a greater measure of cohesion among the Arab States, closer institutional links between the countries of the Maghreb and reinforcement of the African personality. These and other developments would inevitably bring us to the next phase of cooperation which would include the development of inter-institutional relations between these various regional organizations.

Pakistan has a role of vital importance to play in this evolutionary phase. Its situation, on the periphery of the Middle East on the one hand and the Far East on the other, is in itself a compelling factor. Its ideological basis provides a motive power. It is the special heritage of Pakistan, however, which is the most potent factor in the determination of the nature and scope of its role. The Muslims of Pakistan have, along with their Islamic fervour, inherited certain elements of all the great civilizations of the past. Through their association with the Buddhists and the Hindus, among whom they have lived for almost a thousand years, their contacts with Central Asia and indirectly with the ancient civilizations of China and their connection with the West, which has left its own impact, the followers of Islam in Pakistan have developed a unique cosmopolitan outlook. The totality of its circumstances are such that, in the world of tomorrow, Pakistan can play a significant role.

If mankind is to avoid the many pitfalls which lie in its path, many a bridge will have to be built in the world of the future. A mere glance at the human, political and physical geography of the world will show the importance of the situation of Pakistan, as a factor in the building of some, at least, of these bridges.

If this conclusion should sound pretentious, one could quote from the renowned scholar, Philip K. Hitti:

“If some one in the first third of the seventh Christian century had had the audacity to prophesy that within a decade or so some unheralded, unforeseen power, from the hitherto barbarous and little known land of Arabia was to make its appearance, hurl itself against the only two world powers of the age. Fall heir to the one (the Sasanid) and strip the other (the Byzantine) of its fairest provinces, he would undoubtedly have been declared a lunatic. Yet that was exactly what happened.”

It was not so long ago that when the idea of Pakistan was mooted it was regarded as nothing short of lunacy. But as Victor Hugo has pointed out, “Nothing is more powerful in the world than the force of an idea whose time has come”