

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



GENERAL

S/2256
23 July 1951

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

CABLEGRAM DATED 20 JULY 1951 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF PAKISTAN TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

In continuation of my telegram dated 15th July 1951, I have the honour to transmit to your Excellency the text of Prime Minister Liaquat Ali Khan's telegraphic reply dated 19th July 1951 to Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru.

Begins "I am deeply disappointed to read your telegram No. PRIMIN.2173, dated July 17, 1951.

"Instead of revoking the concentration of Indian troops on Pakistan frontiers which you have admitted and thus removing the serious threat to security of Pakistan and international peace, you have proceeded to make a series of allegations and statements unrelated to facts. You have asserted that India's policy continues to be to preserve and ensure peace and to avoid war. The use of military force in Junagadh, Hyderabad and more recently in Nepal are grave warnings against the acceptance of these assertions at their face value. The continued denial by force of arms to the people of Kashmir of their right of self-determination and repeated threats to the security of Pakistan by the massing of Indian troops against its borders are hardly indications of a desire for peace.

"You have referred to a reduction of Indian Army last year. The facts proclaim otherwise. Your defence budget has risen from Rs.1,510 million in 1948-49 to Rs.1,910 million in the current year. Last year the original defence budget was Rs.1,760 million but the revised budget rose to Rs.1,910 million. In the current year's budget, an announcement was made of a small reduction in the strength of the Indian Army, counter-balanced by increases in the Navy and Air Force. But two months later it was reported that even the proposed reduction would not be made. The actual defence expenditure in the current year is thus likely to rise to still higher levels.

"Your allegation that the armed forces of Pakistan were largely massed on Indian frontiers is completely without foundation. This would be borne out by an impartial observer.

51-14261

/"You have been
S/2256

"You have been at pains to distort the significance of expressions of discontent which have appeared in the Pakistan press over your persistent refusal to allow a peaceful solution through a free plebiscite in Kashmir. You have construed the expression of the natural desire for the liberation of Kashmir as propaganda for war against India. At the same time you have either ignored or belittled the continuous and blatant propaganda for war against Pakistan and, indeed, for the very liquidation of Pakistan carried on by the Indian press, prominent Indian leaders and political organisations. This propaganda has been going on in spite of the Delhi Agreement of April 1950, as any impartial observer will testify. For a long time after the Delhi Agreement, the Pakistan press strenuously propagated goodwill towards India, while the Indian press and political leaders continued to fulminate against Pakistan and to make attacks aimed at the integrity of Pakistan.

"When I drew your attention to this violation of the Agreement and asked for action against those responsible for it under Clause C (8) of the Agreement, you pleaded your inability to carry out the obligation undertaken by you.

"You have referred to recent border incidents which you have reported to the United Nations. These incidents have been magnified by you out of all proportion and attributed entirely to Pakistan. I would draw your attention to the statement made by General Nimmo, Chief U.N. Military Observer, on July 13th that quite a number of such violations of the cease-fire agreement have occurred on both sides and that the recent incidents were less serious than some of those which occurred in the past. Surely, it would be a gross distortion of facts to treat these incidents as any evidence of a desire for war.

"You have also referred to the 'no-war' declaration. But as you are aware, the proposal for a 'no-war' declaration could not be carried to a conclusion only because of your refusal to agree that if disputes between India and Pakistan could not be settled by negotiation and mediation, they should be referred to arbitration. In spite of the clear direction in your Constitution calling for the settlement of international disputes by arbitration, you maintained that it was beneath your national dignity to agree to this procedure.

/"There can

"There can be no clearer proof of Pakistan's desire for a peaceful solution of its disputes with India than the proposal I have repeatedly put to you that all our disputes should be settled by negotiation and mediation and failing that by arbitration. Unfortunately you have preferred the threat or use of force in settling disputes in your favour wherever the opportunity has offered itself. You have admitted that troops movements have been ordered by you, but you claim that these are for defensive purposes. The nature and magnitude of these movements and, in particular, the forward move of your armoured division and armoured brigade would not lead anyone to feel that their presence so close to Pakistan's frontiers is for defensive purposes. This plea of defensive purposes loses all validity in the face of the fact that Pakistan had made no troop moves before the concentration of your forces against Pakistan borders.

"There can be no severe strain upon the relations between our two countries than to be subjected, time and again, to the threat constituted by the concentration of forces. I would again urge you most earnestly to withdraw these forces so that this threat to the security of Pakistan and international peace is removed." Ends.

It is requested that this communication may kindly be circulated to the Members of the Security Council,

Assuring your Excellency of my highest consideration,

Ahmed S. Bokhari
Pakistan Permanent Representative
to the United Nations.

