

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTIETH SESSION

Official Records



**1364th
PLENARY MEETING**

Friday, 15 October 1965,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| <i>Agenda item 9:</i> | |
| <i>General debate (concluded)</i> | |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Turkey .</i> | 1 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of the United States of America</i> | 5 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of India . . .</i> | 6 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Thailand.</i> | 11 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Pakistan.</i> | 12 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Greece .</i> | 15 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Cuba . . .</i> | 16 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Cambodia.</i> | 17 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Cyprus .</i> | 17 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of India . . .</i> | 21 |
| <i>Statement by the representative of Pakistan.</i> | 22 |

President: Mr. Amintore FANFANI (Italy).

In the absence of the President, Mr. Collier (Sierra Leone), Vice-President, took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (concluded)

1. The PRESIDENT: I shall give the floor to those representatives who wish to exercise the right of reply.
2. Mr. ERALP (Turkey): I must apologize to the Assembly for taking some more of its time with a statement mainly concerned with issues destined to be thoroughly debated in the appropriate Committees in due course. Nevertheless, the right of reply becomes a duty to reply when one's country is made the target of wanton accusations and deliberate distortions in order to further a conspiracy to deceive the United Nations.
3. The Foreign Minister of Greece, in his statement on Tuesday [1358th meeting], levelled certain charges against my country and accused my Government of what he termed "reprisals resorted to against innocents". Each one of those accusations has already been specifically made in letters by the Permanent Representative of Greece addressed to the Secretary-General and circulated as documents of the Security Council; and each one of them has already been promptly and thoroughly debunked by my letters to the Secretary-General, similarly circulated. There would be no point, therefore, in my attempting to reply to them one by one.
4. I should, however, like to point out that those accusations form a distinct pattern in a campaign of vilification launched by Greece against Turkey for

the purpose of denigrating it in the eyes of the world. Turkey, which has been a haven of religious tolerance for centuries and which has given respect and shelter to the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate for 512 years, is accused of bringing pressure to bear on that holy institution.

5. Measures taken in order to provide for its security are represented as persecution. Two clerical persons who acquired Turkish citizenship and were later deprived of their citizenship because of subversive activities against their new homeland are depicted as victims. Real estate litigation in the courts of the land between the Patriarchate and the established Turkish Orthodox Church concerning the ownership of two churches is denounced as usurpation. The moving to other and safer quarters of a dilapidated orphanage which had become a mortal hazard to the children living in it, as well as to the neighbourhood, is branded as a political act.

6. Then there was the mention of so-called arbitrary expulsions. I have explained at great length in my letters to the Secretary-General the circumstances under which foreigners of Greek citizenship have been brought under the general immigration régime of Turkey. The Treaty of Commerce, Navigation and Establishment of 1930 gave Greek citizens substantial privileges over other aliens living in Turkey. These privileges were granted by Turkey as a gesture of goodwill to the citizens of a neighbouring country with whom lasting friendship was to be maintained. Greek citizens in Turkey were not subjected to the restrictions on length of stay or employment which were applied to other aliens.

7. The Treaty in question was denounced in compliance with its relevant clauses in March 1964. No "futile pretext", as the Foreign Minister of Greece said, was necessary for the exercise of this unquestionable right. Thereafter, aliens from Greece came under the same régime as aliens from any other country. It is always considered a hardship by an alien when immigration authorities inform him that he will not be allowed to stay any longer when his permit expires in a few months. But is it usual to make this a case of international hue and cry? Is it not asking too much of the public opinion of a country to expect it to continue extending special favours to the citizens of a neighbour which has plotted and is plotting against its vital interests? On the other hand, needless to say, the many thousands of Turkish citizens of Greek origin have always enjoyed and continue to enjoy the full protection of the law granted to all citizens of Turkey.

8. This is neither the time nor the place to go into the unenviable plight of the hundred thousand Turks

living under Greek rule in Western Thrace and elsewhere, nor the expropriations of private property and of houses of worship and other inequities against Turks which have been going on in Greece for years. Perhaps it will suffice to give representatives a clearer picture of the second-grade citizenship in which the Turkish minority in Greece is being kept, if I mentioned that, until this month, there was only one high school for over 100,000 Greek citizens of Turkish origin living in Thrace, and that there is not a single member of the Turkish minority who graduated from a Greek university.

9. I felt that I had to refer briefly to the charges of the Foreign Minister of Greece since this question is not to be debated before the Assembly and the slur which has been cast from this rostrum could not be allowed to go unchallenged. The Foreign Minister of Greece has spoken of the violation of the letter and the spirit of the Treaty of Lausanne, the cornerstone of Greek-Turkish relations. Leaving aside for a moment the Greek policy in the question of Cyprus, what could constitute more of a violation of the spirit of Lausanne than this vicious campaign of vilification against Turkey?

10. The Foreign Minister of Greece—and later, of course, Foreign Minister Kyprianou of Cyprus—referred to the former United Nations Mediator, Mr. Galo Plaza, and his report and seemed to be surprised that neither the one nor the other was mentioned in the statement of the Foreign Minister of Turkey. The views of my Government on the report of Mr. Galo Plaza were made clear in a letter addressed by me to the Secretary-General on 31 March 1965.^{1/} No change has occurred, or can occur, in that attitude.

11. In our view, this particular Mediator has virtually disqualified himself from further mediation by exceeding his mandate and making clear-cut detailed recommendations instead of trying to bring the parties together. Under resolution 186 (1964) of the Security Council, the Mediator is designated by the Secretary-General "in agreement" with the four Governments concerned. In our view, when one of those Governments withdraws its agreement to further mediation by the particular person designated, the previously given agreement is invalidated and the designation is void. In this particular case, so far as my Government is concerned, the Mediator has submitted his final report and has bowed out.

12. As for the report of the Mediator [see A/6017], the detailed views of my Government are contained in a pamphlet which my delegation is presently circulating to the various Missions. The report of the Mediator is not an arbitral award. As the Mediator himself so aptly states in paragraph 171 of his report, it is intended as a document for which he alone is responsible. May I briefly point out that a mediator's report which disparagingly qualifies as a "constitutional oddity" the Constitution of the Republic, a Constitution which continues to be revered by a majority of the parties to the dispute, is indeed itself a mediational oddity.

^{1/} Official Records of the Security Council, Twentieth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1965, document S/6267.

13. Under these circumstances, to insist on the impossible--expecting the same mediator to continue to function--can be a severe blow to the institution of mediation itself, which must be maintained and which my Government fervently supports. The mediation effort cannot and should not be made to depend on the person of any one mediator. My Government is anxious to co-operate with any mediation efforts, whether within the terms of the Security Council resolution or without it.

14. In this connexion, perhaps the General Assembly is not aware that in January of this year a mediation offer was made to the parties by an illustrious personage of great international standing, namely, President Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. This offer was immediately accepted by my country, but was rejected out of hand by the Greek-Cypriot Government. As to why this noble and public-spirited offer of the great African President was nipped in the bud, it is not for me to explain.

15. Both the Foreign Ministers of Greece and of Cyprus made pointed references to the latest in a series of attempts by Archbishop Makarios to appear in the ill-fitting guise of an angel of peace at the appropriate moment. I refer, of course, to the so-called Declaration and Memorandum of the Greek Cypriot Administration [A/6039]. The Turkish Community of Cyprus has already made public its violent reaction to this nefarious propaganda manoeuvre. It does not take great perspicacity to see that this document is a brazen attempt to set aside the constitutional rights and guarantees of the Turkish Community and to make them dependent on minority rights which the Greek Cypriot Administration, which does not and cannot rule over the partner Turkish Community, purports to give them. As for the international guarantees that it presumes to offer, one wonders what international guarantees could be stronger than the ones provided under the existing treaties which were unhesitatingly flaunted by the same Greek leadership in December 1963. Moreover, how can the present Government of Cyprus offer so-called guarantees binding for the future when its avowed intention is to turn over the whole island to another Government, namely, the Government of Greece? Furthermore, I should like to remind the Assembly that last July, when the Makarios Administration proposed to exact two laws liable to affect the constitutional rights of the Turkish Community, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council that these measures had increased tension in the Island. The Council, after long deliberation, passed resolution 207 (1965) on 10 August noting the report of the Secretary-General and calling upon all parties to avoid any action which would be likely to worsen the situation.

16. The present propaganda move of the Greek-Cypriot Administration, in utter disregard of resolution 207 (1965) and other resolutions of the Security Council, has increased tension and created incalculable danger to the peace of the Island. So much for the Makarios Declaration which does not seem to be worth the paper on which it is written.

17. The Foreign Minister of Greece spoke of the independence of the Republic of Cyprus and denied that Greece had annexationist tendencies or expan-

sionist leanings. I shall not go into an account of the expansionist adventures of Greece in our lifetime, nor shall I cite hundreds of solemn statements made by various Greek statesmen at various times declaring their unwavering aspiration to bring about the union of Cyprus with Greece. I merely wish to add two more recent ones and will let the Assembly judge for itself. Here is a quotation from the English language newspaper Cyprus Mail, of 23 September 1965, published in Nicosia, headlined "Statement given by Prime Minister Stephanopoulos in Athens on September 22, 1965", and I quote:

"The Prime Minister said he wished to assure the Greek people that Greece would never abandon her desire for the union of Cyprus with mother Greece."

Here is the text of Premier Stephanopoulos' reply of 23 September to General Grivas' cablegram congratulating him on the investiture of his Government:

"The Greek Government will do everything possible for the materialization of Cyprus' desire for uniting with Greece."

18. Here is another one, this' time from General Grivas who is Commander of the Royal Greek Army of Occupation of Cyprus. Incidentally, what this 10,000 strong Greek Army is doing in Cyprus, if it is not preparing the ground for the annexation of the Republic, is to be wondered. It is certainly not there on a picnic. However, here is General Grivas' statement made on the same date, 22 September, and I quote:

"The whole of Greece is now engaged in a fight in Cyprus. This fight is a continuation of the past struggles of the nation. Struggles are won not only with arms but with the strength of faith. It was with this strength that we won the EOKA struggle. We want to unite with the national body of Greece and live in freedom. Our present slogan is: freedom or death. The meaning of this is: enosis or death... We have no aim other than enosis. At this very moment Greece is fighting in Cyprus. She has sent her sons to Cyprus. She has sent the arms you hold in your hands. We must understand clearly the aim of our struggle. This aim is enosis. Anything other than this is false. Our duty is to fight for and win enosis. We shall deserve enosis when we win. Long live enosis, long live Greece."

19. And now here is a statement of policy made by the Prime Minister of Greece in the Greek Parliament on 24 August 1965—that is about three weeks ago. Incidentally, the Prime Minister designate in question on that day was no other than the distinguished Foreign Minister Tsirimokos who spoke to us here the other day [1358th meeting]. He says, and I quote:

"The Greek people will never abandon its desire for the union of Cyprus with Greece. But this is not a claim we make abroad. The claim we make is for unfettered independence, in the name of the principle of self-determination of peoples."

I believe I need not elaborate the point further.

20. The distinguished Foreign Minister Tsirimokos referred to the talks which have been going on

radically between his Government and mine and said this:

"But inasmuch as the question of independence and the future of the Republic of Cyprus is concerned, Greece does not claim the right to make decisions against the will or without the knowledge of the people of Cyprus. The Cypriots alone have the right to make decisions concerning their own fate. No equitable and lasting solution is possible without the consent of the Cypriot people."

21. The noble feeling expressed in these words is shared by my Government. We also believe that no solution of the Cyprus problem can or should be imposed on the peoples, on the two communities, in Cyprus. We have approached the talks with the Greek Government with sincerity in the hope that a common approach may be found to the principal factor in the deterioration in relations between the two countries, namely the question of Cyprus. We hope that the collusion between the Governments of Greece and Cyprus aimed at putting an end to the independence of Cyprus might be abandoned so that we might all co-operate for the peace of our region. Cyprus is and must remain an independent country. But Cyprus is an offspring of Greece and Turkey. It is inhabited by Greeks and Turks who, in their hour of need, turn to Greece and Turkey respectively. We believe that the oldest parties involved in this problem may reach a statesmanlike approach to the question to which other parties might find it possible to rally. If the Greek Government continues to find in Turkey, in the words of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece, an "interlocuteur valable" then the talks may continue with or without mediation. So much for the remarks of the distinguished Foreign Minister of Greece.

22. And now, I should like to devote a few minutes to the statement which we heard yesterday from the distinguished Greek-Cypriot Foreign Minister, Mr. Kyprianou [1361st meeting]. Mr. Kyprianou was rather taken aback on Tuesday when I anticipated that he would be echoing the same distorted presentation of the question of Cyprus as had already been inflicted upon the Assembly. No personal aspersion was, of course, intended, but the anticipation was inevitably borne out. Consequently, a certain amount of repetition has been avoided on my part inasmuch as some of the points raised by Mr. Kyprianou have already been answered in the first part of my remarks. Among them, of course, our continued desire for the mediation efforts of the United Nations and our attitude to the current Greek-Cypriot propaganda manoeuvre which has assumed the shape of a solemn Declaration and Memorandum.

23. Yet the echo sounded by Mr. Kyprianou has been embellished with a few additional points which I should like to deal with briefly. Mr. Kyprianou would have the Assembly believe that the question is really quite simple. You merely apply the lofty principles which are enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and, presto, the equation is solved. But how many people does he think are really naïve enough not to see through the intricate manoeuvre whereby those same cherished principles—independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and so forth—are being prostituted; that they are being cynically employed

as instruments to realize the expansionist aims of Hellenism? Does he not begin to realize, that, after an initial shock, the conscience of the Assembly has awakened to an insidious intrigue whereby the principle of independence is being employed in order to put an end to the independence of one of its members? Does he honestly believe that the Assembly can be made to swallow a scheme whereby what Greek imperialism failed to achieve, when the lid of colonial rule was lifted from the island of Cyprus, it can now achieve through the instrumentality of an independent Republic of Cyprus? Is there any responsible statesman left in the world who has not grasped once and for all that the blind and relentless aim of Archbishop Makarios and of the Greek Cypriot leadership is nothing but enosis, that is, annexation by Greece?

24. I have just quoted from distinguished statesmen of Greece to prove that their aim is one and the same. Earlier I distributed a small and illuminating booklet full of the solemn declarations of the Archbishop concerning his devotion to the cause of enosis. There have been many statements since. Here is an older one made by the Archbishop and quoted in The Sunday Times of London on 20 September 1964:

"I want something higher than being a temporary President of Cyprus. My ambition is to connect my name with history as the architect of enosis (union with Greece)... We want to do it through the United Nations."

That throws some light as to what purpose the United Nations is intended to serve in this cause.

25. Here is a more recent item: the Greek daily newspaper Makhi of Nicosia, in its issue of 1 October 1965—that is, two weeks ago—reports, under the heading "Fight to the end for enosis and only for enosis", that, at a meeting held under the chairmanship of Archbishop Makarios on 30 September 1965, the Greek Orthodox Council of the Holy Synod resolved unanimously, upon the proposal of the Archbishop himself, that the people of Cyprus should continue their fight to bring about enosis. Thus the Church of Cyprus, under the leadership of Archbishop Makarios, renewed its "oath of enosis" which it had previously taken in 1950 when Makarios was elected Archbishop.

26. I have, of course, no knowledge of that "oath of enosis". But we have the memoirs of General Grivas, in which he tells of another oath:

"A new meeting of the liberation committee was called on 7 March 1953, when Archbishop Makarios returned from a visit to the United States, and the twelve members present took this solemn oath of secrecy and obedience: 'I swear in the name of the Holy Trinity to keep secret all I know or come to know about the cause of Enosis, even under torture or at the cost of my life. I shall obey without question the instructions given to me at all times.'"^{2/}

The signatories to this oath were, according to Grivas: Makarios, Archbishop of Cyprus, General Papadopoulos, George Stratos, Professor Konidaris, Lawyer Avgikos, Savvas and Socrates Loizides, General

Grivas, Tsatsomiros, D. Stavropoulos, Demetrios Vezanis and Colonel Alexopoulos.

27. These quotations reflect the light under which all further deliberations of the question of Cyprus in this Assembly should be conducted. Would it not be much more frank if Mr. Kyprianou would come to this rostrum and simply declare: "You can have your independence, territorial integrity and so forth. These principles are useful for Cyprus only if they can help us achieve enosis. If we can use them for our purpose, all well and good, but if not, we shall bring about enosis at all costs, even at the risk of a holocaust."

28. Mr. Kyprianou devoted most of his statement to an enumeration of sacred principles which he demanded should be applied in all cases without discrimination. There was one fundamental principle, however, which he carefully chose to ignore. I refer of course to the principle embodied in the Preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, which speaks of respect for obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law. As for the treaties which gave rise to the independent and sovereign Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Kyprianou simply brushed them aside as having been improvised and imposed upon a reluctant Archbishop, and as being in conflict with the Charter. He adduced Article 103 of the Charter in support of his spurious claim for the invalidity of the treaties. This point of law will of course be debated in the appropriate committee. In our view, there is not the slightest conflict between the treaties in question and the Charter. But may I just remind the Assembly that the Treaty of Guarantee was registered in due form with the United Nations under Article 102 of the Charter by Ambassador Rossides of Cyprus himself. Is it only now, when the Greek Cypriot leadership was chosen to trample upon the treaties in order to move a step closer to enosis, that the question of their validity occurs to them? Some of those treaties took eighteen months to be negotiated. Can it then be said that they were improvised? As for their being imposed upon the Greek Cypriot leadership—that is indeed hard to swallow. Out of many declarations which I could adduce in evidence to the contrary, I shall quote merely two.

29. The first is a statement by the then Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Averoff, at the London Conference in February 1959, and I quote:

"We signed these agreements because this is in the common interest of our countries and they cover relatively and absolutely satisfactorily the interests of the people of Cyprus as a whole. We also signed these agreements because the respected man, Makarios, at the head of the Greek community in Cyprus, whom we considered in all our deliberations as representing the will of the Greeks of Cyprus, having been informed by us, said that he was in agreement... I want to add that we took into consideration his opinion for the fundamental reason that we had declared during our discussions that we will not impose these decisions by force or by other ways on the Greek Cypriots."

That was the Foreign Minister of Greece, Mr. Averoff.

30. Now, here is one from Archbishop Makarios himself. The following quotations are from Keesings

^{2/} Charles Foley (editor), The Memoirs of General Grivas (London, Longman's, 1964), pp. 19-20.

Contemporary Archives of 1959-60. Item No. 17727 reads:

"Archbishop Makarios also issued a statement expressing disapproval of 'any further postponement of Cyprus independence' and declaring that he would 'continue to work for the full implementation of the London and Zurich agreements'."

Further down, Item No. 17728 reads:

"In a speech on April 1 . . . Archbishop Makarios threatened a resumption of 'political disobedience' if the discussions with Britain 'do not end soon in agreement. . . If our discussions do not end soon in agreement [he said], and if the impasse continues, we shall find it necessary to invite the people to declare political disobedience against the British Government and we ourselves will undertake the establishment of a Cyprus Republic. . . On the basis of the Constitution worked out in the Zurich and London agreements—I repeat—on the basis of the Constitution worked out in the Zurich and London Agreements'."

You will note that it is the Archbishop himself who was becoming impatient and who was threatening to impose the agreements on the other parties.

31. In case the Assembly may be puzzled as to the impatience of the Archbishop for independence and may mistake it for a genuine desire for continued independence, however, may I make one final quotation. On 5 January 1962, the Archbishop declared, at a meeting of the Orthodox YWCA:

"The noble struggles of the people never come to an end. These struggles, although undergoing transformation, are never terminated. The struggle of the people of Cyprus will go on."—this was after independence was reached—"The Zurich and London Agreements form a landmark in the course of this struggle, but at the same time a starting point and bastion for further struggles with the object of capitalizing on what has been achieved and for further conquests."

32. This makes it quite clear that the Zurich and London Agreements, which the Archbishop was impatient to implement, and now claims were imposed upon him, were no more than a step deliberately taken towards the ultimate goal of annexation by Greece.

33. May I deal in a few sentences with some of the other blatantly false allegations made by Mr. Kyprianou. He alleged that Turkey had violated the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus. The allegation is false. Any action which Turkey has taken and is entitled to take under the Treaty of Guarantee is, and I quote from the relevant provision of the Treaty, "with the sole aim of re-establishing the state of affairs created by the present Treaty". The state of affairs in question is one in which one community in Cyprus is not in a position to massacre the other.

34. Mr. Kyprianou alleged that Turkish troops were stationed illegally on the island. The allegation is false. The 650 or so Turkish troops who are stationed in Cyprus are there under a valid international treaty, the Treaty of Alliance, and they are there merely

as a symbol of Turkey's intention to protect the independence and territorial integrity of the Republic. There are illegal troops in Cyprus but those are the 10,000-odd members of the Royal Hellenic Forces from Greece who have occupied the island, and the 40,000-strong so-called "national guard" of the Makarios administration which have been mustered and armed to the teeth in order to upset the Constitution and enslave the Turkish community.

35. He alleged that it was not proper to speak of the existence of two distinct communities in Cyprus. In saying this, apart from other cogent considerations, he flagrantly disregarded resolution 186 (1964) of the Security Council, which specifically refers to the two communities as parties to the dispute. Foreign Minister Kyprianou declared that the Turkish community of Cyprus had nothing to fear. I, in turn, find this a preposterous assertion. A tyranny that even today will not allow the Turkish refugees building materials to shelter themselves against the coming winter, that will not even allow them to have shoes for their destitutes, and that but a few months ago resorted to slaughter and starvation as a means of imposing a political settlement cannot make such a claim.

36. Finally, he attempted to present the problem of Cyprus as a relic of colonialism. I submit that it is rather a question of preventing a recurrent attempt at colonialism by Greece. The Turks of Cyprus lived under colonial rule for a hundred years. Five years ago they exercised their right to self-determination, and arrived at the sacred aim for which, alone, that right can be used, namely, independence. They will under no circumstances now consent to being colonized again—this time by their Greek neighbours.

37. I cannot conclude my remarks without saying that my delegation was deeply disappointed by the remarks made on Tuesday [1358th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of India concerning the question of Cyprus. During former sessions of the Assembly, in the years 1955 to 1958, India led the campaign in the United Nations for the independence of Cyprus. It is a source of anguish to us now to see that partisan considerations have prompted India pointedly to ignore the subterfuge to which the Greeks of Cyprus are resorting in order to put an end to that hard-won independence.

38. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The statement made by the representative of Cuba is just about what we would expect from a representative of Cuba, and does not merit a detailed reply. For example, he indulged in a long tirade on Viet-Nam, yet we have made it clear, repeatedly, in this Assembly and outside this Assembly that we are prepared to begin at once unconditional negotiations aimed at a peaceful settlement which will enable the people of South Viet-Nam to determine their future free of all outside interference. Fighting continues only because Hanoi will neither halt its aggression nor agree to negotiate.

39. I find unusually bizarre the representative of Cuba's crocodile tears about the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. We do not see any exodus of Puerto Ricans to Cuba. We do see over 270,000 Cubans who

have fled to the United States, and many, many more Cubans who are waiting desperately for the chance to leave. In fact, Mr. President, in addition, more than 23,000 Cubans have fled to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and have found sanctuary and welcome there. More are coming every week. The people of Puerto Rico have had repeated opportunities over many years in free elections to exercise their right of self-determination, and to choose their own form of government. They have done so and, indeed, their choice was recognized by this Assembly many years ago. By contrast, despite repeated promises by Fidel Castro, Cuba has yet to have a free election since he came to power.

40. Mr. President, as is apparent from the record and, indeed, from the statement made today by the representative of Cuba, Mr. Castro's spurious revolution has devoured many of its children. Perhaps the explanation of Castro's refusal to permit free elections in Cuba is that he himself would be devoured in the process.

41. Mr. ZAKARIA (India): I listened carefully to the statement of the representative of Pakistan yesterday [1362nd meeting], in reply to the statement of my Minister for Foreign Affairs. Nothing that he said came as a surprise to us; it covered no new ground and made no new points. Ever since India lodged a complaint with the Security Council against Pakistan's aggression, the representatives of Pakistan, whether in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, have played the same tune. But facts are facts and cannot change because Pakistan chooses to turn and twist them or uses a new instrument for the purpose.

42. In his statement, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of India invited the attention of the representatives to something which is fundamental to this issue. The incontrovertible fact that three times in eighteen years Pakistan has committed aggression against our territory, twice in the State of Jammu and Kashmir and once in the State of Gujarat, and that by so doing Pakistan has consistently and deliberately refused to honour its obligations under the United Nations Charter.

43. The representative of Pakistan gave no reply to it; he has, I submit, none. Instead, he tried to escape from it by sidetracking the whole issue and posing as a champion of the people's right to self-determination. It is ironical that an aggressor who tries to seize a neighbour's territory by force should pretend to espouse the right of self-determination of the victims of his own aggression. It is even more ironical when he ignores the fact that the people, whose right of self-determination he seeks to advocate here, not only fought its armed hordes but are an integral part of the largest democratic State in the world.

44. Almost the entire statement of the representative of Pakistan yesterday was nothing more than a repetition, in most places word for word, of the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in this Assembly on 28 September 1965 [1339th meeting]. As delegates will recall, this statement was dealt with in detail by Syed Mir Qasim, an acknowledged leader of Kashmir, a co-worker of Sheikh Abdullah

in the freedom struggle of Kashmir, and a delegate of India, in his statement of 29 September 1965 [1342nd meeting]. The representative of Pakistan has, however, avoided dealing with the basic issues to which Syed Mir Qasim referred. I do not propose to weary this Assembly by covering the same ground all over again. It would be taxing its patience unnecessarily. Only a few glaring misrepresentations of fact need attention and I shall deal with them presently.

45. The representative of Pakistan said that he was particularly outraged at the statement of my Foreign Minister that: "Legally, constitutionally, morally and on the basis of the will of the people, the State of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union." [1358th meeting, para. 56.] The Pakistan representative went on to assert that: "... in law, in morality and in the will of the people ... India's continued occupation of Kashmir manifestly lacks any basis". [1362nd meeting, para. 153.]

46. The legal and constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir as a unit of the Indian federation has been explained time and again in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. Repetition would result only in wasting the valuable time of this Assembly. Suffice it to say that the legal position cannot be questioned by any reasonable or prudent person. This has been stated not only by the father of the representative of Pakistan, Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, but also by two permanent members of the Security Council.

47. Speaking in the Security Council on 4 February 1948, the United States representative said:

"The external sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is no longer under control of the Maharaja. ... with the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India, this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India, and that is how India happens to be here as a petitioner."^{3/}

48. Similarly, the representative of the Soviet Union stated:

"The Kashmir question was ... settled by the Kashmir people themselves who consider themselves to be an inalienable part of the Republic of India."^{4/}

49. It is amateurish, therefore, to question the legality of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to the Indian Union. It is, in law, as much a part of India as any of the other fifteen states. This position is also reflected without any ambiguity in the reports of the United Nations Commission, a fact-finding body which was set up by the Security Council. Further, the Legal Adviser to the United Nations Commission, who was asked by it to examine the issue, could not come to any other conclusion than that the legality of the accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India was unquestionable.

50. The representative of Pakistan sought to rely upon the statements made by his father on the constitutional status of Jammu and Kashmir years after

^{3/} Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Nos. 1-15, 240th meeting, p. 371.

^{4/} Ibid., Twelfth Year, 765th meeting, para. 84.

the accession had taken place at his initiative and with his full support. There are innumerable statements made by Sheikh Abdullah, but I shall give only one or two quotations from them in which the Sheikh Saheb explained both the legal and moral aspects of this accession. Speaking at the 241st meeting of the Security Council, Sheikh Abdullah said:

"... Kashmir and the people of Kashmir have lawfully and constitutionally acceded to the Dominion of India, and Pakistan has no right to question that accession".^{5/}

51. Again, in the course of his opening address on 5 November 1951 to the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah said:

"The problem may be posed in this way. First, was Pakistan's action in invading Kashmir in 1947 morally and legally correct, judged by any norm of international behaviour? Sir Owen Dixon's verdict on this issue is perfectly plain. In unambiguous terms he declared Pakistan an aggressor. Secondly, was the Maharaja's accession to India legally valid or not? The legality of the accession has not been seriously questioned by any responsible or independent person or authority.

"These two answers are obviously correct. Then where is the justification of treating India and Pakistan at par in matters pertaining to Kashmir? In fact, the force of logic dictates the conclusion that the aggressor should withdraw his armed forces, and the United Nations should see that Pakistan gets out of the State."^{6/}

52. Putting the basic issue before the people of Kashmir while inaugurating the election campaign of the Jammu and Kashmir National Conference on 24 August 1951 at Gandarbal, Sheikh Abdullah made it clear that the decisions of the Constituent Assembly on those issues were final and irrevocable. To quote his words:

"The decisions of the Constituent Assembly regarding the future affiliation of the State, the future of the State ruling dynasty, the question of compensation to landlords and the Constitution of Jammu and Kashmir will be final and no power on earth can reverse them."

53. It will be of special interest for his son to know that, while speaking in the Constituent Assembly of Jammu and Kashmir on 19 August 1952, Sheikh Abdullah said:

"We have no intention to secede from India. Everybody knows the conditions through which India and Pakistan were passing at the time of our accession to India. Our accession to India, as I have stated in my last speech, is complete."

54. Again, as my Foreign Minister pointed out, it is on the basis of the will of the people that the state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of the Indian Union. The representative of Pakistan has also questioned this. Here, again, I can do no better than to

quote his own father who, at a press conference in Delhi on 18 June 1948, said:

"We, the people of Jammu and Kashmir, have thrown our lot with the Indian people, not in the heat of passion or in a moment of despair, but by deliberate choice."

55. Thus, for six crucial years, Sheikh Abdullah continued to uphold the completeness and irrevocability of the constitutional, legal and moral relationship between the state of Jammu and Kashmir and the Indian Union. I concede that as a citizen of the Republic of India, which guarantees freedom of expression, Sheikh Abdullah had every right to change his views. But surely no one can seriously suggest that this change in his personal view should reverse the whole process which he himself, as the leader of the people of Kashmir and as the Prime Minister of that State, set in motion in 1947 and which has been freely and democratically endorsed by the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

56. I am very sorry to state that the representative of Pakistan, Mr. Tariq Abdullah, appears to take his citizenship and the responsibility attaching to that citizenship rather lightly. Only a few months ago, he was serving as an Indian citizen in our High Commission in London. On his appointment, he took a solemn oath of allegiance to India and to the Constitution of India. His appearance, therefore, as a member of the Pakistani delegation, is indeed surprising. I would have thought that Mr. Tariq Abdullah would have been among the first to denounce Pakistani aggressors who tried to destroy the freedom of our people in Kashmir. Instead, for reasons best known to him, he has chosen to betray our people and has joined hands with the aggressors. A man who swore loyalty to one country until a few months ago, and champions suddenly the cause of the enemy thereafter, cannot carry conviction with this Assembly; he stands self-exposed. He has served neither his father nor the cause of Pakistan, and certainly not the interest of the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, by his strange behaviour. He has in his fevered imagination painted a false picture of the conditions in Kashmir. He has of course not been there for some time, but the tourists and foreign correspondents who have been on the spot, give the lie to his picturesque dramatization of the so-called internal revolt.

57. The representative of Pakistan alleged that the general elections held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir in 1957 and 1962 were rigged. In support of this, he gave some figures of unopposed candidates confined to the Valley of Kashmir and Ladakh. He made no reference at all to the hotly contested elections in the rest of the State, both in 1957 and 1962. May I ask him why he forgot to mention the elections in 1951, the first elections, when his father, Sheikh Abdullah, was the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir—I mean, the vital elections to the Constituent Assembly in which forty-three out of forty-five seats in the Valley and Ladakh were uncontested. Does he want to suggest that his father rigged these elections? He calls the Constituent Assembly "so-called"; but does he know that Sheikh Abdullah was the father of that Constituent Assembly and swore by

^{5/} Ibid., Third Year, Nos. 16-35, 241st meeting, p. 25.

^{6/} Ibid., Twelfth Year, Supplement for January, February and March 1957, document S/PV.762/Add.1, annex VI.

it? Again, he describes Mr. G. M. Sadiq—a close associate and for decades a co-worker of his father—as a puppet. But then would he say the same about his father, when he ruled as the Prime Minister of Jammu and Kashmir from 1947 to 1953? His new-found friends in Pakistan described his father as such and even worse. Again, is he aware that the much-publicized presidential elections in Pakistan were condemned as rigged by no less a person than Miss Fatima Jinnah, the sister of the founder of Pakistan, and popularly known as the "Mother of the Nation"?

58. The representative of Pakistan then tried to revive the dead and discarded theme of an internal revolt in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. I need not repeat what is universally known and accepted about the role of Pakistani infiltrators, masquerading as freedom fighters, who crossed the cease-fire line on 5 August and thereafter. Of course, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan has described them as Sulahuddins or Saladins, and the President of Pakistan has hailed them as freedom fighters, but General Nimmo and the Secretary-General of the United Nations have given them their correct description. I cannot do better than to quote here from The New York Times of October:

"The Indians charged that the infiltrators included regular Pakistani soldiers, members of the Azad Kashmir battalions, armed civilians called Mujahids (fighters for the faith), and civilian porters.

"Pakistan promptly denied this. She said India had fabricated it to cover up an internal rebellion in Kashmir.

"The Pakistan Radio broadcast communiqués by a so-called 'Revolutionary Council'—The New York Times' words—"which, it said, was directing the rebellion.

"However, Lieut.-General Robert H. Nimmo, the [then] chief United Nations Observer in Kashmir, roughly substantiated the Indian charges in his report to the Secretary-General, U Thant.

"Reporters who were in Kashmir at the time saw no evidence of an internal rebellion. . . .

"Some Kashmiris undoubtedly did hide and feed the infiltrators. There is evidence that some also may have helped set up caches of arms in Srinagar, Kashmir's summer capital, but the uprising that Pakistan apparently counted on never occurred."

59. The position is that it is these very infiltrators who, in the last few days, have once again tried unsuccessfully to cause some trouble in Srinagar. They are being dealt with as they should be; but I must make it clear that, because of this very danger to the peace and security of our State of Jammu and Kashmir, the Government of India has been insisting on the complete withdrawal by Pakistan of its thousands of armed personnel, in civilian disguise, who began to cross the cease-fire line on 5 August.

60. According to the representative of Pakistan, the entire Batamula suburb of Srinagar was set on fire and razed to the ground. Here, the insinuation is that this was done by the Indian Army. Evidently, he is not aware of the fact that Radio Pakistan had gleefully

announced that these so-called freedom fighters had set fire to an area of Batamula with important government buildings. The Pakistan Times reported the incident in headlines: "Government buildings in Srinagar on fire. Mujahids"—the word used by Pakistan for those whom it sent across the cease-fire line: "Mujahids active in heart of city. Held State capital cut off from outside. Hundreds of Indians killed in skirmishes". The Pakistan Times specifically mentioned the arson committed in this particular case: "The freedom fighters set many government buildings on fire at Batamula about three miles from Srinagar yesterday and for seven hours, according to the All India Radio." Thus, the suburb of Srinagar was set on fire not by the Indian Army, not by any mythical Revolutionary Council in Kashmir, but, according to Pakistan's own admission, by its troops in civilian disguise.

61. There has been no popular revolt in Kashmir; there has been only sabotage, arson, loot, destruction by infiltrators and, finally, invasion by regular Pakistani troops of our peaceful State of Jammu and Kashmir.

62. The representative of Pakistan attacked India's close relationship with other Afro-Asian countries and, in his attempt to sow seeds of discord, he had the temerity to say, and I quote:

"After having sabotaged the Asian-African Conference in Algiers, India has every need to try to rehabilitate itself in African-Asian esteem." [1362nd meeting, para. 166.]

This is yet another example of misrepresentation of facts and sometimes blatant lies which are perpetrated in this Assembly by the representatives of Pakistan.

63. Permit me to quote from the message sent by Colonel Boumedienne to the President of India on 7 July 1965:

"I am particularly pleased to express to Your Excellency my deep appreciation for the relentless efforts that you have made to ensure a full success for the second Afro-Asian Conference. Efficient interventions that you have made before the friendly Chiefs of States and the positive role that the Indian delegation played at Algiers show the great interest that you give to Afro-Asian solidarity and to the future of developing nations. Hence, I am convinced that your action, which was always positive, will allow the next Algiers meeting to have, by its wide participation, the full success that the peoples attached to the Bandung principles are calling wholeheartedly for."

"I am particularly pleased to express to Your Excellency my deep appreciation for the relentless efforts that you have made to ensure a full success for the second Afro-Asian Conference. Efficient interventions that you have made before the friendly Chiefs of States and the positive role that the Indian delegation played at Algiers show the great interest that you give to the Afro-Asian solidarity and to the future of developing nations. Hence, I am convinced that your action, which was always positive, will allow the next Algiers meeting to have, by its wide

participation, the full success that the peoples attached to the Bandung principles are calling wholeheartedly for."

64. The representative of Pakistan went on to ask: "Is there any newly-independent State, from Asia and Africa, that holds a country against its declared will?" [1362nd meeting, para. 166.] The answer to the representative of Pakistan is very simple. Yes: it is Pakistan which holds Baluchistan against the wishes of the people there. Yes: it is Pakistan which holds the people of Pakhtunistan in bondage against their wishes. The reign of terror let loose in Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan by Pakistan has, as my delegation stated on 29 September [1342nd meeting], exceeded even the limits of a police State. The representative of Pakistan went on to say that, if India needed company, he could suggest to her the company of colonial Powers. India's record in the freedom struggles of the peoples of Africa and Asia is well known. Pakistan cannot belie history. But her own record of serving the interests of colonial Powers, from Suez to Goa, is notorious. Of course, Pakistan would like her record of subservience to colonial Powers to be forgotten. Unfortunately for her, however, her own friends are not prepared to oblige her. My delegation has heard many references by many countries to the recent Indo-Pakistan conflict, but none has been so blatantly in favour of Pakistan as the statement of the Foreign Minister of Pakistan's friend and ally—Portugal. The Foreign Minister of Portugal said in this Assembly on 11 October: "I mentioned Goa above, and the Foreign Minister of Pakistan also referred to Goa as a glaring example of naked ... aggression." [1356th meeting, para. 227.] Who keeps the company of colonial Powers?

65. There have been many denials of the principle of self-determination of people in the world. But there is none so glaring, and none so inhuman, as the denial of the right to self-determination of the people of Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan. Referring to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Pakistan in this Assembly on 28 September, the representative of Afghanistan said yesterday:

"As I have said, we cannot agree with that statement. By way of example, I cite the disputed territory of Pakhtunistan, referred to in pre-partitioned India as the Northwest Frontier Province, and the tribal territories, where the fate of a much larger population than that of Kashmir is involved, and where a population which has been continuously demanding its right to self-determination, was also deprived of that same right." [1362nd meeting, para. 40.]

We entirely agree with him that the people of Pakhtunistan have been, and are being, denied the right of self-determination.

66. The representative of Pakistan threw a challenge to my Foreign Minister to react to his so-called offer concerning the dispatch of an impartial commission to examine the situation in Jammu and Kashmir. As my delegation has stated before, India is the largest democratic State in the world, with a Government responsible to an elected Parliament, an independent judiciary and a free Press. India, in

short, is an open book. The representative of Pakistan evidently did not realize the contradiction in which he was landing himself when he compared conditions in Jammu and Kashmir with those created by the Nazis and quoted statements by opposition leaders. Did the Nazis allow opposition groups to exist and operate? I did not know it. Did the Nazis permit them to freely express their views to foreigners? No. By any standard, India is a free country, but that does not mean that the Government of India will permit any interference in their internal affairs by outsiders. However, there is certainly every justification for constituting such a commission to inquire into the conditions of the down-trodden and suppressed people of East Pakistan, Baluchistan and Pakhtunistan, because it is widely recognized that, while the rules of Pakistan may be free, the people of Pakistan are not.

67. The representative of Pakistan referred scornfully to India's attempt to build a multiracial and multireligious society and to base its statehood upon that foundation. He said: "In that case, Kashmir or no Kashmir, the Indian State is bound to collapse like a house of cards and no props from abroad will keep it steady for long." [Ibid., para. 166.] India has not received any props from abroad. It is Pakistan which, for the last eighteen years, has been subserving the interests of one Power or the other, through military pacts and alliances and otherwise. For us, the preservation of our multiracial and multireligious society is not an excuse. It is the very breath of our life. India not only stands by secular democracy, but is proud of it. India rejects all forms of religious discrimination, for, in its eyes religious discrimination is as much a crime against humanity as is racial discrimination. That is why Kashmir occupies such a pivotal position in our democratic set-up. It is an inseparable link which unites our different groups and people.

68. It is easily, and sometimes conveniently, forgotten that the Muslim population of Kashmir is an integral part of the 50 million Muslims who are spread throughout the length and breadth of the Indian Union and is an integral part of the Indian society. More than any other people, they would resist any attempt made in any quarter to disturb the growing integration of our many races, religions and communities into a single, harmonious and integrated unit under the broad umbrella of our Constitution, which guarantees equality of status and opportunity to all citizens, irrespective of race or creed. Most of the Muslims left behind in India had played an active part in the creation of Pakistan, but today none realize better than they do that they could not have committed a greater folly, a folly which has settled nothing in the Indian sub-continent due to the "hate India" policy of the Pakistani rulers but, on the contrary, has created a host of insoluble problems, endangering the future of our people. The safeguarding of secular democracy is, therefore, a matter of life and death to Indian minorities, as it is, indeed, to the majority community, and they will be prepared to make any sacrifice to defend it. Eighteen years ago they paid a very heavy price for compromising on it, and they are not willing to go through the blood bath again.

69. The conflict between India and Pakistan is a much larger conflict than Pakistan would have this General

Assembly believe. It neither begins nor ends with Kashmir; Kashmir is only one of its eruptions. Pakistan is the child of religious bigotry and intolerance: it believes in giving more and greater rights to members of one particular religion. This is clear from its successive Constitutions, according to which only a Muslim can become the President of Pakistan, and, since the President, under the Pakistani Constitution, is the controller and repository of all executive power in the State, this means that the minorities in Pakistan have been robbed of the substance of political power by the supreme law of the land. It is this attitude of mind which is so pernicious, for it does not consider anyone except a Muslim to be capable of exercising the full rights of citizenship. It is this attitude which has shaken the faith and confidence of all religious minorities in Pakistan—Hindus, Christians, Jews and Buddhists.

70. Pakistan tries to argue that its position is not in any way different from the position in the United Kingdom, for instance, where only a Protestant can be the King or Queen. They conveniently forget that, in Britain, the Queen is a constitutional head, enjoying no real power. At no time in British history has the office of Prime Minister been restricted to a member of any particular religion or denomination. Much more splendid is the example of the United States of America, which was founded as a revolt against religious persecution, and where only a few years ago a Catholic—a member of a religious minority which is hardly 25 per cent of the population—was chosen by the people of America as their supreme executive head.

71. For the 50 million Muslims of India, the very fact that at least one of the sixteen States of the Indian Federation, namely, the State of Jammu and Kashmir, has a Muslim majority is a matter of deep satisfaction. They are determined not to allow anyone to rob them of this satisfaction, and in its defence they will consider no sacrifice too great. In the present conflict with Pakistan, the Muslims have yielded to no other community in India in making the supreme sacrifices on the battlefield in the defence of their motherland. As our Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, has said:

"It has to be remembered that there are 50 million Muslims in India and they are equal and proud partners in building up a new order in this country. They have fought arm in arm with their comrades in their battle against Pakistan and have won the highest military honours."

72. For eighteen years, all kinds of pressures have been put on India to make concessions to the aggressor. Let me make it quite clear now that we shall resist every threat to the foundation of our secular State. Let me make it clear, on behalf of the 50 million Muslims of India to which I have the privilege to belong, that we shall fight to the last man any move to disturb the non-communal character of our Republic.

73. The Pakistani representative mocked at our cohesion. I am even asked: why should not the Government of India be able to take care of any such situation or why should it treat the Muslims of India as hostages

in order to prevent a plebiscite being held in Kashmir? We have already had one terrible experience. We conceded partition, fondly believing that it would end all our troubles and difficulties, but we were sadly disillusioned. Millions of our people had to undergo intolerable suffering. Our economic resources were stretched to the breaking-point in order to rehabilitate the millions who were uprooted by man's inhumanity to man. We lost our greatest man—Mahatma Gandhi. We faced enormous difficulties in our efforts to rebuild our society. No, we shall not allow history to repeat itself. Now more than any time before, our unity is at stake.

74. I wish only that representatives had witnessed the holocaust which followed the partition of India when hundreds of thousands of innocent men, women and children lost their lives at the hands of demented men who claimed the right to commit murder and rape in the name of God. The India of 1965 is not the India of 1948; it is not prepared to swallow the communal poison again at the bidding of anyone.

75. It was the Prophet of Islam who said:

"O Lord! Lord of my life and of everything in the Universe: I affirm that all human beings are brothers unto one another."

Thus, in Islam, on which Pakistan bases its claim to Kashmir, there is no room for the two-nation theory, which is a blot on the history of mankind. Why do not the rulers of Pakistan, which parades itself as an Islamic State, remodel the lives of their citizens on the basis of this profound truth uttered by the Prophet, instead of trying to disrupt our society.

76. We live in a dynamic age where the situation changes from day to day. The two resolutions of the United Nations Commission for Pakistan and India, of 1948 and 1949, on which the Pakistani representative harped, have been killed by the Pakistanis themselves. These resolutions required the ending of aggression by Pakistan committed in 1947-1948. Instead of complying, Pakistan has committed two further aggressions on our territory. Furthermore, they have gifted away more than 2,000 square miles of our territory from that part of Jammu and Kashmir which is still in their illegal occupation to their Chinese overlords. In the face of these developments, how can anyone think in terms of the same situation as prevailed in 1948. Those two resolutions are dead as a dodo, completely killed by further Pakistani aggressions and betrayal and can in no way be revived.

77. The real problem which divides India and Pakistan is the Pakistani aggression on our territory, an aggression which has been established by the United Nations own agencies. No histrionic effort, no forensic ability, no crocodile tears, no false pleas about the people's right of self-determination can hide this fact. It would be monstrous to suggest that the fortunes of a free people should be dependent on Pakistan, the aggressor.

78. In earlier statements, my delegation made India's position quite clear. The status of Jammu and Kashmir, which is a constituent state of the Indian Union, is not negotiable. The only honourable course open to Pakistan, as a Member of the United Nations owing

allegiance to the Charter, is to discontinue its lawless behaviour and end its aggression on our territory. Once this is done, a new atmosphere will be created in which friendly relations and an enduring peace between our two countries would have a chance of becoming a reality.

79. During his recent address to this Assembly, representatives will remember that His Holiness the Pope said: "If you wish to be brothers, let the weapons fall from your hands." [1347th meeting, para. 37.] It was indeed in this spirit that our late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, and our present Prime Minister, Lal Bahadur Shastri, offered a "no-war" pact to Pakistan. Let Pakistan ponder over the Pope's advice. Even at this late stage, after all the sufferings of the armed conflict to which we have been subjected by the Pakistani aggressors, we are prepared to respond.

80. Mr. TONGYAI (Thailand): Once again, the delegation of Thailand is compelled to ask for the floor to reply to yet another barrage of insults and vituperations against Thailand by the Cambodian representative. Under the pretext of exercising the right of reply on Wednesday, 13 October [1359th meeting], the Cambodian representative abused this right by using the Assembly forum to amplify his wanton accusations against my country and, at the same time, to serve the interests of the well-known aggressive forces in Asia.

81. These attacks have become more and more of a personal nature. Their language has generally been below the normal requirements of decency. The Cambodian representative even disregarded the minimum standard and etiquette as practised in this Assembly by calling a Member State a "colony" of another country.

82. As far as my country, Thailand, is concerned, our history has all along been one of an independent country. We have always fought to preserve this heritage of independence. Our ancestors never delivered our national independence into the hands of any foreign Power. We, therefore, have no lessons to learn from other countries about the preservation of our independence, and least of all from Cambodia.

83. From his attitudes and his statements, the most sensitive point of the Cambodian representative seems to be the interests of Communist China. In speaking on this subject, the delegation of Thailand merely exercises its legitimate right of expressing its opinion on a matter of international importance. Surely, the liberty of expression is not to be limited to those favourable to the cause of Communist China.

84. With regard to the situation in Viet-Nam, we certainly have sympathy for the people of South Viet-Nam, because they are fighting and laying down their lives to defend their freedom and national independence from communist imperialistic aggression. Cambodia, on the contrary, has supported and is supporting the aggressive elements which seek to overthrow the legal Government and to destroy the independence of South Viet-Nam. It is an open secret that Cambodian territory is used and allowed to be used as a sanctuary and source of supply for the Communist Viet-Cong.

85. The Cambodian accusations concerning foreign bases in Thailand are absolutely groundless. No foreign bases are, or have ever been, authorized to be established on any part of the Thai territory. No measures or actions are taken, or allowed to be taken, within the Thai territory, except those in defence of our independence, our sovereignty, our territorial integrity, and for the protection of the peaceful lives and properties of our citizens, in conformity with our inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as recognized by the United Nations Charter, especially Articles 51 and 52.

86. To substantiate his accusation, the Cambodian representative referred to articles in some American newspapers as a premise from which truth could be found. If so, what about the truth in a report of an American newspaper to the effect that the Cambodian people are exploited by a vice ring run by a Cambodian high personage?

87. In his statement, the Cambodian representative recalled the death of a South Viet-Nameese President. It is remembered how, on that occasion, the Cambodian leader made an unusual declaration of joy. We remember the official celebrations and public elation expressed by Sihanouk, both in the Press and on the radio at the death of one of our Prime Ministers. The world also remembers that Sihanouk expressed publicly his delight over the tragic death of the late President Kennedy. All these, in themselves, are proofs enough of a strange state of mind.

88. The Cambodian representative claimed that Cambodia has been the victim of Thailand's expansionist policy. Nothing is further from the truth. We have declared time and time again that we have no desire for other people's territory and that we respect all the obligations arising out of international treaties, as well as the Charter of the United Nations. As for the border incident mentioned by the representative of Cambodia, my delegation wishes to state that the Cambodian accusation was completely groundless. The fact proves the contrary. All border incidents have been created by the Cambodian side. A long list can be found in the documents of the Security Council.

89. Also, the Cambodian representative referred to Thailand's policy during the Second World War. But, unfortunately, he could not find any other version, except that of his own Chief of State. I do not intend to engage in and dwell on historical discussion in this forum. Suffice it to say that everything in Sihanouk's version of history must be synchronized with his implacable hostility toward Thailand.

90. Furthermore, the Cambodian representative pretended to know that the Thai people are dissatisfied with their present lot. The Cambodian representative seemed here to be more understanding of the Thai people's feeling than the Thai themselves. His remarks clearly show Cambodia's tendency to interfere in the internal affairs of its neighbours. His reference to the New China News Agency information about the so-called Thai Patriotic Front indicates the close ties between Phnom Penh, Peking and those disruptive elements.

91. The representative of Cambodia attempted to convince the world that Cambodia professes and ad-

heres strictly to the policy of non-alignment. But the statements and attitudes of its leaders, in particular, the Cambodian representative's statements heard here in the Assembly, obviously and distinctly show the world what is the true colour of the face behind the mask of neutrality. Of course, that is a special brand of neutrality, uniquely and typically Cambodian.

92. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): I apologize for taking the rostrum again on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. We have discussed it at great length, but it becomes necessary for me to take the rostrum again, because of the remarkable, almost magnificent distortion of facts which the Assembly has just heard from the heirs of those who were the first to be the champions of the literature of fairy tales and of distortion.

93. The representative of India, who took the floor just now, has outdone that great legacy of fiction. This performance of his this afternoon has been better than the rope trick. He has referred to Pakistan's aggression, saying that in eighteen years it has committed aggression against India on three occasions. Pakistan is a small State; we are much smaller than India, in our resources, in our population, in our ability. It is preposterous for anyone to contend, after an objective appreciation of all the realities, that Pakistan would be given to aggression against a powerful and large neighbour like India. All that we have done in the last eighteen years is to uphold our national sovereignty, to uphold the cause of justice, to uphold a righteous course and, if in so doing, we have been pitted against a merciless neighbour, a neighbour that has itself been given to aggression, whose policy is predicated and based on aggression, it is because we believe that a smaller people, a smaller country can withstand the slaughter and the aggression of a greater neighbour in the course of upholding principles and international morality. We have been accused of committing aggression against a country which is five times our size, a country which, in eighteen years, has an exemplary record of aggression, a country that has committed aggression against Junagadh, Manavadar, Mangrol, against Hyderabad, against the State of Jammu and Kashmir, and is responsible for the Sino-Indian conflict, and also for seizing Goa by force.

94. We do not condone imperialism. We do not say that there should be any vestiges of imperialism left anywhere in the world. Indeed, this is our very cause—our very contention—that we want to see the liquidation of all forms of colonialism, and that is why with all our resources and all our strength we are upholding the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It is not that we condone imperialism; it is that we condemn the methods India chooses in the settlement of disputes. The representative of India says that Pakistan has violated the United Nations Charter in upholding the cause of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. I ask you, Mr. President and fellow delegates: who has violated the United Nations Charter? What has been Pakistan's position? All that Pakistan has sought is the implementation of the United Nations resolutions and adherence to the United Nations Charter. It is we who, for the past eighteen years, have sought sedulously and tirelessly to implement the

United Nations resolutions and the United Nations Charter. It is we who have asked India to implement the very resolutions of the United Nations to which India is a party. That is all we ask—that India, representing 400 million people and claiming to be the largest democracy in the world, implement the solemn pledge which she gave in broad daylight in the United Nations of her free will and of her free accord. Not only did she give this pledge here in the United Nations in 1948 and 1949, but that pledge—that the people of Jammu and Kashmir will exercise the right of self-determination—was given by the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, repeatedly to the people of Pakistan and to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. All we seek is that India should implement her solemn commitments, yet India has the temerity to say that it is Pakistan that has violated the United Nations Charter. It is we who seek to implement the Charter of the United Nations and to strengthen the United Nations and its Charter by pressing for India to fulfil her commitment to Pakistan, to the people of Kashmir and to the United Nations.

95. The representative of India has referred to a so-called acknowledged leader of Kashmir and a co-worker of Sheikh Abdullah, who took the floor a few days ago from this rostrum—a man called Mir Qasim. He has been described as a co-worker of Sheikh Abdullah. And who is Sheikh Abdullah? Sheikh Abdullah is the Lion of Kashmir—the man who has been waging a heroic struggle for the people of Jammu and Kashmir since 1931; a man who has been prepared to make any sacrifice for a righteous cause; a man who was regarded by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru as the champion of the people of Kashmir, as a heroic legend whose fame and glory knew no dimensions of territory; a person who was a hero and a symbol of his people; a person who symbolized freedom and the struggle for emancipation. These are not my words. These are the words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, paraphrased by me, words which are in the records of the United Nations. Yet that great hero, who symbolized freedom, is today in an Indian gaol.

96. By proxy we are told what Sheikh Abudullah said—what Sheikh Abdullah meant—and the Indian representative has the audacity to quote a man, who, in the last eighteen years of our independence, has been incarcerated for eleven years or more by India. Since the independence of India, this great comrade of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, this great symbol of the freedom movement, has been rotting in Indian gaols for more than a decade. When his son—the young Tariq Abdullah, who is a chip off the old block and a valiant fighter who has inherited the great tradition of his father and his people—takes this rostrum, he is ridiculed. In ridiculing Tariq Abdullah, the Indian representative is actually ridiculing Sheikh Abdullah. They have cause for ridiculing him, because it is that same Sheikh Abdullah who now languishes and rots in Indian gaols. We say: release Sheikh Abdullah, the acknowledged leader of the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and let the world hear what he has to say about the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

97. Yesterday, when Tariq Abdullah took the floor, he did say that, originally, Sheikh Abdullah—who had been given solemn pledges and assurances by the Government of India and by the Prime Minister of

India that a plebiscite would be held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir—took those assurances at their face value. He believed them, because they came from a Prime Minister of the largest democracy in the world—from Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. Acting upon those solemn and categorical assurances, he did cooperate with the Indian Government, but on condition that a plebiscite would be held in the State of Jammu and Kashmir to determine the future of the people of that State. However, when time and experience showed that all the Indian Government meant was to perpetrate a fraud on the people of Jammu and Kashmir, he was disillusioned. This was not the first time in history that leaders of a people have been ensnared, entrapped and disillusioned. Thus, when Tariq Abdullah took the floor, he said:

"This will give the Assembly some idea of the causes of my father's disillusionment with India. For a man who had been a staunch nationalist all his life, a personal friend of Pandit Nehru, who condemned bigotry and fanaticism, and under whose leadership Kashmir remained untainted with any religious strife, it could not be but a wrench and a deep crisis to raise the banner of revolt against Indian occupation of Kashmir. Much though he loved the principles of secularism, he could not tolerate that, under their cloak, India should throttle the aspirations of the people of Kashmir, separate them from their brethren in Pakistan and hold them in bondage. He warned Mr. Nehru from 1952 onwards that India was following a disastrous policy in Kashmir, and that, if it reneged on the promise of a fair and impartial plebiscite, it would forfeit all claims to the respect and sympathy of the people of Kashmir as well as the people of the world. When in 1953 he publicly stated his view that the future of India, Pakistan and Kashmir could not be secure without an honourable settlement of the Kashmir dispute, he was deposed and put in gaol. For a long time no legal proceedings were brought against him. When a case was filed, it dragged on for several years. Finally, Sheikh Abdullah was acquitted in 1964, but his freedom was short-lived. Since early this year he has been kept in detention without trial." [1362nd meeting, para. 163.]

This is Sheikh Abdullah, who now languishes in an Indian gaol, and who is being authoritatively quoted as representing the Kashmir position in so far as India is concerned. Yet when the authentic voice of the people of Kashmir, represented by Tariq Abdullah, takes this rostrum, we are told by the Indian representative that what he utters is not true.

98. Let us see what Sheikh Abdullah has to say more recently. The Indian representative has quoted Sheikh Abdullah in 1947, in 1948, in 1950, when—under categorical assurances by the Government of India—he made certain statements which would, later on, betray and belie him and which, though no longer of any relevance, are now being quoted to the Assembly.

99. But let us see the actual position, as it is today. The thinking of Sheikh Abdullah, and what he said in February 1958, is this:

"Since my release, after four and a half years of detention, I have tried to explain my viewpoint and possible solutions in regard to various problems

facing the political future of the State. With sufficient clarity, I hope, I have succeeded in elucidating the following principles: (a) so long as a final decision about the future disposition of Jammu and Kashmir State is not arrived at, the political uncertainty, the economic distress and the miseries which the people of the State are facing at present cannot terminate; (b) the existing strained relations between India and Pakistan are not only a source of great danger to the solidarity of Asia but also threaten the ruin of the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir; the dispute over Kashmir is one of the main contributing factors to these strained relations, and (c) the ultimate decision with regard to the future affiliation of the State rests with the people and can only be achieved by allowing them to exercise their right to self-determination under impartial international supervision in accordance with the universally recognized methods—as has already been agreed to by the parties concerned—or otherwise as is acceptable to them."

100. Again, Sheikh Abdullah, addressing 20,000 people in Jammu on 9 April 1964—not 1948 or 1949—declared emphatically that it would be wrong to claim that the people of Jammu and Kashmir had already exercised their right of self-determination through free general elections, when the truth was that all three elections held had been rigged. This charge was made—he said—not only by him but also by all opposition parties in Jammu and Kashmir, including the Jan Sangh, an extremist Hindu organization.

101. In addition, on 15 April 1964, speaking in Doda, a town in Jammu, Sheikh Abdullah said that the argument that the people of Kashmir had exercised their right of self-determination by electing a constituent assembly was beside the point, because no election was held on the issue of accession. He added that the elections were rigged, even according to the Prime Minister of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, Mr. G. M. Sadiq, who made a certain reference to those elections which I shall not take up the Members' time to repeat here now.

102. Again, on 13 March 1965, speaking at Nottingham, Sheikh Abdullah said:

"When we went to the Security Council it was decided that the question of Kashmir would be settled through a free and impartial plebiscite. Suddenly we started feeling that India's opinion was changing. India was going back on her word. India wanted me to support her on this and it is from here that my quarrel with India started. We have no enmity with anyone. We only want to exercise our right. Once that right is achieved, I would have no objection if the people freely join this country or that, but whichever course they adopt it will be an honourable course. They will not be driven like cattle."

This was in Nottingham, on 13 March 1965, when Sheikh Abdullah was briefly released from gaol and was again imprisoned upon his return to India.

103. The representative of India has said that he does not want to waste the time of this Assembly by repeating all the arguments. None of us wishes to waste the time of this Assembly but much more is

at stake than the time of this Assembly—much, much more is at stake. The principles of the United Nations are at stake. The principle of self-determination is at stake. The causes of war and of peace are at stake and it is necessary to speak out on these issues, because these issues have a bearing on the future of humanity. And it is the direct responsibility of this Assembly not only to hear them but also to resolve these disputes which lead to the slaughter of mankind, to bloodshed and to misery. So it is not a question of wasting the time of this Assembly. It is a question of bringing before this Assembly matters of dire importance which affect the peace in our region and which affect the future of our countries.

104. The representative of India has said that legally, morally and constitutionally the State of Jammu and Kashmir is a part of India. Sheikh Abdullah and many of us before that have informed the Assembly of the legal, moral and political issues involved in the future determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It has been said in defence of the Indian contention that no uprising has ever taken place and that at present there were only infiltrators who went in from Pakistan to be of assistance to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. And, in support of this contention, The New York Times has been quoted, authoritatively. I have here before me the most recent report from The New York Times, if that is an authoritative way of determining the future of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. On 13 October, a headline in The New York Times read: "Police in Kashmir kill three boys; stoning by crowd is charged", and there follows a long report of what is happening in Srinagar, how students are being killed, how demonstrations are being quelled, how popular uprisings are being quashed by the 200,000 Indian soldiers who are in the valley—and more now since the fighting is taking place between India and Pakistan. The police forces, the militia, of the State are all pitted against the poor, helpless, innocent people of Jammu and Kashmir. I should not like to take up the time of the Assembly by reading out the whole statement but this report is in The New York Times, 13 October 1965.

105. Again, on 14 October 1965, there is another report from Jammu and Kashmir by the correspondent of The New York Times. This time the headline reads: "School girls lead Kashmir crusade; hatred of India draws them out of cloistered life"—young schoolgirls of the age of eighteen and younger, who have taken upon themselves the struggle with their comrades for the liberation of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

106. These are facts; these are realities which cannot be ignored. And they march; we want a plebiscite; long live Pakistan; long live the struggle of the people of Jammu and Kashmir; by young students, by mujahids, by freedom fighters, by the 5 million people of Jammu and Kashmir, all united, indissolubly and indivisibly for a fight, for a just cause which cannot be denied to them. It is a righteous cause. They may be pitted against Indian bayonets; they may be pitted against the force, the might and the armada of the Indian army, but their sacrifices will not be in vain. The blood that they shed will not be in vain.

107. We are told that it was the freedom fighters who destroyed and looted and committed arson in

Jammu and Kashmir. It is inconceivable for a people to commit aggression against their own people. It is inconceivable for the people of Jammu and Kashmir to perpetrate wrongs against their own brethren and when the Pakistan Times was quoted with reference to the burning of Patmulla village it was not the Pakistan Times. The Pakistan Times was quoting the All-India Radio and it said that the All-India Radio had said that the village of Patmulla had been razed to the ground. I believe that Mr. Radhakrishnan, the President of India, visited Patmulla, and saw for himself the destruction of that village, the burning of innocent men, women and children, and I believe even he wept. I am told that Mr. Desai, a former Finance Minister of India, when he was told that Indian soldiers and the Indian army had committed genocide and had burned villages, said, in defence of that action, "Well, if someone from Madras wanted to secede from India, I would not mind if villages in Madras were burned."

108. However, the question of Madras or the question of any other constituent part of India has no relevance whatsoever to Kashmir. Kashmir has never been a part of India. Kashmir's future has always been a dispute. I do not say this. This is what India has said. This is what India has maintained: the future of the state of Jammu and Kashmir will be decided by the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Kashmir is not a part of India. It can never be a part of India. It has never been a part of India. We have no quarrel with India, properly so called; with an Indian India, but Kashmir is not an Indian India. It is not a part of India. It has never been a part of India. This is not my assertion. These are the assertions, the pledges and the commitments of the Government of India, itself, and in the space of eighteen years they cannot be forgotten. They can never be forgotten as long as the conscience of mankind exists, as long as there is civilization, and as long as there is a quest for freedom of peoples.

109. Pakistan is also a pluralistic society. We also have multiracial and multilingual components of Pakistan. We have the Baluchi, the Sindhi, the Pathans, the Punjabi and the Bengali. We would not like to see fissiparous tendencies encouraged in India. We should not like to see the disintegration of India. This process of disintegration can be harmful, not only to India, but to its neighbours. We would like to see a strong India. We would like to see a consolidated India, a harmonious and peaceful India, but that India must be Indian India. That India must be a part of India, and not a disputed territory which has been taken by India by force and occupied by India by brute force, by the imposition of its army and by the bayonet.

110. It has been said that, in Pakistan, we are holding various nationalities by force, and reference has been made to certain regions of Pakistan. This is a problem of the people of Pakistan, and if there is any dispute which Pakistan may have with others it is none of India's concern. Our relations with Afghanistan are most cordial. During the war with India, I know for certain where the sympathies of the people of Afghanistan lay, as demonstrated by the people of Afghanistan and reiterated by the Government of Afghanistan.

Mr. RAMANI (Malaysia), Vice-President, took the Chair.

111. The King of Afghanistan, in a communiqué to my President, said: "I as a King give you assurance, I as a Muslim give you assurance, I as an Afghan give you assurance that we are with you, and we will never betray you."

112. It is none of India's concern to meddle in Pakistan's internal affairs. We would not want to meddle in India's internal affairs. By resorting to a just settlement of the dispute over Jammu and Kashmir we are not interfering in India's internal affairs, because the problem of Jammu and Kashmir is not a question of India's internal affairs. It is a question of India fulfilling her pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and it is a question, pure and simple, of the exercise of their right of self-determination. It has been said by the representative of India that the problem is of a much greater dimension, that the problem does not concern Kashmir alone. It is one of religious bigotry. It is one of intolerance.

113. Pakistan has friendly relations with all its neighbours, except, unfortunately, India, and that is not because of any failing on the part of Pakistan. We have friendly relations with Nepal, which is a Hindu State. The majority of the people of Nepal belong to the great Hindu religion. We have over 10 million Hindus in Pakistan and they have lived in peace. Their lives, property and honour have never been jeopardized. We have hardly had any communal disturbances, whereas in India, secular India, they have had over 600-odd communal disturbances. Even during this war they had communal disturbances in which minorities were maltreated.

114. The representative of India contradicts himself when he says that the Muslims of India fought valiantly for India during the struggle against Pakistan; that they were amongst the highest decorated soldiers. I bear tribute to their valour. I bear tribute to all the soldiers of India who fought heroically in this war, but does this not show that our dispute with India is not a religious dispute? That it is not a communal dispute? It is a national dispute. It is a dispute over principles. It is a dispute over the right of self-determination. It is a dispute over the implementation of international agreements. If it were a religious dispute, if it had to deal with the determination of a communal future, then why should the Indian Muslims have fought so valiantly and so bravely? But because it is not a communal dispute, because it has nothing to do with religion, the Indian Muslims—as they rightly should do, according to their great tradition and according to their great religion—fight for their motherland, and we salute their bravery, whether they be Indian, whether they be Muslims, Hindus or Christians.

115. So also those who fought for Pakistan, whether they be Muslims, Hindus, Christians or Buddhists, fought for their motherland. They fought against a predatory aggressor and that is why it is not a religious issue. It has nothing to do with religion. It has nothing to do with bigotry. It has to do with the most sublime and the most liberal principles which have been upheld by mankind, that is, the future of a people, their liberty, their freedom, an international obligation, an international commitment. These are the principles for which Pakistan has fought, and not on the basis of religion or communalism, which the

representative of India, himself, by contradicting himself has established for Pakistan.

116. The dispute over Jammu and Kashmir transcends not only religious frontiers, but also national frontiers. This dispute is not only the concern of India and Pakistan and the people of Jammu and Kashmir. It is the concern of the United Nations. It is the concern of the international community. Just as the international community has supported the freedom movements throughout the world, wherever they be, whether in Asia, Africa or in any other part of the world, it is its moral obligation to support the freedom movement of the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

117. We are not fanatics, we are not bigots. We want peace in order to develop ourselves, in order to give a better life to our people, in order to make progress so that, after centuries of misery, after centuries of poverty, we can march forward. We should also progress and have a better life. This is our concern and our ambition, and we want the whole international community to march side by side with us in the determination of these high objectives.

118. But in life, men have fought for honour, men have fought for self-respect, men have fought for pledges and for nations. They may be small. Their resources may be limited. They may be subjected to one aggression after another. They may face overwhelming obstacles. They may face overwhelming odds. But finally they must triumph.

119. It is our conviction, it is our belief in God, it is our belief in international morality and in the conscience of mankind that the people of Jammu and Kashmir shall not be an exception to this long and glorious march of mankind, for justice, for peace and for honour, and as far as Pakistan is concerned, it is pledged, it is honour-bound to fulfil this promise to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We shall never tire. We shall never rest. We shall continue relentlessly and dauntlessly for the achievement of the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir, and for the fulfilment of international obligations entered into solemnly by sovereign States and sanctified and baptized by the United Nations. This is our right and this we shall fight for, irrespective of the consequences.

120. Mr. LIATIS (Greece): The timing of the Turkish reply at this late hour of the last meeting of our general debate might have been well chosen with the obvious intent of limiting the extent of an eventual counter-reply on the part of my delegation. It is, however, the sense of respect due this Assembly, more than anything else, that compels me at this late hour to be as brief as I can—the more so since Ambassador Eralp's discourse, which we heard a while ago, follows the usual pattern of wilful distortion and propaganda colouring with which most of us are rather familiar.

121. Besides, the problem of Cyprus will soon come up for discussion in all its aspects in the First Committee and, then and there, all interested parties will have ample opportunity to submit their views and elaborate on points of special interest to them. There are, however, two or three points on which I should ask your indulgence to make a few remarks.

122. The representative of Turkey tried to explain away the pressure being exerted on the Greeks of Istanbul by presenting the matter as normal immigration measures taken in respect of aliens. One is never at a loss to find or even to invent legalistic pretexts and excuses for such acts. The substance of the matter is different though. And if I may follow the example of my Turkish colleague, and compare conditions in which the Greeks live in Turkey, and conditions in which Turks live in Greece, may I say only that, while not one Turk has left Greece in the last two years since the flare-up of the Cyprus problem, more than 6,000 Greeks—not one, not ten, not twenty, not 100, not 1,000, but 6,000 of them and more—have been forced to leave Turkey, and most of them, mind you, people who were born in Istanbul. Out of these, about 3,000 were formally expelled. The rest were dependants who naturally followed the departing head of family.

123. Now, those expulsions were justified for reasons of security, and Ambassador Eralp cited a few cases. But the true causes were revealed by Ambassador Eralp himself, who unwittingly betrayed the policy of his Government when he referred to "the principal factor in the deterioration in relations between the two countries, namely the question of Cyprus" [para. 21 above]—thus confirming what we have said all along, namely, that the persecution of Greeks and the Greek Church in Turkey is done in reprisal.

124. As to the haven of tolerance, which Ambassador Eralp claimed that his country was for about 512 years, may I remind this audience of the abject pogrom conducted during the night of 6-7 September 1955 in Istanbul, when some seventy-five Orthodox churches—out of about eighty-two, if I am not mistaken—were partly or wholly destroyed, cemeteries were desecrated, Greek charitable institutions were pillaged, and thousands of shops and homes looted. Damage amounting to \$60 million was thus caused, for which damage the responsibility of highest ranking statesmen and officials was established a few years later by a Turkish court.

125. I was particularly interested by one word in the remarks made by the representative of Turkey, with regard to United Nations mediation. He referred to the Mediator appointed by the Secretary-General on the basis of a Security Council resolution as "the former Mediator". Should we take it that the Government of Turkey has merely dismissed him? Should we suppose that the Secretary-General was not aware of the new authority the Turkish Government has arrogated to itself when, in the introduction to his latest annual report [A/6001/Add.1] he wrote that the Mediator is still available to the parties concerned? This attitude should serve as a serious warning, I think, of the misuse made by the Government of Turkey of one of the most efficient procedures available in the arsenal of the United Nations for the pacific settlement of disputes. As long as any party to the dispute takes upon itself the right to dismiss the offices of a United Nations appointed Mediator simply because it does not agree with, does not like his conclusions, then this might lead to crippling effects for our Organization as a whole.

126. As to enosis, or the wish of the Greek Cypriots to unite with Greece, the point here is not whether such feelings do exist, or in what way and by whom they may be expressed. The point here—the crucial point—is that Greece entertains no annexationist design of any sort on the island of Cyprus. Greece has repeatedly stated, and I am stating again solemnly today, that my country will respect the wishes of the people of Cyprus freely expressed under conditions which we are ready to let the United Nations set up and implement. And I wonder, in concluding, whether the representative of Turkey could give any similar assurance.

127. Mr. ROA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): I must apologize to the General Assembly for taking up its time again in exercise of the right of reply in response to the representative of the United States, who, as you know, has made his exit.

128. I shall be brief. Just as the representative of the United States attempts to reply to the irrefutable statement made by Cuba without having heard it, I too knew in advance what his specious and evasive assertions would be. Not that I have a magic power to divine other people's thoughts, but the matter is very simple: the intellectual decadence of the United States ruling classes has reached such a level that they have lost all power of imagination. It is not for nothing that they invented the broken record policy.

129. I am not surprised that the representative of the United States has suddenly shed his judge's robes for the garb of a Pharisee. Puerto Rico, whether the Yankee imperialists and their representative in the United Nations like it or not, is a fully-fledged Latin American nation, subjugated and oppressed by the United States against the stubborn opposition of its heroic people, through persecution, imprisonment, exile and bloodshed. It is true that there has been no exodus of Puerto Ricans to Cuba. I need hardly say that we would welcome them as brothers. But the representative of the United States deliberately failed to mention that there certainly has been a mass emigration of Puerto Ricans—estimated at more than a million—to this alleged sanctuary of the so-called free world which dispelled their naïve illusions by reserving the most tragic living conditions and the most menial jobs for them. They exchanged colonial misery for imperial disdain.

130. The Cubans that have left our country, those that are leaving and those that are about to leave, with our full consent, are the core of exploiters, lackeys, underlings and dupes that emerge and multiply in all revolutions. The same thing happened at the beginning of the American War of Independence. Thousands of North Americans sought refuge in what is now Canada or in the United Kingdom. But the important thing then in the United States and now in Cuba is that the people remained.

131. But more important than all this is the fact that the representative of the United States has, in his reply, had to limit himself to his broken record. Not one of the facts denounced by the Cuban delegation has been rebutted by another fact; they all stand unrefuted.

132. For its part, the Cuban delegation reaffirms the position it has taken in the General Assembly and renews its denunciation of the policy of exploitation, intervention, subversion and aggression pursued by Yankee imperialism in Latin America, Asia and Africa in violation of the Charter of the United Nations and energetically opposed by all peoples.

133. Mr. HUOT SAMBATH (Cambodia) (translated from French): I must apologize for coming to this rostrum again to reply to the representative of Thailand. I would have preferred to wait for the record of the meeting before doing so. However, as we know, this is the last meeting devoted to the general debate, and that is why I cannot put off my reply. I must therefore rely on the interpreters who, moreover, have worked tirelessly ever since the beginning of our debate and deserve our gratitude.

134. In his reply, the representative of Thailand said that in my statement on 13 October [1359th meeting] I used my right of reply to make a personal attack on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand. But that gentleman from Thailand is precisely the person who recently launched a campaign of slander and lies against Cambodia. He even attacked the Cambodian leaders in the statement he made to the Assembly on 8 October [1353rd meeting]. If the representative of Thailand did not want me to mention the name of his Minister of Foreign Affairs so frequently he should have asked him not to attack the Cambodian leaders instead of coming here to complain.

135. With regard to the question of Viet-Nam, the representative of Thailand repeated the stupid accusation concerning the alleged Viet-Cong sanctuary which is supposed to be situated in Cambodia. This accusation is too crude for me to waste the Assembly's time by replying to it in detail. I shall limit myself to quoting a recent article by a correspondent of The New York Times, Mr. Seymour Topping, to whom I referred in my last statement. Mr. Seymour Topping was invited to Cambodia specifically to inquire into this alleged Viet-Cong sanctuary in my country. In The New York Times of 14 October 1965, Mr. Seymour Topping wrote as follows:

"It is the consensus of Western diplomats and independent observers stationed in Cambodia that the country"—namely Cambodia—"is not a major sanctuary or a major route for the delivery of military equipment and supplies to the Viet-Cong."

136. Moreover, I should like to point out to the representative of Thailand that there is still an International Control Commission in Cambodia composed of India, Canada and Poland. Those who have any doubts about my reply to this ridiculous accusation from Thailand can ask the Commission to inquire into the matter.

137. The Thai representative then denied that there was a foreign military base in his country. But if so, were the two United States airmen captured in the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, of whom I spoke in my recent statement [1359th meeting], invented by the United States Press? The representative of the United States might perhaps be able to give us a few details on this point.

138. The representative of Thailand also said that Prince Norodom Sihanouk was delighted at the death

of the late President John F. Kennedy. Once again the representative of Thailand resorts to lies to arouse American public opinion against Cambodia. Here is the truth. On the death of President John F. Kennedy the Royal Government of Cambodia decreed three days of national mourning on the instructions of Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Head of State of Cambodia. Our flag flew at half-mast throughout those three days. The radio, the Press and the entire people of Cambodia scrupulously observed those three days of mourning. As Minister for Foreign Affairs, I myself went to the United States Embassy to convey the condolences of Prince Norodom Sihanouk and of the Royal Government and the people of Cambodia to the Government and people of the United States. My signature still stands in the book in which condolences were entered in the United States embassy. In addition, Prince Norodom Sihanouk was represented at President Kennedy's funeral at Washington by the Head of the Royal Government of Cambodia, Prince Norodom Kantol, who travelled specially from Phnom Penh to Washington to attend the funeral. I am not asking the United States people to demonstrate their gratitude to us, but I would simply like them to be informed that Cambodia and its Head of State shared their mourning at President Kennedy's death.

139. The representative of Thailand also said that his country respected international treaties and the principles of the United Nations Charter. I should simply like to ask him why his Government refuses to recognize the common frontiers between our two countries when they are clearly defined by international agreements and by the judgement of the International Court of Justice at The Hague on the case of the Temple of Preah Vihear.^{2/}

140. The representative of Thailand has reproached us for interfering in the domestic affairs of Thailand by talking of the creation of the Thai Patriotic Front. However, if representatives here would like to refer to the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Thailand on 8 October and to my reply of 13 October they would see that it was that Minister who revealed to us—and that for the first time—the existence of the Thai Patriotic Front and certainly not the representative of Cambodia.

141. With regard to our neutrality, the representative of Thailand is right to say that it is a special brand of neutrality which is uniquely Cambodian, because in a region which at present knows nothing but ruin, poverty and mourning, Cambodia is the only country which enjoys internal peace, national union and progress, while the same cannot be said of its neighbours, including Thailand.

142. Mr. KYPRIANOU (Cyprus): It was to be expected that the representative of Turkey would try to do his best to prove that he was right when he predicted before I spoke that I was going to speak lies. Therefore, he had to do a lot of homework to confirm his statement. He admitted today that that was what he tried to do. He said, of course, that he proved that what I said before the Assembly yesterday was deliberate distortion. The expression "deliberate distortion" is well known by now. It has been used by

^{2/} Case concerning the Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia v. Thailand), Merits, Judgement of 15 June 1962: ICJ Reports 1962, p. 6.

the representative of Turkey many times in the Security Council to refer to almost anything I have said.

143. I humbly wish to state that we take the United Nations very seriously. We do not come before the United Nations to tell lies. We do not come before the United Nations to distort facts. The facts are well known. There may be certain facts which are not yet known, but we shall have ample opportunity to put them before the Committee and the plenary meeting when the time comes.

144. What has Mr. Eralp discovered today? He discovered today that the struggle of EOKA during the colonial occupation of Cyprus was a struggle for self-determination that would have resulted in the union of Cyprus with Greece. That was a great discovery indeed. What else did he discover? He discovered today that the people of Cyprus, the vast majority of whom are Greek, desire the union of Cyprus with Greece. What a great discovery.

145. We are not afraid to talk about enosis or about the union of Cyprus with Greece, but when we talk about it, we must give the background and the circumstances of this idea.

146. With respect to the people of Cyprus, the question of the union of Cyprus with Greece is one for the people of Cyprus themselves. With respect to Turkey, what is the real position of Turkey towards enosis, which they publicly described here in the United Nations as anathema? As far as we know, Turkey was negotiating the Acheson plan parallel with the continuation of United Nations mediation. What was the Acheson plan? The Acheson plan was the union of Cyprus with Greece, but not of the whole of Cyprus. Therefore, if it is enosis, but not of the whole of Cyprus, with Greece, Turkey has no objection, and in fact negotiates it. But if it is enosis on the basis of the will of the people, without partition, without NATO bases and without Turkish bases, then enosis is anathema to Turkey, and Turkey comes here and states "We stand for the independence of Cyprus". The statement of the representative of Turkey today was revealing. Turkey stands for the independence of Cyprus, provided that independence is not full. Turkey stands for the sovereignty of Cyprus, provided the sovereignty is not full. This is clear from his statement.

147. The representative of Turkey took exception to what I said the other day that Turkey violated the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Cyprus. Mr. Eralp said that what Turkey did was in accordance with the Treaty of Guarantee for the purpose of restoring constitutional order. I do not have the slightest belief that the bombing of a country is done for the purpose of protecting the constitution of that country. That is a very peculiar concept. I would challenge any other country in this Assembly to accept a similar protection. Would any country agree that another country has the right to intervene in, to interfere with and even to bomb the country for the purpose of protecting the constitution of that country? I trust that we shall have ample time at the appropriate opportunity to deal with this famous Treaty of Guarantee when we discuss the specific item of Cyprus.

148. But I have to submit in this respect that as regards what Mr. Eralp said—that it is Cyprus which registered the Treaty of Guarantee with the Secretariat and, to use his own expression, that Mr. Rossides himself did it—and not wishing to use the same phraseology that he does, I would simply say that his information is wrong.

149. The Treaty of Guarantee was registered by the United Kingdom on 12 December 1960. But whatever the situation with regard to the registration of the Treaty of Guarantee, the fact remains that the registration of a treaty with the United Nations is not something that should be pertinently stated in connexion with the validity of a treaty, because the registration itself does not bear upon the merits of a treaty.

150. We would not doubt the validity of the relevant Article of the Charter of the United Nations which speaks of the principle regarding the respect of treaties, but as it is stated clearly in the draft articles on the law treaties prepared by the International Law Commission earlier this year, it is only treaties in force which are covered by the rule. As I have, I believe, demonstrated in the course of my statement as well as on other occasions, and especially during the detailed debates before the Security Council, neither the Treaty of Guarantee nor the Treaty of Alliance is in force.

151. The Turkish representative presented today a very false picture, to say the least, of how those treaties came into being, and he tried to prove that the President of Cyprus, Archbishop Makarios, was very anxious to sign those agreements. According to his view, Archbishop Makarios not only signed them freely and negotiated them freely, but he was too anxious to sign them.

152. I challenge anyone to have a look at those agreements and, without any further comment of my own, to say whether anyone could be so anxious to sign them. It would suffice at this stage to quote what President Makarios himself said in connexion with those agreements:

"At the Conference at Lancaster House on 5 February 1959, which I was invited to attend as leader of the Greek Cypriots, I raised a number of objections and expressed strong misgivings regarding certain provisions of the agreement arrived at in Zurich between the Greek and the Turkish Governments and adopted by the British Government. I tried very hard to bring about the change in at least some of those provisions. I failed, however, in that effort and I was faced with the dilemma either of signing the agreement as it stood or of rejecting it with all the grave consequences which would have ensued. In the circumstances, I had no alternative but to sign the agreement. This was the course dictated by me by necessity."

The necessity in this respect stemmed from the fact that if those agreements were not signed, bloodshed would have continued; Cyprus would have been kept under colonial rule, with other terrible consequences which one could not foresee.

153. When one is faced with the dilemma of either signing something which is bad—very bad indeed in this case—or not signing it, as a result of which there

will be bloodshed, with other terrible consequences that one could not have foreseen, I think it was the only possible choice for a statesman like the President of Cyprus, who has always been approaching the problems of his own country in a responsible way. He chose the bad for the sake of peace. It does not mean that that choice which he made at that time, under the circumstances I have described, precludes the people of Cyprus for ever from being entitled to the enjoyment of the same rights to which every other country in this Assembly is entitled, or to which other colonial peoples still under colonial rule are entitled.

154. Mr. Ian Smith is arguing, in the case of Southern Rhodesia, that according to the present Constitution his is the legal Government of the country. It is a Constitution granted by the British Government and the British Government was the appropriate authority to grant it. But can anyone in this hall argue that the Constitution of Southern Rhodesia must be maintained? Can anyone in this hall argue that minority rule in Southern Rhodesia must be maintained and upheld? We would not. This is a very similar case in certain respects. In Southern Rhodesia a minority is governing the country and oppressing the vast majority of the population. In Cyprus the attempt on the part of foreign Powers has been to impose upon the vast majority of the people their own will—not even the will of the minority, but their own will through the minority—something which is not unusual in the history of colonialism, as I submitted the other day.

155. The Turkish representative again took exception to another point which I raised in the course of my statement yesterday. I said yesterday that anyone who approaches the Cyprus problem on the basis of two separate communities—and of course in conformity with the interpretation given to that term by Turkey—is condoning the policy of division. And I gave a historical sketch yesterday of the background of how that phrase, innocuous in itself, came to acquire significance in the particular case of Cyprus. The Turkish representative said today that I have even taken a stand contrary to resolution 186 (1964) of the Security Council.

156. The phrase "communities" is used in that resolution, but it is not used in the way that Mr. Eralp wants us to believe. He speaks of the communities, but when resolution 186 (1964) of the Security Council speaks of the solution of the Cyprus problem, it specifically states that the solution of the Cyprus problem should be in accordance with the principles of the Charter and the well-being of the people of Cyprus as a whole.

157. With regard to the United Nations Mediator, I wish, first of all, to make the same point that the representative of Greece made a few minutes ago. I do not think it is proper for the representative of any Government in this hall to come to this rostrum and speak of the United Nations Mediator as the "former Mediator". It is not Turkey which appointed the Mediator. It is true that Turkey consented to the appointment and that is an additional reason why Turkey should not behave in this way. Turkey cannot withdraw its consent whenever it likes, as Mr. Eralp put it, otherwise the whole purpose of mediation is

killed and undermined. Furthermore, I should like to emphasize that it is not Turkey which can declare the Mediator of the United Nations to be the "former Mediator". I do not think that Turkey has the right of veto in this respect. I do not think the Turkish representative has replaced the Secretary-General of the United Nations in this respect; and in particular at a moment when the Secretary-General of the United Nations himself states quite categorically to this Assembly, in his report, that the Mediator is still there, that Dr. Galo Plaza is still the United Nations Mediator, as far as the Secretary-General is concerned.

158. Then, in order to prove to the Assembly how fond the Turkish Government is of mediation and how much this idea is being supported by Turkey, the representative of Turkey spoke of the President of Ghana, Dr. Nkrumah. We have great respect for the President of Ghana. We admire his courage and his ability. We know only too well that he is an international personality. We know very well because we have co-operated with him in many respects: at the Conference of non-aligned nations in Cairo, and previous to that at the Conference of non-aligned nations in Belgrade and at various Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences. We have an additional reason to be respectful and thankful to the President of Ghana, and that reason is his full support for the just cause of Cyprus, with his signature of the Cairo Declaration,^{8/} and his approval of two Commonwealth decisions on the Cyprus issue. It is because of that respect that we did not try to involve President Nkrumah at the wrong time.

159. Why was it the wrong time? The United Nations mediation was in process. And the Turkish representative came before you today and stated clearly and unequivocally that the Turkish Government had accepted that a mediation initiative should be undertaken by the President of Ghana. When? In January 1964, behind the back of the United Nations Mediator, before the United Nations Mediator presented his report, which gave rise, as we are told, to the objections of Turkey to Dr. Galo Plaza. Even before the views of the Mediator were known, Turkey was trying to undermine the task of the United Nations Mediator, and disrespectfully trying to involve an international personality without even respecting the prestige of that great personality.

160. The President of Ghana could have been useful. We are open to his advice. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, we, particularly in Cyprus, are grateful for his support. But we do not wish to play this kind of game. To have approached other personalities, when the United Nations mediation was in process, to work with the United Nations Mediator and at the same time to try to involve other people, without, of course, informing the United Nations Mediator, was disrespectful to those personalities, and an insult to them.

161. The representative of Turkey was very emphatic on this question of the Mediator. He said that his Government's position has not changed and cannot change. It is a veto. It is an effort to exercise the

^{8/} See document A/5763.

right of veto over the mediation of the United Nations. As far as we are concerned, our position is that we entirely agree with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. We are ready to continue our co-operation with the United Nations Mediator. We accept the view of the Secretary-General that the Mediator of the United Nations is Dr. Galo Plaza.

162. We come now to the last point of the Turkish representative's reply. He described the declaration of my Government on human minority rights as the "so-called declaration", and, if I correctly put down his own expression, as "not worth the paper that it was written on". Perhaps his mere expression would have been enough; but with your permission, Sir, I should like to say a few words.

163. As I said at the opening of my reply tonight, we take the United Nations very seriously. We have put our faith in it. We want to see the United Nations playing a decisive role in every respect. When we come to the United Nations and declare before you in all solemnity, in the most official manner possible, by letter of the President of Cyprus addressed to the Secretary-General [A/6039], that our Government is prepared not only to guarantee the human rights of all its citizens, irrespective of religion, or race or ethnic origin, but that our Government is prepared to grant certain additional specific minority rights—and not only that—that our Government is prepared to see that those rights are internationally guaranteed through the United Nations in the manner which I described yesterday in my statement, Mr. Eralp called this a nefarious propaganda manoeuvre. Sir, it is not propaganda and it is not a manoeuvre. It is a commitment in this Assembly, a commitment to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

164. He dismissed all these rights and all these guarantees as of no importance. He then said that the rights of the Turks in Cyprus are guaranteed by the present arrangements—"present arrangements" meaning the so-called agreements of Zurich and London. There are two aspects: the rights and the guarantees. As far as the rights which we have declared our intention to grant in the case of the Turks of Cyprus as well as the other minorities in Cyprus, I have this to say. If they are not of so much importance, let the Turkish Government grant exactly the same rights to the Greek minority and other minorities in Turkey. If the method of guaranteeing those rights, that is to say, the presence in Cyprus of the United Nations Commissioner and all the other machinery which I described today, has no importance and is not the right way, and if it is not something serious, something which one should appreciate, let the Turkish Government accept the same procedure in the case of guaranteeing the rights of the minorities in Turkey.

165. I think the Assembly, and the whole world, would welcome an agreement between the Turkish Government and ourselves that we would apply, in the case of our respective minorities, exactly the same rights and the same guarantees. We could enter into an agreement before the Assembly in all solemnity—and I repeat that we take the United Nations seriously and we mean what we say in this hall.

166. The Turkish representative said something which I had not heard before in connexion with any similar case. He said that our declaration was likely to increase tension in Cyprus. He said that the declaration of minority rights and of guaranteeing those minority rights through the United Nations represented a method of increasing tension, and he attempted to confirm his view by an extraordinary interpretation which he himself gave to the last resolution adopted by the Security Council.

167. Tension in Cyprus is not created by the pacifying measures which my Government is continually taking for the purpose of restoring and maintaining peace, and as a series of constructive steps toward a final solution, a just and peaceful solution, on the basis of the principles of the Charter. And, when we speak of the principles of the Charter, we speak of all the principles, and we do not attempt to give to those principles any interpretation different from the one which has been accepted by all in similar cases. We do not try to make use of those principles at the expense of the minorities in Cyprus.

168. In fact, in this connexion, I should inform the Assembly that the representatives of the other minorities in Cyprus—the Armenian minority, the Latin minority, and the Maronite minority—have expressed their gratitude to the Cyprus Government for that declaration of intention which was deposited the other day with the Secretary-General. Why is it that the representatives of other minorities, which are smaller indeed—but perhaps, because of the fact that they are smaller, they are in need of greater and stronger guarantees—have accepted the declaration of our Government as a magnanimous gesture?

169. This declaration of intention is a challenge—and we mean it to be a challenge. The acceptance or non-acceptance of that declaration will prove in this Assembly which party is really interested in the well-being of the people of Cyprus as a whole and of the minorities in particular.

170. The right of veto of the representatives of the minority over the rule of the majority—is that a minority right that should be guaranteed? Is that the kind of minority right to which the representative of Turkey is referring? Shall we accept—and does anyone in this Assembly accept, in the case of his own country—that the representatives of a minority should have the right of veto in foreign affairs, in defence, in taxation, in internal security? Is that the kind of régime that Turkey would be prepared to accept in its own case? Is that the kind of régime we are all fighting to secure in the case of the colonies and in the case of Southern Rhodesia?

171. I think one has to accept the truth in the case of Cyprus if we are to promote a peaceful solution. We do not come here to play with words. We do not come here to speak of the sanctity of treaties when we all know too well how those treaties came about, how those treaties were imposed, in what circumstances they were imposed, what the content of those treaties is, how those treaties have been used—violated, if you like, but used—and how they have become the means of aggression, and the instruments of a policy of division, of a policy of partition.

172. The Turkish representative has made a great effort in defence of his case—and it must be a very hard thing to defend a wrong case. Fortunately, I have not found myself in that position. The role of Turkey in the whole problem of Cyprus is only too well known. I would accept as historical fact that Turkey is not wholly to blame; I would accept as historical fact that Turkey found itself involved in the Cyprus problem without perhaps, at a certain stage, realizing it.

173. I should like to quote from the memoirs of the British Prime Minister who was in office in 1955, or perhaps a little earlier than that—namely, Sir Anthony Eden, as he was then called. I shall not attempt to read any particular meaning of my own into what I am going to quote; I shall not interpret it, but shall simply leave it to the Assembly. He said:

"The Turkish newspapers had hitherto been more outspoken than the Turkish Government, which had behaved with restraint. It was as well, I wrote in a telegram at the time, that they should speak out, because it was the truth that the Turks would never let the Greeks have Cyprus." ^{2/}

This small paragraph indicates clearly how Turkey was involved in the Cyprus issue.

174. I do not wish to refer to the persecutions of Greeks in Istanbul; that has been referred to by the representative of Greece. But to come here, as the Turkish representative did, and present his country as a paradise of religious tolerance—that is a bit too much. I am not going to enumerate how many patriots have been executed, how many people have been hanged. I am not going to refer again to the Armenian tragedy, which, one day, must really come before this Assembly. It is a pity that there is no Armenian who has the right to speak here and put before the Assembly the story of what happened to that unfortunate nation.

175. We do not want any harm done to anyone. We do not want bad relations with anyone. We want good relations with everybody. But, if we are going to have those good relations, the concessions should not be sought on our side, because we have nothing to give up, we have nothing to bargain with, we have nothing to give in exchange for the friendship and understanding of others.

176. We are not trying to get something to which we are not entitled so that we can give something in exchange. We are asking for the rights that everybody has. The results of the exercise of those rights may not please Turkey. The results of the exercise of those rights may not please others. But is the main criterion for granting those rights whether this will please or displease others? That is not the problem. The problem is whether we have and whether we are entitled to those rights. And I should like to repeat the same question which I put before the Assembly yesterday and which the Turkish representative tried to make fun of. The whole problem is before the Assembly in a simple question: is Cyprus entitled to the rights to which everybody else is entitled under the Charter, or is Cyprus an exception? Could the

resolution which has been adopted [resolution 2012 (XX)] and the one which we hope we shall be able to adopt on Rhodesia be valid in the case of Cyprus, or not? Could the resolutions on complete freedom and the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and the principles contained therein, hold good in the case of Cyprus, or not? Is Cyprus entitled to unrestricted sovereignty like every other country, or not? Can any country intervene in the internal affairs of Cyprus, using force and bombs and sending troops? Can this be condoned in the case of Cyprus but dismissed and opposed in all other cases? Can anyone accept any instrument as valid when its purpose is to curtail the sovereignty and the real freedom of a country—the essence of freedom, the essence of democracy, the essence of sovereignty, the essence of independence, the essence of self-determination, the essence of human dignity?

177. If you can condone a situation which would be tantamount, in the case of Cyprus, to putting Cyprus into a straitjacket, to depriving Cyprus of its essential rights, if you can do that, I submit, in all humility, that it is not only the people of Cyprus who are going to suffer; it is not Cyprus alone that will not enjoy justice. It would amount to and constitute a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations. It would be contrary to all the noble principles that this Organization stands for. It would be undermining the very foundation upon which the United Nations is based. It would undermine the authority of the United Nations. The principles of the Charter are primarily for the small countries, and if all these principles were denied in the case of Cyprus, they would, for the small peoples, for the small countries of the world, be principles without any meaning.

178. We continue to have faith and confidence in the United Nations. It is our intention to proceed through the United Nations. It is our intention to keep the problem of Cyprus within the framework of the United Nations. The problem of Cyprus is not a problem for NATO or any other organization and we shall not permit the question of Cyprus to be thrown out of the window of the United Nations. It must stay in the United Nations; it must be given a United Nations solution.

179. I do not think that, in connexion with the Cyprus question, one should be diplomatic. I do not think that, in this respect, one should try to play politics. We shall not do so because it is a question of existence, a question of survival. It is for us a question of human and national dignity. We shall always be frank and straightforward with you, and whatever we say in this hall we mean. We take the United Nations very seriously, and we should like to see the United Nations take seriously into consideration our own demands which are based on the Charter of the United Nations and on nothing else.

180. Mr. ZAKARIA (India): The Assembly heard, a little while ago, the Foreign Minister of Pakistan replying to my statement. It was, however, I submit, no reply, but at best a reiteration of the stand of his Government. But he avoided answering the basic question of aggression against our territory by his country; and that is what constitutes a violation of the United Nations Charter. Not once, but three times

^{2/} Anthony Eden, Full Circle (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960), p. 446.

in eighteen years, Pakistani aggression against India has taken place. However hard Mr. Bhutto may try—and I concede that he has been trying very hard—he cannot get rid of the monster of aggression which pursues him, I submit, like his own shadow.

181. I was also amused to hear the Pakistani Foreign Minister so full of exuberance and praise of Sheikh Abdullah. But he should go through the records of his own predecessors to know what they thought of the Sheikh until yesterday. The fact is that when Sheikh Abdullah wielded power he was one of the most outspoken champions of Kashmir's integration with India. Today, in opposition, he may say something else. That, as I said in my statement, cannot alter a situation which the Sheikh and the National Conference, among others, were instrumental in bringing about.

182. Today, Mr. Bhutto described Sheikh Abdullah to this Assembly as "the Lion of Kashmir". But until yesterday, when Sheikh Abdullah was with us—and he came here several times on behalf of India to argue the case of Kashmir's accession to India—he was described by the Pakistanis as a "mouse". Can there be greater irony?

183. Mr. Bhutto made several other points, but I must humbly submit that they were all points repeated over and over again with full and complete replies by the Indian delegation. The records of the United Nations are full of them. I have, therefore, no intention of entering into another exchange of abuse on the same old grounds and of prolonging this debate. My delegation has made our position on Kashmir absolutely and completely clear. There can be, and there shall be, no deviation from that position.

184. Mr. AYUB (Pakistan): I apologize to you, Mr. Vice-President, and to the representatives for seeking the floor at this late hour. I agree entirely with the last remark of the representative of India, that nothing is gained by repeating, ad nauseam, the arguments for and against the issues which have been put to this Assembly. I have no more desire than he had to go over this well-trodden ground. Statements, some lengthy, some short, have been made to this Assembly with regard to the problem of Kashmir by the Foreign Ministers of both India and Pakistan and by other members of the delegations, dealing with, and sometimes repeating, the various points, arguments and quotations that each of us is perfectly capable of citing, but I should like to recapitulate the position, as I see it, so that at the end of this debate the main features and the salient facts are not drowned in oratory or controversy.

185. The first point which emerges very clearly, and which has not been controverted by any of the representatives of India, is that the Kashmir dispute has been before the United Nations since January 1948. It is still an unresolved dispute. The dispute concerns not merely India and Pakistan; the fate of 5 million people is at stake. The dispute cannot, I submit, be resolved without reference to these people.

186. The second point which comes up very clearly—and this is a short answer to the charge of aggression which the representative of India made earlier in the day, and which was repeated again

now—is that all these charges were made, were debated and were rebutted in the Security Council between January and April in 1948. The Security Council took into account all that India could say in support of its allegation, and came to the conclusion, as I submitted in my earlier intervention of 29 September, that this was not a relevant issue. What mattered was that the future of this disputed territory should be decided by ascertaining the wishes of the people. If there were time, and if anyone were interested, I could quote from the statements of the various representatives who took part in that debate, but the verbatim records of the Security Council are available to all Members of the Assembly.

187. The next point to note is that the international agreement with regard to Kashmir, which is embodied in the two resolutions of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, was arrived at and accepted by India long after the so-called accession of Jammu and Kashmir, which goes back to 27 October 1947, and long after India's allegation that Pakistan had been guilty of an act of aggression at that time.

188. India cannot today come and plead that a subsequent international agreement is not binding because of some earlier event or earlier contentions that the representative of India might have raised before the Security Council.

189. The representative of India, in his first intervention this afternoon, quoted statements of the representative of the United States in support of his argument that Jammu and Kashmir was legally a part of India. I have before me three statements of representatives of the United States to the contrary. I would be reluctant to take the time of the Assembly to read all of them, but I will give the references.

190. The first was made at the 243rd meeting of the Security Council, held on 10 February 1948, when the United States representative, Mr. Austin, declared:

"As I have said, there seems to be no other way of bringing peace to that part of the world than this specific method of agreement between the parties, which involve such management and such control of the plebiscite—to which both parties have assented—as to ensure that everyone interested will know that it is free, fair and just." ^{10/}

191. Three years later, when the Kashmir problem was again before the Security Council, Mr. Gross, speaking on behalf of the United States, had this to say at the 532nd meeting of the Security Council on 21 February 1951:

"The United States Government firmly believes that there can be no real and lasting settlement of the Kashmir dispute which is not acceptable to both parties. Any attempt to decide the issue without the consent of both parties would only leave a constant and explosive irritant in the relations between these two Governments, an irritant which would effectively prevent the bringing about of peace and security in South Asia. Our friendship for the Governments and

^{10/} Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Nos. 16-35, 243rd meeting, p. 75.

peoples of Pakistan and India has led us always to stand ready to extend whatever aid and service we can in contributing to their friendly and peaceful relationship. The Prime Minister of India on 2 November 1947, in a radio broadcast, stated that the future of Kashmir should be settled by a referendum held under international auspices, such as the United Nations. He repeated this pledge in Press statements as late as 30 September 1950 and 16 January 1951."

That was 1951. He went on to say:

"Moreover,"—and this bears out the point I submitted earlier—"in the light of the commitment of the Government of India, as expressed in its acceptance of the 5 January 1949 resolution of the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan, it is clear that such a plebiscite can be held only under United Nations auspices, if it is to provide the guarantees of fairness and impartiality expressed in the Commission's resolution." ^{11/}

192. Finally, and I think this states the views of the United States Government as clearly as anyone could put them, Ambassador Gross had this to say at the meeting of the Security Council held on 21 March 1951:

"The responsibility of the Government of India and of the Government of Pakistan, under their international commitment in accepting these two resolutions, is to co-operate in settling the question of accession to India or Pakistan by a free and impartial plebiscite under United Nations auspices. . . .

"The parties, moreover, are committed to permit the people of Kashmir to decide the question of accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India or to Pakistan. That commitment is not, as the distinguished representative of India has said, and I quote the words he used in the Security Council, 'to give the people the right to decide whether they would remain in India or not'. To phrase the plebiscite question in this form would be to disregard the binding agreement accepted by both parties. The Security Council has from the beginning held that the issue of accession is one which is to be settled by a fair and impartial plebiscite under United Nations auspices, and both parties, in the language of their own commitments, have accepted this view." ^{12/}

193. This too is, and has been throughout, our view of this problem. The representative of India repeated something that one of his colleagues had said earlier, that the United Nations resolutions—presumably he meant India's commitments under them—had lapsed. He said that they were as dead as a dodo. I submitted the other day that international agreements do not lapse with the passage of time; least of all do they lapse through the default of one of the parties to such agreements. If there is a dispute—and time and again the representatives of India seek to cast doubts as to whether Pakistan or India has been in default under these international agreements or the United Nations resolutions—it should, I submit, be decided through

the well-known procedures prescribed by the Charter of the United Nations. The matter could be dealt with by the Security Council, as in the past; it could be dealt with by the General Assembly itself, if it so chooses. It could be dealt with by referring issues of a legal character to the International Court. We have been prepared to do so, we have made this offer before and I repeat it again: we are prepared to accept the impartial judgement of a third party on the question as to whether it is India or Pakistan which has failed to observe the provisions of the two UNCIP resolutions. If it is established that Pakistan has been in default as regards certain commitments that were meant to be carried out, we are perfectly willing to carry them out, provided a similar obligation is accepted by India and the United Nations ensures that India will carry out that commitment.

194. The representative of India quoted certain statements made by Sheikh Abdullah in the days when he saw eye-to-eye with the Government of India and was their chief Minister in Srinagar, and sometimes a member of their delegation to the United Nations. Our representative, particularly Mr. Tariq Abdullah, reminded the Assembly of the statements his father had made after he had been disillusioned by the policies of the Government of India and by the manner in which his old personal friend and the much respected Prime Minister of India had gone back on his solemn pledges to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. All these statements are there and the representatives can read them.

195. But if you have any doubts in your minds as to what are the feelings of Sheikh Abdullah—and it seems that both India and Pakistan are quoting him with respect—why does not the Government of India release Sheikh Abdullah from detention? He is in gaol without trial and no charges have been brought against him. Bring him here to this forum and let the General Assembly hear from Sheikh Abdullah's own lips both as to the views he held in the past and the views which he holds today on the basic question of whether the people of Jammu and Kashmir wish to remain with India or whether they wish to join Pakistan. We are perfectly prepared to hear Sheikh Abdullah's views and to give them the weight and importance which they undoubtedly deserve.

196. Speakers on both sides have quoted press reports as to what is currently going on in Indian-occupied Kashmir. In fact, both quoted reports from the same newspaper, one representative from an earlier edition of this newspaper and another from a later edition. However, there is a perfectly good way of ascertaining the facts. The United Nations does not have to go by reports from Press correspondents, however well informed they may be or however able they may be. The United Nations has the means and the machinery for ascertaining the facts and forming its own conclusions.

197. May I repeat the offer that was made the other day on behalf of our delegation by Mr. Tariq Abdullah, that an impartial commission of investigation be sent immediately to Jammu and Kashmir in order to examine the situation throughout the State, to obtain the evidence of the acknowledged leaders of the people of Jammu and Kashmir and to report its findings to

^{11/} Ibid., Sixth Year, 532nd meeting, paras. 32-33.

^{12/} Ibid., 537th meeting, paras. 29 and 30.

the Security Council or the General Assembly. There is nothing sinister in this proposal. The representative of India has said that India is a great democracy, that it is an open society and that it has a free Press. Then what are they worried about? What have they to hide from an international commission which wishes only to ascertain the facts and the views of people who can speak on behalf of the oppressed people of Jammu and Kashmir? It is astonishing that this offer was not accepted immediately and that this controversy, at any rate as to what is happening in Jammu and Kashmir, was not set at rest.

198. The Kashmir dispute is an explosive issue. Twice within our lifetimes it has led to war between India and Pakistan. The armed forces of India and Pakistan are still facing each other across hundreds of miles of the sub-continent. The issue is not going to be resolved by clever debating points or by citing this part or that part of the record of the Security Council's handling of the problem during the last eighteen years. A cease-fire was brought about through the intervention of the Security Council and as a result of joint action by the four permanent members of the Council. But that cease-fire was only the first step envisaged by the Security Council; other steps have still to follow. There is the problem of withdrawal of troops. And then the most crucial problem remains: to settle the political problem which is the root-cause of the conflict between India and Pakistan, namely the future of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. If the United Nations wishes to solve this problem

—and I have not doubt that that is the wish of the Members of the Assembly—I submit that they have to ensure that in arriving at such a political settlement, past international agreements with regard to Jammu and Kashmir have to be honoured. The time has long since gone when any sovereign State, even a State as big as India, can treat an international agreement as a scrap of paper. We know what happened to countries that described international treaties in those words. Certainly the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations cannot be parties to this approach to international commitments or to resolutions of the United Nations which two sovereign States willingly accepted seventeen years ago.

199. It will also be your bounden duty—and I mean the international community, the General Assembly of the United Nations as the largest and most representative body of the international community—to ensure that the fundamental right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide the future affiliation of their State is fully respected.

200. That, in sum, is our position. That is our only request.

201. The PRESIDENT: With that last statement we have completed the list of speakers wishing to speak in exercise of their right of reply. I therefore declare the General Debate concluded.

The meeting rose at 6.55 p.m.