

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



1339th
PLENARY MEETING

Tuesday, 28 September 1965,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (continued)

Speech by Mr. Kapwepwe (Zambia)	1
Speech by Mr. Karjalainen (Finland)	4
Speech by Mr. Shiina (Japan)	6
Speech by Mr. Bhutto (Pakistan)	11
Statement by the representative of India	19

President: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (continued)

1. Mr. KAPWEPWE (Zambia): Mr. President, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to this very high and important office. Your distinguished career as a public servant of your great country is well known to us all and my delegation is happy that the proceedings of the twentieth session of the General Assembly will be conducted under your able guidance.

2. I should like also to pay tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Quaison-Sackey, for the able manner in which he conducted the affairs of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly at a time when the very existence of this Organization was threatened. I should like to wish him well in his new post as Foreign Minister of Ghana.

3. My delegation joins other delegations in congratulating the Gambia, the Maldivé Islands and Singapore on their admission to the United Nations. We are always gratified to witness the growth of the United Nations through the admission of new Members.

4. Last year, on that memorable occasion when Zambia became a Member of this big family of nations we made a public declaration and pledge that "Zambia will do all in its power to be a worthy Member of this great international Organization" [1291st meeting, para. 5]. We pledged ourselves to fight for what is right and to be true to the principles expressed in the Charter of the United Nations.

5. It is with a sense of great honour and gratitude that my colleagues and I once again take our place in this honourable Assembly, upon which the hopes for the survival of mankind are pinned. This occasion is of double importance to us. Not only are we on the threshold of celebrating the first anniversary of our independence, which qualified us for membership of this family of nations, but also we are here today, together with our sister nations, to mark the be-

ginning of an era with this International Co-operation Year. Few things in the world today can be rated in importance with international co-operation. For in international co-operation, we achieve understanding; in understanding there is peace; and in peace, happiness and prosperity for mankind.

6. We in Zambia, though still suffering from the inevitable teething troubles of new nationhood, are as eager as any genuinely peace-loving nation to promote co-operation and peace in the world. Even with our limited resources, we have established diplomatic missions abroad. We have sent out many goodwill missions to cultivate the ground for international co-operation in cultural, economic and other spheres. We are happy to say that everywhere we went we were received with open hands. This type of symbiosis is dear to the heart of Zambia; and it has been with this genuine belief in international peace and security that we have sent goodwill missions to as many countries as our resources would permit, regardless of whether they were Western or Eastern, States Members of the United Nations or not.

7. We are proud to record that within the first year of our independence we have played host to the Committee of Twenty-Four^{1/} to make its work more effective, realistic and practical. We have also played host to a regional conference of the World Health Organization.^{2/} We have not hesitated to participate in the activities of the Organization of African Unity. We have lent support, both financial and moral, together with the other independent African States, in connexion with the South West Africa case now pending before the International Court of Justice. We shall continue to make every effort to play our part in maintaining international peace and security.

8. It is the wish of every country that there should be international harmony and prosperity. But this noble wish is frustrated by the existence of a number of disturbing incidents and situations to which I should now like to refer.

9. The subject of pressing urgency to us in Africa is colonialism and imperialism. I have in mind, in particular, the question of Rhodesia, the Portuguese territories of Angola and Mozambique, and South Africa. Zambia views with concern the contradictions in the policies of some countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which, while supporting the principles of anti-colonialism and self-determination for colonial peoples, supply arms and ammunition

^{1/} Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

^{2/} The 15th session of the Regional Committee for Africa, held in Lusaka, September 1965.

to certain colonial Powers which use such weaponry to suppress their subjects. We regard this as a blatant negation of the principles of the Charter and demand that such malpractices cease.

10. There can never be permanent international peace and security until colonialism and imperialism are liquidated completely. Zambia believes that the existence of colonialism is a naked violation of the Charter; and we call upon all colonial Powers to grant independence of our brethren still under the yoke of foreign domination. For we strongly believe that the exploitation of man by man can never serve the cause of peace and happiness. Foreign rule, however benevolent it may be considered to be, cannot be a substitute for national independence which alone can give men a sense of sovereign equality and the human dignity to which all of us aspire.

11. The question of Southern Rhodesia is of special concern to us. President Kaunda's reply to Southern Rhodesia's threat to carry out economic measures against Zambia should the United Kingdom punish its treasonable act has already been circulated to all Member States by the Secretary-General.^{3/} It makes clear our stand on Southern Rhodesia. We echo Security Council resolution 202 (1965) as well as the resolutions of the Committee of Twenty-Four calling on the United Kingdom to convene a constitutional conference to which all the political leaders of Southern Rhodesia would be invited for the purpose of elaborating a new constitution leading to majority rule. Britain must act now—not only because Southern Rhodesia is its own creation, but also because, as a signatory to the Charter of the United Nations, it is obligated to bring about self-determination based on universal suffrage in the colony of Southern Rhodesia.

12. We in Zambia are not at all happy about Britain's beggar-my-neighbour attitude towards Mr. Smith's Government. It is quite obvious to everyone that ultimate constitutional responsibility in that colony rests with the British Government, which will be held answerable for anything that may happen to the people of Southern Rhodesia. We view with dismay statements made by the British Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, during his recent visit to West Africa, that the Africans of Southern Rhodesia are not ripe for self-rule and that, in the event of a unilateral declaration of independence, the United Kingdom would never undertake military intervention as a counter-measure because Rhodesia is too strong militarily.

13. The first argument is one which has been harped on in every colonial territory, prior to independence, and we can dismiss it as a sheer gimmick. The second is more than a confession on the part of the United Kingdom. We believe that the United Kingdom is deliberately washing its hands of the Rhodesian problem, giving free rein to the white minority government to achieve its objectives by illegal means.

14. Our opposition to the granting of independence to the minority group in Southern Rhodesia stems from humanitarian considerations. History clearly shows that once a minority group is granted independence

it resorts to oppressive rule calculated to protect its own interests, to the detriment of those of the majority. The minority becomes corrupt and spiritually deformed; and this leads to an explosive revolt by the oppressed masses. Granting independence to a minority group thus is equivalent to planting a time bomb. The explosive eventuality must be prevented. This can be effectively done by granting majority rule. It is for this reason also that we warn the United Kingdom not to grant independence to the minority group in Southern Rhodesia. Africa will be free anyway.

15. The existence of apartheid in South Africa poses a major threat to international peace and security. The Government of South Africa has continued to flout international opinion with impunity and has embarked on a course of suppression and enslavement of the indigenous people. That country has not heeded the appeals of the United Nations to abandon its dangerous policies of apartheid. It has even extended its oppressive policies to South West Africa, despite the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice that it, acting alone, cannot change the international status of South West Africa. Even as I am speaking now it is busy building a military base in the Caprivi Strip, which is an international territory, at a point dangerously close to Zambia. South Africa may argue that this base is for commercial purposes. But we know the full facts behind this project.

16. Now I should like to turn to the question of Chinese representation in the United Nations. Zambia stands by its plea that that country should be seated in the United Nations. Apart from China's large population, we feel that certain issues that rend the Eastern Hemisphere and threaten international peace and security could be effectively and speedily settled with China's presence in the United Nations. China has been excluded from the United Nations, ostracized from this international community; it feels frustrated and annoyed. Because of this, it is likely to behave in a way calculated to draw the attention of the world to the fact that it is a Power to reckon with. Is this not human nature? We must have foresight. China has already made its own atomic bomb. Its exclusion from the United Nations will turn it into a powerful antagonist of the United Nations. We have seen the behaviour of China outside the United Nations. Let us now bring it into our fold and watch its behaviour as a Member of the United Nations. Let us, I beg you, forget China's past history and look to the future. In order to achieve the principle of universality in the membership of the United Nations, Zambia believes that all independent States should be admitted to this Organization. We feel strongly that unless this is done, the United Nations will remain defective as an institution for achieving international peace and security.

17. The armed conflict in Asia is fraught with dangers which might lead to global war. Zambia believes that the fighting in Viet-Nam should be stopped to prevent further loss of innocent lives. A negotiated settlement of that conflict is likely to bear more fruitful results than will a military solution.

^{3/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twentieth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1965, document S/6344.

18. Zambia joins other States in welcoming the cease-fire in Kashmir as demanded by the Security Council. This cease-fire should be followed by a negotiated settlement of the dispute without delay so as to achieve a more lasting peace between the two great nations of India and Pakistan. We should like to pay tribute to these countries for accepting Security Council resolution 211 (1965) calling for a halt to hostilities. We wish also to convey our gratitude to the Secretary-General, U Thant, for the leading role he played in bringing about the cease-fire.

19. Let me now turn to the vexing question of disarmament. We believe—and I am sure most of us here do believe—that man, of whatever social system, race or religion, is the centre of world history—and not his spear, or his guns, or his nuclear bombs. Our duty, therefore, is to man and society and we should spare no effort or time in endeavouring to achieve general and complete disarmament. Zambia does not believe in lip-service on an important issue like this one. We believe in action—and quick action, too. For this reason we did not hesitate to sign the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty.^{4/} Zambia actively co-sponsored the Disarmament Commission resolution reaffirming the call of the General Assembly to all States to become parties to the partial nuclear test-ban Treaty^{5/} and to consider as a matter of priority the question of extending the scope of the partial test-ban Treaty to cover underground tests. Zambia also believes it is a matter of urgency that the United Nations should consider the question of a treaty or convention to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. To this end we have co-sponsored the inclusion on the current agenda of the General Assembly session of an item entitled: Declaration on the denuclearization of Africa, as we wish our continent to be free of nuclear weapons. We would like to see the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee continue its efforts to develop a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control and consider all proposals for measures to relax international tension and halt and reverse the arms race. We are interested in seeing a substantial part of the resources released by the reduction of military expenditures converted to programmes of economic and social development of the developing countries.

20. Much as we appreciate the fact that the question of disarmament is highly technical, Zambia nevertheless believes that the efforts of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee should be further aided by a world disarmament conference to which all countries would be invited. Such a conference, as conceived by the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in October 1964, would provide powerful support to the efforts which are being made to set in motion the process of disarmament by formulating proposals and guidelines with a view to speeding up general and complete disarmament. Zambia was happy to be one of the co-sponsors of the Disarmament Commission resolution calling for a world disarmament conference,^{6/} because

^{4/} Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (Moscow, 5 August 1963).

^{5/} See Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/225.

^{6/} *Ibid.*, document DC/224.

we firmly believe that the question of disarmament should be tackled on a global scale, embracing both the States Members of the United Nations and non-members of this international body.

21. One of the causes of international tension is the existence of military bases on foreign soil. Zambia advocates the liquidation of all military bases imposed on foreign territories as a means of foreign domination. However, we make a distinction between military bases imposed on foreign territories and those established and maintained through bilateral agreements which purport to ensure and safeguard the territorial integrity of the countries accommodating them.

22. We, as a non-aligned nation, feel in duty bound to contribute whatever little we have towards complete disarmament. We do not want to see the "cold war" between East and West develop into a "hot war". Indeed, pacification in this vale of tears seems to be the role to which all non-aligned countries are assigned. At this juncture, I feel I should pay tribute to our non-aligned sister nations for the relentlessness with which they have pursued this goal. We are well aware that some people in the West as well as in the East look upon our policy of non-alignment as a compound of political fickleness, ideological impotence and economic beggarliness. They are, with amazing irregularity, continually labelling us "pro-West" or "pro-East". But they will realize sooner or later that we are none of these things. Our policy is not an improvisation in a pit of indecision; it is not a policy of appeasement between the East and the West; it is not symptomatic of any political or ideological sterility. It is a dynamic policy, self-contained, by which we are determined to examine every world issue on its own merits; to criticize or support anyone from the East or the West as a particular situation warrants. We refuse to be slaves to such intransigent ideologies as those of the East and the West. We are realists, not idealists; we are adaptable and not grasshopper minded. Our policy is not isolationist, for isolationism in this brutal world is not only impracticable but dangerous. We do not fear being involved in world affairs. In fact we make it a point that we are worthily involved on our terms but not at the will of other Powers. We, the non-aligned, may be accused of forming a third Power bloc and thereby defeating our own policy of non-alignment. But let me point out that we are not a Power bloc; we are just a moral force dedicated to infuse humane sanity into this callous world of bigotry.

23. I should like to end with an observation on the United Nations. We may seem obsessed with concern for the Organization's future. Well, this is because Zambia sees it as a saviour of mankind from growing international anarchy, and so we are resigned to its continued existence. Despite its shortcomings, this Organization is of paramount importance to us all. We can count among its recent achievements the establishment of the United Nations Trade and Development Board and the conclusion of a Convention on Transit Trade of Land-Locked Countries, of which my country is one. The record of the Economic and Social Council is quite im-

pressive as a shining example of fruitful international co-operation dedicated to raising the living standards of our people.

24. However, we all saw during the nineteenth session of the General Assembly, how this world body ground to a jerky halt, because of conflicting views among its Members regarding the interpretation of some provisions of the Charter. That the Organization was more and more becoming an arena of the East-West "cold war" is obvious enough; but we believe that there was something more to the deadlock. There was a constitutional hitch which suggested that the Charter should be reviewed if the machinery is to run more smoothly. Whilst we accept the principle that the functions of the Security Council and the General Assembly are to be regarded as complementary rather than contradictory, we feel that the respective areas of operation must be more clearly defined. It is with this in view that we suggest that matters of paramount importance to international peace and security and those pertaining to peace-keeping should be referred by the Security Council to the General Assembly for ratification by a two-thirds majority.

25. We should also like to see a permanent fund established for peace-keeping operations, to which all Member States would be required to subscribe annually, for we feel very strongly that the present system of *ad hoc* assessments and voluntary contributions made in leap-frog fashion is highly unsatisfactory.

26. Finally, Zambia feels as much as other Member States that Article 19 of the United Nations Charter is very important and necessary too; but we feel that the last sentence in the Article is of so wide an import that it is capable of diverse interpretations, leaving loop-holes for defaulting in the payment of assessments. Our view is that specifications should be inserted in Article 19 to prevent such situations from arising; for this noble body must be preserved and strengthened at all costs.

27. You may remember that, last year, the President of the Republic of Zambia made public his Government's intention to make a voluntary contribution to relieve the financial difficulties of the United Nations. It is my honour to announce in the name of the President, Government and people of Zambia that we have now decided to make a voluntary contribution, from our meagre resources, amounting to \$14,000. We hope that this small sum will contribute to the welfare of the United Nations, the principles and purposes of which we all cherish.

28. Mr. KARJALAINEN (Finland): Mr. President, permit me, on behalf of the Government of Finland and on my own behalf, to extend to you the most cordial congratulations on your election to your high office. We are particularly pleased that this year, when the world looks to the General Assembly with such great expectations, we should have as our President a distinguished and experienced statesman from a country which has made a great contribution to the work of the United Nations and international co-operation in general, a country with which Finland has always had the friendliest relations.

29. The resumption of the work of the General Assembly in a normal manner has been generally greeted with a sense of relief. It is true that we have not yet been able to find a solution to the issues of principle which were the cause of the paralysis of the last session. But the will to preserve and strengthen our Organization, which was created for the furtherance of peaceful relations among States and the development of international co-operation, has prevailed over these differences. This should give cause for general satisfaction.

30. Today there is indeed need for faith in the United Nations and for determination to work for it. The use of violence and force in international relations has increased in recent times. This has caused deep concern and anxiety all over the world. It is a direct challenge to the fundamental values of international relations which this Organization stands for and which we all have undertaken to respect. Foremost among these is the principle that disputes among States must be settled in a peaceful way and that nations, regardless of ideological and other differences, must live in peace as good neighbours.

31. The ability of the United Nations to face the challenge of violent events depends on the Member States themselves. As our distinguished Secretary-General has often pointed out, the United Nations is as strong as the Member States are willing to make it. The United Nations is available to its Members as an instrument for negotiation, conciliation and co-operation, and, in the last resort, as an instrument for keeping the peace. The Member States themselves must decide to what extent and in what manner they wish to make use of it.

32. An encouraging example of what the United Nations can do for the maintenance of peace is that a cease-fire between India and Pakistan has been reached through the efforts of the Security Council and the Secretary-General. The intervention of the United Nations in this conflict proved to be successful primarily because the Security Council was able to agree on the steps needed to restore peace. This has strengthened our confidence in the usefulness of the United Nations as a peace-keeping instrument as well as in the will and readiness of the members of the Council to take joint action to protect the world from the dangers of expanding conflicts. We are all aware, however, that in order to achieve a lasting peace and create good-neighbourly relations between these two countries it is necessary to tackle the underlying political problems. As important as it is to stop violence, the intervention of the United Nations must not be limited to insulating the political problem in question. This applies also to the problem of Cyprus. United Nations action in Cyprus has been successful in the sense that it has stopped the bloodshed. But we must emphasize the need for a solution of the political problem as well. A continued postponement of the political solution cannot but cause difficulties for all countries concerned, even for those which have voluntarily placed troops at the disposal of the United Nations.

33. The Government of Finland has repeatedly proved its readiness to assist the United Nations in its

peace-keeping activities through financial assistance—of which the voluntary contribution pledged by my Government in response to the Secretary-General's appeal is the most recent example—as well as by placing military forces at the disposal of the United Nations. At present there are 1,000 Finnish soldiers serving with the United Nations Force in Cyprus. Finnish officers are with the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan, and, in response to the Secretary-General's appeal, Finland has agreed to participate in the strengthening of this Group. Finland has also, along with the other Nordic countries, established a stand-by force, which the Government can, at short notice, put at the disposal of the United Nations for peace-keeping operations.

34. It is obvious that a neutral country like Finland, which wishes to uphold friendly relations with all nations and to stay outside conflicts between great Powers, considers it essential for the continued success of the United Nations peace-keeping activities that wide agreement be reached among the Member States on the principles and procedures to be followed in carrying out such operations. In view of the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, agreement among the permanent members of the Council is naturally of decisive importance. At the same time, it is important that these activities enjoy the support and the co-operation of other Member States. So long as there is ambiguity and uncertainty about these vital questions within the United Nations, the Organization cannot effectively fulfil its peace-keeping function. One of the most important tasks for this Assembly, therefore, in our view, is to continue negotiations, on the basis of the guidelines submitted by the President of the nineteenth session and the Secretary-General, with a view to reaching agreement on generally acceptable arrangements to be followed in the carrying-out and the financing of peace-keeping operations.

35. At the same time, I do agree with the opinion expressed in their report, that the debate on these questions seems to some extent purely academic. In spite of unresolved legal and other differences, the United Nations has been able to carry out its peace-keeping task in, for instance, Cyprus and Suez. In this dynamic world we cannot, and indeed we would be ill-advised, to attempt to draw up firm and detailed plans for every conceivable situation. Instead of increasing the effectiveness of the Organization, we would only impose restrictions upon ourselves. A pragmatic approach to the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations would, it seems, best serve to improve its capacity to act.

36. In this connexion, I should like to take the opportunity of joining, in the name of the Finnish Government, in the expressions of appreciation and esteem which have been addressed to our Secretary-General. The consistent, courageous and unselfish manner in which he has worked to solve the internal difficulties of the United Nations, and for the cause of world peace and international co-operation, has significantly strengthened not only his personal prestige, but also that of the Organization as a whole.

The personal role of the Secretary-General as a conciliator and mediator is a valuable part of the United Nations peace-keeping machinery. But as he himself has recently stated, the United Nations, in order truly to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends, ought to be a universal organization. As an instrument for international negotiations and co-operation, the United Nations can be effective only if it is available to all States. Otherwise the Organization might find itself dangerously by-passed by events.

37. That has been the case not only with regard to the tragic events that have taken place in South East Asia but also in regard to disarmament. There is not much hope of general and complete disarmament so long as two great Powers, both possessing nuclear arms, are not taking part in the deliberations of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee. However, this does not permit others to give up their efforts. Finland was among the countries which, during the session of the Disarmament Commission last spring, recommended that the work of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee be continued. We appreciate the fact that the Committee did meet again. The continuance of the work of the Committee constitutes in itself an important factor in the international situation even though no concrete results have been achieved at this stage. It is obvious, however, that if we do not soon find a way out of the present vicious circle in disarmament negotiations, we may well lose our last chance of halting the spread of nuclear weapons. This danger is indeed one of the central problems of our time. If, in addition to the Powers that presently possess nuclear weapons, even one more nation acquires, or can be regarded as having acquired, nuclear weapons, or indirectly achieves the status of a nuclear Power, then it will probably be too late to try to stop the further proliferation of these weapons.

38. An effective treaty to halt the proliferation of nuclear arms is no doubt a complex matter. But while we should strive with all means at our disposal towards this goal, we should, as a first step, without waiting for a total solution of the problem, without further delay, extend the ban on nuclear tests to cover underground tests. A speedy agreement on a complete test ban would in itself be extremely valuable, and it would no doubt have a positive effect on the international atmosphere. It would strengthen our confidence in the possibility of achieving progress in the field of disarmament and generally in maintaining peace.

39. In the field of international economic co-operation, the unanimous decision of the last session of the General Assembly [resolution 1995 (XIX)] to establish the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development as a permanent organ of the Assembly was undoubtedly of historic importance. We have now succeeded in establishing the necessary administrative framework for this new organ. It is obvious, however, that the economic development of the less-developed world and the related problems in world trade depend ultimately on the will of Member States to achieve positive results. Finland, for her part, is ready to do her share in this common endeavour.

40. It would be unrealistic not to recognize the difficulties that lie ahead. In searching for solutions we should above all try to avoid generalizations. We should, as objectively and realistically as possible, try to estimate the practical possibilities that each individual country possesses to contribute to the solution of the problems. We ought to bear in mind that not only among the developing countries but among the industrialized countries as well, marked variations exist in the degree and pattern of economic development. I should, in this connexion, like to mention that we have in Finland initiated a serious study of our possibilities of contributing towards the attainment of the objectives set forth for the Conference on Trade and Development. In this work we are closely co-operating with the other Nordic countries. Shortly after the conclusion of the first Trade Conference, an inter-Nordic working group was established. The group has since met regularly with a view to enabling the Nordic countries jointly to offer a constructive contribution towards the solving of the trade and development problems of the developing countries. This Nordic co-operation has already led to concrete results. For instance, a joint Nordic proposal for a more rapid reduction of tariffs on tropical products has been submitted to GATT. The Nordic countries have also jointly undertaken assistance projects in some developing countries and plans for enlarging this kind of technical co-operation are presently being studied.

41. The Finnish Government has for several consecutive years increased its contributions to the United Nations technical assistance programmes. Also this year, we propose substantially to increase our contributions.

42. In spite of the efforts of many countries, we are, however, still far from the goals we have set for ourselves in our efforts to assist the developing countries. The information available to us indicates that in spite of the efforts of the United Nations and its Member States the gap in the economic development of the industrialized and the developing countries is increasing rather than decreasing. A cause for special concern is the food situation in the world. It is still very serious; in fact, in many parts of the world it is worse than a decade ago. In the long run these problems may pose a much more serious threat to humanity than some occasional, limited political disputes in different parts of the world. If we are not able to find more effective solutions than hitherto to these development problems, then progress in other fields may well be endangered.

43. Mr. SHIINA (Japan): ^{Z/} Mr. President, on behalf of the delegation of Japan, may I express to you our warm congratulations on your election as President of the twentieth session of the General Assembly. I am confident that, with your wisdom and wealth of experience in the field of international diplomacy, you will successfully lead us to many significant accomplishments during this important session.

44. I wish also at this time to express our profound thanks and appreciation to our former President,

^{Z/} Mr. Shiina spoke in Japanese. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

Mr. Alex Quaison-Sackey, the Foreign Minister of Ghana. Elected President of the nineteenth session at a moment of great crisis in the United Nations, Mr. Quaison-Sackey fulfilled his heavy responsibilities with great tact and efficiency. It is in large measure due to his devoted efforts that we have been able to make substantial progress towards a solution of the problems that have beset us.

45. I wish also to take this opportunity to pay tribute to U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, who has demonstrated rare qualities of leadership and ability to enhance the prestige of his office and, through it, of the United Nations. He has achieved many laudable things during the most difficult days of our Organization, and we have high hopes for his future achievements, especially during this period when the peace of Asia is so greatly disturbed.

46. It gives me great pleasure to welcome the Gambia, Singapore and the Maldiv Islands to our midst and I wish to offer our warm congratulations to the delegations of these countries. We look forward to working closely with them in our common task of maintaining world peace in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

47. The United Nations is the world's temple of peace, created in the terrible ravages of war, and its foundation is the desire of mankind to seek justice and peace. As this twentieth session of the General Assembly gets under way, we must renew our determination to safeguard this world Organization from whatever storms and tempests might strike it in the future.

48. The nineteenth session of the General Assembly, deadlocked by conflicting positions on the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter, and prevented from discussing a number of important problems, was a disappointing session. It has also been a matter of grave concern to us that, since last year, certain States have been levelling unwarranted criticisms against this Organization. Yet the deadlock of the General Assembly did not altogether paralyse the functions and activities of the various other organs of the United Nations. On the contrary, these organs have been well able to carry on their proper functions. With regard to the criticism of the United Nations, which I just mentioned, we should note that only a handful of States are indulging in this activity and that their charges are clearly unjustified and unjustifiable.

49. I believe that all Member States continue to place their utmost confidence and hope in the United Nations. How, let us ask ourselves, would it have been possible to resolve the conflict over the question of the applicability of Article 19 of the Charter and to restore the General Assembly to normalcy in spite of differences in the basic positions of various parties, had it not been for such confidence and hope? How would it have been possible for the amendments to the Charter on enlargement of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council to enter into effect within such a short time, with ratification by so great a number of Member States?

50. My Government, inspired by feelings of confidence and hope in the United Nations, as manifested

by the peoples of all Member States, including my own, has renewed its determination to exert its utmost efforts towards maintaining this Organization and further strengthening its functions. Now that the long-standing, legitimate aspirations of the Afro-Asian countries for enlargement of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council have been fulfilled, we are fully aware that a greater responsibility devolves upon us, the countries of Africa and Asia. Bearing this in mind, we are determined to spare no effort in furthering co-operation towards achieving the objectives of the United Nations.

51. With regard to the pressing financial situation of the United Nations, the Member States have agreed to solve the present difficulties by means of voluntary contributions of all the Member States. Behind this agreement there exists, I believe, a strong awareness among the Members that this Organization is vested with the highest authority to deal with the problems of international peace and security, and that it must not, therefore, be left in a situation where it is unable adequately to carry out its functions. I am convinced that these financial difficulties of the Organization should be solved through the co-operative efforts of the entire membership. On such conviction and as an evidence of the desire to strengthen the United Nations, Japan is prepared to make a voluntary contribution towards helping to relieve the financial difficulties of the United Nations in the amount which it deems would be an appropriate and equitable share of the responsibilities.

52. Since last year, we have been discussing the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations, and running through all of our discussions there are indications of the existence, among almost all the Member States of a common appreciation of the role played by the United Nations in times of grave world crisis and various local disputes. These Members remain profoundly hopeful that the Organization will continue to fulfil this vital function for the purpose of maintaining world peace in the future and they are quite determined to make further devoted efforts in that direction. Such determination and such efforts by every Member State constitute the very motivating power that opens up the way toward a brighter future for the United Nations. In this belief, Japan is willing and prepared to further its co-operation with and try to make greater contributions to the United Nations peace-keeping operation in as many aspects as possible.

53. The United Nations, having celebrated the twentieth anniversary of its birth, is entering a new stage. Being thus at an important moment in its history, I think it is very useful to discuss the future of this Organization. One of the most important tasks assigned to us is to enable the United Nations to carry on effective peace-keeping operation on a healthy and solid financial basis. I would therefore like to touch upon these questions and express the basic views of my delegation.

54. It goes without saying that the Security Council is the organ primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is regrettable, however, that on occasion, in the past, this principal organ of the United Nations, because of a lack of

unanimity among its five permanent members, was unable to fulfil this responsibility. It is necessary at this time, therefore, when the strengthening of the peace-keeping functions of the Organization is one of the most urgent needs of the day, that the newly expanded Security Council should devote its most serious efforts to ensuring that it can carry out its duties.

55. If the Security Council fails in performing its responsibilities and we can do nothing but helplessly watch the development of a situation, then the United Nations can never fulfil its tasks as an Organization responsible for the maintenance of international peace.

56. In such circumstances in the past, peace-keeping operations were carried out by the General Assembly, and I believe that in the future, too, the General Assembly should discuss the matter immediately, in virtue of its functions and competence under the Charter, and offer such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

57. In so far as concerns the financing of future peace-keeping operations, we consider that the principle of collective financial responsibility, as well as the General Assembly's competence in the matter of assessment of expenses should be maintained except in cases of voluntary contributions or special arrangements among the parties directly involved. Believing as I do that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, established under General Assembly resolution 2006 (XIX), has done a great deal to overcome the difficulties prevailing in the Organization in the past few years and to make possible the return to normal conditions of the General Assembly, I think it advisable that the General Assembly at the present session should direct the Special Committee to continue to study the various questions touching on future peace-keeping operations, including the financial aspects of those questions, and to report to the General Assembly at the earliest possible opportunity.

58. I should like to suggest that further study be undertaken of the various ways and means for the peaceful settlement of disputes such as are closely related to the question of United Nations peace-keeping operations. As one of the methods for the pacific settlement of disputes, one might consider whether the United Nations should not have an effective and authoritative presence permanently stationed in every part of the world.

59. In the economic field, there already exist several regional economic commissions with permanent secretariats. They are playing a valuable role by providing regularly a detailed and accurate analysis of the economic situation of each geographical region and by facilitating contacts and relationships regarding economic matters between the United Nations and various regional groups. In the political field, however, we have nothing comparable so far, except a few temporary or ad hoc bodies.

60. I think, therefore, that in the vital field of peace-keeping the presence of our Organization in various parts of the world might be established through the stationing, for example, of representatives

of the Secretary-General in various key centres. It would naturally be desirable if such representatives of the highest executive office of the Organization were posted permanently in the various geographical regions. If that were not feasible, roving institutions of some form or other might also serve the purpose. It goes without saying that the activities of such representatives or institutions to ensure the United Nations presence in the world would be limited to the extent of the authority conferred upon the Secretary-General by the Charter. It is conceivable, however, that certain peace-keeping activities, such as inquiry or fact-finding in a given situation or dispute, might be conferred upon such representatives or institutions by request either of the Security Council or the General Assembly.

61. As a means of facilitating the composition and sending out of fact-finding missions or conciliation committees, I should like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation created by General Assembly resolution 268D (III) of 28 April 1949. By this resolution, each Member State is invited to designate persons who are deemed to be well fitted to serve as members of such a panel, and who would be disposed to serve in that capacity, so that the Secretary-General might always have easy access to the list of such persons. It appears that this panel has thus far not been very well employed, but it would greatly contribute to the strengthening of the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations if Member States were to try to make use of this panel. It would also be useful to make a thorough study of the reasons, if any, why this institution has not in the past been very active and to consider whether it might be improved.

62. When we review the world situation today, it is gratifying to observe that a certain amount of dialogue and mutual understanding, pointing toward the relaxation of tensions, is developing between the United States and the USSR, and that efforts for peaceful co-existence are gradually bearing positive fruits. To these efforts due credit should be given. However, as the threat of global war recedes, local disputes seem to arise in various parts of the world. Asia is now plagued by conflict—in Viet-Nam, over Kashmir and around Malaysia—and fighting still continues in that region. Priceless human lives and wealth so dearly needed for the building up of Asia are being dissipated in these conflicts—conflicts among brethren, among Asian countries themselves.

63. If all countries, in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, would resolve to settle their disputes by peaceful means and refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force, the peace of the world would be established.

64. Since Japan joined the United Nations, it has been our basic foreign policy to strengthen this Organization, pledging consistently our fullest support and co-operation. As an Asian Member, we are determined to do our utmost to contribute to the maintenance of peace in Asia and in the world. Japan's candidature for election, during this session of the General Assembly, to the seat of a non-

permanent member of the Security Council bespeaks our earnest desire to serve the cause of peace.

65. The conflict in Viet-Nam has become increasingly serious during the past year. My Government seeks a peaceful settlement of this conflict. Undoubtedly, the situation is highly complex. We are fully aware that there are great difficulties in the way of a peaceful solution, for there are great gaps between the parties involved and heavy fighting is going on between them. But peaceful solutions have to be found, no matter how difficult the task, and it is our earnest hope that the problem will be solved through discussions in the interest of peace in Asia and the lessening of tension in the world.

66. However, neither the call by the non-aligned nations for negotiations without any pre-conditions, nor the United States proposal for unconditional discussions, nor the proposal for the dispatch of a British Commonwealth mission, has met a favourable response from North Viet-Nam.

67. At this point, let me briefly recount the position taken by both parties on the conditions for peace. The United States is not opposed to discussing the four conditions put forward by North Viet-Nam, nor is it opposed to the Viet-Nameese people's deciding their own future through free elections. The United States has also made clear its intention of ultimately withdrawing its forces now engaged in assisting in the defence of South Viet-Nam. North Viet-Nam, on the other hand, has not shown any desire to come forward to talk, but on the contrary seems to be bent on demanding the immediate withdrawal of United States forces, believing that it can win the war in Viet-Nam and unilaterally force its conditions upon others.

68. I believe that if the Communist side changes its attitude and, in a spirit of compromise, responds to the proposals for entering into unconditional discussions there will emerge a good opportunity to restore peace in Viet-Nam. In this connexion, I strongly urge all parties concerned to commit themselves to a policy of resolving the conflict through discussion and to enter into discussions with minimum delay in order to attain a peaceful solution of the conflict. At the same time, I call upon all States Members of the United Nations to assist and cooperate towards achieving this objective.

69. Today the call for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Viet-Nam is heard all over the world. My delegation wishes earnestly and hopefully that the present session will exert its influence towards the early solution of the Viet-Nameese conflict. Japan, for its part, will spare no effort towards this end.

70. The recent outbreak of a major armed conflict between India and Pakistan over the question of Kashmir was a matter of deep regret to us. Having friendly relations with both countries and being ourselves an Asian nation, Japan was agonized by the development and our Prime Minister, Mr. Sato, lost no time in appealing to the leaders of the two countries to cease fighting without delay.

71. It was most fortunate that the leaders of India and Pakistan listened to the world's opinion as re-

flected in the resolutions of the Security Council and with wisdom and courage reached a statesman-like decision to adhere to the appeal for a cease-fire.

72. I wish, at this time, to pay my deep respect not only to the leaders of India and Pakistan, but also to the Security Council and to the Secretary-General for their unceasing and dedicated efforts to halt the hostilities. Such efforts as these contribute greatly to enhancing the prestige and function of the United Nations, in whose hands rests the responsibility for the maintenance of international peace.

73. However, it is a matter of deep regret that, according to the reports of the Secretary-General on the observance of the cease-fire, the situation in the troubled area is showing signs of deterioration and the cease-fire has not as yet been fully carried out.

74. The dispute between India and Pakistan has a long and complicated history, and each country may have its own reasons for the position which it is taking. But however that may be, I appeal to them both to co-operate, with courage and in good faith, by carrying out the cease-fire, and implementing the resolutions recently adopted by the Security Council. I also ask them to make a just appraisal of the efforts which the United Nations has made in their dispute in the past and to make every possible effort towards a final and peaceful settlement in co-operation with this Organization. With full appreciation of the delicate nature of the situation still existing, all States should strictly refrain from any act which in any way might aggravate it.

75. As to the dispute between Indonesia and Malaysia, there seems as yet no early prospect of a peaceful settlement. We view with regret the withdrawal of Indonesia from the United Nations early this year. During the past year, we have on various occasions extended every possible indirect assistance to find a peaceful solution of the issue between Indonesia and Malaysia, both of which are our friendly neighbours. While we hope that the countries concerned will exert their best efforts for a peaceful settlement, our Government stands ready to continue its co-operation and will spare no effort to find a just and equitable solution of the problem.

76. As I said at the nineteenth session [1290th meeting], there is no doubt that the question of China occupies a very important place in the consideration of the Asian situation. Japan, having close geographical, historical and cultural ties with China, must always be deeply concerned with the development of the China question.

77. It is because we believe that this question is one of great complexity and has far-reaching implications in the context of peace in Asia, that Japan has hitherto asserted and again asserts that it requires very careful deliberation, based on a realistic and balanced appraisal of all the factors involved. In view of the fact that the question of Chinese representation is an important one which touches the very core of the China question, I wish again to urge the General Assembly to maintain the same prudent attitude that it has taken at previous sessions in dealing with this question.

78. An indispensable requisite for the realization of lasting peace and prosperity in the world is that the developing countries be helped to overcome their economic stagnation and promote their development. The solution of the so-called "North-South problem" is thus among our most important tasks from the standpoint of strengthening the fabric of world peace.

79. It is gratifying that the United Nations, by designating the 1960's as the United Nations Development Decade, decided to enlist the co-operation of all Member States towards the solution of the problem of a world-wide scale, and that various measures have already been put into effect in such areas as industrial development and international trade. In particular, a good and encouraging sign in this respect is the fact that various organs of the Conference on Trade and Development, established by resolution 1995 (XIX) of the General Assembly last year, have begun operating in a steady manner. As we are now entering the last half of the United Nations Development Decade, Japan earnestly hopes and is confident that the United Nations, being regarded always as the centre of concerted action, not only by the various organs associated with it but also by the Member States, will continue to play a positive role towards the attainment of its objectives.

80. As a nation which for nearly a century has trodden the thorny path of economic development, Japan cannot but have full and sympathetic regard for the aspirations of the developing countries and the various difficulties which confront them. We shall not spare any effort within our power to co-operate with the developing countries in helping them to expand and diversify their exports. Japan is taking fully into consideration the international demand for increased foreign aid, as evidenced at the first meeting of the Conference on Trade and Development, and is determined to continue to intensify its efforts with 1 per cent of our national income as an aid target. It is along these lines that we hope and intend to play a constructive role in pursuing the objectives of the Development Decade.

81. I should like to say a word or two in particular about the economic development of Asia. We greatly appreciate and highly commend the achievements of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. The scheme for the establishment of an Asian Development Bank, which has been actively promoted by the Commission, is an outstanding example. Japan has lent active co-operation to this project from the very start and intends to make a contribution amounting to \$200 million to the capital of this bank. As an Asian nation, Japan sincerely hopes and expects that the day will soon come when the Asian Development Bank will start its operations, thus making a valuable contribution towards the promotion of economic co-operation among Asian countries.

82. I should now like to touch upon the question of disarmament, a subject of deepest concern to everyone in our contemporary world.

83. In April this year, the United Nations Disarmament Commission convened at the initiative of the USSR, after lying dormant for five years, and came

up with recommendations which led to the resumption of the meetings of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee at Geneva after nearly a year's recess. This is a welcome and gratifying development.

84. As has been pointed out by the Disarmament Commission, the world's most urgent task is to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban and the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Coming at such a time, the second nuclear explosion by the People's Republic of China in its territory, in May, for the purpose of nuclear weapons development was a most regrettable occurrence. The leaders of that country would have had us believe by their statements at the time that the explosion was a great step forward towards the maintenance of international peace and security. On the contrary, one is constrained to say that such test explosions, carried out at the very moment when the world has been exerting all its possible efforts to achieve the total banning of nuclear tests and the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, cannot contribute in the least to the maintenance of the peace and security of the world. It is my earnest desire that the People's Republic of China, and France as well, will respond positively to the aspirations of the world's millions by adhering immediately to the partial test-ban Treaty.

85. The prohibition of nuclear weapons tests and the prevention of the proliferation of such weapons serve in common the purpose of restricting the development of the nuclear capabilities of States. When we take into account that any non-nuclear Power would have to conduct nuclear explosions to develop its own nuclear arsenal, the total prohibition of nuclear weapons tests would be one of the most effective means of achieving non-proliferation.

86. We are aware that the question of inspection and verification of underground tests constitutes, at present, a major obstacle to the conclusion by the nuclear Powers of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. It is said in this connexion that recent scientific developments in this field would make it possible to reduce the number of on-site inspections to a minimum. We sincerely hope that the nuclear Powers, by composing the remaining differences between their respective positions, may be able to agree promptly on the terms of a total test-ban treaty. It seems most desirable, in this connexion, that the nuclear Powers, and the non-nuclear Powers as well, which have a substantial amount of seismographic knowledge, should undertake a study of the development of methods of detection and inspection of underground testing. If such a study is undertaken, my country is prepared to co-operate fully with other countries.

87. Turning now to the question of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, we note that a draft treaty on preventing nuclear proliferation submitted by the United States^{8/} and a proposal on a unilateral declaration of non-acquisition of nuclear weapons made by Italy^{2/}—and this on your initiative, Mr. President—at the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee

have paved the way for a solution of this question. The proposals deserve serious study and we highly appreciate the efforts of these countries. It is the view of the Japanese Government that, when we aim at preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, we must at the same time take fully into account the security of each nation, and the nuclear and non-nuclear Powers should all equally share the sacrifices. Confronted with such a grave problem as this, self-restraint by countries with a potential nuclear weapons capability is most desirable, but we should, at the same time, listen to their voices with great respect and careful attention. Moreover, utmost efforts should be made to enable all nuclear Powers and non-nuclear Powers with nuclear potential to adhere to a treaty to be concluded on this subject.

88. The General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA], which has just concluded its ninth regular session in Tokyo, aims at, as one of its objectives, the wide application of international safeguards against the diversion of atomic energy from peaceful to military uses. In Japan, research and development in the field of atomic energy is confined by law to peaceful purposes only, and my Government has co-operated positively in the application of international safeguards. It is my earnest hope that all other countries that have not yet done so will likewise accept and adhere to some form of international safeguards.

89. As regards the question of convening a world disarmament conference, which is on the agenda of this session, the delegation of Japan supports, in principle, the convening of such a conference. However, if it is to achieve positive results, it is quite evident that we need the most careful examination of various aspects of the problem and adequate preparatory work. I therefore urge that all of us should, at this session, give deliberate and detailed consideration to this subject, including such points as categories of countries to be invited, the date when such a conference should be convened, and the agenda items to which special priority should be given.

90. Having attempted to explain the basic positions and desires of the Japanese delegation regarding various important questions which now confront the United Nations, with special reference to those concerning United Nations peace-keeping operations, the situation in Asia, the problem of economic development, disarmament and so forth, I should now like to conclude with a few general observations.

91. Given the current drift of the world towards multipolarization, the United Nations is, I believe, the only effective Organization that can unite the world. In the present-day world, in which a trip to the moon is no longer a romantic dream, all of us must rise above differences of nationality, race, language, and religion. We must unite and exert our utmost efforts in the cause of peace and for the prosperity and welfare of all mankind. The United Nations may have to go through many tests before it becomes a really effective Organization, competent to realize fully the lofty ideals of mankind set forth in the Charter. It is incumbent upon every Member State to support and help the United Nations in order to make it the Organization it was intended

^{8/} Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for January to December 1965, document DC/227, Annex I, section A.

^{2/} *Ibid.*, section D.

to be; it is more necessary than ever that every Member State should co-operate and endeavour to strengthen the United Nations.

92. Mr. President, I hope and trust that this Assembly under your leadership, will accomplish many fruitful results, and that it will contribute further to the strengthening of the United Nations, as well as to the peace, security and prosperity of the world. To that end my delegation pledges its diligent effort and co-operation.

93. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): Mr. President, I should first of all like to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the Assembly. We count it a good fortune of this Assembly to have your guidance. Your personal stature and renown and the fact that you represent a country with which Pakistan has friendly ties are a source of special gratification to us.

94. The outstanding development of the present century is the emergence of the peoples of Africa and Asia from an era of colonial domination. There are no two opinions about the need for completing this process of emancipation by liquidating the remaining vestiges of colonial rule wherever they might still exist.

95. The question that the world community has to face is how to reinforce the principle of equality and the recognition of diversity in the attitudes of Member States. A progressive equilibrium needs to be established between norms of international conduct and the need to accommodate maximum diversity. The physical and human realities of Asia and Africa make it imperative that unity should be sought through diversity. The need for tranquillity is paramount for the countries of Asia and Africa to enable them to secure for themselves an orderly transition. They must be free to reach their own equilibrium and find their own levels. They must be assisted in a constructive manner to consolidate their political independence through economic and social emancipation. The international community should be mindful of its responsibilities. It should recognize that it is no longer possible to think in terms of spheres of influence. The dynamics of the present world situation are such that classification in terms of exclusive influence becomes futile. Events tend to bring about rapid shifts of gravity. Realities transcend political alignments and groupings.

96. While promoting the growth of the African-Asian personality, the peoples of Africa and Asia are mindful not only of their own needs. They are also anxious to avoid the conflict and strife which could neutralize their national efforts, increase global tensions and jeopardize the very purpose and justification for the momentous changes that have taken place in recent times. It is now that we need to make a determined effort to prevent developments from taking place which could lead to a confrontation between the resurgent forces of Africa and Asia on the one hand and the more powerful countries of the world on the other.

97. The countries of Africa and Asia met in Bandung over ten years ago.^{10/} On that historic occasion they

demonstrated their collective desire to establish norms of co-operation and international conduct which have been acclaimed throughout the world. The Bandung principles represent a landmark in the evolution of an orderly international society. The concept of African-Asian solidarity is not exclusive or parochial. Its objectives are humane. It is our profound belief that in attending to our fundamental needs we promote the cause of world peace and co-operation. We feel confident that our efforts will receive commendations and encouragement. The greater cohesion of Africa and Asia and their freedom from exploitation and domination will be a powerful insurance against future conflict.

98. No discussion of the scheme of things in Asia and Africa would be complete without a reference to the People's Republic of China. In fact, the lack of Chinese participation lends a distinct air of unreality to our deliberations even in this world Organization. In these crucial times, when developments are taking place which might well prove decisive to the entire future of humanity, it is highly regrettable that China has been excluded so far from the United Nations; but, if this exclusion continues, the United Nations will find itself powerless to apply itself effectively to international problems, particularly to those in Asia. At a time when the need for strengthening the United Nations is advocated, it is ironical that the one logical and most important step in that direction, namely the seating of the representative of the People's Republic of China in this Organization, has yet to be taken. Our experience in recent years has proved conclusively that the United Nations without the People's Republic of China is as incomplete as a triangle with two sides. Either the United Nations moves forward towards greater effectiveness or it is bound to be overtaken by events. If the world continues to stand by and allow this to take place, it will in fact be guilty of unpardonable shortsightedness.

99. The world has been deeply concerned over the conflict between India and my country. This has found expression in the statements of speakers in this debate. Though there might be a difference of emphasis in their statements, there are two thoughts that are common to them: first, sorrow at this conflict; second, the conviction that the cease-fire this time must lead to a final settlement of the grave political problem underlying the conflict, namely, the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which is in dispute. Pakistan shares both these feelings and this conviction.

100. The war with India is not of our seeking. It is a war of self-defence against an armed attack launched on our borders without warning on the morning of 6 September and aimed at the seizure of Lahore, our second largest city and the very heart of Pakistan. We are defending the integrity of our territory and the sanctity of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, which the Government of India has denied them, despite its promises and pledges to them, for the past eighteen long years. Those two principles are inseparable. We can no more surrender the one than forsake the other.

^{10/} Asian-African Conference, Bandung, 18-24 April 1955.

101. We find that impartial world opinion—the opinion that transcends the pressures and postures of power political—has awakened to the need for a just and final settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. Who except India could be so purblind as to deny that the problem of Jammu and Kashmir, the problem of the life and future of 5 million human beings, the problem that has twice led to war between India and Pakistan and that threatens the future of 600 million people, needs now to be settled on a just and permanent basis?

102. It is because the Kashmir dispute so clearly involves principles of the widest human scope that Governments and peoples everywhere have supported Pakistan in the crisis which we are facing today. I should like to take this opportunity, on behalf of my country and my people, to express in this forum our deep and heartfelt gratitude for the moral and material support extended to Pakistan by many countries of the world. I should like in particular to mention that in our hour of peril we were not forsaken by our brothers in Iran and Turkey; we were not forsaken by the great bloc of Arab countries, stretching from the great ocean of Asia and Africa to the Atlantic Ocean, to which Pakistan is linked, let me say, not merely by ties of religion and of common culture but by common adherence to the idea of justice and peace; and we were not forsaken by our great neighbour of the north, the People's Republic of China, which gave us full moral support and, rising high above ideological differences, upheld the cause of righteousness to condemn the war of aggression launched against us by India.

103. To the Government and people of Indonesia I should like to address a special word of thanks—that great nation of 100 million people unrepresented in this Assembly. From this rostrum permit me, on behalf of the Government and people of Pakistan, to pay a lasting tribute to the President of Indonesia, to the Government of Indonesia and to the great people of Indonesia, who gave us brave and unstinting support in our moment of need and crisis. The people of Pakistan shall not forget the many proofs of true friendship given by the Indonesian President. The bonds that bind our two peoples have been tempered by this crisis and have become stronger than steel.

104. These countries and peoples have given us their support because ours is not a local or a parochial cause. In supporting us, they support one of the main objectives of the United Nations: peace with justice. They uphold the principle that you cannot settle a problem pertaining to a people if you by-pass that people, ignore that people; and they affirm that in this post-colonial age we cannot sanction a new colonialism—that of India's domination in Jammu and Kashmir.

105. The attitude of these Governments is a proof that the old categories, the facile classifications, of the cold war are now obsolete. Some of these Governments are aligned, some are non-aligned. In both cases they have shown that, to them, the considerations of justice and fairness come before all other considerations.

106. Since the whole world has been concerned with the failure thus far to resolve the Jammu and Kashmir

dispute, I must refer to at least two or three basic issues involved in it. The first and the foremost is the right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The second issue is the sanctity of international agreements, especially those brought about by the United Nations itself. The third is the effectiveness of the United Nations in securing peaceful settlement of international disputes.

107. I need hardly emphasize that the principle of self-determination is an integral element of the international order embodied in the United Nations. Indeed, being older than the United Nations, it is basic to the political civilization which this Organization seeks to represent.

108. This principle was the basis of many territorial settlements achieved in Europe from the middle of the last century which have proved enduring. The emergence of Norway in 1905, and of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia after the First World War; the incorporation of Schleswig in Denmark and of the Saar in Germany—these are outstanding examples which attest to the universal recognition of the principle of self-determination.

109. It was against this background that the right of peoples to self-determination was proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter of 14 August 1941, the United Nations Declaration, signed in Washington on 1 January 1942, the Moscow Declaration of 30 October 1943, and the Cairo Declaration of 26 November 1943. This principle was finally embodied in Article 1, paragraph 2 of the Charter, which provides that one of the purposes of the United Nations is:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace".

110. The principle was also enshrined in Articles 55, 73 and 76 of the Charter. It was upheld in the Declaration of the Bandung Conference of 1955, in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and in the Declaration of the Second Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in 1964.

111. During the lifetime of the United Nations, the accession to independence of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria, as well as the emergence of a number of other African States, that are now respected Members of this Organization, from the status of Trust Territories was expressly based on the principle of self-determination, on ascertaining and respecting the wishes of the peoples involved.

112. The principle of self-determination was also at the root of the partition of the sub-continent and the emergence of India and Pakistan as separate sovereign States in August 1947. The same principle of self-determination was explicitly applied to those states the accession of which to India or to Pakistan was in dispute. Indeed, referring to the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru of India stated this clearly in a broadcast on 2 November 1947:

"And here let me make clear that it has been our policy all along that where there is a dispute

about the accession of a State to either Dominion, the decision must be made by the people of that State."

113. This principle was repeated by India's representative in the Security Council, in the course of a debate on the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, when he said:

"...when he"—the ruler of a small state—"takes one view and his people take another view, the wishes of the people have to be ascertained. When so ascertained, the Ruler has to take action in accordance with the verdict of the people. That is our position."^{11/}

This is also the position of Pakistan with regard to Jammu and Kashmir.

114. President Woodrow Wilson first enunciated this principle in his address before the League to Enforce Peace when he said: "We believe that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which it shall live". In a speech on 24 January 1918 he said that "self-determination is not a mere phrase; it is an imperative principle of action which statesmen will henceforth ignore at their peril".

115. That this principle has not been confined to one political system or philosophy is pointedly brought home to us by the first official pronouncement of the USSR Government after the Revolution of 1917, which was the Decree on Peace adopted by the All-Russian Convention of Soviets', Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies of 8 November 1917. This historic declaration demanded an immediate peace without forcible annexation and without indemnity, and defined as forcible annexation the retention by any State of any nation without the latter being given the right of free voting in the determination of the forms of its national existence "under the conditions of the complete removal of the armies of the annexing or the more powerful nation". This Decree was printed in *Izvestia* of 29 October and 9 November 1917.

116. More recently, the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, in its very first paragraph, stated: "...it is the inalienable right of all people to control their own destiny".

117. Still more recently, the Declaration of the Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo in 1964, stated:

"The Conference solemnly reaffirms the right of peoples to self-determination and to make their own destiny.

"It stresses that this right constitutes one of the essential principles of the United Nations Charter, that it was laid down also in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity, and that the Conferences of Bandung and Belgrade demanded that it should be respected, and in particular insisted that it should be effectively exercised.

"The Conference notes that this right is still violated or its exercise denied in many regions

of the world and results in a continued increase of tension and the extension of the areas of war.

"The Conference denounces the attitude of those Powers which oppose the exercise of the right of the peoples of self-determination.

"It condemns the use of force, and all forms of intimidation, interference and intervention which are aimed at preventing the exercise of this right."^{12/}

118. This Declaration also stated:

"The process of liberation is irresistible and irreversible. Colonized peoples may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial Powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations."^{13/}

119. Every word in these declarations, these expressions of the great forces of history, sanctions Pakistan's standpoint on Jammu and Kashmir. When we say that there cannot be any enduring settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir question without that settlement's being freely accepted by the people immediately concerned, we take our stand on the principles so clearly reaffirmed in the Declaration of the Cairo Conference and enshrined in the Charter of the Organization of African Unity.

120. When we insist that India cannot be allowed forcibly to annex Jammu and Kashmir, that the people of Jammu and Kashmir should be given the right of free voting to determine their accession to India or Pakistan, that this right can be exercised only when India's army is completely removed from Jammu and Kashmir, we follow exactly Lenin's Decree on Peace.

121. Is it imaginable that, on an issue of this nature Pakistan will compromise on the basic principle of self-determination and ever be a party to a settlement that negates or displaces it in any way? Is it reasonable that any responsible Power, having due regard to the basic norms of international life, will ever expect us to do so?

122. But despite the universal recognition of this principle, there are always some Powers that try, albeit vainly, to turn back the whole current of history. Human greed being what it is, we find colonial Powers—in Angola and Mozambique, in Southern Rhodesia and in South West Africa—denying a people their right to choose their own destiny as India denies it to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The technique employed by this small but assorted company is one and the same. It is not to question the principle as such, but to assert that it does not apply to the case involved. The excuse is always available to them that the colony is an integral part of their metropolitan territory, or that they are building multi-racial and multi-religious societies and, if they permit the self-determination of one group or area, their whole State may disintegrate. In pleading this excuse, they try to exploit the fear of dismemberment among many sovereign States.

^{11/} See *Official Records of the Security Council*, Third Year, Nos. 36-51, 264th meeting, p. 50.

^{12/} Document A/5763, section II.

^{13/} *Ibid.*, section I.

123. That this plea is specious and is meant only to delude the world is apparent to anyone who is acquainted with the history of modern colonialism and the struggle for emancipation of subjugated peoples.

124. Indian leaders argue that self-determination is a disruptive principle which will lead to the dismemberment of States in Africa and Asia. They assert that the survival of India as a democracy, as a secular State indeed as a united country, would be at stake if a plebiscite were to be held in Jammu and Kashmir, the very same plebiscite which India pledged to the people of Jammu and Kashmir eighteen years ago.

125. This argument has been answered by a well-known Indian leader. Allow me to quote Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan:

"... if we are so sure of the verdict of the people of Kashmir, why are we so opposed to giving them another opportunity to reiterate it? The answer given is that this would start the process of disintegration of India. Few things have been said in the course of this controversy more silly than this one. The assumption behind the argument is that the states of India are held together by force and not by the sentiment of a common nationality. It is an assumption that makes a mockery of the Indian nation and a tyrant of the Indian State."

126. Those are the words of a famous Indian leader, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. I do not consider it appropriate to go into the question of the nature of Indian secularism and democracy, although much can be said on that subject. I will say only that it would not be rational for Pakistan to wish the destruction or weakening of the Indian Union. Pakistan's own progress and stability cannot be served by chaos and disruption across its border. Quite the contrary. Whether Indian fears in this respect are the nightmare of a feverish imagination, or just another stratagem by which India has for eighteen years prevented the implementation of its own international agreement on Kashmir, is a question which needs to be dispassionately considered and answered.

127. The forcible annexation of Jammu and Kashmir by India is not a guarantee of Indian secularism, democracy or territorial integrity. On the contrary, it keeps alive those very fears and suspicions which made it impossible for the Muslim minority to accept a united Indian State. If the Nagas, the Sikhs and other communities have grievances against the Government of India, then the fate of Jammu and Kashmir can act only as a spur to their fears and suspicions. The Nagas and the Sikhs can be pacified, not by the example of forcible occupation of Jammu and Kashmir, but by a just redress of their grievances.

128. India has long used the argument that the fabric of Indian secularism is too weak to withstand a decision by the people of Jammu and Kashmir to opt for Pakistan. Indian propaganda has raised the spectre of the majority community falling upon the 50 million Muslims of India if Kashmir opted for Pakistan. I will not try to answer the question whether such a mediaeval and reactionary and undemocratic argument is worthy of the country which claims

to be a great secular and modern democracy. The fact is, however, that nothing of the kind will happen, unless the Indian Government permits it to happen. This is pure and simple blackmail to prevent the people of Jammu and Kashmir from exercising their right of free choice.

129. It is pertinent here to quote from an editorial in The Times, London, of 23 September 1965:

"... one of their arguments against any consultation of Kashmiri opinion—that it would lead inevitably to communal trouble throughout India—has been disproved in conditions far more tense than any such consultation could evoke."

130. India asserts that the dispute between Pakistan and India does not concern the rights of the people of Jammu and Kashmir but is a struggle between democracy and secularism, between democracy and dictatorship, between nationalism and fanaticism. I shall not go into the history which made inevitable the creation of the two independent and sovereign States in the sub-continent. For 800 years Muslims ruled the sub-continent. It is for historians to ponder the question why in the long period of intermingling, followed by two centuries of unitary administration under the British, it was not possible for a sense of common nationality to emerge in the sub-continent. It is sufficient to say that history cannot be undone.

131. The struggle which led to the creation of Pakistan was not a struggle between secularism and religion but between two nationalisms—the Muslim nationalism which led to the creation of Pakistan and which is heir to the 800 years of Muslim rule, and the Hindu nationalism which harkened back for its inspiration to the epoch of Hindu greatness before the Muslims came to the sub-continent. The creation of Pakistan, where Muslims would be free to develop in accordance with their culture and way of life, was the result of the democratic process of self-determination in which each of the provinces which today form part of Pakistan freely and formally expressed its desire to do so. Kashmir alone of those States, provinces and territories of pre-partitioned India, has been deprived of the right to participate in this process of self-determination.

132. That is the basic fact. India cannot deny it because, in the very letter accepting the Maharaja's accession, India's Head of State declared on 27 October 1947:

"In consistence with their policy that, in the case of any State where the issue of accession has been the subject of dispute, the question of accession should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State, it is my Government's wish that, as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and its soil cleared of the invader, the question of the State's accession should be settled by a reference to the people."

133. India cannot deny it because, immediately after the Maharaja's accession, the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, said in a telegram to the Prime Minister of Pakistan:

"Our view, which we have repeatedly made public, is that the question of accession in any disputed

territory or State must be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people and we adhere to this view."

134. India cannot deny it because the Prime Minister of India solemnly stated again on 2 November 1947:

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

135. Finally, India cannot deny it because the Prime Minister of India stated in the Constituent Assembly of India on 25 November 1947:

"In order to establish our bona fides, we have suggested that when the people are given the chance to decide their future this should be done under the supervision of an impartial tribunal such as the United Nations Organization. The issue in Kashmir is whether violence and naked force should decide the future or the will of the people."

That was a quotation from Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru.

136. This is exactly what we have said all these years, and we say today: let India establish its bona fides, let the people of Kashmir be given the chance to decide their future which was pledged to them by India, let this be done under the impartial auspices of the United Nations, let not violence and naked force but the will of the people decide the future of Jammu and Kashmir.

137. This is the basic issue involved in Jammu and Kashmir. Of equal importance is the issue of the honouring of obligations undertaken through international agreements. This agreement was concluded between India and Pakistan when a plan of settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute was negotiated by the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP), submitted to the two Governments, and accepted by both Governments. The plan embodied in the UNCIP resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949 provided for: a cease-fire and the demarcation of a cease-fire line; the demilitarization of the State of Jammu and Kashmir; and a free and impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations to determine the question of the accession of the State to India or Pakistan.

138. It is upon acceptance of the proposals of UNCIP by India and Pakistan that hostilities ceased on 1 January 1949. Then, as now, the cease-fire was meant to be a prelude to a permanent settlement which was to be achieved through a plebiscite under United Nations auspices after a synchronized withdrawal of forces.

139. The whole history of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is India's exploitation of the cease-fire, the first part of the agreement, for the purpose of evading the implementation of the other two parts, rather than of facilitating them.

140. But failure to conform to an agreement by one party cannot render it invalid or obsolete. If it did,

there would be no order in international life and the entire basis of the United Nations Charter would be undermined. Even though the agreement embodied in the two United Nations resolutions was not implemented by India, the Security Council repeatedly made clear its binding nature as an agreement and affirmed that its provisions were recognized and accepted by both India and Pakistan.

141. As the distinguished representative of Norway, Mr. Sunde said at the 467th meeting of the Security Council:

"It is for the plebiscite to determine the ultimate fate of the State.

"I would like to add that this principle, this key-stone of the whole structure, has an importance which transcends the obligatory force it derives from the consent of the parties. The principle has its intrinsic value because it embodies the only criterion for determining Kashmir's fate which is compatible with modern democratic ideals."^{14/}

142. That the UNCIP resolutions represent the engagement of the parties to the process and method by which the final settlement of the Kashmir dispute is to be reached has not been reaffirmed only by the Security Council. It has also been repeatedly admitted by India itself. I shall quote only two of these statements.

143. At the 608th meeting of the Security Council, the representative of India, Mrs. Pandit, said:

"We do not seek to go behind the UNCIP resolutions, or to ignore the vital elements of principle contained in them... We have always adhered to the UNCIP resolution... We cannot be a party to the reversal of previous decisions taken by the United Nations Commission with the agreement of the parties."^{15/}

144. At the 773rd meeting of the Security Council, the Indian representative and former Defence Minister of India, Mr. Krishna Menon, said:

"...we have accepted [the resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan], we are parties to them, whether we like them or not."^{16/}

I repeat: "whether we like them or not".

145. India is a party to the UNCIP resolutions, whether India likes them or not. That it does not like them is no ground to consider them obsolete. It had been made clear by the United Nations Commission itself that the lack of co-operation from either side would not be considered a technical or practical reason for not holding a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir. Such lack of co-operation, the Commission held, would be a breach of commitments formally undertaken by the Governments of India and Pakistan.

146. The agreement with regard to a plebiscite binds not only India and Pakistan; it also binds

^{14/} Official Records of the Security Council, Fifth Year, No. 9, 467th meeting, p. 5.

^{15/} *Ibid.*, Seventh Year, 608th meeting, para. 36.

^{16/} *Ibid.*, Twelfth Year, 773rd meeting, para. 83.

the United Nations. Because of its binding nature and because of the principle of the stipulations pour autrui it involves third party beneficiaries—namely, the people of Jammu and Kashmir—it cannot, I submit, be changed or modified even by the Security Council, far less repudiated by one of the parties.

147. This is the position of Pakistan. In surrendering it, Pakistan would surrender not only a basic principle of its national policy but the very principle of its allegiance to the United Nations. I can pledge from this rostrum that my Government intends no such surrender.

148. The third issue which is involved in the Jammu and Kashmir dispute is that of the effectiveness of the United Nations for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

149. To all those who put their faith in international peace-making, it should be a cause for concern that this dispute has remained unresolved not only because of India's intransigence but also because of the failure of the Security Council to overcome that intransigence. The history of the dispute is a history of opportunities neglected, of chances thrown away, of warnings disdained.

150. Since 1949, Pakistan has repeatedly approached the Security Council. Every time we asked not for a verdict in our favour or against India, but for the Council to spell out the obligations of the parties under the international agreement. Every time we warned that the issue involved the questions of war or peace in the subcontinent. Every time we were ignored.

151. Ever since it became plain to the Commission that India was determined to block the demilitarization of Kashmir and to prevent the plebiscite, there has been no lack of opportunities for the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility. When the Commission reported its failure, the Security Council should have realized the futility of further negotiations and should have called upon the two parties to fulfil their obligations. It did not do so. When the Commission suggested that the differences between the two Governments with regard to their obligations for demilitarization should be submitted to arbitration, President Truman of the United States and Mr. Attlee, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, endorsed that suggestion and Pakistan accepted it. At that point too, the Security Council had an opportunity to support the appeals of the United States and the United Kingdom and to bring pressure to bear upon India to accept it. Again this was not done.

152. When Sir Owen Dixon, who replaced the United Nations Commission, reported that he could not make India agree to withdraw its troops from Kashmir and allow the people of the State freely to decide their future, it had become manifestly clear that India was no longer acting in good faith, and mere persuasion was no longer enough. Again, the Council refused to grasp the nettle. Again, it put its faith in further mediatory efforts, this time by Dr. Frank P. Graham.

153. When, after persevering efforts over a period of years, Dr. Graham made a clear report in 1958^{17/}

^{17/} *Ibid.*, Thirteenth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1958, document S/3984.

about Pakistan's acceptance of his proposals and India's rejection of them, again the Security Council did nothing. It will be interesting to those Members of the Assembly who do not know it that, in the past seven years, the Security Council has not found time even to consider Dr. Graham's report.

154. At each stage, India went one step further in defiance of the international agreement. The Security Council, instead of discharging its duty under the Charter, continuously yielded to India's manoeuvres until India became convinced that it could defy the Council with impunity. By letting that situation arise, the Council abdicated its functions under the Charter. This had a far-reaching effect. It jeopardized peace in our region. It gave rise to grave doubts as to whether the United Nations was capable of securing the implementation of an agreement which it had itself brought about. It brought the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations into disrepute.

155. Having manoeuvred the Security Council into a position of helplessness, India openly repudiated its obligations under the United Nations resolutions. The Council merely watched a process of continuous attrition. After 1962, it found it difficult even to pass a resolution asking for the parties to negotiate with due regard to their commitments. It was not a question of imposing a solution on one party to a dispute. It was a question of securing India's compliance with the agreement which it had freely and solemnly entered into. And thus the world witnessed the pitiful inadequacy of the principal organ of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

156. It is a painful story, this story of the Security Council's inaction. The world knows how all avenues leading to a peaceful settlement of the dispute—the recognized methods of negotiations, mediation and arbitration—were blocked by India. For no reason understandable in terms of the Charter, this inhibited the Council, instead of stimulating it into action. It is no secret that, in 1964, when there was a mass uprising in Jammu and Kashmir, the Council met only reluctantly. A distinguished representative at that time said to us that we had brought a "dead horse" to the Council. Another expressed the opinion that we were using the Council for internal propaganda. I put it to the members of this Assembly: Could any situation be more exasperating for a country which is a party to an international dispute? Here was a question in which not only Pakistan was deeply and vitally interested. Here was a question which was also a matter of life and death for the five million people of Jammu and Kashmir. Here was a question which involved the peace and stability of Asia. But the Council was content with meeting, hearing parties and adjourning sine die.

157. When, through the years, we warned the Security Council that the problem should be resolved before it led to an explosion, our warnings either went unheeded or were termed an empty threat. I again ask the Members of the Assembly: What language is one supposed to speak when one wants to bring out the urgency of a situation and the grave dangers in its remaining unresolved? Pakistan spoke that language; it spoke the language of reason and remon-

strance; it made constructive proposals such as the induction of a United Nations force pending a plebiscite. But nothing made India budge an inch. Nothing moved the primary organ of the United Nations into action.

158. Such was the position in the Security Council. Outside the Council, from 1949 to this day, India has spurned every offer, rejected every suggestion, barred every avenue for the peaceful settlement of the dispute. It has ruled out recourse to the International Court of Justice. It has rejected mediation, conciliation and even good offices, including those of the Secretary-General. When India has made a show of willingness to enter into bilateral negotiations with Pakistan, it has been only to tide over some crisis in its internal or foreign relations. In the long negotiations in 1962 and 1963, during the Sino-Indian conflict, India's position was that it would retain the possession of Kashmir, which it had obtained by force, and all there was to negotiate was how best to establish it in that possession. Finally, India's real attitude was made clear by its Home Minister on 1 July 1965, when he stated:

"Kashmir is an integral part of India. It is a settled fact which cannot be the subject of debate or negotiations."

159. Such a declaration foreclosed the pacific settlement of the dispute. India brazenly sought to annex the State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1964. Concurrently, for the third time, Sheikh Abdullah, the Lion of Kashmir, was thrown into prison in 1965 by the Indian Government.

160. What was the result? The result was that the tensions which had been accumulating through the years exploded, and a situation arose precisely of the kind about which we had warned the Security Council and the world for over a decade. The people of Jammu and Kashmir could no longer be content with a non-violent rebellion and were forced to take to arms, which eventually led to war between India and Pakistan, one of the gravest situations ever faced by the United Nations.

161. In view of the background of this dispute, we are certain that both the United Nations and Pakistan, as a Member of the United Nations, have arrived at the crossroads. For the United Nations, there are two paths open. One is to continue to condone further evasions by India, to succumb to the pressures of power politics, and to foreclose the chances of a just and enduring peace between India and Pakistan. The other is to take prompt measures to secure a just and honourable settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute and to save India and Pakistan from another catastrophe. Need I say that the fear and misery in both countries, the grief and suffering endured, the blood that has been shed, all cry out for an immediate settlement of the dispute on the only basis on which it can be finally settled: the basis of the will of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

162. It is upon the path chosen by the United Nations that Pakistan's course will itself depend. If the United Nations works for a settlement, not on our terms, but in terms of the Charter, in terms of the international agreement accepted by both parties, then Pakistan will not stint its co-operation in the slightest

measure. If, however, delays still prevail, if the expediences of power politics rule the day, then Pakistan will be forced to conclude that the norms and purposes of the Charter and the actual practice of the political organs of the United Nations are no longer in harmony. The choice that will be forced upon us will be the choice between a principle and a pledge, on the one side, and the dictates of power, on the other. It will be painful, but it will involve no dilemma. Pakistan will opt for the principles of the Charter rather than for the expediences of this Organization. I have every confidence that, when we say that we might have to withdraw from this Organization, our fellow Member States will not consider this to be a threat or ultimatum by Pakistan, but the outcome of deep and long disillusionment over its ineffectiveness to resolve a dispute which has been a threat to world peace, just because one Member State, India, which holds an excessive number of sensitive posts in the Secretariat of the United Nations, refuses to honour its commitments.

163. Pakistan will never presume to dictate to the Security Council. But our fellow Members will appreciate that, when faced by a situation of the extreme nature of the one which confronts Pakistan today, a country has to ask itself some fundamental questions. One of these questions is: What kind of peace do we seek? The second question is: What kind of peace is it that the United Nations assures for its Members?

164. The United Nations Charter could not be clearer on the subject. Article 2, paragraph 3, makes it binding on Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice are not endangered. The point here is the conjunction of peace and justice. There are some who separate the two—who, in other words, elect, or want others to elect, peace at any price. But peace at any price is not the purpose of this Organization. Peace at any price could be achieved without this Organization. The United Nations came into being as the result of a war waged against aggressors. If that war had not been waged—if the peoples of Britain, France, the USSR and the United States, and the resistance movements in Europe and other parts of the world had not fought against fascism—we still would have had a peace imposed by a victorious aggressor. But it would have been a dark, evil, iniquitous peace. It would not have been the peace envisaged in the United Nations Charter.

165. To impose an unjust peace on a Member of the United Nations is, therefore, to undermine the Charter. The very purpose of the United Nations, as laid down in Article 1 of the Charter, is completely disregarded when a country is enjoined to "live with" a problem, rather than make vigorous efforts for its resolution. A sophisticated expression of this trend has been the formulation of what is called the law of the cease-fire. This so-called law is nothing but a justification, a rationalization, for doing nothing to settle disputes, especially those which involve the life and future of millions of human beings.

166. The more one analyses it, the more it seems to be but an expression of the philosophy of the

status quo. This was the philosophy that brought death and dishonour to the League of Nations. It is the philosophy of those nations which are secure in their possessions and resources and have the ability to enforce their will upon others. It is not, and cannot be, the philosophy of those who have been robbed of their rights, who have suffered infringements and who cannot be expected to tolerate the status quo. Justice sometimes demands a change in it.

167. The test of the United Nations lies in whether it can ensure that this change will be peaceful and will conform to human justice. If it does not stand the test, the conclusion will be unavoidable that it is a monopoly of the "haves" and that it cannot adjust itself to dynamic currents of international life based on justice and honour.

168. Mr. President, you are aware of the very grave situation prevailing in India and Pakistan today. It would be dishonest for anyone to suggest that the cease-fire in any way mitigates the dangers that lie ahead, if the root cause of the conflict is not removed.

169. It is no use having the Security Council congratulate itself on the accomplishment of the cease-fire. Will it be any consolation to anyone that the United Nations has an observer corps merely to observe and report violations of the cease-fire? A cease-fire and its observation do not amount to peace. What is needed is firm action to eradicate the incentives to violence and fighting. What is needed is action to remove the seeds of war.

170. Pakistan accepted the call for the cease-fire in the confidence that it would lead, not to mere exhortations and appeals, but to a self-executing machinery for a final settlement of the Kashmir dispute. Security Council resolution 211 (1965), of 20 September 1965, describes a cease-fire as "a first step towards a peaceful settlement of the outstanding differences between the two countries on Kashmir and other related matters." As far as we are concerned, there are no "other related matters"; there is only the Kashmir dispute between us. There is nothing in this resolution which precludes the implementation of the UNCIP resolutions which have been the sole point of agreement between the parties and which alone can ensure an enduring settlement. If anything is plain in this resolution, it is that the cease-fire should not lead to the spurious and bullet-riddled peace which has been the lot of both India and Pakistan for all these years.

171. Pakistan believes that the Security Council and the Assembly will not allow the spirit of this resolution again to be eroded. We have made proposals and I will leave it to the judgement of Members of this Organization whether our proposals are just and fair. It is no use telling us that India does not accept them. If they are just and fair, and are the only ones that make a reference to the will of the people, then it is for this Organization and the world at large to make India accept them.

172. Indeed, India's objections to these proposals follow the same pattern as the variety of pretexts which it has put forward for depriving the people of Jammu and Kashmir of their right to decide their future.

173. Today I present the following proposal. Let both countries withdraw their forces from the State of Jammu and Kashmir. Let the United Nations send a force consisting of contingents from African, Asian and Latin American countries, countries which have no interest in the outcome of the plebiscite in Kashmir and which are not involved in the exigencies of international power politics.

174. India has given the stock answers that it will not accept "foreign" troops on Indian soil. The State of Jammu and Kashmir is not a part of India; that is precisely the point at issue. But what passes comprehension is that India, which has sent its own troops to serve in United Nations forces in other countries, which has deputed one of its Generals as Chief Military Adviser to the Secretary-General for many long years, which has pretensions to the leadership of the Afro-Asian community and seeks hegemony over the Indian Ocean region, should consider that the stationing of a United Nations force in Kashmir, composed of African, Asian and Latin American contingents, would constitute a "foreign" intrusion and an affront to the honour of India.

175. If we had made the demand that Kashmir be given to us, the United Nations would have every right to look askance at our suggestion. We are asking that a plebiscite—the most orderly, peaceful and equitable method for the solution of the problem—be held within a reasonable period. Those who read "Kashmir" for "plebiscite" and consider our demand unreasonable admit, in effect, that if Kashmir is given the chance to decide its fate, it will link its destiny with Pakistan.

176. This is the reality of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute. This is the primary fact of the present situation between India and Pakistan. For eighteen years, this dispute has been before the United Nations. For eighteen years it has been the victim of apathy and inertia. At times it has been caught in the coils of the cold war. But the human core of the dispute might have been obscured from other eyes; it could not be eclipsed in Pakistan's eyes. The suffering of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, their being sundered from their brethren in Pakistan, their families divided, their hopes deferred, their voice unheard—these could not but weigh heavily on the conscience and feelings of the hundred million people of Pakistan.

177. When Pakistan, a country much smaller than India, was invaded by India, the sufferings of both Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir were fused. These sufferings formed a single resolve to fight against India's aggression against Pakistan and Kashmir. These passions may be disregarded in the calculations of power politics, but history deals far more justly with them. When we say that we are giving the United Nations a last chance to settle the Jammu and Kashmir dispute, we are saying that we are determined not to let a righteous cause be abandoned. It is not the will of Allah that the victims of injustice and aggression should have no higher court of appeal.

178. The PRESIDENT (translated from French): I give the floor to the Indian representative, who has asked to exercise his right of reply.

179. Mr. QASIM (India): The other night, in the darkest hours before dawn, when man's faculties are at their lowest ebb, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan tried in vain to bemuse and browbeat the Security Council. And now he has the temerity to come to this Assembly, in broad daylight, to make a further attempt to befuddle and confuse this gathering of world Powers. But to the world which knows the facts, his words ring hollow and are mere sound and fury.

180. And what are the facts? Twice in eighteen years Pakistan has carried fire and sword into the peace-loving area of Kashmir. Twice in eighteen years—and during this entire period when Pakistan would not leave that part of India in peace—the people of Kashmir have given their answer in blood to their self-styled "liberators"; whose aim is to subjugate them by force. Having failed in their attempts on both occasions, Pakistan now seeks to use the offices

of the very same world body and the Charter which it has repeatedly defied to attain the same end by guile, by raising the slogan of self-determination hypocritically. My delegation reserves the right to reply in detail to the Foreign Minister of Pakistan and expose the utter falsity of his position. With your permission, Mr. President, we shall do this tomorrow.

181. As for the abuses and false charges hurled by the Foreign Minister against my country and my people, they are the usual hymn of hate and we repudiate them wholeheartedly, and treat them with the contempt that they deserve. But the tragedy is that they reveal a state of mind in the rulers of Pakistan which prevents the development of friendly relations which my country has striven for and which, we are quite sure, the people of Pakistan desire equally ardently.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.