

Speeches and Statements (April 1 – June 30 1972)

SPEECHES AND STATEMENTS

(APRIL 1 – JUNE 30 1972)

ZULFIQAR ALI BHUTTO



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

**Transcript of interview with Dr. Walter Berg of German
Television in Karachi on April 2, 1972.**

Question: Mr. President, what is your opinion had been the main causes for the disintegration of the Islamic Republic in its original structure and what are the lesson to be drawn from this tragic development?

President: Well, there are, suppose, many causes over the past 25 years but if you pinpoint them apart from the classic ones which were known before partition about the distance and all that, but in spite of the distance we remained together for 25 years, I think basically the economic exploitation of East Pakistan was the primary factor and secondary, I think that lack of political participation and intuitions was the second factor. If we had evolved a constitution in the earlier years, when there was all the enthusiasm to work together, that would have brought about the participation, strengthened political parties in both wings of the country, strengthened the services: and with that, of course, as I said earlier, the first and the most important factor was the economic system. There was exploitation. My party repeatedly warned the successive governments about the internal colonial structure of the economy and we advocated social and economic reforms giving the east Pakistan much greater participation but I think there are other factors also, taking everything into account, these are the two most important factors in my opinion.

Question: then if one count put back clock of history for a year, would you repeat your boycott of the National Assembly under similar circumstances?

President: I would if I did boycott. I know the whole press outside Pakistan kept using that word and I kept denying that I was boycotting the assembly. I put forward two alternatives. One was to give us a little more time to arrive at a settlement outside the Assembly so that we could go into the assembly and frame a constitution in 120 days.

Question: this agreement on fundamentals?

President: yes, because you see the stipulation was that if the constitution is not framed in 120 days, the Assembly would stand dissolved and the points of view were on the one hand one

extreme asking for confederation and on the other hand were people wanting some common federation. The reconcile those two conflicting opinions we wanted a little time and we said that if this time is not given to us then the stipulation of framing the constitution in 120 days should be withdrawn. We put forth two concrete alternatives. One, either we should be given time to come to a settlement or the period of 120 days should be withdrawn.

Question: so it wants a straightforward boycott, it was just a situation of another timing?

President: and that also we stipulated, that we wanted about two to three weeks more at the most. That means instead of the Assembly Session being held on the 3rd of March. And we tried to have another meeting with Mujibur Rahman. Tried to influence public opinion and tried to get to an agreement. Failing that, we said, we would go to the Assembly.

Question: Now regarding the new constitution, do you think that the Islamic Foundation of Pakistan excludes the possibility of a secular constitution though it were to probably encourage more socially progressive development?

President: No, not at all. I don't think there is any incompatibility with the Islamic framework of Pakistan and the Islamic basis of Pakistan with a secular constitution.

Question: Is that to be combined?

President: Yes, of course, because Islam guarantees to the minorities their dues, their rights, and does not discriminate against other minorities, either religious or racial. So it is quite compatible to have secular constitution and stand by Islamic principles. Turkey has a secular constitution and in the have a secular constitution.

Question: And the necessity of preserving the unity of Pakistan, what does that mean – argument in favor or against a federalist structure of the state with a certain degree of autonomy?

President: No. I think the composition of our country is such that the federal form of constitution is unavoidable. We have no choice. This is the mistake that some people made in the past. They thought that they had a choice to impose a constitution on Pakistan. As you know, as you know as a German, that you don't really have a choice. You see the conditions and the constitution must reflect those conditions. It must mirror the realities of the existing conditions of the country. That is why we have objective conditions which require a federal constitution.

Question: And towards this end this could mean autonomy for the provinces?

President: IN federalism there is always autonomy for the provinces.

Question: But not as much as East Bengal was asking for?

President: That was a different situation altogether. East Pakistan had certain reasons. One was that we were one thousand miles away. The second was that they were the majority of the people. Third was that they earned a great deal for foreign exchange. There were many factors which called for a special arrangement.

Question: Which could not be compared with all this....?

President: Geographically contiguous. If we should have a six-point constitution in West Pakistan now, why should not India have a federation of that nature as well?

Question: You were emphasizing this very strongly in your speech the other day in Sanghar. Is this a certain process or clement of, say, regional chauvinism?

President: Well, we are passing through the transition and let us say that the backlash of the East Pakistan problem was felt here also. Certain elements picked up extreme form of autonomy bordering on secession, bordering on confederation. But if we go about it sensibly, I am sure that within a short period of time we will be able to make things settle down.

Question: And what scope of co-operation do you see really. 'realistically' is the right word, between the three states in the subcontinent in future?

President: That depends on the other two as well. Still we have not recognized Bangladesh. Mr. Mujibur Rahman claims he will have nothing to do with us until we recognize Bangladesh but I think that's not logical and it does not make political sense that we should in the abstract just get up and say we recognize Bangladesh. We must meet; we must discuss. We would like to still hope and feel that we can convince them to have some links with us and he gave me this assurance before he left that he'll retain some links. I'd like to meet him and ask him what had made him change his mind and why we should not have some links. Especially the experience of the last three months should have shown him and convinced him that it's necessary to have some link. If after that I'm convinced that he would much rather have links with the devil rather than with us, I'll come back and tell my people that I've tried my best. I made every human effort to convince the leaders of East Pakistan. This is the answer they gave me. Perhaps for some time let us accept that position because if we don't, then who takes advantage? In the world, certainly the Pakistan sentiment doesn't grow and only the sentiment of those who want to break it totally and for all time and for all time. And in any event, those links have to be restored 10 years from now, 15 years from now; we must first go apart, recognize that reality and then again come together. So all right. The Germans had to take a decision. We took it. Others had to take the position. It paints us. It paints us very deeply. But then these are the forces in play in contemporary times and we must take note of the music of contemporary times.

Question: And your relationship with Delhi?

President: Delhi, yes, we'd like to have good relations with Delhi. We'd like to have very good relations. But relations in which Delhi also believes that we have a right to live and that we have our legitimate aspirations and we have our legitimate problems and if Delhi, in the spirit of objectivity and friendship, discusses these problems with us, we don't say suddenly, today, but 25 years have passed, a few more years can pass, we are prepared to bring down the tensions. We are prepared to

normalize relations and embark on a new path. We want to try to succeed where our past generations failed. That would be good for Delhi; it would be good for Islamabad. certainly it would be good for the poor people of both countries. But if Delhi assumed an arrogant atmosphere and attitude and feels that it now has a right to impose anything of its own will and choice on Pakistan then I'm afraid with all the goodwill in the world we cant do anything about it.

Question: You have said several times that you want a new start. But how do your countrymen take it after what has happened, after what the Indians have done?

President: Yes, but my people do trust me. You see, it's a question of faith and they know that I would speak in th eir interest. And that's why I have this advantage, but I consider it a disadvantage also because one can't exploit it. I remember when Ayub Khan became president, of course in a different situation, foreigners said you can now do anything but why should you do anything? You should do the right thing whether you're in power, whether you're powerful or not. No matter how powerful you are, if you do the wrong thing that's not applying that power in the interests of the people. The other day a journalist told me "But look what do Gaulle did. He took the brave decision of giving the right of self-determination to the people of Algeria". I said yes, because it is the right thing. If he had done the wrong thing it would not have gone to his credit. If he had used that power to stop the right of self-determination, that would have been the wrong thing. So I don't use his position I have with the people to do something against their interests. I can certainly, within the limits of the need for give -and-take., make some adjustments and take a flexible attitude but I can't take apposition which will be basically against the people's interest, and the people know that.

Question: And the people believe that?

President: And the people know that. And it is my convection, it is my faith. I've learned a little bit about the world and about the history of countries. If you use your power against the people, if you use your power to do the wrong thin, to break international principles, that cannot succeed over a period of time.

Question: Mr. President, you were emphasizing many times during the last couple of weeks that you are ready to make a new start. How do your countrymen take to that?

President: Well, I have come from the people; I'm a creature of the people. They have seen me. They have tested me, and I think they have confidence in my leadership and they know that I'm not going to do anything against their interests and I think that this is a great trust, it's a very sacred trust and I have no intention of abusing it.

Question: So you think, sir, there is a popular sentiment in favor of a reconciliation with India after all that has happened during the last war?

President: Well, I think there is a sentiment now to put down arms for some time, if not for all time, there is that feeling. I think that feeling must be there also. Don't forget that in 25 years we've had three wars and in these three wars we haven't achieved our objectives, military objectives. If India thinks that she has achieved her military objectives by breaking Pakistan, she is mistaken, because India's problems are going to become much more after the fall of Dacca. They were much less before the fall of Dacca. And I use the word "fall" of Dacca deliberately, advisedly, because Dacca has to fall only to Pakistan. Dacca has fallen even to its own people. Dacca has fallen to India and fallen against it. So I don't think we have won, neither they nor we, but three wars in 25 years – wars fought by two of the poorest countries. So I think they also have the feeling, if I can sense it from this distance.

Question: Talking about the benefit of the people, you have conceived and you have conception of Islamic socialism. What does it mean? What are your aims?

President: Well, it's not a new concept really. I think all I can say is that we have tried to articulate it. The word has been used before. It has been used a new phrase but we've tried to give it shape-articulated it. Now there are Christian Democrats in Europe, Christians Socialists at work who are Christians as well as Socialists and we can be Muslims as well as believe in the scientific method of economic development. We can accept

Marxism not in its totality, that the state will wither away, because the Marxist state had not withered away, it has become strong. But is basically scientific approach. So we would like to develop our economic system basically on those lines. First, now a mixed economy moving gradually towards that end. So we take that aspect of Marxism confined to the economic sphere, reject the one related to disbelief in God and that the state withers away, and we adapt it to our conditions keeping our frame work of values, being proud of them, having full faith in the destiny of the Muslim people. That explains it basically.

Question: Yes, what about nationalization of industries? As I understood it, the nationalization doesn't mean change in propriety, it's just a change in management.

President: Well, we've taken over management and that is effective step and I think with the control of management we can lay down policy on production, on future advancement of those industries. We have taken control. The main thing about it is that we have taken control, control over the means of production and distribution. But here we've taken over control and the control now lies with the state. State alone will determine the policy of these industries. If we had gone about it the other way we would have had to pay fantastic compensation and we don't have the money to pay the compensation. You can ask me why then we have appropriated land without compensation. Land is a different matter. Different principles apply to land-owners.

Question: Did you gain enough land or will you gain enough land to distribute to the majority of the landless farmer?

President: Well, you see there will always be a pressure of the population on the land. That is simple mathematics. The land is simply not enough for the population of Pakistan. Even if we were to take away and forfeit all the lands there would still be pressure of the population on the land, number one, secondary, when Ayub Khan had a kind of reform 700,000 acres were taken over by the state then. Well, we are going to also see to it that as much of the peasantry as possible is accommodated on the lands. Our reforms are drastic. They are basic, and time will show that they are basic. That there are certain factors, fixed factors, like the population of the country and the area of the land available. We can't go outside that scope.

Question: Then your own family is very much affected by the land reforms. Isn't it?

President: Yes

Question: There are very many people in very many different ways and some say Mr. Bhutto comes from a feudal family, how can he be a socialist. Others say he is a democrat but at the same time a ruling autocrat and striving at a one-party state. You're described as a vibrant Indian hater; the others say Mr. Bhutto is a man of peace. Others worship you as a man of destiny who has to fulfill. Wants to fulfill on historic mission. Others say, well, no, Mr. Bhutto is just thinking of Bhuttoism. Now could you, Mr. President.

President: I think the mixed picture comes out of the mixed situation, out of a confused situation. The situation is chaotic and so many reflections of that chaos come in the minds of people. In the first place, the simpler answer to the question is that I come from a feudal background, feudal family, how can I be a socialist? This is a bit uncharitable not only to me but is actually being derogatory of nation's leadership. In Europe you accept people coming from the aristocracy as being influenced by their mind and by their convictions. You, in the back of your mind, refuse to believe that Asian leaders can be influenced by principles and convictions. That is why you give us a subjective route, that we must be having some greedy or some selfish motive to propound the principles. So this actually is a reflection of the European era, of concept of the Asian man in the colonial period. You have never questioned your own people who, in England, or in France, or in Germany, came from very big families but on principles they accepted the cause of socialism, never questioned it. But here because we are Asians and you have a concept of the Asian and that is a betrayal of that concept. I'm sorry if I'm using hard words but I must speak the truth because I have heard enough of this.

Question: Yes, you must have heard it many, many times?

President: Yes, and only from foreign correspondents and foreigners. So the time has come when I must speak out rather plainly on it. That's one thing. Secondly, the question is as I told

you, I believe in objective politics as much as possible. That reality is an important factor, in that principles should be subordinated into a passing reality. The principles must remain in fact but within the scope of those principles there is considerable room in politics to step backwards and forwards, not to go against the current and tide. One must know when to move forward and when to go back, like in military work. And so with the principles remaining unchanged, intact, one has to be a little flexible, and if you're not flexible the people suffer. Theories don't matter finally. Theories are important because out of theories comes clarity, comes an approach, comes a sense of direction. Theories are the blueprints of the political architecture. You cannot ignore these things but if sometimes the design has to be changed for some reason or for a catastrophe or something or the other that has happened, then we must take cognizance of it. And basically our own people have said all sorts of things about me; I'm a Fascist; I'm not really a socialist; I don't believe in democracy. Basically, I believe in democracy.

Question: I hope you don't resent this, I ask these provocative questions in order to get provocative answers.

President: I've not been provoked in the past but I thought the time has come when I must.

Question: One must get tired of this, I'm sure.

President: Basically, of course, I believe in democracy, I've got a commitment to the democratic approach. We have seen the benefits of democracy in other parts of the world and we have seen the utter failure of the non-democratic systems. They succeed very well for a period of time but then they collapse. But here again we're trying. As soon as I took over I told the nation that we'd be away with this Martial Law. We would be through with it. We'd have the Assembly and we'd put a constitution through the Assembly. We'd have the Assembly give us a constitution. That means we have the people giving us a constitution and we'll make every effort to make that constitution work. But there are upheavals. There are explosions that take place and Asia is going through a period of explosions and upheavals. Institutions, they come into being and before they take root they become obsolete because things are moving so fast. Events are moving fast. People are moving fast. My mind is

moving fast. So we have problems and I will not say that all our problems will be overcome by having a constitution and by restoring democracy, but when things settle down generally then I think these institutions will begin to work and they can settle down generally only when we have overcome fundamentally the economic challenge.

Question: An American Colleague of mine once wrote that you admire most Genghis Khan and Napoleon, Adenauer, de Gaulle and Mao Tse-Tung. Now this is very widespread.

President: Widespread. He didn't ask me in that way. From the New York Times. He told me to mention people who have influenced my mind. I said when I was in school and college I used to keep pictures of heroes in my room and that stage is gone and I don't have that kind of hero-worship; I can't have that kind of hero-worship in individuals and personalities but certain people have interested me more than others and he asked me so I said well, in the military field, Genghis Khan was a genius. Not that his name, I mentioned Genghis. So also I said Napoleon, of course, mentioned Adenauer in our times; Mao Tse-Tung in our times and de Gaulle. But it was in that sense.

Question: Yes, from Adenauer to Mao Tse-Tung. It's a very wide.....

President: Yes, but Adenauer's role is in Europe. Mao Tse-Tung remained in Asia but both were international figures.

Question: One very conservative; one very revolutionary.

President: Well, conditions in Germany were different. The situation in Germany is different and they both made their nations. Mr. Brandt is able to do today is because there if Adenauer was not there. So what Mr. Brandt is able to do today is because there was an Adenauer.

Question: And I thank you very much, Mr. President. May I ask one question? Would you agree to a "Meet the Press" conference if we come here at any time of your convenience? "Meet the Press" is panel of three journalists from Germany but it's probable that we would interview you for half an hour and we

would proceed to Dacca and interview Mujibur Rahman for half an hour. Do you think that could be done?

President: Yes. In principle I agree. Whenever you like. Give me some time.

Dr. Berg: Yes sure, I would keep in contact with you and if you agree in principle it is just a question of timing that you send us a cable and say in three days we can do it.

President: You'd have to synchronize it with him (Mujib) also.

Dr. Berg: Yes, sure.

Address to the Nation Announcing Police Reforms

On April 12, 1972

Citizens, custodians of law and order,

We attach the highest importance to the welfare and contentment of the police. This is for self-evident reasons. A dissatisfied police force seeks to give vent to its fury on the people. This in turn leads to a vicious circle of conflict and tension between the people and the police. We have been the victims of this vicious circle for far too long. We are determined gradually to break it by taking measures to create a better equation and a better relationship between the people and the police. This police reform is as much a reform for the people as it is for the police. I am determined to make our police force a modern, exemplary force. We do not look on the responsibilities of the police only in the limited context of law and order. Nevertheless, a modern state does deal with the problems of crime, delinquency and law-breaking. The primary responsibility of the police is to deal with this vital problem. All conceptions of law and order, safety of the individuals, protection of the weak and the helpless from the strong and powerful, are in the ultimate analysis dependent on the efficient and proper working of the police. If the police force in a country is given its due place in society, is well trained, disciplined and well equipped; if it acts in an honest manner without fear or favour; if it is accountable to the people, then without doubt the state structure has been laid on correct foundations.

On December 20, 1971 in my first address to the nation, I mentioned the need to provide the policemen with a living wage, to put an end to the image of zulm and corruption and to replace it with that of a friend and a protector of the law abiding citizens and the poor. Mr. G. Ahmed, an experienced police officer, was immediately entrusted with the task of translating these objectives into a workable programme. On receipt of this report, for the purpose of providing immediate relief, the decisions of the Government relating to pay and allowances of subordinate staff of the police force were announced by the Finance Minister on February 27.

A police force can be responsible and responsive only if it is accountable to the people. I have taken this as a cardinal principle. I have decided that the public and the police should meet each other periodically in District Consultative Committees to review the police public relations. At the provincial level, a standing committee of the provincial legislature would be constituted for this purpose. In this way it is hoped the accountability and co-operation will go hand in hand.

The public will also have new institution. The Ombudsman and the administrative courts will be formed for the redress of its grievances against the administration. The Ombudsman may investigate or cause to be investigated by any agency public complaints regarding excesses, abuse of authority, or failure of the administration. The administrative courts would examine public complaints against erroneous actions of the administration. These courts will have power to adjudicate cases brought before them by members of the public who may have suffered injustices at the hands of Government authorities.

Provision is being made for summarily dealing with cases of corruption which cannot be dealt with under the ordinary procedures. The corrupt will find no mercy. Special tribunals will be appointed for this purpose with power to retire corrupt officials. While we will do everything to ensure that the honest are not victimized or subjected to the pressure of influential and interested individuals, it is to be ensured that the corrupt are weeded out. Efficiency and discipline rules will also be modified so as to enable action to be taken under the police rules in order to meet the requirements of a uniformed, efficient police force.

The police force, as it now stands, is being reorganized. In future, in order to promote the acquisition of skills and specialization, the crime police will be separately organized in urban areas on an experimental basis.

A feeder police organization will be set up and this organization will deal with such offences as inter-provincial smuggling, illicit traffic in drugs currency offences, enforcement of laws relating to foreigners, immigration and passport, child - lifting from one province to another and other heinous inter - provincial crimes.

Training and discipline are the sine qua non of an effective force. The police training school at Sihala is being organized into a police training academy so that proper training can be imparted to senior police officers as well. Quality of training for both officers and men will be improved. Along with academic grounding, attention will be devoted to impress upon trainees the duties of the police towards society.

It has been decided to improve the mobility of the police force and more vehicles will be provided to them for this purpose. The network in provincial, range and district headquarters will be improved and all police stations connected by telephone or wireless. The force shall be equipped with better weapons on modern lines.

I have always held the view that it is not possible to have an honest policeman with enormous powers at a salary of Rs. 70/- a month, which was the case before. We have already changed this position. Now, the minimum salary that a policeman will draw will be Rs. 110/-. In addition to this, we will continue the ration subsidy of Rs. 11.75/- we have also increased the existing allowances and have introduced new ones. Policemen will now be paid per mensem a crime allowance of Rs. 10/-, a traffic allowances of Rs. 50/- a conveyance allowance of Rs. 5/-, a washing allowance of Rs. 3/-, house rent allowance at the rate of 15% of the initial salary (say against Rs. 1/- to 3/- for a constable and Rs. 2.50 to Rs. 5/- for a head constable before) and a horse allowance of Rs. 60/- (as against the previous allowance of Rs. 40/- per mensem). Inspectors, sub-inspectors and Assistant Sub-Inspectors will continue to draw the motor cycle allowance admissible to them.

Police personnel will get a disability pension according to the formula applicable to armed forces. The widow of a police officer, killed in the discharge of his duty, will receive pension according to her husbands entitlement.

In addition to sanctioning these allowances, I have decided that in the provinces of Punjab, NWFP and Baluchistan, every year additional residential accommodation will be provided at the rate of 5% till it meets the requirements of 50% of the total strength of the police force. This is not being done in the province of Sindh as these facilities already exist there.

It will also be ensured that special ration depots are opened in all Police Lines so that essential food articles are available to the policemen at controlled rates. Police hospitals will be improved, adequately staffed and kept well-stocked with medicines. Medical treatment will be free for policemen and their families. Adequate funds are being provided by the Provincial Governments for this purpose. My Government has already declared that education up to Matric shall be free for the children of all Government employees drawing a salary of up to Rs. 500/- a month. This benefit will extend to policemen as well.

We have also decided to increase the issue of summer uniforms from one to two per year.

While the increase in pay and allowances was a must, I confess that I would have felt happier if more could have been done. However, this is all that can be done at present with the available resources of the country. A press conference will be held soon after the session of the National Assembly to elaborate on the measures of reforms.

My dear custodians of law and order, you have a very important role to perform. Your nation looks upon you to do this honestly and efficiently. Your nation is poor. It is beset with immense problems. I repeat, it is giving you all that it can afford at present. Pakistan expects you to do your duty diligently and faithfully. And when you do your duty to the people, they will give you their support and respect. I sincerely hope you will now improve your image and will serve the nation with a spirit of dedication, with smartness and with patriotic fervors.

Address the nation announcing law reforms on April 13, 1972.

Citizens and Friends,

There are two fundamental functions of government in every state that hopes to survive. The first of these functions is the preservation of the state and its citizens from external dangers. The second fundamental function of every state is to preserve itself and its citizens from internal dangers. The state must protect itself from internal breaches of peace ranging from simple assault and other private wrongs to treason. It must also prevent any undermining of the social order and at the same time it must keep open the avenues of social progress including the adjudication of disputes between citizens.

In the process of preserving the state internally, the courts play a vital part. They provide the instrumentality for the trial of disputes between individuals for the protection of human beings living in organized society. This makes the administration of justice an indispensable concomitant of a civilized society. This is part of the basic creed of a Muslim. It is repeatedly emphasized in the Holy Quran as one of the highest attributes of man. So it is said in Al-Nisa: "Ye who believe? Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to God, even as against yourself". The Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) is nevertheless, for a variety of reasons no attention worth the name had been paid to it so far in Pakistan. A Family Law Commission was set up in 1955 and a Law Reforms Commission in 1958. Some half-hearted action was taken on the reports of these two commissions but it was found to be inadequate. Some of the changes in the law made after the report of the Law Commission were not in consonance with its report. Later on they had to be retracted.

Justice delayed is justice denied is an ancient adage. In truth, a provision which may well be devised for or against a party may dwell in the intricacies of procedure. With a view to these factors we have now proclaimed law reforms which in the main follow the recommendations of the Law Commission set up in 1967. The details of the law ordinance will be explained by the Law Minister at a press conference shortly to be

convened by him. I may briefly recapitulate some of the salient features of this reform.

In the field of criminal procedure, the commitment proceedings have been abolished, the summons -case trial procedure is made the rule in the Magisterial Courts, while the warrant-case trial procedure will continue in the High Courts and the Courts of Session. Categories of offences which may be compounded have been enlarged, the jurisdiction of the courts of session widened and courts in general empowered to punish a person who swears false testimony.

In the field of civil procedure, a sharp departure from old practice is the conferment of revisional jurisdiction on District Judges and the limiting of right of second appeal in certain cases. The letters patent appeals in the High Courts have been abolished, so also the appeals in suits in which the value of the property is less than Rs. 2.000 – they merely added one more tier to courts of appeal. Provisions have also been made for speedy service of the parties and their witnesses which, more than anything else, was the prime cause of delay. It is hoped that all these measures will lead to speedier disposal of cases than hitherto for.

A recurrent demand of the people since the days of the British in the Indo -Pakistan subcontinent has been the separation of judiciary from the executive. This was introduced by administrative order at one time in the province of West Pakistan. Soon enough it was found that a half-way house has no benefits, and the status quo was resumed. Things were not allowed to rest at that. So there came a time when a previous regime not only took administrative steps to tighten the executive power over subordinate criminal judiciary but actually pushed the clock of progress back by the endorsement of the West Pakistan Criminal law (Amendment) Act which introduced the Jirga system which was the very travesty of justice. The dispensation of justice because the hand maiden of the rulers. Before the Law Reforms Commission, 1967, an argument was sought to be made for retention of special tribunals. The commission, after full consideration, reflected this view, and accepted the popular demand that judiciary be separated from the executive. During the last two years, however, no action was taken on this report and the matter, as it often happens, lay in cold storage.

The Law Reforms Ordinance, 1972, which is being promulgated today, fulfils a long cherished desire of the people. Justice hence forth will be completely independent of the executive, and independence is a basic requirement for impartiality. However, as the separation would involve a huge dislocation of machinery, the provincial Governments have been empowered to enforce this part at any time upto the 1st January next year. If a Provincial Government is able to do so earlier, it is permissible to enforce this provision forth with. There would be no hurdle in its way towards the acceptance of the demand. Once accepted and written into law, it would be impossible for any subsequent Government to go back upon it. It will become a part of our way of life. The golden principle that justice is not only to be done but also must be seen to be done has now been implemented. There will be a separation of powers inasmuch as the prosecutors and the judges will henceforth be completely separate. We trust that the stories of police high-handedness and of the perversion of justice will become tales of the past.

We are setting up a permanent Law Commission with a jurist who is or has been a judge of the Supreme Court to be its Chairman. The members will be experts in different branches of law-civil., criminal, commercial etc. modern concept of welfare state has led to enormous legislation on variety of subjects to deal with situations and contingencies that had never arisen before. It also require scrutiny of the existing laws which, under modern conditions, is as necessary as repairs are necessary to a railway, if it has to continue as a going concern. All this requires expert advice and, therefore, the necessity of a Permanent Law Commission.

In certain respects the ordinance goes beyond the recommendations of the Law Reform Commission. The law of evidence in relation to the trial of civil and criminal cases arising out of statements which are defamatory is being amended so that complainant or the plaintiff is not subjected to scandalous questions in cross examination at the initial stage of the proceedings when the question before the court will be whether the defamatory statement was made and, if so, whether it was true.

The legal Practitioners and Bar Council Act, 1965, is also being amended to require counsel appearing in any case whether civil, criminal or otherwise to fill up a power of attorney signifying his acceptance of brief by him with a certificate separately signed by him indicating fees settled and paid with balance, if any, remaining payable.

Provision with regard to grant of bail for under-trials and convicts whose appeals are pending have been liberalized in more than one respect. For example, every accused person must be brought to trial within 6 months of his arrest failing which he shall be entitled to be released on bail, however serious the charge against him may be.

We have played our part. It is now for the judges to fulfill their function. However perfect the law, however high the ideals, it will come to nothing if those who administer it do not perform their best. Integrity of character in judges is a paramount requirement. But integrity ought not to degenerate into license, impartiality cannot be allowed to mean perverseness. I attach the highest importance to the selection of judges. It goes without saying that judges must be well-qualified. But that is never enough.

It has been said that there is a difficulty in measuring judicial attributes objectively and that in our search for selection of the best judges we are driven inevitably to the best method of selection. More than that, we cannot do.

Good law administered by good judges and judicial powers available to the rich and the poor alike, these are the dreams of everyone. The vista is pleasant and I have no doubt that judges will rise to the occasion. We Muslims have a glorious heritage. The people of Pakistan are equally determined to have a glorious future.

Address as the president of the National Assembly of Pakistan on April 14, 1972

You have bestowed upon me a signal honour, the Presidency of the first ever truly elected representative Assembly of Pakistan. It is an honour that I will always remember and cherish. For, no honour can be greater than the presidency of this house, charged as it is with the task of giving to the people of Pakistan a constitution. I see before me other show may perhaps be more wise or deserving, but you have kindly given me this pride of place. I am grateful to you. Even more, I thank the people of Pakistan who elected you and me and conferred on us this great honour. We are assembled here as a symbol of the victory of the people, the voice of the people has indeed prevailed. And, above all, I am grateful to Almighty Allah who in His infinite mercy and grace has seen fit to have me preside over this august body and the destiny of the nation at this critical juncture. I thank you again for giving me this honour to serve you. I once again, here and now, rededicate myself before this distinguished House, before the people of Pakistan and before Almighty Allah to serve Pakistan and our people to the final limits of my ability.

Honourable members of this distinguished House: we are assembled today at a time which in every respect is the most crucial in the brief and blighted history of our state. Our people, our friends and, most of all, our enemies are keenly watching the proceedings of this House. This is so because our terribly bruised and sundered nation is facing its severest test of survival.

The people who have reposed their confidence in us expect that through our deliberations and joint endeavors we will now replace their worries and anxieties with deliverance and hope. Our friends, who view us with genuine sympathy and concern, pray that we shall overcome our difficulties and realize the true potential of Pakistan. Our enemies, who have already done us grievous injury, are waiting for the chance to bury us. If we keep before ourselves all these grim realities, a full measure of the challenge facing this House becomes self-evident.

In appreciating our grave responsibilities, it would be proper to remember also the signal honour bestowed upon us. Pakistan has had several national assemblies including two that, like this House, were also charged with the framing of a constitution. It is however, for the first time that we celebrates today the true majesty of the people who are the real sovereigns of the state of Pakistan. This assembly and I cannot emphasis it too much, is the first whose members have been directly elected on the basis of adult franchise.

So our meeting is an historic event. It is also a sad one. Half the seats in this House are empty and those elected representatives who should have been with us here today, are a thousand miles away in another capital. This need not have been so. It would not have been so if our self-appointed masters had heeded our please for a political settlement and allowed the selected representatives to negotiate its terms in freedom.

I am sure we would have found a way out, and why to? After all, we had come together of our own free will and lived together as one nation for 24 years. This came about because of the shared compulsions of history, religion, economic well-being and survival. Then why did we suffer the great tragedy of 1971? Why from the heights of independence in 1947 did we plunge to the depths of defeat, disintegration and despair in 1971? Let us go back and examine why 1947 came about, and why 1971. To do so, we must first examine the seeds of inspiration that fructified into Pakistan.

Hon'ble Members:

Many views have been expressed about the genesis of Pakistan: many inter-related factors did indeed inspire the quest for a Muslim homeland. But in essence we separated from India because we rejected its iniquitous system, its exploitation and domination. This struggle against tyranny culminated in our people braving the enormous hazards of Partition to carve out Pakistan, the pure land of promise and fulfillment. Millions of India Muslims made the great pilgrimage to integrate with the Balouch, the Bengali, the Pathan, the Punjabi and the Sindhi to build to largest Muslim State on the foundations of Islamic Justice and brotherhood. Our ambition was to create a country where we could shape every thing according to our beliefs, our traditions and our aspirations.

The exploitation and denomination of the Muslim began long before the middle of the nineteenth century, the date that is commonly accepted-long before 1843 when Sindh was taken over by the British or when a few years later the Punjab was annexed. It really commenced with the eclipse of the Mughal Empire in 1707 and became visible fifty years later after the defeat of Siraj-ud-Daula by Clive at Plessey in 1757. It was the support of the powerful Hindu merchants of the area as much as the treachery of Mir Jafar that gave the British their victory,.

Clive's administration looted Bengal so freely that it was denounced as a robber state. It was Muslim Bengal that bore the main brunt of British occupation. The systematic plundering and maladministration brought in their wake a famine in 1770 that destroyed a third of the population. Who were these unfortunate people? Mostly the poor Muslims of Bengal. Although it led to the passage of an Act in the British Parliament to regulate the administration of Bengal, the old British -Bania combination continued in power. Their victims were the Muslims, whether they were land owners, tenants, or weavers. Muslims were not given employment in the army or the civil services. Their educational and religious funds were misapplied and misappropriated, their lands extensively taken over.

Muslim areas in the west of the subcontinent did not suffer this prolonged ruthless exploitation as they did not fall to the British till some 90 years after the Battle of Plassey. But, subsequently, they too did not escape the material effects of British hostility or the Bania's suffocating hold.

It was only natural for the Muslims to react to this dual tyranny of the British and the Hindus. The first manifestation of this discontent occurred with Haji Shariatullah's Faraizi Movement. It began as a religious revival, aimed at the elimination of Hindu customs, but soon became a broader socio-economic movement. Although tormented by Hindu Zamindars and the British planters, the defiant peasant struggled against the imposition of 23 unauthorized taxes and such indignities as the "Beard Tax". Illiterate Muslim peasants gave large-scale support to Mujahid Colonies, and traveled hundreds of miles to Sitana to take part in the Jihad against the British.

These were the first small stirrings of discontent and revolt. The Muslim of the subcontinent were in the forefront of the war of Liberation in 1857. The failure of that great struggle and the exile of the last Mughal emperor marked the total decline of Muslim influence. At the same time it made way for the Hindu community to monopolize all spheres of activity.

Every crisis throws up new leaders of thought and action. Here, Syed Ahmed Khan came to the forefront. Realizing that an important factor in the decline of Muslims was their total neglect of education, he established the Muhammadan Anglo -Oriental College at Aligarh. In his thirty years of devotion to modern education and social reforms , Syed Ahmed also planted the seeds of Muslim nationalism. He gave expression to the separate character of the Muslims. He advised the Muslims to maintain this separate identity by not participating in the Indian National Congress. Some of his observations on the Hindu -Muslim question foreshadowed the statements of the Muslims who later called for and created Pakistan.

Syed Ahmed, however, concentrated his efforts on education. He went so far as to advise Muslims against active politics. But this policy was inherently inadequate and had to be abandoned soon after his death, and this primarily for two reasons. The majority Hindu community through its monopoly of economic enterprise was tightening its stranglehold, reinforcing their position through their newly formed political machine. And so, in December 1906, the All-India Muslim League was formed to represent and project the political interest of the Muslims.

This symbolized the distinctiveness of the two major communities they were clearly moving apart. It was evident that between the grasping Hindu and the deprived Muslim lay a world of difference in needs, beliefs and aspirations. This separateness was given expression in the Lahore Resolution which formulated the demand for Pakistan in 1940.

The Lahore Resolution was the logical culmination of Allama Mohammad Iqbal's call in 1930, when he said that "the formation of a consolidated North West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny the All -India Muslim League's conference at Allahbad in 1930. allama Iqbal may not have been the first to put forward the idea of a Muslim state, but

he made the first concrete proposal to which Chaudhry Rahmat Ali gave a name which is sacred to us today. Allama Iqbal's proposal found an echo in Bengal where Abdul Rahim and Hussain Shaheed Suhrawardy organized the Bengal Muslim Conference.

The political goal of the Muslim was finally spelt out at Lahore on 23 March, 1940 with the adoption of the Pakistan resolution. Its crucial clause asserted that the only constitutional arrangement acceptable to the Muslims of the subcontinent would be the one that would ensure that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted that the areas in which Muslims are numerically in majority, as in the north western and eastern zones of India, should be grouped to constitute independent states.

At the time of the Lahore resolution and subsequently there was some controversy as to whether one or two sovereign Muslim states were envisaged. However, at the 1946 Convention of Muslim League legislators, a resolution was passed calling for a single sovereign state. It was the demand for one Pakistan for which the Muslims of the whole subcontinent struggled. But there remained a hard core mainly in East Pakistan, who continued to maintain that the Lahore Resolution had envisaged two separate sovereign states. Despite the resolve of this hard core they could never have succeeded in realizing their dream but for the failure of Pakistan's leadership to fulfill the dream specifically revived this issue and brought it to the forefront of public attention when he introduced his six-point formula. The story of his success is the story of our failure. But now we must return to the 1940s.

The evolution of Pakistan was a gradual process to which many Muslims contributed. But there can be no doubt that one man alone can truly bear the title of the architect of Pakistan Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah.

It is significant that the Quaid had initially not only worked with the Indian National Congress but had been one of its principal leaders. But he came to the inescapable conclusion that the ineradicable differences between the two communities and the intransigence of the Hindu leaders would not allow the Muslims of the subcontinent to find their salvation in anything short of a separate homeland Pakistan.

The Quaid organized and revitalized the Muslims. His demand for Pakistan immediately evoked great enthusiasm amongst the Muslim masses. There was a spontaneous reaction from our down-trodden and subject people. The demand for Pakistan held the enchanting promise of a homeland where economic and social justice would prevail and where all men and women would be equal. Under the Quaid's leadership the movement went from strength to strength, and gained its first significant victory in the formulation of the Cripps proposals of March 1942.

Throughout these years, the Hindu majority bitterly resisted the concept of Pakistan. Its leaders resorted to every device to ensure the defeat of a scheme that would have made the Muslims the masters of their own fate. The reason was the same old one: the desire to continue the economic, political and cultural enslavement of the Muslims.

The Hindu community dominated banks, insurance, trade, industry, land resources, education virtually everything of real significance or consequence. Sind and Punjab grew large quantities of excellent cotton, but for the Hindu owned textile mills of Ahmadabad and Bombay. East Bengal grew the finest jute, but the jute mills were in Calcutta and were owned by Hindus. It was clearly a case of the "haves" wanting to crush the "have-nots" under their heel. It was only the Quaid's single minded determination and the sacrifice of countless millions of Muslims in the subcontinent that defeated the Hindu leaderships threats and machinations and finally forced the British to concede to Pakistan. But imperial Britain, in collusion with the Hindu Congress, gave us cruel parting kicks.

With the announcement of the 3rd June, 1947 plan for the partition of the subcontinent into the states of India and Pakistan, collusion between the Indian National Congress and the British authority in India, as represented by Lord Mountbatten, strengthened and grew space. They had come to the mutual conclusion that if the Muslims persisted in wanting Pakistan, they would let them have their Pakistan, but not as they wished, and certainly not in a manner that would allow the fledgling state a firm start. It was, therefore, decided to rush through the transfer of power.

The haste with which the transfer of power was to be effected was calculated to produce immense difficulties for Pakistan. In the practical working of the Partition Plan, the Indian Union was to become virtually the successor state to British India, and Pakistan was placed in the position of a territory seceding from the parent country. Thus, Pakistan was made to begin life facing innumerable difficulties, without a well-ordered administration, without Armed Forces, and without even rudimentary equipment necessary for Government establishments. Nothing could be more patently designed to handicap the new state of Pakistan from the very beginning, place obstacles in the path of its development and progress, and endanger its very survival.

There is now sufficient historical evidence available to draw the conclusion that the British Government's decision to transfer power, precipitately within such a limited period of time, was the price paid to the Congress for agreeing to stay within the Commonwealth. What incalculable loss it would cause Pakistan in terms of human life and suffering as well as material goods pricked the conscience neither of the last Viceroy nor the Congress.

From the very beginning, acceptance of partition by the Indian National Congress was merely a tactical move to cover its real aim of ruling over the entire subcontinent. Mr. Gandhi never tired of alluding to the partition of the subcontinent as a "moral evil", accepted under the compulsion of circumstances.

The resolution on the partition of the subcontinent passed by the All-India Congress Committee on 14th June 1947, contained a revealing proviso. "The All-India Congress Committee earnestly trusts that when the present passions have subsided, India's problems will be viewed in their proper perspective and the false doctrine of two nations in India will be discredited and discarded by all."

Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukerji also declared soon afterwards: "Our aim must be to re-annex Pakistan to India. I have no doubt this is bound to come, whether by pressure of economic or political or other reasons". On the eve of Independence, almost every prominent Indian leader of that period openly lamented the

Partition of the subcontinent and made no secret of the hope that sooner or later Pakistan would be reintegrated with India by force or fraud.

It was against this background of antagonism in India that the new state of Pakistan came into being. The attitude of the Indian leaders was fully supported by the British authorities, whose callousness was exemplified in the remark of Lord Mountbatten: "Administratively it is the difference between putting up a permanent building, and a nissen hut or a tent. As far as Pakistan is concerned we are putting up a tent. We can do no more". This was to be Pakistan's lot also in the division of the former employees of the Government of India, in the division of financial assets and responsibilities, and in the division of the Armed Forces and stores which was settled between the 3rd of June and the 14th of August, 1947. Pakistan was very much the victim of the iniquitous apportionment that took place.

The details of the intrigues and squabbles characterizing the entire process of the division of assets are too sordid and time-consuming to bear repeating here. When, in fact, on the 14th of August, 1947, Pakistan entered its first day of existence as an independent and sovereign state, it did so in the tattered tent of Lord Mountbatten's imaginations which was furnished with nothing but the idealism of our people and their determination to survive against all odds.

As Pakistan came into being, the railway trains carrying its administrative personnel and equipment were consistently blown up and destroyed on their journey from India. Millions of refugees were pouring across our borders in a state of appalling destitution and misery. Muslims who were still in certain parts of India preparing to migrate to Pakistan were massacred and their belongings looted.

Although the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir had entered into a standstill agreement with Pakistan on the 15th of August, 1947, a conspiracy was started to bring this predominantly Muslim state into the talons of India. It was this which led to open revolt by the people of Jammu and Kashmir against the collusion of the Maharaja with India a few weeks later.

With our administrative machinery ineffective, our Armed Forces disrupted, our office equipment and military stores destroyed or misappropriated, our population overwhelmed with the influx of countless refugees in a state of destitution and indescribable suffering, our economy throttled by the machinations of India, our territorial integrity infringed by the invasion of Manavadar, Mongrol and Junagadh and our very existence threatened by India's naked military aggression in Jammu and Kashmir, it was in this inauspicious situation of confusion and uncertainty that the history of Pakistan began. It was only the will and the determination of the people of Pakistan, under the inspiration and leadership of Quaid-i-Azam that enabled the country to survive its first tempestuous year.

Then on 11 September, 1948 the light which had lit our path to freedom disappeared. Quaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah breathed his last, and the largest Muslim State mourned the loss of its incomparable leader. The annals of mankind will enshrine his name amongst those who leave immortal legacies behind them.

Enormous though our difficulties were during the life-time of the Quaid-i-Azam, the presence of his towering personality at the helm of affairs gave an incalculable sense of security and confidence to the entire nation. But with his death, the stage was set for another scene.

Within less than 30 hours of the Quaid-i-Azam's passing away, the Indian army, invading the state of Hyderabad Deccan, annexed it by an act of naked military aggression. In a way, this set the tone of the era which we in Pakistan entered after the death of the Founder of the state.

Quaid-i-Azam's disappearance from the scene occurred at a time when conditions in Pakistan were still in a state of flux politically, administratively, economically and internationally. The mantle of leadership fell on his trusted lieutenant, Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan. He discharged his duties admirably against overwhelming odds, but with his assassination the stream of our history began to flow and flow inexorably faster, in muddy channels. Indeed the channels which were merely muddy in 1951 turned to rivers of blood in 1971.

What happened in this span of time to shatter our dreams and hopes? Why, indeed, should the very people who so bravely faced the ordeals and hardships of 1947 with determination, devotion and dedication of the highest order, fall prey so easily now to confusion of mind and purpose to mistrust, hate and violence and plunged into civil war? Why should some of our best institutions so degenerate as to be scarcely recognizable? Why should all these troubles, humiliations and defeats have fallen on us? Why should the horrors of the year 1971 have been enacted?

We must try to understand the causes of our misfortunes, admitting to ourselves that they were not chance events like the fall of meteorites from the skies or an earthquake over which our human wills have no control. The circumstances in which Pakistan was born were adverse enough but the fact that the state could survive many years points to the conclusion that it could have survived in a better way than it did, growing strong internally and fostering a contented population. We must understand the causes of disintegration whose roots go back in the past. I shall now briefly touch upon some of them.

In the first place, soon after the death of Quaid-i-Azam, the pattern of our economic and social growth began to deviate drastically from the goals which the Father of the Nation had set before us. The Quaid-i-Azam said that Pakistan was being created, to use his words, “not for the capitalists, but for the poor people. P on an earlier occasion he said of the landlords and capitalists that:

“The exploitation of the masses has gone into their blood. They have forgotten the lesson of Islam. Greed and selfishness have made these people subordinate the interests of others in order to fatten themselves. I visited some villages. There are millions and millions of our people who hardly get one meal a day. Is this civilization? Is this the aim of Pakistan? Do you visualise that millions have been exploited and cannot get one meal a day? If that is the idea of Pakistan, I would not have it. If they are wise they will have to adjust themselves to the new modern conditions of life. If they don't, God help them.” (Quaid-i-Azam's presidential address at the All -India Muslim League Session at Delhi in August, 1943).

The support of ordinary men and women, the farmers of the Punjab canal colonies, the indomitable villagers of the North-West Frontier Province, the rugged Baluchis, the toiling peasantry of Sindh, the marginally subsisting share croppers and fishermen of the East Wing had made Pakistan possible. The Quaid recognized that the future of the country depended on them rather than on the handful of administrators and politicians, landlords and industrialists who had thrown in their lot with him.

To the masses Pakistan meant not only freedom from exploitation by Hindus but also a land where oppression of the poor by the rich would cease and where social justice which Islam enjoins would guide their leaders. Pakistan meant a new social and economic order to the masses both in the East and the West wings. This explains the upsurge of national energy in the first years of Pakistan. This hope of a better future also explains the angry disillusionment during the later years when leadership faltered and finally failed.

The class which was to play the most important part in the new nation consisted of the big land -owning families in West Pakistan. They exercised extensive local influence and lived in feudal splendour. Many entered politics and became pillars of the Muslim League. All of them maintained a strong vested interest in an agrarian system which conferred upon them privilege and power at the expense of their tenantry.

Side by side with this traditional power group, Pakistan witnessed the rapid rise of an influential industrial and business oligarchy.

In the 1950_s when the Government of Pakistan first started giving serious thought to industrial development, it chose a haphazard path. It was largely influenced by those who wanted to get rich quick in a protected market. It was the golden age for private investors setting up factories with the object of making quick profits in consumer goods. No heed whatsoever was paid to a rational programme of industrialisation, which requires as its basis a capital goods industry. The foreign exchange that had been earned in the Korean war boom was, thus, frittered away. This only increased Pakistan's dependence on loans in the years to come.

Political independence in 1947 did not result in economic independence. In economic terms, Pakistan, for many years, suffered from the after-effects of having been a colony. Moreover, the boom that occurred in Europe in the late 1950s had a detrimental effect upon Pakistan. While the cost of capital goods and equipment which Pakistan required steadily rose, the price of raw materials we exported declined in the world market. And yet no heed was paid to developing any basic industries in Pakistan.

Instead of sound planning, a system of patronage in licence-giving became the order of the day. The banking industry was abused its prime object became the provision of public deposits for investment in industries for which the entrepreneur provided little or no capital. His contribution was mainly the licence he obtained under a patronage a licence which only helped to increase the foreign exchange debt liability of the nation for generations. Some of the results of the excessive concessions, including tax holidays, which our entrepreneurs enjoyed in their protected market can be seen today in the inefficient running of most industries and the total absence of quality control. Nobody cared about the poor consumer, the ultimate victim of Pakistan's economic stagnation. Nobody cared for anything as long as the rich became richer.

With what result? What have we inherited? A narrow-based consumer industry which produces mainly non-essential items. A textile industry which, despite local raw material, produces poor quality goods at prices considerably above the international level. We have virtually no heavy or basic industries either for civilian or military production. Whereas India now makes four types of aircraft and two types of tanks, we in Pakistan do not even produce the components to manufacture a complete bicycle.

Without having enjoyed any real benefits from foreign loans, we have been landed with an immense debt liability. As of 30th June 1971, Pakistan's actual outstanding debt was U.S. \$3.350 million, which is about Rs. 1,600 crores, and the annual debt-serving liability we inherited was US \$251 million or Rs. 120 crores. For that matter the Government had borrowed internally to turn of Rs. 747 crores on 30th March, 1971.

Pakistan increasingly became the property of the few. This was as true in politics as in economics and every other field. The landed aristocracy originally dominated politics. To their select number was soon added the magnates of commerce and industry. Politics became an easy and effective instrument for preserving and enhancing wealth and power. The vicious circle of wealth, power and politics, rotating amongst a limited circle, became the most impregnable vested interest in Pakistan.

Inevitable, the perpetuation of the status quo became a prime objective. It was only thus that the ruling oligarchy could be confirmed in power. To this, all energies were directed. Even the most elementary reforms were denied to the people. The hope for a just and egalitarian Pakistan rapidly began to recede.

In a democratic society the people's will gains expression through their elected representative.

Elections are the corner-stone of democracy. But the vested interests, which consolidated their position soon after the creation of Pakistan, feared the limitation that elections would bring on their freedom to exploit the country. The abominable status quo could best be preserved by denying the people the electoral process. Constitution-making was repeatedly deferred in order to delay general elections. The old guard continued to hold sway. No weeding out process, not even through elections, was allowed. Pakistan has since paid a heavy price for this failure.

In 1954 a compromise on the constitution could have been attained which would have reflected the realities of the situation between the East and West wings. The Basic Principles Committee of the Constituent Assembly prepares a draft constitution which proposed a federal structure for Pakistan. Although it was by no means an ideal arrangement, even this proposal was not accepted. The Governor-General illegally dissolved the Constituent Assembly shortly before the draft was to be approved by the Constituent Assembly.

With the passage of time, mutual suspicions deepened between the two wings and made even more difficult the task of finding a constitutional settlement. The imposition of One Unit in 1955 further increased inter-regional tension accentuated

polarization between the two wings, encouraging them to vie with each other virtually as two independent states. In 1956, the second Constituent Assembly, which was not really a representative body, passed a new constitution. But it was short-lived and collapsed in two years. Four years later Ayub Khan gave the country yet another constitution which was in reality early a cover for his personal rule. The struggle for a constitution made by the elected representatives of the people continued. So much for the past melancholy efforts at constitution-making. After 24 years, we, as the genuine representatives of the people, have assembled together on this auspicious day to give a firm and true beginning to the return of democratic constitutional order for the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Hon'ble Members:

In the absence of a constitution, the bureaucratic machine rapidly enhanced its strength. In the first few years of Pakistan, the civil service established a good record. The small batch of administrators that fell to the share of Pakistan on Partition gave admirable service in the first period of confusion, working under trying conditions in which there was often no office accommodation, not even furniture. It was to the ir credit that within a brief period, essential services like railways, posts and telegraphs began to function.

The natural corollary to the absence of democratic institutions and responsible governments was that the civil service became dominant. It soon began to formulate policy instead of merely implementing it. The civil service forgot the Quaid's words: you are not rulers. You do not belong to the ruling class. You being to the servants. "They became part of the structure of the old guard politicians and the industrialists. Their aim also centered on the preservation for the status quo. They shared the common ambition of self aggrandizement and enrichment. As early as 1951-52, an official survey carried out by the special police establishment revealed that of the 1,134 persons proceeded against under the Foreign Exchange Regulations Act and the Hoarding and Black marketing Act, 737 were Government. Corruption began to spared its tentacles and soon had a malignant stranglehold on the body politic of our country.

The bureaucracy increasingly strengthened its grip over the affairs of state. The demarcation of duty between the policy makers and the implementing officials began to blur and disappear. Minister gradually became dependent not on public support the public was indeed allowed minimal expression but on officials to consolidate their position. They even encouraged civil servants to become Ministers, Prime Ministers and Governor - Generals.

The bureaucratic and military machine who took over the Government of Pakistan comprised a very small group. It was in no way a representative Government. Not only was the vast majority of West Pakistanis excluded from the governmental and administrative process, but, more detrimental in the long run, was the fact that the ruling elite included virtually no Bengalis. Khawaja Nazimuddin, Hussain Saheeed Suhrawardy and Fazlul Haque were a very limited exception.

Although Bengalis had been in the forefront of the political struggle for Pakistan indeed I may go so far as to say that without the dedication and sacrifices of Muslim Bengal, Pakistan would not have come into existence once the centre of power shifted from the political sphere to the military bureaucratic sphere, Bengalis found that they were excluded and deprived of influence.

East Pakistan was in fact governed by the neo-colonialist capitalists of West Pakistan who exploited the country with callous thoroughness. Fortunes were made in East Pakistan but not by Bengalis. The same exploitation prevailed throughout Pakistan but its effects were felt more intensely in the East Wing. Hence a deep and lasting hatred was engendered, which finally exploded in violence and blood-shed.

But this need not have been. On the road to 1971 there were halting places where the path could have been turned in less stony and pitted directions. The advent to General Ayub Khan was welcomed in East Pakistan as the beginning of a new era, because the Armed Forces enjoyed the confidence of the people. But the hopes of the Bengalis were cruelly shattered.

Ayub Khan's claim to introduce democracy proved to be no more than a hollow farce. The 1962 constitution converted a

population of nearly 70 million into an electoral college of 40,000, which was closely manipulated and directed from Islamabad. far from representing the people, these so -called elected, representatives stood merely for their own aggrandizement and enrichment. They were completely discredited and regarded as tools of the neo-colonialists. The stage was indeed being set for Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

The people of Pakistan gave Ayub Khan every opportunity and support to put the country on the road to progress. But he was not a man of the people. He built his power structure on three anti-people forces, basic democrats. Bureaucracy and big business. He missed a golden opportunity. The price of his failure was an ever widening rift between the two wings. It is here that militant Bengali nationalism began to show its face.

The Indo-Pakistan war in September 1965 galvanized the people yet again. No sacrifice was too great to maintain the integrity of Pakistan. East Pakistanis in the armed forces and in the civil services gave their all in the service of Pakistan. The people of East Pakistan also stood by their brethren in the West Wing who were under attack. But the enthusiasm of the people was soon dissipated. A nation that stood firmly united in September 1965 began to disintegrate in January 1966 with the Tashkent Declaration. A pall of gloom fell over the people of West Pakistan and a sense of distance and insecurity spread fast in the East Wing.

In the depressing aftermath, in February 1966, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman entered with his Six-Points, may be wrapped in mystery, but there can be no doubt about its impact on Pakistan. At first, Auyb Khan's regime gave wide publicity and coverage to Six-Pints, thinking that this would divide the opposition and divert the attention of the people from his capitulation. But within a few months, fearing that he had created a Frankenstein monster in Six-Points, Ayub Khan clamped down on the Awami League and put Sheikh Mujibur Rahman in jail.

Although General Ayub Khan survived the crisis after Tashkent, conditions in the country continued to deteriorate and the people became increasingly alienated.

On the 1st December, 1967, the Pakistan People's Party was founded at Lahore. In September, 1968, it had won enough strength to lead a great revolt against the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. The masses throughout the length and breadth of the West Wing supported the party's struggle. By the end of November the people of East Pakistan had also joined the revolt and by March, 1969, Ayub Khan was toppled.

With the removal of General Ayub Khan the way was opened for a new approach to the problems of East Pakistan. At the time when Sheikh Mujibur Rahman first proposed his Six - Point programme, I was Foreign Minister and advocated that since East Pakistanis had genuine grievances there should be a political debate to arrive at an equitable settlement. Ayub Khan, however, rejected this proposal and turned from the weapon of language to the language of weapons. I repeated my views when Yahya Khan assumed power, but his regime was as myopic as its predecessor.

Honourable Members:

In 21 years of Pakistan's life our people had twice seen the proclamation of Martial Law and the abrogation of the constitution. At the same time, our people had experienced a rapid deterioration in their economic conditions. By the time General Yahya Khan assumed power, a general breakdown became apparent.

No regime lacking a political base, dependent entirely on bureaucrats. This was particularly true of a Generals' junta, without roots in the people, without the participation and support of the people.

Yahya Khan tried to tackle the constitutional problems but not in good faith. He put forward a plan and time-table on the 28th November, 1969, for the transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people. At the same time, he took two other important and salutary steps: to break One Unit and to abolish parity between the two wings, thereby introducing the concept of one man one vote which would thereby give the people of the East Wing their majority rights in the legislature.

His plan was to permit a year-long election campaign at the end of which the National Assembly would be convened for the purpose of framing a constitution. On 30th of March, 1970, he

promulgated his Legal Framework Order under which elections would be held and the National Assembly summoned to frame a constitution.

The general elections for the National Assembly were held on the 7th of December, 1970, and elections for the Provincial Assemblies on the 17th of December, 1970. The result was an overwhelming victory in East Pakistan for the Awami League led by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, while in West Pakistan the Pakistan People's Party secured a massive mandate. The way appeared open for the convention of the National Assembly to draw up a constitution and subsequently to tackle the long-standing problems confronting both wings. What went wrong? Why are half the seats in this Assembly vacant?

The answer to a great event lies in the tragic history of Pakistan which I have briefly outlined. The mistakes of the politicians, followed by the one man rule of Ayub Khan and intensified by the follies of Yahya Khan, finally exploded in 1971.

Just as Ayub Khan failed to understand the forces behind the demand for autonomy, so also did Yahya Khan. There is a very thin line indeed between maximum autonomy and secession. There is very little to distinguish between a loose federation, confederation and independence. This can be readily seen from the different interpretations given to Six-Points. And to Six-Points we must now turn.

The Pakistan People's Party from its inception maintained that Six-Points did not allow for a genuine federation. This was put forward in the Party's foundation documents and consistently thereafter. During the election campaign, the people's party rejected Six-Point without making it a vituperative question. After the elections, the overwhelming victory of the Awami League made Six-points the critical issue. At the meetings between the Awami League leaders and the people's Party in January 1971, my party explained that it was indeed a unique constitutional proposal which envisaged a federation whose central government exercised power only in the matters of Defence and Foreign Affairs, the latter in any case being limited by the exclusion of foreign trade and aid.

We pointed out that foreign policy in Pakistan, as with most Third World countries, was concerned to a large extent with economic development and international trade and aid. If these were to be excluded from the field of foreign affairs, it would only leave war and confrontation within the competence of the Central Government, resulting in a death-blow to the foundation of Pakistan's foreign policy. Similarly, defence affairs were closely associated with foreign policy. Without proper control over foreign policy, there could be no means of determining and implementing an effective defence policy. Likewise, the provisions concerning currency were tantamount to establishing two regional rates of exchange, particularly in view of the restriction on inter wing trade, which would necessitate payment either in foreign exchange or under a barter arrangement. In a nutshell, the National Assembly of 313 members would be virtually redundant, limited as it would have been to the two subjects of defence and foreign affairs, less foreign trade and aid. We pointed out that such a Central Government, divested of any real authority, would be totally helpless. We went on to explain that we too stood for maximum provincial autonomy, but at the same time desired a viable centre.

The Pakistan Peoples Party at no time challenged the rights of the Awami League majority. We merely sought a consensus between the two wings and, after all, that is that the constitution of any country is about. This desire motivated the Pakistan Peoples Party both upto the 1st of March and throughout the month of March 1971.

The Peoples Party maintained that the rationale of Six - Points, based on the virtual independence of the two wings from each other, was made all the more untenable by the Awami League's demand that they should have complete control of the Central Government, and, as a consequence, the destiny of the West Wing, at least in the field of defence and foreign affairs. The Peoples Party maintained that the Awami League could rely on their majority only if they accepted the concept of one Pakistan, they could not exclude the West Wing majority in a confederal, or a near confederal, Six -Point arrangement in which, of necessity, the two wings would have to be equal partners, the principle of majority rule was applicable only in a federal arrangement. Under the Awami League's proposal the West Wing would remain a permanent minority in a joint defence

arrangement, which would allow only for a rudimentary common foreign policy, such a tenuous arrangement could not possibly last. If Awami League desired the exclusion of the majority party of the West Wing from the Central Government they would have to modify their Six-Points and accept a genuine federation for Pakistan.

Even apart from the imposition of such a constitutional arrangement, the Awami League placed a heavy burden on the West Wing, claiming that the West would be responsible for Rs. 3,800 crores of a total external debt liability of Rs. 4,000 crores, and also for the internal debt to the tune of Rs. 3,100 crores. What was more, according to the Awami League calculations, East Pakistan's contribution towards the running costs of the Central Government was to be only 24 percent, notwithstanding the fact that its population was 56 percent of the total. Even this contribution, according to the Awami League's claim, would be set off against "Reparations" due from the West Wing for its past exploitation of the East Wing.

We must take note of the fact that neither before issuing the summons for the Assembly on 13th February, 1971, nor when the session was postponed on the 1st of March, nor at any time before 28th June, 1971, did General Yahya Khan disclose that Mujibur Rahman had earlier given him a positive assurance that there would be negotiations to arrive at a settlement outside the Assembly. Only four months later in his broadcast to the nation on the 28th of June did Yahya disclose that Mujibur Rahman had "Clearly indicated that all the major provisions of the constitution would be settled by the political parties in parleys outside the Assembly". The contradictory position taken by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman after the elections by refusing to arrive at any settlement should have been brought to the attention of the people of Pakistan. It could well have facilitated the preliminary negotiations for which the People's Party repeatedly called in those dark days.

We were only given the possibility of one round of discussions with the Awami League Leaders. That was in Dacca in January 1971. We returned to the West Wing and held meetings with our own party men and other political parties. We pleaded for a little time a few weeks but our request was ignored. On the 13th of February General Yahya Khan announced that the

National Assembly would be convened on the 3rd March. Equally abruptly and without consultation, general Yahya Khan on the 1st of March postponed the National Assembly session without fixing a further date.

This suited Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. He did not want to allow the west wing majority party any time for arriving at a negotiated settlement. After the elections, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman became completely rigid in position. He had made up his mind and wanted to push his six-pints through with the brute strength of his majority in the Assembly.

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was indeed encouraged by General Yahya Khan's failure to implement his own Legal Framework Order on the question of autonomy until it was too late. Right from the date the Legal Framework Order was promulgated on the 30th of March, 1970, upto the 6th of March, 1971, Yahya Khan made no pronouncement on Six points, in spite of the fact that the provision of the Six-Point formula were clearly in conflict with his Legal Framework Order. By the 6th of March, Sheikh Mujib's position had become too strong, and it was too late. Six-Points, which had been disregarded in 1966 and given scant attention even in February 1969, had become the creed of the people in East Pakistani. With the active support of big business and the East Pakistani administration, the Awami League's position had strengthened significantly towards the end of 1969, and soared in 1970, reaching an apogee when it was allowed to turn the tragic November cyclone to its advantage.

With the announcement of the National Assembly session for 3rd of March, 1971, the peoples Party faced a dilemma. We believed that the best way to arrive at a settlement was for the two majority parties to reach a broad understanding of the constitutional and political issues involved before the Assembly was convened. If this were not achieved, at least the Assembly itself would remain intact. But if, on the other hand, the crises were to be met within the Assembly, the deadlock would result in the breakdown of the Assembly itself. Thus, closing the final door on democracy.

On the 15th of February, at Peshawar. I said that the Pakistan People's Party would participate in the session if given assurance, even private, that we would be heard and if found

reasonable, our proposals would be considered by the Awami League. No such assurance was given. Then on the 28th of February, at Lahore, I put forward two alternatives: either the 120-day limitation imposed by the Legal Framework Order should be waived, or a brief postponement allowed.

But the postponement of the Assembly sine die on the 1st of March and the violent reaction of the Awami League in East Pakistan set at naught the efforts of the People's Party to arrive at a preliminary settlement. Therefore, when General Yahya Khan announced on the 6th of March that the Assembly was to be reconvened on the 23rd of March, the People's Party agreed to attend the session. But this session was fated never to be.

From the 21st to the 25th of March discussions were held at Dacca at which the Government, the Awami League and the Peoples Party participated. During these talks the People's Party maintained that any settlement should be put to vote of the National Assembly. However, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman was set on his path of secession and nothing could stop him. He insisted that the two committees for the East and West Wings should sit separately ab initio. He refused to have a meeting of the National Assembly. Whereas three weeks earlier the announcement of the postponement had provoked the Awami League to go on a rampage. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman now did not want the Assembly to meet at all. Whereas previously he had insisted that all matters should be settled within the Assembly, on the 7th of March he raised a Four Point demand which, he insisted, should be met outside the Assembly before he would, to use his own words, "consider" attending the Assembly. Whereas he had said that there was no necessity for talks between the majority parties before the Assembly, he now insisted that his entire proposal should be settled by the parties without the Assembly meeting, even briefly.

The story of our endeavours made to arrive at an equitable constitutional settlement is well known and required no repetition now, Sheikh Mujib's rigidity left only two alternatives to General Yahya Khan, capitulation or military action. General Yahya Khan took the second course, he resorted to military action in the face of a movement which, let no one doubt, was secessionist. If any one doubts this then the first words of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman on returning to Dacca in January after ten months of

incarceration should dispel doubt. He said that he had realized his dream of a sovereign, independent Bangladesh.

General Yahya Khan decided to clamp down not only in the East Wing but throughout the country. Martial Law was tightened and strict censorship was introduced. Public meetings and political activities were banned. There was to be no check on the Generals Junta, there was to be no limitation to its rule. They were the masters.

Hon'ble Members:

The final tragedy of December, 1971, followed the great tragedy of March, 1971, little purpose is served in recounting here the sordid details of the bloody and ignominious chapter in our history.

Limited military action was necessary as a last resort to counter secession, but through its own grave mistake the Generals regime began to lose East Pakistan from the very day it sought to save it through military action. The regime pursued a policy of military subjugation of the East Wing. No effort, whatsoever, was made to win the hearts of our Bengali brethren, and in particular progressive forces were singled out for liquidation. As early as the night of 26th March, immediately on my return from Dacca to Karachi, I told the regime that East Pakistan could not be saved unless a solution of a political nature is found. I pointed out that military measures would become meaningless unless they formed a part of an overall political policy. East Pakistan had to be satisfied if it were to be saved – there must be an end to domination and exploitation, both political and economic. Long over-due economic reforms of a basic character had to be implemented without delay. If the correct course was not followed, why should East Pakistan want to stay as part of Pakistan – what stake would they have left in Pakistan with their inherent rights denied to them. I emphasized strongly the need and importance of a political solution to the crisis. But my advice went unheeded. The junta went on their merry way, after all why should they not – they were the rulers.

The regime continued its policy of attrition. It deliberately attempted to create a political vacuum. Realizing that the solution to the problems of East Pakistan would be made more difficult, if not impossible, if the situation was allowed to continue,

I called for the transfer of power. This demand I voiced as early as 25th of April, 1971 at Lahore. The political problems of the country could be solved only by political, means and this would not be achieved except by transferring power.

Events were moving fast. On the 28th of June, 1971, General Yahya Khan, departing from his legal framework order, announced a new plan and time table for the restoration of democracy. He had decided to impose a dictated constitution on the people of Pakistan. He tried to get pre -acceptance of all political parties. All the other political parties acquiesced, if not supported, General Yahya Khan's plan of 28th June. But the People's Party resisted. In my first communication with General Yahya Khan, after the announcement of 28th June, I pointed out that he had o mandate to frame the constitution. Against all odds, the Pakistan People's Party pursued its struggle for the restoration of the people's rights.

After the Indo-Soviet Pact was signed on the 9th August, 1971, the danger to P akistan's territorial integrity became imminent. To save east Pakistan immediate political and economic measures were imperative more than ever before. But these issues were beyond the comprehension of the Junta.

On the 2nd of September, I told Yahya Khan's regime that if force and not reform is for a retracted period the main instrument of policy, then East Pakistan would be pushed beyond the pale, it was not a matter of year but of months before the limit was over stepped. Then again at the Quaid-i-Azam's mazar, on the 11th of September, I called for an immediate end to the rule of the Generals saying that the country was virtually on the brink of collapse.

In a major policy statement on the 29th on September, 1971, declared:

“It is our considered opinion that if democracy is not restored before the end of the year, it will be too late to salvage and save Pakistan...Let me now put everyone on notice that the present regime cannot cope with the mess”.

I lamented:

“O my people! Let this long night of terror and uncertainty come to an end”.

I also demanded that:

“The rule of the Generals must end and the people of Pakistan must take their destiny in their own hands.”

But no heed was paid to our pleas. For our advice we suffered further victimization. Our appeal for a political settlement resulted in General Yahya Khan’s attempts to foist a puppet Government on the people of Pakistan.

General Yahya Khan planned to give a constitution to the people in a manner which, as I said on the 28th of November.

“Casts aspersion on the patriotism of every elected representative and puts the whole nation under a cloud of suspicion. It arrogates to an individual the sole authority and wisdom to determine the loyalty and affection of the whole populace to the motherland...It is clearly repugnant to the people’s thinking and militates against the demands of the nation as a whole.....The scheme is neither acceptable nor viable.”

Meantime, the Indians had on the 22nd of November launched an attack on the eastern half of Pakistan. Instead of concentrating on Indian aggression, the junta continued in their efforts to entrench and perpetuate their rule. On the 3rd of December the war spread to the western front. By the 10th of December the first surrender message was conveyed to the United Nations from East Pakistan. On the 14th of December a formal surrender message was conveyed and on the 17th of December cease-fire was accepted in the West Wing. These are recent events still raw in our minds and do not require to be dilated upon.

In spite of all the concerted efforts and last -minute manoeuvring to retain power, General Yahya Khan was finally compelled on the 20th of December, 1971, to transfer power. The rule of the Generals was brought to an end—voice of the people prevailed. But military rule had resulted in the loss of half the country and the remaining half was also near disintegration on the 20th of December, 1971, when I assumed office.

Hon'ble Members:

Even on the 29th of September, 1971, I said:

“The call of the people’s Party for the transfer of power reflected only the aspirations and wishes of the people who voted for the party, and it was our unshakable conviction that this was the only way to preserve Pakistan. With the Exchequer empty, the economy in chaos, with a directionless foreign policy, with a frustrated and angry population, transfer of power meant only the transfer of onerous responsibility. We know that no bed of roses lay ahead. But we had committed ourselves to the people of Pakistan to effect a grand reconciliation through socialism and democracy. We could not escape from this responsibility.

When I look back today on what we inherited on the 20th of December, the position in September appears rosy in contrast.

The circumstances under which I was called, on the demand of the people, to take over the ship of state on the 20th of December, 1971, are well known and, I hope, by now well understood. Desperate men who were blinded by their lust for power and seemed to have been possessed by a death wish, had first destroyed and then surrendered half the country to an aggressor. The other half was in imminent danger of destruction. The people of West Pakistan were lost and completely demoralized. Every institution worth the name, every field of human endeavour, was in total disarray. The air was thick with intrigue and conspiracy. An appalling defeat and disgrace had been inflicted on our unprepared people. Above all, the enemies of Pakistan were on top of us. Despite these catastrophic circumstance, I was duty-bound to the people to take over responsibility on that fateful day last December.

Let us all be quite clear about the reasons which led me to undertake a seemingly hopeless task. It certainly was not a hunger for power that influenced my decision —I was only inheriting death, destruction and humiliation, a virtual skeleton of a State. At such a time it is the basic obligation of every citizen to do his best by his motherland. But even more so I was compelled to accept this challenge because of my commitment

to the people. My party had been given a massive mandate in the elections, and in the hour of supreme crisis it was our bounden national duty to try and save the burning ship of State, even if we perished in the effort.

My first priority, as I said at the time, was to restore the shattered morale of the people. This was absolutely imperative. For, without the collective response, without the active co-operation of the people, no leader and no government can hope to succeed even in normal times, let alone in the time of total crisis that faced us.

Thus, within a matter of hours of my accepting the awesome responsibility, several steps were initiated to come to grips with the situation, physically and psychologically. The Generals who had brought disgrace and destruction to the nation were removed and civilian authority established over the Armed Forces. A Commission of inquiry, headed by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was appointed to inquire into the military debacle. These swift actions and the demonstration of my government's unshakable resolve to preserve Pakistan in honour and dignity dispelled at least some of the gloom and restored a measure of confidence amongst the people. A ray of light penetrated the depths of darkness in which the people had been made to fall.

So we set out on the long march to healing and reconstruction. Every-thing was crying out loud for immediate attention. Without loss of time we started picking up the pieces, moving simultaneously on several fronts, both at home and abroad—for it was, and still is, a race against time. Many of the immense problems that assailed our nation would certainly have over-whelmed us had we failed to move fast.

We had to contend with the consequences of Indian aggression and occupation, and the threat of further violations of our frontiers. Then again, the overwhelming majority of our people, groaning under a tyrannical system, needed immediate assistance and relief. On both these fronts, we have moved ahead notwithstanding the serious limitations imposed by the highly delicate national and international situation. We have proceeded within the framework of policy and basic philosophy which were the electoral platform of the Pakistan People's Party.

There has been no deviation. There cannot be any deviation by a leadership which is rooted in the people, which derives its entire political strength from the people. We have in the short span of four months introduced many reforms. They are recent events, I do not wish to take the House's time unnecessarily by mentioning them here. Let history and the people of Pakistan judge our reforms.

The reforms that have been introduced by your government are only a first step, but a vital one, in the process of restoring to the people their inherent rights. When fully implemented, the reforms will bring about a constructive change in the existing structure and complexion of our society and will revitalize the fields of education, health, agriculture, labour and finance. Let me assure you that these measures are not going to join the dust heap of past reforms. They will be implemented, and implemented in full and with speed by your Government.

In the brief period of four months, the people's Government has worked ceaselessly to deal with numerous other problems as well. We have endeavoured to dismantle gradually the well-entrenched apparatus of the rulers, and, step by step, and frequently several steps at a time, tried to replace it with representative institutions and individuals at all levels.

Provincial governments are being established which reflect the majority parties in the Provinces. The Central Government includes representatives of other political parties to strengthen national unity.

While dealing with a multitude of problems in Pakistan and initiating actions to give a sense of purpose and direction to the nation, we had to salvage at the same time our position internationally. The folly and blunders of our predecessors had made us a target of abuse for the world. International public opinion, much of the world press and many powerful governments had turned against us. Even some of the friendly countries were beginning to despair of us.

Foreign relations had reached their lowest ebb in the history of Pakistan, and it was against this background that I undertook several lightning visits abroad to re-establish our position. In the hour of need, one inevitably turns first to friends

and neighbors. My first journey abroad was a brief visit to Kabul which shows the importance we attach to our closest neighbor. I am happy to inform the House that I had useful discussions in Kabul.

On the subject of first visits, the first Head of State to visit Pakistan after the crisis was His Majesty the Shahinshah of Iran. We deeply appreciated this gesture of solidarity by the leader of a neighboring nation. I would be failing in my duty if I did not here mention that, in every crisis, Turkey, the People's Republic of China and Iran have stood by our causes with unstinted and unhesitating support.

My first major visit abroad took me to the Muslim world—to Iran, Turkey, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Egypt and Syria. The main we were taking a firm hold of our national affairs, to thank them for their past help and to seek their understanding for our grave predicament. Our Muslim brothers showed warm sympathy, understanding and support for our position. It was a mission of renaissance—the rebirth of our relations with the Muslim world.

My second mission outside the country was to the People's Republic of China. The Government and the great people of China have stood by Pakistan through all our trials and tribulations. As in the past, so they did again in 1971. We went to Peking to express our gratitude in person. We returned further inspired and strengthened in the knowledge of their friendship and increased support.

Another country which upheld the fundamental principle of international law and morality in our moment of crisis was the United States. At the time of my appearance before the Security Council in December last, I had already visited the United States and conferred with President Nixon. Before December and subsequently, the United States played an honorable and forthright role in the crisis confronting the subcontinent, and we appreciate the support and understanding they have shown us.

Since assuming office, I could not go everywhere abroad myself—but I have sent personal envoys to the United States again and to several countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and the Middle East. They have explained our position and sought

support for Pakistan. Two of my Ministers have recently returned from missions covering Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of North Vietnam.

On the 16th of March, I went to the Soviet Union, our great northern neighbor, to repair our mutual relations. I am happy to inform the House that with out compromising our basic principles, we were able to convince the leaders of the Soviet Union that we desired peace in the subcontinent, and good relations with all States in our propinquity. I am glad that we have been able to normalize our relations with this Great Power and neighboring State.

Hon'able Members:

As a result of the reactivation of our foreign policy, I can safely say that there is today a much greater understanding of our position throughout the world. We are approached more in the spirit of constructive enquiry rather than as an object of derision and abuse.

The field of our immediate concern was, and continues to be, the consequence of Indian aggression. India has not only vivisected, to borrow a favorite Gandhian phrase, our motherland to create a new State by force: what is more, large tracts of what is left to us are also under Indian occupation. Then there are the 93,000 Pakistan prisoners of war being held by India in patent violation of the Geneva Convention and all norms of international conduct.

Hon'ble Members of the House:

When I assumed the responsibility of Government and viewed the debris, I resolved in my mind that the only sane course to follow was to seek an accommodation with India on the basis of an honorable and just settlement. Similarly, I resolved that though it was perhaps too late to bring what in Dacca they now call "Bangladesh" back to the fold in some form or the other, this had to be done and this required negotiations.

It was in the light of this genuine desire for peace and amity in the South Asian subcontinent that I made several gestures, principally the unconditional release of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. In addition, several approaches were made through third parties

both to India and Sheikh Mujib for holding negotiations designed to bring lasting tranquility to our region.

There has been some limited progress but no spectacular breakthrough so far, but it is not for want of genuine efforts on our part. Instead of grasping our hand of friendship, both India and Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's Sonar Bengal have been doing many things that can only stoke the fires of hostility and hatred. Non-Bengalis are being massacred in East Bengal in the name of secularism. Our prisoners of war are being ill-treated and provoked by the Indians. There are threats of war crimes trials.

Hon'ble Members:

We want to live in peace with India. We want Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to overcome his problems and his difficulties. For, we ardently believe that the people of the whole subcontinent deserve a better future than the constant friction and conflict that has marred their past. Our people, both theirs and ours, are too poor to live in a state of permanent hostility. We want to direct all our energies from wars of destruction to wars on poverty, illiteracy and hunger. We shall go on trying to resolve our differences and shall always remain ready to seize any reasonable opportunity to realise this supreme objective.

But what we do not want, and what no true Pakistani will ever accept is a dictated, imposed peace. Such a settlement, let us make no mistake about this, will mean subjugation and servitude, a living death. I shall never be a party to such an ignominious settlement.

We are prepared to resolve all our bilateral differences. But we cannot bargain State Principles for human flesh. The right of self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir has not been bestowed on them either by India or Pakistan—it is their inherent right which no one can take away from them.

We made many overtures, took many initiatives, and now India has come back with its first positive response. Recently, I received a letter from the Prime Minister of India stating that India was prepared to discuss all outstanding issues unconditionally and that she seeks peaceful co-existence with Pakistan. My answer welcoming this approach has been communicated to her.

It is my earnest hope that the negotiations we are going to start will be conducted in a spirit of fairness. Given that kind of approach, there is no reason why we should not make a good beginning and resolve amicably at least the more pressing issues.

While dealing with our immediate problems with our neighbors, we have also to keep in view our long-term objectives in the changed circumstances. The severance of our eastern limb by force has significantly altered our geographic focus. This will naturally affect our geo-political perspective. The geographical distance between us and the nations of South East Asia has grown. This does not mean that we have lost interest in the welfare of their peoples. Nevertheless, at the moment, as we stand, it is within the ambit of South and Western Asia. It is here that our primary concern must henceforth lie.

There is the whole uninterrupted belt of Muslim nations, beginning with Iran and Afghanistan and culminating on the shores of the Atlantic with Morocco. With the people of all these states we share a cultural heritage, religious beliefs and a good deal of history. There is, thus, a solid community of interest which is further buttressed by the similarity of our aspirations and our hopes. Clearly, we have to make a major effort in building upon the fraternal ties that already bind us to the Muslim world.

However, I want to make it clear that our endeavors to strengthen further our relations with the Muslim States to the west of Pakistan does not mean that we, in any way, seek to reduce our own national identity and separateness.

Our position in Asia also inevitably makes our relations with our two giant northern neighbors, the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union, of prime importance to us. Our ties with the People's Republic of China have always been close; their support in the recent crisis has forged an even deeper and more enduring friendship between us. As for the Soviet Union, I am glad to report that the discussions we held in Moscow pointed the way to a happier relationship and understanding.

While the Great Powers who are our neighbors are naturally of most immediate concern to us, we must also look to

the colossal industrial and military powers whose policies have an intimate effect upon affairs everywhere. The United States of America has helped us generously in the past. With our policy of friendship with China now vindicated, the strain between us has been removed. And in view of the helpful attitude of the United States over the past few months, there is every hope of continued and deepening friendship between our countries. Similarly, we shall try to develop friendly bilateral ties with the major industrial states in Europe.

Hon'ble Members:

The question may be asked whether it is possible to have good relations with all the Great Powers and yet maintain basic national interests. I say yes, as I maintained some years ago when I was foreign Minister. Yes, it is possible, if an ethical foreign policy based on fundamental national principles is pursued without taking a partisan approach to the Great Power differences. It can be achieved by pursuing a bilateral foreign policy of which, I can say with some pride, I was author when I held office as foreign Minister.

Independence and self-respect must be the basis of our foreign policy. It was for this reason that we decided to leave the commonwealth, though the abandonment of long-held ties is never easy. But we want, nevertheless, to maintain and strengthen bilateral relations with the countries of the commonwealth. The recent visit of the British Foreign Secretary led us to hope for improved relations between our two countries.

Distinguished Members:

When we speak of our foreign policy aims and objective, we have, of course, to remember that it would be a futile exercise unless and until we are a strong, united nation. In the absence of this essential prerequisite, we cannot hope to play a part even remotely commensurate with our reduced size, let alone our ambitions. Therefore, we have to shape our internal plans and policies in such a way that they help the people of Pakistan into a strong, vibrant and lively nation.

If we look objectively at our history and the state of our nation today, we shall have to acknowledge that the primary cause of our trouble and our weaknesses lies in the neglect and betrayal of our people. They have been treated like sub-humans,

insulated at every step, deprived not only of their basic rights and needs, but also of hope itself. What crime have our people committed that they should have been so denied and abused? Are they not Muslims who fought and shed their blood for the creation of our sacred homeland? Their deprivations and their humiliations are a blot on our nationhood, and unless we recognize this we cannot even begin to set our house in order. Only through the sweat and sacrifice of countless millions of poor people was Pakistan created and only they can now preserve it.

Ironically enough, we now come full circle. At the outset of Pakistan, the rights of each individual Pakistani had been fully recognized. On the 26th of March, 1948, Quaid-i-Azam said:

“you are only voicing my sentiments and the sentiments of millions of Mussalmans when you say that Pakistan should be based on the sure foundations of social justice and Islamic socialism which emphasizes equality and brotherhood of man. Similarly, you are voicing my thoughts in asking and in aspiring for equal opportunities for all....”

Quaid-i-Azam Millat Liaquat Ali Khan reiterated this theme in August, 1949 by declaring.....

“There are a number of issues being talked about now-a-days. But we are convinced that for us there is only one issue, namely, Islamic socialism which, in a nutshell, means that every person in this land has equal rights to be provided with food, shelter, clothing education and medical facilities.

But it was not for over 20 years that the meaning of Islamic socialism was to be implemented. In the intervening time those who paid lip-service to democracy brazenly exploited the people and reduced them to an unparalleled level of humiliation and drudgery.

Hon’ble Members of the House:

All this has to come to an end now, and a tragic chapter brought to a close. The night of terror has given way to the dawn of a new era. In the new beginning that we have made, the long suffering people of our land are our central concern and a sacrosanct responsibility. They are our real wealth and our most potent resource. I have made certain specific commitments to

them, and, Insha Allah, I shall redeem all the pledges I have made. We are going to lift the burden of our poor people everywhere. We are going to give them a vital stake in our national future and well being. What is more, I am equally determined to remove in the shortest possible time all regional disparities. Certain decisions have already been taken doubling the allocation of development resource to Baluchistan and the Frontier Provinces. Other will follow.

Apart from the obvious requirement of justice and equity between man and man and between regions, there is a fundamental philosophy governing this approach. Our economic muscle and national cohesion can grow only with a just economic and social order. It is only when every peasant and every worker and the entire population of all the regions are convinced in their own mind that each one of them is striving and struggling for the good of all, that the creative energies of the entire nation will be fully harnessed. Otherwise, we shall not overcome our national crisis.

This total national effort is also imperative for another reason. We are exposed to grave external danger. The size and scope of the threat are such that it would be unfair to expect our gallant Armed Forces to meet it alone. Our brave people will have to share the burden with the valiant forces and stand shoulder to shoulder with them in the defence of our motherland.

In our egalitarian society, there is, of course, a place for everyone the worker and the enlightened industrialist and businessman, the peasant and the fair-minded land-owner. All can contribute to the challenging process of national reconstruction and national reconciliation. We must all pull together. I need and seek the constructive co-operation of every male and female citizen. I carry in my hand no magic wand. I alone can achieve no miracles. But with the co-operation of the people, we can move ahead rapidly on an exciting new course to finally create the Pakistan our Quaid-i-Azam set out to build, and for which millions have struggled and sacrificed.

The members of this House have a special responsibility. You, as the elected representatives of the people, must be the highest expression of their needs and aspirations. But as well as reflecting them, you have a duty to set an example and act as an

inspiration to those whom you represent. The future well-being of our country lies in the success of this august House.

In the immediate term we have to fulfil the solemn responsibility of bestowing on Pakistan an Interim Constitution. Expectations in the country are high. In the selfish interests of a few, we should not be deprived for nearly a generation of a truly representative government. So often have the people been failed. Let not the people say that, when they are at least at the point of victory, their own representatives finally failed them.

I want to emphasize that our immediate task in these three days is to adopt for our people an Interim Constitution. The making of the permanent constitution will be the responsibility of the House when it reconvenes on the 14th of August, 1972, after a committee of the House prepares and presents a draft constitution on the 1st of August.

There were two main options possible for us as the basis of the Interim Constitution the Government of India Act, 1935, with consequential amendments, or the 1961 constitution with consequential amendments.

In these dark and difficult days it was decided to go back to the creation of Pakistan to recapture the idealism and fervour of the Father of the Nation. So we are adopting the constitutions with which they began the task of building Pakistan. We have consequently settled for an Interim constitution based on the Government of India Act, 1935, read in conjunction with the Indian Independence Act, 1947, with consequential amendments.

In adopting the Interim constitution the House does not abandon any position it may take in making the permanent constitution for the country neither in the precise form of government nor in the exact measure of autonomy for the provinces. These require detailed discussion and debate and this the House will fully enjoy when it reconvenes on the 14th of August. The draft of the interim constitution, which is before you, provides for a parliamentary form of government. It also provides for the measure of autonomy which the provinces enjoyed prior to the imposition of one unit in the west wing. Similar autonomy is enjoyed by the states of India. The House may, in the exercise

of its year long constitution making powers, commencing from the 14th August, decide to supplement this measure of autonomy or make any other provision. We have deliberately not made any major departure from the original enactments this is in order to allow the house a free hand in making the permanent constitution. The draft of the Interim Constitution provided for its own amendment, during the same period, prior to the finalizing of the permanent constitution. The Minister for Law and parliamentary Affairs in moving the Bill for the Interim Constitution will explain its salient features in more detail.

For several good reasons it was decided to have a short session with limited debate. The purpose is to allow, for an early return of constitutional government based on the Interim Constitution and consequently delay the return to constitutional rule.

Hon'ble members of the distinguished House:

This great day, in fact this very minute, I have a most decisive announcement to make. In my hand now I have the commitment and pledge of over one hundred Members of this august Assembly to vote for the approval of continuation of Martial Law till 14th of August, 1972. I am thankful to these Honourable Members. I am particularly grateful to those who, although belonging to other political parties, have reposed their confidence in my leadership and my judgment. They know full well that I will not retain martial Law one day longer than in absolutely necessary. This was my commitment to the people of Pakistan. It was my commitment to those over 100 members comprising more than 70% of the present strength of this House. It is in deference to them and not to those who played with the safety and security of the State that when and only if this House adopts, on the 17th of April, 1972, the Interim Constitution now before it, Martial Law will stand lifted on the 21st of April, 1972. In that event the commencing day of the interim constitution shall be the 21st of April, 1972 and not 14th August, 1972 despite the internet risks in the situation, I have decided that for the confidence reposed by over 100 members amongst you for the sake of the people of Pakistan who joined me in my struggle against Martial Law, we should accept these risks and the challenge that goes with them. This demonstrates my commitment to democracy and my infinite faith in the people. With all the power to the people, we are determined to build

democracy to establish socialism under the guidance of Islam to make this Islamic Republic of Pakistan a haven of happiness for the people and a pillar of strength in the comity of nations. We are the harbingers of a new order pulsating with pragmatic idealism and in tune with the symphony of the Third World.

This is the message of the new Pakistan, destined to vindicate her honor, I salute our people, I pay homage to their sacrifices, I pay tribute to their resolve to recreate a new path trailed with glory.

This is the cry of the people. I hear it clearly. As a Muslim I swear by Almighty Allah that we shall cross the broken bridge to reach the mountain peaks even if my blood is shed in the process. And how can a man die better than facing fearful odds.

Honourable Members:

History beckons us, and our people are ready to march forward. Do we, the Members of this distinguished Assembly, have the courage and wisdom to lead our people towards their cherished goal, Democracy? As the Quaid said: "Democracy is in our blood. It is in our marrow." When the fruit of democracy is within our reach, shall we now fail to grasp it?

Let us indeed remember the Quaid -i-Azam's words: "Failure is a word unknown to me." Such resolve and determination brought Pakistan into being. The people of Pakistan have been failed too long, they have too long been denied their rights. We have failed to honor the Quaid's pledge of Islamic Socialism. We have failed even to safeguard the integrity of our country. We cannot afford more failures.

Let us together resolve to banish the word failure from the vocabulary of Pakistan. Let us build our own success, and Insha Allah we shall realize the dream of Pakistan.

I thank you. Pakistan Zindabad.

On the conclusion of his address, while replying to a motion of thanks by a member who also demanded trial of Gen. Yahya Khan and his advisers for their alleged role in the dismemberment of Pakistan, the president said: "The question is that this matter is sub Judice in a way, because the Chief Justice

of the Supreme Court along with the Chief Justices of the High Courts are holding secret enquiry, and as soon as the findings for the court of enquiry are known, certainly we will take concrete measures, but until the enquiry is completed it would not be appropriate for us to make any bold or positive statement which will unnecessarily influence the court of enquiry.

Speech delivered at the public oath-taking ceremony at Rawalpindi on April 21, 1972

My dear friends, elders, peasants, workers and students
Assalam-o-Alaikum:

I have made many public speeches in my life. I have been taking part in discussion and debates from my school days. I have made speeches not only in Pakistan but also taken part in discussions in international forums in many foreign countries. This is not my first public speech in Rawalpindi, anyway.

You would recall that before the elections and during and after the elections I made many public speeches here. But I find myself at a loss for words today. So overwhelmed I am by the significance of this day. This is an extremely auspicious day to only because it is Jumat-ul-Mubarak but also a day on which we commemorate our great national poet Allama Iqbal. Not only that, it is also the people's day because the people of Pakistan have got today their constitution. After a struggle of 25 years, the country has seen today the dawn of a truly democratic era, and the elected representatives of the people have been given a constitution. Now this is your constitution albeit it is an Interim Constitution, which is unheard of in the country's history, by bringing an end to Martial Law. And for this reason on this auspicious day I wish to congratulate you and thank all those friends who, in response to our invitation, have assembled here. I am grateful to all of you.

Let me assure you and through you all friends you all friends that it shall always be my endeavor to consolidate national unity. Indeed, national unity can be strengthened only by acting on principles, when we extend due respect to opposition, and struggle for realization of the people's aspirations and their prosperity. I wish to assure the leaders of the various parties who have assembled here that, if need be, I shall travel from Karachi to Khyber to strengthen national unity and to bring about greater co-operation among us. This is the need of the hour and the

demand of the country that there should be greater national cohesion at this juncture.

Friends, perhaps those who are given to criticism, those who always criticize, will say where was the need for this pomp and show and extravagant spending on this occasion for a poor and a backward country. But I wish to tell the critics that this is not mere pomp and show. This is a peoples gathering. There is no greater strength than the people themselves. When the moneyed people and the capitalists gobble up crores and crores of nations money, nobody protests. But when the poor people are invited, when they are saluted on their day of victor, the narrow minded say what is the need of all this. I fervently believe this is my way of thinking that I will not take any basic step without permission, indulgence and co-operation of the poor.

So this is not the governments day. It is the people's day, the poor mans day. It is the laborers day, the farmer's day and the students' day. I have invited you to participate because it is through your efforts that this day has been possible. This is the fruition of your struggle. I, therefore, thought that it would be proper if the Government and the opposition both combine to pay their homage to you and to say how grateful they are to you. It is your victory, Pakistan's victory and the people's victory.

And for this reason, I believe that in future we will progress day by day, Insha Allah. Whatever the Government has already done is very little. I will never say that we have done a great deal. But whatever we have been able to achieve during the last months is commensurate with our capabilities and the national resources that were available to us. But I promise you that if we get the time and if you bear with us, you will see that, Insha Allah, we will fulfill each and every promise that we made.

My friends, we respect the constitution because we know that it is the fundamental law. The constitution is a legal framework without which the country's affairs cannot be managed properly and we cannot progress. You have got an interim constitution after 25 years but it is your constitution. Besides, you have struggled for democracy; we have all struggled for it.

Pakistan today has not only a people's constitution but has seen the beginning of an era of democracy. And as a result of the peoples struggle Martial Law has been buried. Insha Allah, it shall be our endeavour never to allow in this country an anti - people era. You should bear in mind the hardships and injustices which you have under the Martial Law regime, the injustices and the cruelties you have suffered. If you are not vigilant and if you do not handle things carefully, if the politicians make mistakes, and if we indulge in pretty matters, go along destructive channels or fight among ourselves, it is just possible that the bygone era might recur. So you should be vigilant. We all should be vigilant. We have to defend democracy like one man. I have told you before that while one man can destroy a nation, no one can build it single handed. If we are to reconstruct are rebuild, it has to be a co-operation effort, a co-operation struggle. It is not my duty alone: it is not the Governments duty alone: it is not the duty of the opposition parties alone. It is the duty of the whole nation, the responsibility o the whole nation. So you should remember, my dear friends, that we have to make a success of this democracy. We have to draw up a final constitution after this Interim Constitution. And after this, the most important and vital thing is that we have to bring about economic justice in the country. It is only a Government based on justice which can bring about economic justice.

On this occasion, on this auspicious occasion, I pay homage not only to the people of Pakistan but to the brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and their officers, I salute them. We are proud of our brave Armed Forces. The injustice done to Pakistan in the past which led us to trouble was not the fault of our brave Forces. There were selfish people who usurped the Government and exploited the nation, the people, and also exploited the Armed Forces. It was not a military Government, it was an oligarchy. There wre a few people who wanted to lord it over and usurp Pakistan. The Armed Forces were not at fault. They were dragged into politics. The Armed Forces were exploited. There were people who got rich on bribes. See, what they have done to the nation. There were some individuals who did wrong to the country. The Armed Forces were not at fault, the people were not at fault. It was the system that was at fault. So w ith God's help bury this system and do not let it come again. We have to give a permanent constitution to the country and to spell out the responsibilities as well as the rights of different sections of the

people. The responsibilities of looking after the political affairs have been entrusted to the people while the Armed Forces have been asked to fulfil their own responsibilities. The people and the Government and also the opposition groups have to do constructive work. We have to build Pakistan. The Armed Forces are to defend the territorial integrity of the country, to defend the frontiers. And, Insha Allah, we will fulfill our responsibilities.

I had said that I will not make a long speech. I have no intention to make a long speech. But there are one or two things which I want to tell you. There were serious internal problems. With your co-operation and with God's grace we have, to some extent, found a solution for them, besides we have to give full attention to external problems and world events. But we have to pay the utmost attention to problems in our neighbourhood, in the neighbouring countries, specially India with whom we had a war. This was not our first war. Unfortunately, this was the third war in the course of 25 years. There are problems between Pakistan and India. War creates problems and no one is really a winner in a war. We have to give a great deal of thought to problems that have cropped up as a result of the war. In this connection I want to tell you that since we assumed power it has been our endeavour to find an equitable solution to these problems.

You must have seen in the newspapers that an emissary of the Indian Government is coming to Pakistan on the 25th of this month. We will have discussions with him on many problems but the one problem which is upper most in my mind relates to our prisoners of war. The war ended on the 17th December. The formal cease-fire came on the 27th December. Today, it is 21st April that means four months have already passed since the end of the war. We have made it clear that we want to live in peace with our neighbours. The Indian Prime Minister has also said the same thing. Now that they also want a peaceful co-existence and so does Pakistan, then on what pretext are the Pakistani POWs held in India. This is against the international law and against the third Geneva Convention. It violates the resolution of the General Assembly. A resolution of the Security Council.

My friends, the United Nations is not the voice of one nation. It is the voice of the whole world. It is the world court of law. We respect law. Even backward countries like ours respect

law. The whole world should respect the United Nations and its resolutions.

We respect our courts of law. We have our High Courts and the Supreme Court. Who administered the oath of office to me? It was the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. We respect him. We respect his decisions. It was only yesterday that they decided that the previous regime was illegal and unconstitutional. We respect each and every verdict passed by them. When we respect and honour our courts of law, we expect others to respect and honour the verdict of the world court of law. The decision should be accepted by all. It is the decision of the Geneva Convention. Besides, 105 nations represented at the General Assembly of the United Nations gave the verdict in our favour which was, in fact, the verdict in favour of truth and justice that the war should end, aggression should end, and the armed forces should withdraw from the borders and go back to their respective countries and the POWs should be repatriated. We respect this verdict the verdict of the Security Council. The five great powers represented at the Security Council enjoyed veto but none of them exercised it in favour of the above mentioned resolution. This was actually a referendum in favour of Pakistan and India should accept it. This is the voice of the whole world, a referendum of the whole world. Why does India not abide by it? I wish to tell India that we want peace and mutual relations based on justice. We do not want a war between our two countries, I should even go to the extent of telling the Indian Prime Minister that if she keeps our brothers as POWs without any justification and in spite of the verdict of the entire world, in spite of the fact that the war has ended, and she wishes to keep our prisoners as hostages, she will be committing a big mistake. We will not make a similar mistake. I am even prepared to repatriate the Indian POWs without any preconditions.

If, despite perpetuating injustices to Pakistan, Mrs. Indira Gandhi wishes to keep Pakistani POWs as hostages for bargaining purposes, we will not be a party to it. We will not go against principles since two wrongs do not make a right. If India wants to keep our POWs in spite of the worlds verdict against it and in spite of the resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, we will still respect the law. I will say to them, keep our POWs. They are brave Pakistani Muslims. I have just received a vote of confidence from the National Assembly. I wish

to get a vote of confidence from you too. I know there are some who do not like this procedure. But I will tell them that this is my way and if the people do not like it, they will throw me out and will not vote for me in the next election.

Now I ask you, do you approve that I should return the Indian POWs to their homes without preconditions? (This was reciprocated by resounding "Yes" from the audience). I have taken the approval of the National Assembly. I have taken your approval also. It is my proposal that even if the Indian Government does not want to release our POWs forthwith, I am prepared to go ahead unilaterally. If the Indian Prime Minister makes a request for the borders tomorrow. If our sisters, our mothers and our brothers have to undergo more sufferings on this account, there is no alternative, but I do not want the kith and kin of Indian POWs to suffer the same agony. I do not wish to be cruel to them since it is against the principles of justice.

In the end, I would like to say that I could take the oath of my office in a closed room but I wanted to take the oath in public and in front of my people. If you have been inconvenienced, I am sorry for it. But I am grateful to you all.

Pakistan Paindabad. Quaid-i-Azam Zindabad.

Message to Secretary-General, Pakistan Federal Union of Journalists on April 22, 1972.

I have learnt with pleasure that the Pakistan Federal Union of Journalist (PEUJ) is celebrating the 9th Anniversary of the founding of the Afro-Asian Journalists Association (AAJA) on April 24 this year, along with other AAJA members throughout Asia and Africa.

The founding of the AAJA in 1963 is a landmark in the history of the oppressed peoples of Asia and Africa and the rest of the world in their struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, a struggle to achieve complete political and economic independence, to consolidate freedom if independence is achieved, to resist aggression and foreign interference and to preserve national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Raising the banner of the Bandung spirit, the journalists of Asia-Africa have joined the ranks of freedom fighters and they, therefore, must use their pens to oppose imperialism and colonialism in all its forms and manifestations and support all just struggles of the oppressed people particularly the people of Indo-China, Kashmir, Palestine, Southern Rhodesia, and Mozambique.

On this occasion, I extend my greetings to the PFUJ and though in to all members of AAJA and in particular Mr. Djawoto, the AAJA Secretary General, and hope that Asian -African Journalists will continue to raise high the spirit of anti -imperialism, anti-colonialism and truthfully portray the just aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and the rest of the world.

Eid-e-Miladun Nabi Message on April 22, 1972

It is the birthday of the Holy Prophet today (Peace be upon him). Let us bow our heads in reverence and allow the clear light of his teachings to transform our lives. He was for all ages and all times and though 1400 years have passed since God chose to enlighten him, there is not a piece of earth today where homage is not being paid to him.

He emancipated man from the bondage of superstition and dogma. He brought a message of love, peace and compassion. He liberated the human mind and lit up with reason the dark recesses of ignorance in which mankind languished for centuries. He exemplified the perfect life through his conduct and taught men how to fulfil their temporal and divine obligations.

He crusaded against tyranny and injustice and preached tolerance and of noble descent himself, went forth and embraced as equals the lowly and the poor. He was the first true revolutionary. And on this happy day, I send forth my greetings to Muslims all over the world and pray that we can once again dedicate ourselves to the teachings of the Holy prophet (peace be upon him) and rekindle in our souls the light that he first lit.

Transcript of interview with Mr. Richard Lindley of Independent Television News, London on April 25, 1972

Question: Mr. Bhutto talking to the press the other night you said. "India must trust us". Now why should Mrs. Gandhi trust a man like yourself who so often preached a thousand years war against India?

President: But finally it will have to boil down to a question of trust, whether it is me or anyone else, and today I happen to be the expected president of Pakistan and shall have to meet with an elected leader. And I represent the wishes and feelings of the people of Pakistan. The whole world knows that Indo - Pakistan problems have persisted for 25 years since we became independent and there will have to be mutual trust and confidence. On our part we are prepared to give that trust and India will also have to take the same position if they want a final settlement. Between a lawyer and a client there is a judiciary relations relationship. Between nations, once trust is broken, really trust had to be repaired whether it is India, Pakistan, France, Germany or any other antagonist. If you really want to bury the hatchet, then we will have to trust one another.

Question: But its true isn't it that you have been an apostle of confrontation with India. How are you really going to persuade Mrs. Gandhi. The events and circumstances persuaded her as well as us, and I do not appolotise for my policy of confrontation. It was the right policy at that time when I was in Government when I was Foreign Minister. Circumstances were such. In 1962 Kashmir was within our grasp we could have merely walked in and at that time national interests required a policy of confrontation, but Azad Kashmir did not pursue it. And right up to 1965 we could have settled the problems militarily as today India has indeed settled it militarily. Has she not? By taking East Pakistan by military force she has brought about a situation where now the Indian emissary who has come to Pakistan is talking the language of flowers, and naturally, in the position of a victor. In spring time especially, why not throw a bouquet of flowers on the defeated, so the point is the when the situation called for a policy of confrontation, I pursued it. Now there is the

present situation on account of a number of factors, and the fault of previous Governments and Leaders they were not leaders, they were usurpers they bungled up everything and they have given me pieces, fragmented pieces, small pieces, and I have to put them together. So I have to take an approach which is commensurate with the realities.

Question: You talk about Mr. Dhar, India's emissary here, that in his preliminary negotiations, using flowery language, tossing a bouquet towards you, do you think to all, as some of the people I spoke to here do, that in the long term India is determined on the end of Pakistan as an independent nation?

President: That has been India's past record for the last years, but I would not like to say that now because I would like to trust India, as much as India should take the risk of trusting us, I'd like to trust India, as much Indian leaders. And perhaps it would be a long time before they have really swallowed and devoured and digested East Pakistan. So let us hope that we can have a generation of peace.

Question: Obviously your first priority must be to get your prisoners of war home again, you said that, you made that very plain. But how are you going to persuade Mrs. Gandhi that once they are home again, they are not going to push you towards confrontation once more perhaps even to a war of revenge?

President: No. I don't think that anyone can push me around in a hurry, and especially our prisoners of war. They're not an articulate political force as such. They might fan out. They don't need to fan out. There are enough people who are jingoistic as it is but we can settle the sentiments if we make progress and I don't want Pakistan to get the title of a revanchist state.

Question: You did right after the war, as soon as you took office, you did talk rather in terms of avenging the humiliation, you don't really think that pressures here in Pakistan will push you towards a confrontation again?

President: Not revenge in that sense not revenge in the sense of going to war again. Revenge in the sense of normal rehabilitation and to let the world know that we are not inherently a people whom you can lose and have lost, that we are equals in

the subcontinent even in our reduced state. We have to show to the world and show to India by economic development, by making grand new experiments in administration, in making a democracy work and in a host of other ways to show that we are still equals in the subcontinent.

Question: Mrs. Gandhi seems to want to use her strong bargaining position to make the new case fire line in Kashmir an international frontier. How is this something that could ever be acceptable to the people of Pakistan let alone the people of Azad Kashmir?

President: But the people of Kashmir come first because it is their future and their faith which is involved. It the people of Kashmir have given up the nation that they don't have the stamina and grit to achieve their rights, the whole world put together cannot help them to achieve their rights. Primarily, they have to be in the forefront and we have been in the forefront for 14 years. Perhaps that's why the problem had not been resolved till now. We cannot abandon a right which belongs to them. As I said to you the other right, we have not conferred it, we cannot take it back. And I think it is really shooting the gun to go straight to Kashmir. There are so many fundamental matters to be tackled and resolved, and if India has taken that position for 25 years let us go step by step and then finally come up with the top of the ladder called Kashmir. Why should India now reverse that historical position propounded by no less a person than Pandit Nehru, the father of the present Prime Minister. I know, I have heard that the present Prime Minister says that her father was a saint and not a politician, but she does great injustice to her father. He was an outstanding politician. Perhaps, with all due respect a greater politician than the present incumbent.

Question: How do you think you are going to get on with Mrs. Gandhi?

President: I hope to get on well and I have respect for her. I never liked it when Yahya called her "that woman". She is an elected leader of a big country. We respect a leader of people. We would give her all the respect and all the consideration that is due to a leader of the country and a successful Prime Minister. So, we will meet her with reverence and respect but, of course, with a sense of equality because although East Pakistan has

been severed away from Pakistan, we still believe in the concept of sovereign equality of states. And we're 60,000,000 people and with a good history, with a good account of ourselves. And I have lifted the morale of the people again not by fanning hatred I have not done that but by going in the direction of reform and revolution. So I'm looking forward to our encounter, to our meeting, and I hope it will be a productive dialogue.

Question: You don't think you are placing too much weight on this face-to-face encounter you want your temperaments are surely very different?

President: Yes, but this is also necessary. We must have this face-to-face encounter and as I told you the other night it is not that we don't respect has shown that they don't break the Gordian knot.

Question: Is it necessary to meet face to face?

President: Very necessary.

Question: You have taken a pretty strong line on these war crimes trials that Sheikh Mujib proposes to hold in Dacca. You said it is a matter of principle you and if they're held they will much everything up. Does that really mean that if anybody is tried for war crimes in Dacca it is going to be a bit impossible to come to any settlement here on the subcontinent?

President: Well, I think objectively speaking things will become extremely difficult and don't think I have used any strong words or made any strong statement. A person in a weak position cannot make strong statements and strong statement have to be followed up. You become the prisoner of your own words. I'm not in a position today to make strong statements. I don't think I've made a strong statement. I think I've not closed the windows for political settlement, political compromise, but if the trials are held it would arouse the worst of feelings and it would make my task almost impossible.

Question: Clearly, as well as wanting to be sure that you are genuine in your search for peace. Mrs. Gandhi is going to want to assure herself that you are going to remain president of

Pakistan. If it is not a rule question just how secure is your position?

President: Well, my position as president of Pakistan does not depend on Mrs. Gandhi good will, as much as my presence in the political scene did not depend on anyone's goodwill, because you know there was a time quite a number of the great powers and the super-duper powers were determined to see that I didn't get back into the political arena or the political corridors of power of Pakistan. And I think without disrespect to any other leader of Asia, Africa and Latin America, I am sort of an exception who has resisted and overcome the object of the great powers to come back into the political arena. So my being the president of Pakistan, in my opinion, is not dependent on Mrs. Gandhi or any of the great power. It is dependent on the man in the street, the man in the rags.

Question: Some of your opponents, of course, would say that your support is as regional as Sheikh Mujib's support was in East Pakistan?

President: If Pakistan has become entirely regional, I don't think that is correct. My party is strong in all the provinces. They talk about the majority of their parties in the two smaller provinces but really they have a majority of one and a half and they keep on talking about their majority but we're quite strong everywhere and, in any case, we represent over 80 percent of the people in terms of a parliamentary majority. In terms of the peoples grateful to the people throughout Pakistan for their support.

Question: There are suggestions, of course, that with all the powers you have under your new interim Constitution you are something of a dictator not in the sense that your predecessors were but nevertheless you are all-powerful?

President: No, once you have constitutional rule you can't take that position because I think the same could be said for President de Gaulle, the same could be said for the Prime Minister of Britain, the same could be said for, the President of the United States of America, the same could be said for the Prime Minister of India, not only the present one but even her predecessors. So the question is that when cons titutionally,

when the people give you a certain quantum of power, that's not wrong power. Wrong power comes when you destroy the people's rights and the people's confidence so that the point is in your country to call it stability and good government. Now why don't you want to call it good government in India and Pakistan.

Question: People are very ready, when they come upon you and write about you, they call you brilliant and versatile and able and they don't seem so ready to think of you as reliable, steady and dependable. Have you any comment on that?

President: The people you've met must be the most undependable people that inhabit the earth because they have never stood the people. I am talking about the politicians if you have met them. They have been unscrupulous, they have profited by the absence of scruples and when they find a person who is dedicated to principles but he is flexible—you know the Indians say that India won the war, say that I am a man of contradictions. It is an ironical thing for the Indians to say that. But what is the subcontinent and if I am a product of subcontinent's realities, it is not a reflection on me, it is a reflection on the realities of the subcontinent.

Question: So you see yourself as pragmatic rather than devious?

President: But pragmatic with idealism and with set principles.

Question: As these preliminary talks with India get under way here, what earthly reason is there why any peace settlement that emerges should be any more lasting than those that have gone with the war?

President: Will, fundamental realities have changed and we are in a qualitatively new situation.

Question: You don't feel that there is any more reason why they should succeed than that?

President: That is a very big reason.

Question: It's only a matter of time you've made claim before you recognize Bangladesh. What sort of country is what remains of Pakistan going to be?

President: Pakistan still maintains its ideological complexion because the Lahore Resolution of 1940 talked of two states, of two Muslim states. That was later on amended to make one state and the British left one state. So you can argue till the cows come home whether it was one or two states, but now we are one state and we can pick up that part of the argument—and why not—to reinforce our ideological basis. I don't see anything immoral in that although the Indians have said that the two - nation theory has collapsed. How has the two -nation theory collapsed, by the emergence of three nations, two-nation theory would have collapsed if there had emerged one nation. Because India says there is one nation—we said there were two. If at that time we had said there are three, the Indians would have said, “My God, that is out of the question we might consider two, we can't consider three. “So the two-nation theory does not collapse by the creation of a third nation. It would have collapsed if they'd all become one nation. Now if India thinks that it has collapsed so in order to reabsorb both East Pakistan and West Pakistan that is another matter. But that is not the reality today. So we have an ideological basis and we will also place emphasis on territorial propriety.

Question: Yes were talking about a non-activist, low-profile foreign policy. But what sort of role do you see for Pakistan to play on the subcontinent. What kind of country is it going to be in relation of others here?

President: Well, our foreign muscle will be judged by our internal muscle and for the time being I am concentrating on really creating the internal muscle. We have great potential. I think my country can become a kind of West Germany of Europe in Asia and once I unleash all the force, we bring back our manpower into play in development projects, electrification, rural health centers. I have great faith in the people of Pakistan and I am banking everything on their strength, on their resurgence, on their resuscitation, and you will see, if I get these four years or five years, which is my constitutional right, I am determined to change the face of Pakistan, make it really into a part of Asia that the moment you enter Pakistan you would say, “my God, we

have entered a country which is really pulsating, vibrant and active and vigorous.

Question: Will you have to change the nature of the people?

President: They are ready for peace but they are ready to vindicate their honor and that can be vindicated without going to arms, without going to war. Germany has vindicated her honor without going to war.

Lindley: Mr. President thank you very much.

Transcript of interview with Der Spiegel at Lahore on April 26, 1972

Question: Mr. President, there have been three wars between India and Pakistan. Now you begin peace talks. Do you think that means peace for the subcontinent in the future or is there the danger of other wars between Pakistan and India?

President: I can't look into the future for all time to come but I hope that we can come to a kind of settlement which will bring permanent peace, durable peace, and if we can settle our disputes properly to the satisfaction of both parties, in conformity with international principles, I believe that we can have peace for all time and until the world undergoes some kind of a metamorphosis which we cannot anticipate. But I do not see why we cannot arrive at a durable settlement.

Question: In spite of all the problems, there is the Bangladesh problem, there is the Kashmir problems, there is the problem of population, all sorts of problems. How could you imagine a durable peace which would not be lasting for only two years or a few years?

President: Yes, well, to put the same thing in a different way, peace which is not imposed, peace which is not in violation of established principles if they want to take their military victory to a logical conclusion by subjugating Pakistan politically as well. In that case there would not be much hope for peace, for a durable peace. And you know there are many problems; far too many problems; but then sometimes when there are far too many problems a breakthrough becomes simpler rather than when there might be just one problem. So the main thing is the intention to live in peace and to come to the conclusion that war is not really an answer for the settlement of our outstanding differences.

Question: Victorious states tend to be, let us say attempt to try to change their victory into political gains in their sense so there are problems, I think very difficult problems to be solved

first like the prisoners of war. What would you propose, what should India do with the prisoners of war or what would you do if India goes ahead and let's say, there are some war criminals trials in Bangladesh or something like that?

President: Actually victorious states have in the histories of Europe especially tried to take their gains to the ultimate conclusion but what has that brought about when in 1914, at the end of the 1914 war, that attitude was taken. It did not really contribute to durable peace and we saw again the Second World War yet unleashed on Europe and the rest of the world. That is a most striking example of when you impose a humiliating or an insulting peace at the conclusion of the war. And I can give so many other examples. Secondly, as far the subcontinent is concerned, there have been so many ups and downs.

Today we exist as India and Pakistan but it has been a question of the confrontation between the two major communities, whom our leader, the Quaid -i-Azam, later on described as the two major nationalities in the subcontinent—the Hindus and the Muslims. There have been so many ups and downs between these two major communities—sometimes the Muslims have won, sometimes the Hindus have won. There has been Muslim India for seven to eight hundred years—there has been Hindu India. So, are we going to go around in this vicious circle all the time or should we not have an honorable co - existence between our countries? So, I believe that judging from the lessons of our own history and from the lessons that international history has shown, I believe that there should be a new change, a new mood for a lasting peace.

And you have mentioned the question of war trials, of our prisoners of war. I would like to state here quite candidly that apart from the legal rights or wrongs the international law on this subject is not quite clear and in any case you cannot apply the analogy of Nuremberg to this or to these so-called trials, which are being proposed by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. But legally you can argue one way or the other. But the problem finally is not legal; it is political in the sense as to what sort of climate these trials, so-called trials, will generate. It won't generate a good climate and it is not going to assist in the settlement of our disputes.

As it is, even without this gimmick, and it is a gimmick, we have enough problems. You mentioned them yourselves; Bangladesh, India, equilibrium between India and Pakistan, Kashmir, population, prisoners of war; so many adjustments to be made of trade, commerce and hostile propaganda against one another, restoration of diplomatic relations. All these things are enough as it is. And now on top of that, as if there was nothing on the plate, comes this fantastic demand to try, people who were defending their own country.

Question: But, Mr. Bhutto, wouldn't you say that some of these people who defended Pakistan are really, did go a step too far? Will they go scot-free?

President: Well, the point is this that much has been made of this. I don't condone it. I don't apologize for it. I've also said that those prepared to get their names, we are not going to boast about our standards in the military field, especially before the Germans, but we have had high standards and so if we want to retain or restore our high standards, that does not mean that we have aggressive intent in our mind and vindication of national honour does come by so many method—by economic progress, by making Pakistan really a country which can show to the world that its people are hard working; that the per capita income here is the highest in the subcontinent; that our people are progressive; that when you come to the subcontinent; that our people part of it you'll find that the best facilities are available here; our roads are good, our schools are good. So we can make our country into a modern, model, progressive country. There also we can vindicate our honor and show to the world that well we are a people who have efficient manpower, good man-power, able people. And it was in that context also I said that we wanted to restore to Pakistan its standards in the military field because certainly we don't want to go down in the world with a bad reputation and a reputation that we lost one part of our country and that we were not able to defend another part of our country and that we were not able to defend another part of our country. This was a fluke which happened, more on account of the circumstances. We don't want to go to war with anyone but we also want to retain those standards which our people's traditions and history amply justify.

Question: Well, Mr. President, good armament in such a large scale, in such a massive scale, would harm, I think, the social and economic progress of the country, so can have a very fine fighting machine with all the arms you need again and, at the same time, have progress in social and economic matters in the country.

President: Yes, I agree but the point is that now our position is reduced economically and physically than it was in the past and nevertheless the Indian Government recently has increased its military budget. I can't understand that because we are now in a small size and our resources are more limited, our foreign exchange has also been cut as a result of our losses of jute and other things. But nevertheless a substantial increase was made in the defense budget of India this year when they presented their budget to parliament. So that leaves us with no choice. Why should India increase her budget in spite of the changed circumstances? So that answer your question.. Secondary, if India reduces her budget then, and if there is, if there is no possibility of war and our disputes are resolved, we will reduce our budget also I hope because we are interested more in economic development and in social welfare and a reduced army can also be an efficient army. We can make it more mobile, we can make it more efficient. We can concentrate on it in such a way that it remains a good army, remains an efficient army, not geared for war, not poised for conflict.

Question: But, Mr. President, as long as there are two outstanding problems, the older problem of Kashmir, the latest problem, recognition of Bangladesh, that long Pakistan will always be looked upon as wanting revenge.

President: Well, we are trying to settle these problems. That's why I'm keen to meet the Indian Prime Minister. We're not delaying a meeting. We have said from the beginning that we are anxious for an early meeting and we are anxious for an early meeting, not to see Delhi in its summer months but to settle our problems.

Question: Under what conditions would you recognize Bangladesh as the president of Pakistan?

President: This is a hypothetical question today and second it must come at the right time after I've had discussion with Mr. Mujibur Rahman. And it is connected with other problems as well. It's not a problem in isolation.

Question: Do you intend to meet Mr. Mujibur Rahman?

President: Yes, I've already said it, that I'd like to meet him and I'd like to meet him also as soon as possible because I can't take these decisions in isolation. They will have to be taken into the totality of the picture.

Question: But, Mr. President, you talked to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman before you escorted him to the airport. You must have had detailed discussion. Is nothing of that coming true?

President: Well, in the first place, at that time he was in Pakistan here with us and he can always take the position that he was in custody, he was not a free man, so I don't want to mention that conversation those two conversations we had, very long ones, on the 27th of December and one the 7th of January. But I want to meet him now in a different situation. He is now styled as the Prime Minister of Bangladesh and will not be on our territory so whatever he says and whatever he's going to do will be in a different context.

Question: India has been arming herself and has increased its military budget. May be India feels a sort of super power in South Asia since the last war. Do you recognize his Indian position or the Indian wish for that position in this phase?

President: the wish is there. The wish has been there for a very long time. The wish has been there when India became free which can be judged from Pandit Nehru's Statements, from statements of Mr. Pannikar, who was an Indian political theorist and an ambassador and a distinguished Indian leader and there are their books right from the old times. So the wish has always been there. But you know on this matter of super powers and great powers, I have a point of view and that is that a super power does not emerge or a great power does not emerge from the size, its size. If that were the case, well, there are many big countries. Brazil is a big country. And Canada is a big country. It could have become a super power. Smaller countries like Japan,

they're not super powers but they have been great powers and you see the question is in history those countries that have had the attributes of greatness in them, even if they've been defeated or they have had setbacks, they've re-emerged in some form or the other to assert themselves.

Now I'm not trying to preach a theory which you, your country preached. I don't believe in that theory. I don't think that there are certain nations, certain people born to be great and others not born to be great. That's not the theory. I don't subscribe to that theory. But there are certain advantages certain countries have, certain nations have, of historical accidents, other things. They take advantage of those and then they are technologically or otherwise advanced. A combination of factors makes a great people, not size alone, not technology alone. A number of factors put together. And that is why China was destroyed they were called opium eaters and things like that but they've been great in history and they came back. So also Russia. So also France. So also Germany. So also United States. Now India has been great in that sense also. But India has been great, really great, for a period of time, not fleeting, on two occasions. One was at the time of the Asoka Empire and the other was at the time of the Moghuls.

Question: And this is, was, Muslim India

President: That was Muslim India and that was Buddhist India. So I wish India all the luck in the world to become great but I don't see those attributes which you have in mind of a super power. If India tries to be a super power, and she's welcome to make that effort, but I think it will be a futile effort.

Question: But you will not consign yourself and Pakistan to be a minor power, to be a second class country.

President: I don't think so. I don't think so. I don't think that's possible. If you give us, my people, a decade, you will see that we will reassert ourselves and we will make our fullest contribution to world peace and to international relations and to the peace in the subcontinent and I am talking in constructive, positive terms and if anyone thinks that they're going to relegate Pakistan into a status of a small country, and I don't want to be disrespectful, then I don't think that historically that is correct

because Pakistan has a sense of destiny. Its people feel that sense of destiny. They have achieved great results in the past. They're a proud people. They resisted conquerors, the British. They have a past. They have a good past and I can't help it if they have this past and they're proud of it. They're confident people and I will not set myself out to take away those qualities of my people and I will not set myself out to take away those qualities of my people and, as such, they'll again make their constructive contributions.

Question: What would be a settlement for Kashmir? It's been a problem for 25 years now. Now again there is talk of internationalizing the cease-fire line. Status quo ante without any progress. What could be the possibility?

President: I have made my position quite clear on this matter. We have not given Kashmir the right of self-determination and nor can we take it away from them. It is their right, it is their inherent right, but if they want to get their rights they have to assert themselves to get those rights.

Question: Would you have that?

President: Well, the world, the whole world would sympathise with them and why should there be international law and why should there be international conduct; why should there be right of self-determination; why should there be United Nations; why should there be Security Council; why should people only support the right of self-determination of the people of Algeria or people of Guatemala or people of Nicaragua?

Question: Or the people of Bangladesh?

President: Bangladesh was a part of Pakistan. It exercised its right of self-determination exercised. They were on the forefront of the struggle for Pakistan. So the question is Bangladesh is outright secession through a military conquest.

Question: Mr. President, could you visualize a solution for Kashmir in the style of Bangladesh? What happened in Bengal last year that the same thing could happen in Kashmir if the peace talks fail in Delhi?

President: I am not in a position to answer that because for one thing that might spoil our negotiations with India; secondly, it's really a hypothetical question.

Question: well, we will insist a little. You know that the main part of your army is stationed along the Kashmir border. Now, do you feel that the Indians will try something or would you like to try something?

President: No, no, we're not going to try something. You can print that and you can take it from me that we're not going to do something silly like that and under no circumstances we would take any adventurist steps of that nature. We have had enough of adventurism. We've suffered too much for adventurism. No, that's out of the question. We have our army poised there for two reasons. One, because Indians are concentrating their forces there and they have taken a lot of actions, activist position they have taken on the cease-fire line over there and so since the Indians are so active we are trying to take precautions against that. Secondly, you see, Kashmir is a disputed territory and India, if it attacks Pakistan's frontiers again after having got such a bad name for its intervention in Pakistan and having taken half the country away that will not go down too well in the eyes of the world or anyone else.

Question: Who will help Pakistan?

President: The people of Pakistan will help themselves for a change and on that, of course, we will have a completely new thinking in our country and we are going to see to it that everyone defends Pakistan.

Question: That is why youngsters and old people between the age of 18 and 35 I believe are all drafted and in the Army in Kashmir.

President: That's what Azad Kashmir President said the other day, I saw it in the papers where he said that this is happening. I don't think it is on such a large scale but it will have to be done on a massive scale. I haven't yet even begun to move in that direction fully but I have to make Pakistan impregnable, its

defenses impregnable, every part of my country should become a fortress.

Question: That's why you started the peoples Guard?

President: Well that was a beginning but everyone will be a guard, everyone will guard our sovereign integrity.

Question: Mr. President, you started some reforms on the social and the economic sector. Let's say the land reforms. I think you started a lot but is it working? Is it beginning to work?

President: Well, you see, the implementation has barely started. Take land reforms. The forms are being filled by the land-owners and by the 15th of May they'll have to submit that thing. Naturally, it will take some time for the implementation to show its results.

Question: Isn't there some deadline for beginning of these actually?

President: Yes, we have set down very rigid deadlines and given no margin of complacency. I mean it is a full-time operation. In four months I think it's very difficult to have the reforms that we have had and thank God when we were not in office our party had done quite a lot of homework and search and prepared some papers on these subjects. If we hadn't done that, I don't think we would have been in a position to do so much in three months.

Question: But, Mr. President, the so-called vested interests in Pakistan have also done their homework so they claim they have split up the lands, they have taken the money outside. The industrialists. What can you do about that?

President: Well, you see, the point is this, that there have been some land transfers. As a result of it, I've reduced the other day further ceiling by almost 25 percent, even more, and I have stipulated in the land reform very drastic punishment for those who give wrong forms and give wrong information, No, I do admit some have tried to circumvent the reforms but you see we have said that transfer must be genuine, made only to one's sons, daughters, wives. We have not made it collateral to cousins, aunts

and all. And I don't think people in Pakistan have so many concubines and so many children that hundreds and thousands are being redistributed. So that also is exaggerated. So when we have restricted it to just the children, the children of the person or the wives, or the husband doing it for the wife or the wife doing it for the husband.

Question: But will land gained from these land reforms actually go into the hands of the small peasants or the labourers? Will they be given enough chance to hang on to this land, to make it fertile?

President: Yes, certainly. And some very good land is going to come to them and they're getting it free. They won't have to pay a penny. They won't pay a penny and 12 ½ acres in the Punjab, in certain good areas, to get that free, they could not have had it in their best dreams. And secondly, those tenants who are going to remain tenants, will no longer have to pay any tax liabilities. That's all been transferred to the land-owner. So even they will benefit vastly.

Question: I have one question. Let's say in Europe, President Bhutto is the son of a former landlord, landlord himself, millionaire, socialist himself. Did you give away some of your land?

President: Yes, of course. In 1958 and now also.

Question: Now also, with the new land reforms?

President: I'll give you the details. I'll give you the details by the 15th because I haven't been to my estate but now, of course. Even before this change I would have had to give something. One of my sons was having to give quite a bit. But my other children, I think, were not giving as much. That's how I came to know. I said, no, we must get more cut. We must be taxed more. So I reduced the ceiling further.

Question: In your first days as the president you aimed at the big capitalists of Pakistan, industrialists. You even arrested some of them and you say they should bring some of the money back they took outside the country in the last five or ten years. Did this bring any results up till now?

President: Yes, but I'm not fully satisfied. And now we have been working on our scheme and by the 30th of April they have taken to give us money which we think will be quite fair, I forget at the moment the figure because I don't know the latest position.

Question: Is it crores or....?

President: Yes, I think so.

Question: In dollars?

President: Yes. You see on the one hand the business community talks about restoration of confidence and on the other hand it is dragging its feet. The sooner it finishes with these matters the better it is for them, the better it is for everyone. And if they settle down, we are quite prepared to give them assurances, a kind of a charter. Now this is what we've done and we want to stop for the time being and concentrate on consolidating these reforms.

Question: Mr. Bhutto, your party is called People's party. Its programme is some socialist programme, do you have any expels or is that an all Pakistani socialism? If it is, could you just declare in a few words, would you describe it?

President: Yes, of course, but then you have got in Europe also Christian Democrats, Democratic Socialists. Our Party's socialism is that we are a Muslim people, we have our faith, we have our values, we have our traditions and we stand by those and as far as socialism is concerned, we accept only that part of Marxism which is, which concerns economics. We don't have to accept the totality of Marx, the whole theory of Marx from beginning to end: it's dialectics, its classless society, stateless society. With fifty years of Marxist state, one can't become a stateless society. Now for that matter classless society. Nor do we accept that world is entirely material, there is no God, there are no spiritual values. Why should we accept all that? We accepted the limited part confined to its scientific, economic doctrine. They've become a little obsolete by time. So we don't have to be rigid. We're not rigid. We say it's a very deep and penetrating study on economics. And whatever remains valid in

our light and whatever remains beneficial to our country we must, with the passage of time, try to accept, use it as yardstick.

Question: How did the millionaire and landlord become a socialist?

President: Well, who do you ask me that question? Why is it that only Asians who have a background, one background, cannot accept principles? You see in Europe you don't ask this question.

Question: Well, sometimes we ask.

President: Here you make it your main theme. But in Europe and in England you accept the fact that principles to a person are more important. And in Asia, I suppose, you doubt that politicians in Asia can stand by principles.

Question: No, but I think it is not as often in Asia or in the under-developed countries as it is, may be, in industrialized countries.

President: But at the time when Europe was not all that industrialized even so there were people who stood by socialism of that day, of those time because after 1848 the question really began on these modern times. But then there were people who felt, there were individuals who felt for the people, who revolted against the status quo, who felt that cruelty and exploitation was too repugnant to bear, even if they had to suffer themselves in the process.

French revolution produced many people from the aristocracy who also revolted against the system. So, I don't think that it is something which is exceptional or something which is surprising. And, after all, if you serve the country, if you serve the people, if you serve the community, what better wealth is there than making people happy? What better wealth is there than to get their blessings and to know that they feel that you have bettered their lot. Now it depends on one's approach. One's outlook and one's philosophy of life. So, I've always thought that more important. Money has never been an important factor to me because partly, I think, I came from a background where I didn't have to beg, I didn't have to starve. But even other wise

there are rich people who worship money and I don't think, I don't feel there is that much value on it. I place my values on other things which are more important in my book and in my conscience.

Question: Is one of these power?

President: No, power too I was telling you the other night that power by itself in politics is axiomatic. People are in politics to attain power and nobody's in politics to preach. Politics means to get into power. That's not important. That is the objective of politics. What is important is what, I said at dinner the other night, what you do with that power, if you abuse that power, if you use it to tyrannise, if you use it to destroy people, then, of course, that's terrible to desire power for that purpose. But if you desire power to put your people right, to create a new climate, a new era, to see that children go to schools, that people can get basic amenities of life, to make your country, to make it blossom, to make it bloom, to make a contribution to good. That's what power for a purpose is. And that's the difference.

Question: Mr. President, you abolished Martial Law yet you govern under emergency law. Why does there have to be an emergency? Is it because of India or is it to avoid the remainder of Pakistan from splitting up?

President: Pakistan is not going to split up in a hurry and even the other Pakistan would not have split up without foreign intervention. So sometimes when I see amusing, exaggerated stories in some sections of the Western press, and, incidentally, I haven't seen any in the German, as if it's a peach melba, the Frontier is the peach and is going to fall, and the melba is going to come this side. I don't think that's going to happen in a hurry, I can assure you. It is the wishful thinking of some people who have conjured up the fact that this country must not last. So if a little thing happens, they exaggerate and magnify it. Overnight they create great leaders and overnight create forces. Pathans have always carried a gun on their shoulders. Suddenly their eyes have opened to the fact that the Pathans are carrying a gun on their shoulders.

Question: Then did they see Pathans before?

President: Oh, they have, they have. You see its like one American journalist, a friend of mine, Selig Harrison, who long ago wrote a book called “The Dangerous Dacade”, on India. And his prognosis was that India was going to split up.

Question: Well, he’s such a fie journalist otherwise...

President: And so you see that it’s a thing there of the people now, after the fall of East Pakistan, after the fall of Dacca, many people said well this country should never have come into being. Pakistan is not going to fall in such a hurry. That’s out of the question. But as far as the emergency is concerned, first of all, which country of the world has not been under an emergency which is at war, which has remained at war, when there has been no cesession of hostilities, not a peace treaty, where the country, half of it gone and the other half threatened. There are people inside our territory, the enemy is inside our territory, activities on the cease fire line. That there should be emergency powers, emergency powers have been exercised by all countries when they want. Even in India the have an emergency. She has not lifted it. Mrs. Gandhi has not lifted her emergency. And she can have more reason to lift the emergency because they’re the victorious country. If Pakistan had been the victorious country, perhaps I might have lifted the emergency. But having been victorious they don’t lift the emergency. It’s a constitutional exercise of constitutional power by the National Assembly itself and every constitution in the world contains emergency provisions. And when is it more valid to implement those emergency provisions than in a situation like this?

Question: May be Western Countries, or Western people, Western pressmen, then you over estimate the freedom of pres. Mr. President, why did you censure or lets say why did you censure some of your newspapers and even got some of the editors in jail?

President: the first person we arrested, put behind bars, we not a journalist. He was a civil servant, a bureaucrat who sat in a journalists editors chair for two or three days to claim that he was ajournalist. We have got some very good grounds for his detention, number one. Number two, these other little people, these papers because they are not really important, if it were

some important paper one can understand that with their wide circulation they're playing havoc. But you know what they did was they said nothing but indulged in filthy abuses. Absolutely the dirtiest possible abuses. And if you can read Urdu, I could have them translated. In any country, no society, no decent people would tolerate that kind of thing and let it pass as journalism. Now we did not take action although there was Martial law. We called for those people. We told them that look, this is not right. This is not done. This is not decency. You don't write like that against a people, against a country, against a government, against the head of state, against governors, who have been directly elected by the people, just abuse them left, right and centre and then we have a code of conduct for journalists. Now come before the body, comprising journalists, and explain whether this is not a flagrant violation of the code of conduct. Some of them refused to come. One of them came and made even more abuses. So you see the point is, there is a law. There is a law of defamation, a law of decency, there is law like that in all countries. And so it was for these reasons that we were compelled to....

Question: Have they been tried for defamation? You can't take Governors and President for defamation cases. Would you take your President if some small paper, some provincial paper, abused father, mother, sister, brother, children, will you take it for defamation?

Well, let's go to - I feel, more important matters - the foreign policy of Pakistan. I think in your speech at the Assembly you mentioned China the Arab countries and United States are friends of Pakistan. And you took office and you went to China, you went to Russia. You have been to America and the other Arab countries. How are the external relations of Pakistan now - a-days?

President: I think external relations are getting better. I think a better understanding of Pakistan's point of view is being felt and we have again reactivated our foreign policy. Our foreign policy had fallen into the doldrums. It was not projected properly by the former regime partly because they did not understand foreign policy and did not understand internal policy. I really think they did not understand it. But I think we're getting back into the

stride and I have made certain visits to other countries, to Muslim countries, to Muslim Countries, soviet Union and China and I intend to complete my vi sits to the other remaining Muslim Countries, But, of course, if Mrs. Gandhi does not release our prisoners of war and keeps them as hostages in spite of the fact that I might release her prisoners of war unilaterally.

Question: Did she respond to your offer?

President: Not yet. Not yet. But if she doesn't do that then I intend to go on a very long international mission. I'll go everywhere. I'll go and mobilize myself international opinion on this matter and it will have to be done with a very effective team. I'll take people with me. Some of them I'll send somewhere else. Because the world now must also do right by Pakistan. We have partly suffered because of the hostile international climate that was created by India on the refugees, which now the whole world knows that there were not ten million refugees. So, if we ware going and I have our nationals as hostages, then we'll have to mobilize very strongly international opinion.

Question: You have been in Russia. Russia was INdias friend during the was How did you get along with the Russian leaders?

President: Well, I think we have got a better understanding of each other's position and I believe that some of our misunderstandings have been removed and I think that in the future our relations will be better.

Question: I think at the dinner you said some very interesting things. That your relations with Russia are fine but your relations with China are the most important for Pakistan. So you think China is the most important friend and patron of Pakistan? It was, has been and will be.

President: Yes, but the point is that China has stood by us in every crisis. They have been good friends of Pakistan and we want to be friends we cant do that on any condition. We can do that independent of conditions it does n't mean that in order to have good relations with the Sovier Union we must have bad relations with China. This is the condition that I did not accept when I was foreign Minister.

Question: Well, even Mr. Nixon goes to Peking and to Moscow.

President: But even as Foreign Minister I did not accept that position. When the Americans at that time were so allergic to China and I said that its not possible for us not to have good relations with China in order to have good relations with the United States. That we could have good relations with the United States as well as with China. At that time president Kennedy and, of course, after wards President Johnson simply could not accept that position. Now the American Government accepts that position. President Nixon has also gone to China. So the Soviet Union also must accept that it is possible for us to have good relations with the Soviet Union without having detrimental relations with China.

Question: May be two last questions. The first one. Let's be frank. I think Pakistan is sort of broke in economics or foreign exchange you know. Who's helping you just now over this very difficult period? Could you tell us who's helping you?

President: No, we have been giving, we have been making what we can out of what we have got. We haven't got very much but nor have we done very many fantastic or great things and I don't know why the problem should arise because the point is that we want to honor our debts, we want to have good confidence of our relations with other count ries. And if Indonesia could get a moratorium and certain other terms for the foreign debt, then of course, we are prepared to also continue to abide by our obligations. But if the whole world keeps telling us that we are dead broke and we have a very big debt to pay, then we won't be able to pay that debt.

Question: May be a last question. You are going, I think you are going soon to Delhi to speak with Mrs. Gandhi. Do you know, have you had any talks with her before?

President: Yes, I know her quite wel I. We have had meetings before. Of course, I had more meetings with her father, the late Pandit Jawanhar Lal Nehru, who was Prime Minister. I had a long discussion with him over the Kashmir dispute because I was leading Pakistan delegation on the Kashmir

dispute. Then I had a discussion with him on other matters. I've met her also. I've had meetings with her in the Commonwealth Conferences, but detailed negotiations I've not had with her like I had with her father.

Question: How would you judge her if you want to say anything?

President: You can't say. It's very difficult to say unless you meet. Let us see if she has got peace in her heart, then, of course, I'll be able to see it. As I said the other night, politicians have got a sixth sense in which you can feel and if that feeling is there, if I can feel that she has peace in her heart, I think we can make progress.

Der Spiegel: Mr. President, thank you.

Address at the foundation stone-laying ceremony of the national broadcasting house at Islamabad on April 27, 1972

What a pleasure it is to be here this morning to lay the foundation stone of the national broadcasting House from where Radio Pakistan would broadcast national programmes. The serene surroundings of Islamabad, I hope, will give an inspiring fillip to our creative activities and urge us to greater devotion to this fundamental responsibility.

Unfortunately, in our country no genuine efforts have been made for educating the masses. Our former masters were afraid of the awakening of the people for reasons that are self-evident. The percentage of literacy is very low. Few can afford to purchase television sets. Thus, the Radio remains the most powerful medium of mass contact and it shall remain so for quite some time to come. Radio, with its longer range and because of inexpensive transistorised receiving sets, has reached almost every home in the far-flung places. As such, a much greater responsibility devolves on Radio to educate the people, to bring about greater awareness among them, to provide the public with salutary entertainment, to keep them informed of significant happenings inside the country and abroad and prepare them for an all-out effort for national reconstruction. Radio must reflect the new order, the new concept and the new urges and aspirations of the people. It must project the new changes that are taking place in the structure of our society.

It is after a long time that a truly representative government has come into power in our country. The night of terror and oppression, of darkness and falsehood has ended. There is the dawn of a new era, of socialism, of an egalitarian society, determined to mitigate the suffering of the poor, to usher in a new economic and social order and rebuild Pakistan into a modern, progressive State in accordance with the dynamic ideology of Islam.

The new revolutionary Government took over at a time when the country had suffered a great disaster and was facing greater humiliation. Death, destruction and despondency had engulfed the entire country. The morale of the people had been

shattered and the economy was in chaos. Rebuilding the country is a gigantic task requiring selfless efforts of the entire nation. The new government immediately addressed itself to the dire situation and took swift actions to tackle the enormous problems that assailed our people.

A part from reviving the confidence of the people in their capabilities and in their destiny, the Government has introduced a number of reforms and framed new policies in every sphere of life aimed at creating a new society free of exploitation, where there would be justice and equality, where the peasants and workers shall no longer groan under the tyranny of feudal lords, heartless business tycoons, callous industrial magnates and corrupt officials. In our new society there will be amity and co-operation between the labor and the management, between the hiris and the land-owners—all striving to make effective contribution to the process of national reconstruction.

The people's Government has restored democracy and ended Martial Law. The genius of our people shall now blossom freely in this new atmosphere of light and freshness. The impediments which had blocked the assertion of the people's go is a people's order designed to bring new hope to farms and factories, to clear the slums and backward areas and to bring new schools and colleges.

We have, however, not achieved our total objectives. We have made a modest beginning. We still have a very long way to go. The creative energies of the entire nation have to be harnessed to meet the challenge of national reconstruction. It is here that Radio, possessing the widest range of all the publicity media, has to play a decisive role. It must quickly reorientate its programmes to reflect the new state of affairs. It must objectively project the reforms that have taken place in the fields of education, agriculture, industry and business and law and administration. It must go all out to dispel gloom and despair from the minds of the people and infuse in them a vibrant spirit. Radio has to present attractive programmes aimed at eradicating regionalism and parochialism and promoting national integration on a voluntary basis. The youth of the country are the vanguard of new Pakistan. The future of the country belongs to them and they must prepare for these onerous responsibilities. Each and every programme of Radio Pakistan must be attractive and

purposeful reflecting a sense of urgency and firm resolve essential for our onward march towards our cherished goals.

I am glad to learn that Radio Pakistan has grown into a network with a much larger number of transmitters, studios and staff engaged day in and day out in the arduous task of educating and entertaining the masses, explaining the policies of the Government and promoting good-will. It is also encouraging to know that Radio Pakistan has embarked upon a Crash Programme in order to open new stations and install new transmitters to provide reliable medium-wave reception to every region in Pakistan and to reach foreign listeners with a clear message. I can assure you that Government will consider your proposal for development expeditiously and afford all possible assistance.

Similarly, the Government is conscious of the fact that radio receivers, though much cheaper than before, are still beyond the purchasing power of the poor peasants and workers. As Radio must reach this class of our society the price of single band, medium-wave sets must be reduced substantially. I hope the manufacturers and the Government agencies concerned will examine this issue and soon make it possible for the poor to own a radio.

The Government is aware that the present organizational structure of Radio Pakistan is out-dated, totally ill-equipped to provide the kind of service expected in a democratic country. The present administrative and financial controls are impeding its working and severely restrict its ability to achieve national objectives. An organisation whose activities are predominantly creative cannot afford to be run as just another department of the Government. We have given serious thought to this matter and I am glad to announce that Radio Pakistan will become a Statutory Corporation on the 1st of July this year. I am sure this will afford it an opportunity to reorganise itself on modern lines and with greater administrative and financial freedom it will achieve professional efficiency of a high standard. It will be able to offer better terms of service to its employees, attract artists and present much better programmes.

I am sure the Islamabad Complex when completed will fulfil the need of having a respectable Broadcasting House in the

Capital and also afford modern technical facilities for production and transmission of programmes. I shall watch its progress with keen interest.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen, today is the birthday of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). It was on this day that Allah, in His infinite mercy, blessed mankind with the Crown of His creation who was not only the final messenger of Divine Revelation but also set a lasting and inspiring example of a life of devotion and dedication for which no sacrifice was too great to be made, no impediment too harrowing for making a beginning towards improvement, and no disappointment too poignant to shake the believers' faith in ideals. This sacred day reminds us of the glorious principles of equality, justice and brotherhood, of freedom and universal peace, of banishing fear and ignorance. For a Muslim there cannot be a more auspicious occasion than the birthday of the Holy Prophet and I am, therefore, very happy to lay the foundation stone of the National Broadcasting House on this auspicious day. I pray it will serve the cause of the people of Pakistan. Thanks you.

Message to President Nixon on Apollo-16 Mission's success on April 28, 1972

We in Pakistan have followed with great admiration and interest the voyage of Apollo-16. Please accept, Mr. President, and convey to the American people our felicitations on the successful completion of this remarkable mission which is yet another landmark in the realization of man's burning desire to know more of the universe in which we live. I would also request you to please convey our congratulations and most hearty welcome back to the astronauts of Apollo-16. By their courage and endurance, they have added a new chapter to the odyssey in space. We join with you in applauding the scientists and technicians of your great country who have made this accomplishment possible by their devoted efforts.

May Day message on April 30, 1972

Today the working people in Pakistan and all over the world are celebrating May Day, a day of great significance in the history of the working class movement.

The blood of innocent, hungry workers shed by the brutal forces of exploitation on the streets of Chicago in 1886 led to the consolidation of an organized working class movement which had taken birth 15 years earlier out of the revolutionary flames of the Paris commune.

The just demands of the workers have been met to some extent because of the unity, struggle and sacrifices of the working classes; but the forces of oppression continue to exist and continue to usurp the wealth produced by the proletariat, by the peasants and other working people.

The workers of Pakistan who are observing May day today must keep a vigilant eye on all forces of exploitation, internal and external. But while they must organize themselves and struggle in a disciplined manner to achieve what is their right, they must also struggle to maintain and safeguard Pakistan's hard-won independence, its sovereignty and territorial integrity. Without freedom, we shall have nothing: but with freedom we can have everything.

Your Government which has come to power through your own votes gives the highest importance to the well-being of the working class. The workers and peasants are the backbone of the nation; they are the fountainhead of all power and all good. It is for this reason that the Government came out with radical reforms in the field of agriculture and industry. The labor reforms have been introduced to allow the working class to get on its feet. It is a first step and if there are any shortcomings in the new labor laws, which come to light during their application, they will be modified.

Let us all join hands to produce more and share the wealth we generate among ourselves. The more we produce, the more we can raise the standard of living of the down-trodden masses. Revolution and production go together.

On this day, we must pledge to rebuild the nation, rebuild the country remove all sources of exploitation and oppression. Let the government and the people join together in the great revolutionary struggle for a brighter, securer and happier Pakistan.

On this day, I congratulate and greet all working people throughout Pakistan and earnestly hope that when we celebrate May Day next year we shall have more victories to our credit.

Workers of all lands unite you have nothing to lose but your shackles and a world to win.

Statement naming Mr. Mumtaz Ali Bhutto as the Pakistan People's Party Leader in the Sind Assembly on May 1, 1972

Pakistan has returned to constitutional rule. We have in operation today a parliamentary democracy after all the dark years of our people in the wilderness of authoritarianism.

Since Provincial Assemblies are soon to be summoned, the question of the appointment of parliamentary party leaders is to be finalized. During my meeting on April 28 with the MPAs-elect of the Pakistan People's Party in the Sindh Assembly, I was by common agreement given the task of nominating a party leader. After extensive consultation with party leaders and after careful thought, I have decided to nominate Mr. Mumtaz Ali Bhutto to this important office.

Although in normal times, as a matter of policy, members of the National Legislature should not be associated with provincial parliamentary arrangements, in view of the extraordinary circumstances prevailing today the departure we are making for the time being appears to be unavoidable.

In my opinion which is shared by party leaders and others whom I consulted, Mr. Mumtaz Ali Bhutto is eminently suited for this position of high responsibility. He has been Governor of Sind since the transfer of power and during his months in office, months of turmoil and turbulence, of industrial and student unrest, months which marked the ushering in of revolutionary and fundamental reforms in all sectors, he acquitted himself with exceptional ability of his responsibilities. He brought to his difficult assignment a maturity of administrative and political judgment.

He acquired an intimate and first-hand understanding of problems that our common people face. He is fully alive to the hopes and aspirations of workers, students and peasants. I have no doubt that this appointment will have the full and unstinted

support of all the parliamentary groups in the Assembly and, above all, of the people of Sindh.

Transcript of interview with Mr. George Vergese of “The Hindustan Times” at Rawalpindi on May 4. 1972.

Question: When do you think the summit is going to take place?

President: I think you know my position. From the beginning I have felt that the sooner it takes place the better, before positions harden and attitudes crystallize and old notions reassert themselves. So I thought it would have been better to meet immediately after the war because the lessons of the war, the consequences of the war would be felt everywhere and with that point in mind I thought we should meet soon. But now I think we would be meeting in the near future. We have left the dates to your Government when Mr. Dhar came here, I told him that I don't want to quarrel about procedures, although procedures are important in their own place, but procedures as to whether it should be the beginning of June or end of May, that is left to your convenience. Whether it should be in Delhi or some other place in India, that is also left to your convenience.

Question: How do you think the emissaries' talks have gone? Have they gone beyond fixing the date? Have you been able to make any headway here so that the way to the summit door has been eased?

President: Yes and no. I am glad they moved cautiously. Sometimes we fly off the trapeze more or less in the subcontinent and that is why I think in the past one of the reasons why we haven't made any progress. Hopes will light up, soar up. With a little turn of the wrist, they will dash to the ground. So I think they have done, on the whole, a good job taking these factors into account. Primarily, I told our people, my delegation, that they should confine themselves to working out the agenda because the moment they enter into it would be better that they kept themselves strictly to the agenda, to the procedural question. When Mr. Dhar met me here, he advocated going forward a little bit, eating into the substance a little bit, not chewing it altogether. I said it is all right. If you want to do that, if it facilitates your discussions or if you think it makes a

contribution to the meeting that we are going to have with the Prime Minister, certainly, nothing sacrosanct about it. I thought it would have been better to leave it there but let us go ahead. So I think they have done a neat job of the agenda and they have also discussed a little bit of the substance. So we have a peep into your thinking a little bit and you have to some extent into ours. I don't think that will do any harm. The main bout or the main problem will come when we get together and have to take some hard decisions.

Question: Prior to the summit you expect that there will be any move at all for sort of pre-summit adjustments of any kind such as restoration of diplomatic ties, normalization of P. & T, flights, things like that?

President: Pakistan's position is abundantly clear. I said before I went to the Soviet Union and on my return, yes, why not? Let's restore diplomatic relations. It is much better to deal with each other bilaterally than through third countries, although we have respect for the third countries who have assisted us in this delicate phase. It is much better to deal with one another directly, so again it is for you to respond to what I have said. I will be prepared. I am ready to send someone tomorrow. We have even got the person in mind so we would like to anticipate some of these developments. We are completely ready for that. And even for the other matters, the question of P & T, travel, communications.

Question: These are hopeful steps. If these were taken they will certainly improve the atmosphere and get some of the smaller problems out of the way.

President: Yes, but the main problem is not these questions. The main problem is to really fight hard against the prejudices of the past. And the more vistas open up, the more it is possible to fight hard these built-in prejudices which have become monuments of hate and suspicion. These are the monuments that have to be broken. Of course, by opening up new vistas and new avenues of communication and dialogue, if you haven't really had a change of heart, we can put another brick on the pyramid. Or if we have had a change of heart we can demolish it brick by brick. I think our people are ready for a settlement, a good settlement, a fair settlement, a proper

settlement. I hate to use the word "Honorable" We've over-used that phrase. And we are ready. I think. If I sense our peoples feelings, they are ready for a good and firm settlement but I would also like to tell you quite frankly, not that I want to introduce a jarring note, that they have felt and we have felt a tremendous sense of feeling of loss of pride. That has come into the picture. I don't have to dilate on it. So they are sensitive, we are sensitive and the other, I told your other colleagues that, please try and put yourselves in our shoes and we'll try and put ourselves in your shoes. We've never tried to do that in the past and if you put yourself in our shoes you'll find that we are treading on very delicate ground-the raw feelings of the people. And the healing processes have barely begun so you must take that factor into account.

Question: A spokesman, I think after the Muree talks in Islamabad, said that, I think the phrase he used was that Pakistan would have no objection if Sheikh Mujib Joined these summit talks. Has this issue come up and do you think this is a possibility? Some of the issues are tripartite, some are bilateral.

President: Exactly. What I'm going to say, actually the point is that there are some problems which concern all three of us. At least that's the position you've taken. Although it is strictly a legal position, but, however, I won't go into that. But that's the position you've taken. We have to take that into account. The second thing is that there are certain matters which concern you and us exclusively and there are some problems which concern Mr. Mujib Rahman and us exclusively, Now I told Mr. Dhar that when we begin our negotiations, let us have a preliminary discussion between ourselves, between your Prime Minister and us. And then at any stage that we feel that its appropriate to have some kind of discussion with Mr. Mujibur Rahman, that can be done. I have no objection to that because you see, I can meet Mr. Mujibur Rahman and you cant draw any inference from it because it don't have to tell you that it is, that doesn't mean itself it is a factor, that we have taken a certain position. I have no objection to that, no inhibition as such as that would mean that we have taken a legal step towards recognition. So, I have no objection.

Question: But is this something that has been processed further? Is it merely an idea that has been thrown up or is it

something that is being pursued so as to try to achieve that and facilitate these talks so that all the knots can be united rather than there be a pause and a further effort to try and get a meeting at some other level or some other place at some other time?

President: Yes, I think it is an idea thrown into the discussions but here again I am afraid and I tried to explain this difficulty to Mr. Dhar and I would also like you to please bear in this with me. I don't think it will be possible to unite everything in one mighty go and this was exactly what I told Kosygin and Ayub Khan and Lal Bahadur Shastri at Tashkent. I said, well you people have seen the world more than I have and you know problems better than I do, but I know our people and they are not going to stomach all this in one capsule, one go, one shot, the whole lot. You must prepare them, step by step, slowly, explain to them, make them feel that it's the right thing that has been done. There are so many factors which get injected into the situation and Indo-Pakistan affairs have remained irrational, the methodology is very important, otherwise, when irrational people do irrational between two rational people. So when rational people become irrational, the methodology is very important, otherwise, when irrational people do irrational things it is like a storm and you know a storm also subsides and settles down. But you see the position now. The point is that you have your difficulties, we have ours, but objectively speaking the difficulties are here (pointing to his heart) because you don't have to recognize Bangladesh. You recognized Bangladesh, you assisted them, you went in unilaterally to bring it about. Whether we recognize it or not, that we have to do here. It is a problem for me really. It is neither a problem for Mujib nor Mrs. Gandhi. Then if it does take place it will be a moment of joy and satisfaction and jubilation for you. But it is for me here to carry my people on this difficult problem. And on other questions also to carry them with me. Basically, the weight of the decision falls on us. Therefore, I think you have to rely on our judgment, on how we proceed and I can assure you that if you get the impression that I am just trying to buy time, I am not so stupid to plead this because I am not doing it for that purpose. You can't trick us; we can't trick you. We know each other too well. Perhaps in one meeting we might get away with something but then you will see through the whole thing. We know each other too well. Perhaps in one meeting we might get away with something but then you

will see through the whole thing. We know other. We have lived together for centuries. No one knows us better than we know each other. So that is out of complete sincerity that I am telling you that you will have to have faith in my judgment rather than have the whole thing blow in our face and I don't want that to happen. I want to face this challenge with a sense of vision. It will be a satisfaction that where our leaders in the past failed, we have succeeded in bringing peace, provided I do succeed in bringing a settlement that our people think it is fair, it is right, it is a good settlement and in my opinion, for me personally, that will be a sign of very great satisfaction that I was able to bring back peace which our people accepted, which they thought was the right peace and that now they can look forth to a better tomorrow, development, eradication of poverty and, apart from all that, sleep in comfort. That I think is a very big challenge, a very big task and I am not going to allow it to flit away, fizzle out over small little things and taking a petty approach. We have for too long taken petty approaches. So please do understand this and when you go back through your papers do try to explain this to your people. I tried to explain this to Mr. Dhar and I think he understood my difficulties and I am hopeful that the people at large will also understand this.

Question: One problem that seems to arise that Mujib has taken a position because he says that he faces over difficult kind of house situation with his people there. He says that recognition should precede talks. The position you had taken earlier was let there be talks first and then see what comes out of that and then the rest might follow. How does one bridge this gap because the issues that you have stated are uppermost in your mind and one can understand that about prisoners and the return of these prisoners. Bangladesh people have talked about some war crimes trials which also touches on a part of this problem. How can one come to grips with these problems unless there is some meetings of the minds and what would be the kind of manner or method by which this dialogue could be started because if it starts then perhaps there is some hope of getting some reconciliation?

President: I tried to explain our difficulties to Mujib when he was here on the 27th of December and 7th of January. And at that time I tried to explain to him how I saw future events being unfurled and I had to tell him that I must make a genuine search

for some equation between us and the people must know that a search has been made and they must know that we made every sincere endeavour to try to maintain some link among ourselves. For this reason, I had a break diplomatic relations with certain countries. I knew we would like to restore them again but it is not important as to what I think. It is important what my people think. And that is why we had to take certain steps of that nature. Here also, how can I explain to our people that, in the abstract, one fine morning I say that we recognize Bangladesh when they say that this Bangladesh come about of the mistakes of our military rulers or due to the invasion of India, or both, or whatever it is. And some people say, well now the people of East Pakistan should be allowed to have a referendum. Let us hear them, what they have to say once the military forces are vacated. So there are all sorts of appealing theories on the matter. We have lived together for 24 years. We struggled together for Pakistan. The sacrifices of Bengal were no less than those of people here, perhaps more and they are Muslims. They must be feeling for us now that they have seen what has happened to them. I can't just one fine morning say, "Look, we have decided to recognize Bangladesh". It is all right for other countries. It has been a part of our country so it is different for Pakistan. It is more logical that if we meet Mujibur Rahman and after discussions, I come back and tell my people, "Look, I have done my best. I met him. I discussed the question with him. I told him please do try and find our what we can do to have some sort of communication, some association. But he is adamant. He says no. he is a representative of his people. No, nothing doing. Now what choice have we got left?" Something like that would be logical, sensible. What does Mujib lose by that? After all, he should to be a spilt child. The question is he loses nothing by that. It is a funny sense of pride that you must first recognize us. So it is only a matter of modalities, one meeting or so, one meeting even, I can come back and tell my people after all there is a limit to human endeavour. I think he should have no objections to that. If it took United States 30 years to recognize the Soviet Union and they have not yet recognized China, well this was a part of our country. If it means a matter of months of weeks then by then I think we would done the right thing, made every effort. It is not that I am trying to be a stickler for this. I don't see why he is being a stickler. Here he seemed to understand my difficulties but now from there he seems something entirely different. And it is about time he controlled some of his people on these things. There will

be people who will try to complicate the problem. He will complicate his own position by taking this kind of attitude. I don't see any sense in it. I told him I will take a flexible attitude. It is only a question of telling our people, coming back and telling them this is what they say. This is what I got from the horse's mouth. And that is all.

Question: Do you think it will be possible to make a start then, through an intermediary or correspondence so that that could start the dialogue?

President: But I wrote to him in January or February telling him that please do not think I want to interfere in your affairs. Therein itself is our thinking or the way how, step by step, we have taken our people to this new situation. It is not that I haven't written to him. That letter went to him. Then I sent him food grains. Again he took the position that it should be routed through the UN. I don't see why we should route it through the UN. We are short to food ourselves. If we are going to spend 11 million dollars and send the food, it should not be lumped together with some of the other contributions. Our people are making a sacrifice. There again their reply is negative. In the Lahore Speech of mine which I made on return from the Soviet Union I said well if they keep saying "Assalamo Alaikum", "Assalamo Alaikum", we might have to say "Walekum Assalam". So he has heard that said in front of 500,000 people. And if we were not moving in that direction, I wouldn't have said that. I don't really understand why he is being difficult in this matter. Correspondence, yes. Emissaries, yes. But the best thing would be for him and me to wait and we better meet and it would be better if we meet at some place outside the subcontinent because if we meet in Delhi on these questions, you will be accused of having influenced him. In Dacca there will be some compulsions. If he comes here, then there will again be some matters. So it should be some friendly country outside the subcontinent. I see no objection to that.

Question: You say that you would like to see some links are retained or re-established. What kind of links would you wish?

President: I leave it to them. If they say none, then it would be academic going into this.

Question: But what would be the possible like?

President: Nothing spectacular. Now, we are realistic enough to know you can't put the clock back. The moving finger has written. So trade and communications. That sort of thing. Nothing profound to begin with.

Question: What about this other problem, about the Biharis there and Bengalis here? Since this again is a human problem, would some movement here help to amend the situation in a more favourable manner? That is, to change peoples thinking?

President: The Bangalis are here. I know there's something economic and Mr. Mujibur Rahman made certain statements but since you're in Pakistan. I don't mind if you go anywhere and see the position. After all, the Bengalis are volatile, as you know. They are sensitive. But that, I can't take care of that. I know there's some grievance in their mind and they are upset. Well, they get upset very easily. Without any disrespect, but really I tell you the truth, we've gone out of our way to see that their feelings are not hurt and no dislocation and inconvenience is caused to them. But at the same time, certain degree of segregation has become inevitable. This has happened because Bihari feelings have been worked up. there was some trouble there and it continues. We have quite a volatile Bihari population. In Karachi there was a huge demonstration a day before I went to the Soviet Union. And they have been wanting to seek revenge and otherwise, generally, people's feelings, well, they want to go, they've left us. You know how it is among the people, uneducated people. So I don't want that to happen because I know if that happened, there would be quite a problem to face, so some element of segregation is there. But we are not doing anything to cause them inconvenience or trouble and as I've said, we welcome you in this context to see the situation yourself. But as far as Biharis in East Pakistan are concerned, before Mujibur Rahman left he volunteered the statement that he's going to look after them and he's going to tell the Bengalis that now the past is over and that they are free citizens. They should be permitted to go to their work, live honourably, properly. And I think in his first speech were these ugly demonstrations in the stadium and various other things. But

now the question is Biharis are the citizens of that land. A full generation of them have grown up, 25 years have passed. They have no other country. It's their right to live there. They've contributed to the growth of that place. They are part of it and you can't whimsically and arbitrarily say that that one million people are not wanted. Today it is the Biharis, tomorrow it will be the Chakmas. There are some other ethnic communities. Is Mujib then building what some people feel a racist state? And on the one hand is it going to be that? But on the other hand he says it's secular state, democratic state. So secular that those people who left East Pakistan 25 years ago are also, under certain conditions, permitted to come back seeing their draft interim constitution. I have had the position it is his duty also, in principle, to protect because there are so many ethnic minorities and others here. All of a sudden one pocket of influence starts getting up and putting pressure that they should be declared second class citizens or they should be thrown out of Pakistan. That's the law of the jungle. Let him accept his responsibilities. Then after he's accepted his responsibilities and they feel a sense of safety and security, then, after that, if there is some head-for-head shifting to be done, divided families, other hard cases, or if one Bengali goes a Bihari can come, that kind of thing we'll be prepared to accommodate and adjust. But we simply cannot go back to the 1947 horrors. Because you know one such episode of that kind is enough in a lifetime of a people and it really makes me shudder to think when I look back as to how it is, massive exodus that took place, both sides. You had your problem but I'm talking about our problem, shanty towns, slums, diseases, crime, questions of integration. Now we have some dreams of building this country and they will be put into the reverse here if, in this frenzy and fear, they are told, well, what's your option you want to go? Then naturally, everyone would say yes. They want to go because they feel a sense of insecurity. They're not wanted. The people are being encouraged to persecute them. But if they stop and normal conditions return, because you know the poor people, the ones who sleep on the streets and in the Jhuggis and the huts, they're the ones who suffer the most really in all such debacles and the rest. And secondly, they're the ones who forget earlier than the others. They've got a very big heart. If you and I retain these things, our mentality, the educated ones, the middle class, never forgetting we must direct things, the poor, the heart, they forget it. So they settle down. And the Biharies living around various parts of East

Pakistan, it will be all over for them. It won't be over in the minds of other educated elements but for these people. So once that happens and there is some sensible approach that you want to make the great trek thousand miles away, then I think the people will be matched.

Question: I think that Mujib has said that his own estimate is that if the offer is made, I think in one of his speeches, he said that perhaps the outside half might want to come away and half might want to stay. Now, I'll certainly agree with your point of view even half, it's a human problem and it's a large one but would you think it possible that if there's some movement of Bengalis who want to go back from here, they'll go, any of the Biharis who wants from there to come over here can't. then there are in theory large number may be on the lists of wanting to make the move. In point of fact, once the option is given, the climate will change. Simply put, would not people say, well now we have the option to go, so now should we go? The debate will be enough that we must be allowed to go but should we go and, therefore, the context would change. Do you see any possibility of making a start so that some will go from here and some come from there and then may be once that process starts, the feeling's process will be in motion also?

President: Yes, but you know on that problem I released Mujib unconditionally to create a climate of confidence, make a gesture. Now you see what happens is that was, I hate to use such words, but that was regarded as the biggest lever in our hands and I didn't want to, it was disgusting to me, I felt repugnant when people started saying to me, well, you know, this is the big lever, use this. I thought that was not the way to begin the search for peace. If we go about in that miserly way that I've got something in my hand and let me keep to it and let me extract something out of them then I will release this bird. So I thought that, no, I took the calculated risk of saying, no, we don't approach the problem in that way. Let us have a different mental outlook rather than that. And we're not going to a gambling den, we're going to live together on the some subcontinent. After having done that, there as not even been a microscopic reciprocity. Just so much water down the dam. As if it didn't happen. As if he was always in East Pakistan. Forgotten, really forgotten. And if there had been some reciprocity either from his side or from Delhi, then I had the strength and I would have said,

look, this was the right thing to do. But it's the right thing to have done. I don't regret it. But in the long, looking at the long run, the people, the man in the street doesn't look at the long run. He says "Kia Kia" What happened? We expected that the moment Mujib goes our prisoners of war will come back. But they're still there. The war has ended. There's a cease-fire. Emissaries have come and gone. Leaders of both countries have talked of peace. There are two United Nations resolutions. There is Article 118 of the Third Geneva Convention. Still this is not happening. Our Mr. President, he's an emotional man. He has sent away Mr. Mujibur Rahman. Look how Indians are calculating, approaching this problem. Even in victory they're not being magnanimous." Now the other day I said I'm prepared to send to embarrass us. So now the question is, well we shouldn't have done this in a hurry. Now if I do all these other things I put myself in a more difficult corner, to be very frank with you.

Question: What about, of course, this is about normalization between Pakistan and India. Where do we start? What are the issues and which are the most urgent ones and how do we, how do we proceed as you would see it or as you would us?

President: Well, you would like to proceed on the basis that we've been wanting it for the last 25 years. We'd like to proceed the way you've wanted it for the last 25 years. Pandit Nehru used to say let's first go with the smaller ones and build ourselves up to the biggest one. That would create confidence, that would generate good will and I have had the privilege of having many meetings with him on this question and we used to eloquently and fervently argue that no, get to the heart of the problem. When Mr. Dhar was talking I went back. It was a little nostalgic and reminiscent. But the words he was using were the words I used to use with you and the words that I was using were more or less the kind of words that you used to use with us. Now, you know, the point is, why did that happen? The real reason why that happened is that at that time you found it more difficult to get your people to agree to the kind of a settlement that you felt might emerge out of grappling with the fundamental. That's why, psychologically or subconsciously, you wanted to put it back so that you could proceed and tell your people the advantages of settlement. That's the real reason why, because now it will perhaps, according to your estimation or ours, may not

be exactly when we were pleading the other way around. So the question is, and I hinted about it earlier, that it is really I who have to do the selling and since I have to do the selling, please leave the timing and the procedures on these matters to me. And I think we won't fail.

Question: Apart from the normalization part of the diplomatic ties and communications and travel and so on, in the aftermath of the war, our prisoners, both Eastern and Western, there are the territories that are occupied on either sides, there is the cease-fire line. Now withdrawal from all the points, that will be made. Now, as far as the exchange of prisoners on the Eastern side, I think that's no problem at all. That could be immediately done. As far as the question of withdrawals is concerned, one question that will arise and this is one of the issues in which Indian Popular opinion, I think, Mrs. Gandhi would have to carry, is withdrawal to where. The cease-fire line or what becomes is the way the argument starts. So why not allow more scope for the kind of give-and-take which will have to be there so that if it was issue by issue, there are certain things that can be straightaway settled.

President: You see, it can be on that basis but on the ground, no. We can talk it over and have some, draw a picture in our mind but the picture that should come out or will come out can't be, Bass" that's all, here it is, the grand sweep. That will not be possible for me. Quite candidly. But in our own mind we can resolve something on those lines. And these, all these are actually connected problems, prisoners of war, the withdrawal of forces. I told you, you know I told your people and Mr. Dhar that prisoner of war problem will as the time passes, become counter-productive of diminishing returns. You have diminishing blocks in your hand. In January the problem here was extremely explosive. February. But then we got to our people. We integrated them. It is not a military government. I've sent my people out, party have to bear with us. And now I think, other foreign journalists have also observed, that pressure onus, that's gone. On the other hand, a sympathy has developed that well, yes, we must strengthen our present hand and we're not going to allow principles to be bartered for human flesh. And they know now that they're there. Lists have come. It is only a painful separation. And, like our son who goes to Oxford or Harvard, you feel and miss him and all that, and then after some time you

know he's there to study. You get letters. You get used to it. So the question is this, that if a gesture had been made instead, that would have been a breakthrough kind of thing. But whoever advised the Prime Minister let's keep them on, I don't think that was the right advice. However, the problem is that I said to some of your colleagues in January when I met them in my house in Larkana that please don't waste time on this matter because today, I told them quite candidly, it's hurting me like hell. But after some time it won't because I said that I have been thrown up by the people like your leaders have but, in the circumstances in which I was thrown up by the people, our conditions are entirely different from yours. You had Pandit Nehru, who was a legendary figure, and the Congress of his time, his strength, his discipline, his image. They've won one election after another. But there was almost a setback at one stage after his death and Mrs. Gandhi at one time headed for the Congress Party. People were saying outside that well she can't fight the old guard.

But in our country there was a different situation. We had no elections. and we had no assemblies. So when you have no elections and no assemblies, leaders don't get time, they don't get noted. A politician gets to be known either in an election or in the assembly. And that's a democratic procedure. That's how people come into prominence and here in 1947 after the assemblies were dissolved and then President Ayub Khan came, then Yahya Khan came. Thirteen years, no assemblies. No politics. A political situation even. You had to suffocate. So that point is that to have an election after such a long period of time and then for an unknown person to defeat the old guard, their political ideals, who clung to the old notions also, who try to play on faith. I'm a Muslim. I'm proud of being a Muslim. But because we wanted reforms, they told our orthodox peasantry that we were not Muslims, we were infidels. And the ulemas, the mullahs they all got up against us and having fought the languages, fought provinces. They had by that time become so antipathetic to each other that something popular in Punjab, well that should be unpopular in another place. Something popular in other places, absolutely unpopular in Punjab. Mr. Mujibur Rahman, he had people speaking one language; they were all Bengalis; they were all united and talking of exploitation from West Pakistan. He had a negative campaign. But my political career was very short compared to all these stalwarts who claim to have been in Pakistan movement and all that sort of thing. And we had no

funds at all. people say that well China was giving us funds. Out of the question. And I wish they had, we would have done better. But no funds at all. Nothing of the kind. And the great powers were hostile. Soviet Union thought I had messed up Tashkent. The United States thought that I was pro-China. So it wasn't an easy task. Now the question is, see, when the dust settles and the achievement of our victory, and your people are hostile, you wrote also distorted things. So the point is, I succeeded because I really went to the people. I have tried. I know their thinking, I know what they wanted. So I think I know how. And knowing our people, I'm telling you that if that gesture had been made at that time, I would at once have gone ahead because I want to go ahead. And at the same time now I say that in the situation in which we find ourselves, I am quite confident that we will achieve peace. I feel so. There's something in my heart that tells me that we'll achieve peace. And there's something in my political sense of judgment, the sixth sense, that makes me feel that, and I'm telling you the truth. I'll make such a search for that, even if it kills me. I don't mind. So now in that, in that spirit we are, with that mental approach we would like to begin these discussions. But then as I said, because I have to do most of the, take most of the difficulties, let this be really a patient thing in which we don't forget the past history, the past failures. It's much better that three months or two months or six months have been taken instead of something going ahead and dashing to the ground. And then we again involve the great powers, again we go about with hat in hand to chanceries of the world making a fool of ourselves.

Question: Would you say the crucial issue ultimately is Kashmir, once these immediate problems of the aftermath of the war come out? Now in the interviews you granted to the other Indian journalists earlier you spoke of co-operation. You referred to a phrase again used that you've taken a kind of sweep of history and I think in the interview granted to Kuldip Nayyar of "The Statesman" you used language of approximately the same kind that you've willing to consider the concept of a soft frontier. Could you elaborate on that? What kind of idea do you have at the back of your mind because this is the concept that I have been propogating and I see it has a starting point of achieving some kind of notice.

President: I would not like to elaborate. I said something on those lines. Because you know one tends to get caught by words. Your three colleagues who came here, we had good discussions. I'm not saying that they misquoted me. Perhaps they misunderstood me some way or the other and if one of those lines and bits and pieces were picked up here by our defeated politicians, by others and all, some of them said that I promoted confederation. Someone said I am prepared to sell everything just down the river and all that sort of thing. And I know that was not the intention because naturally you don't want to write something which will unnecessarily cause complications for me and especially something that I've not said. So I leave it for the general position that I read that article you wrote, a longish one. I studied and I think something on those lines, we can talk about that. I don't think that any heaven will fall if we take such steps. And then, of course, it depends so much on everyone, almost on every citizen, the contribution that he makes. Now for instance when your journalist friends came here, went to hotels and knew the kind of reception they got there, they were happy. There wasn't hostility. I don't know why your government is not allowing some of our journalists to go across. But they haven't said no; they haven't said yes.....that's all right but I thought they would also go and they would also see the atmosphere, the people's feelings. That would help. So that's why I want you to stay here. You're welcome to travel around and see my problems, see my difficulties and we'll appreciate it if you know the problems that we face, problems we inherited. When I look back to those four months, I wonder how we really survived them, picked up the morale. At one time everyone thought that now Pakistan has become a peach melba. The peach is Frontier which is surely going to fall off and the melba, Baluchistan, which is going in the other direction. All sorts of things were said and done. But I think that with goodwill, give-and-take, we have, I think, made a little progress, even in bringing about some internal cohesion. But you know if things go wrong, if you mess up your society, then naturally everyone gets angry and everyone gets frustrated; and if you make it good, then everyone feels happy. So at one time I, who now am the President of Pakistan, was so disgusted my self. I said, what's the future? And it was a painful thing you know. I'm not trying to blame the system for our present plight because you might think that I'm trying to find an escape for the basic reasons. But at one time the condition of Pakistan had deteriorated to such an extent

that people really had lost all hope. They didn't want to look for the next day to come. And I'm happy to see now that there's a sense of buoyancy. Confidence is again coming back to the people and they would like to make a participation. And they are gradually coming into the picture to make a participation. That's why I tried, I've held the swearing-in in public; bring them all in because it is no longer now three or four people ruling the country. So I think in that way we can make a much greater contribution to the people of our country by letting down arms and by picking up a shovel and a plough and ploughing the fields and bringing about economic prosperity. I think that if we do that we'll pass you and we'll pass our friend there. And that will be a big achievement.

Question: How do you envisage the future of this subcontinent? There was a partition settlement in 1957 which, in a sense, has come unstuck. So while it is a tragedy in one sense. It is an opportunity in another to reconstruct it in a manner that will take care of our aspirations and needs for the future. What kind of possibility do you see here? You have previously said that words like "no war" and "confederation" are anathemas here in their particular connotations. Setting aside those particular words which immediately conjure up a sense of surrender, defeat and things like that. But what kind of concept do you have as to how we can rebuild it nearer to the heart's desire?

President: Again, in non-legal terms because these legal terms have become terms of art and I don't see why Europe should be different from us. Europe has also had its wars, its problems. Today, Western Europe is collaborating with Eastern Europe. So the point is that we can see the same kind of pattern for the future in the subcontinent, keeping our identities as it is. And that is not necessarily to break our personalities. These personalities have now emerged in 25 years. Let us see how their personalities emerge at the other end; but ours has in some form or other. You have also built some kind of a structure in 25 years past. Sometimes people have to go apart to get together. So I don't see why we can't build the proper bridges, we can't have greater and greater collaboration. I can't define it.

Question: do you think the great power may feel differently about it? They may feel that their interests may be prejudiced if these countries get together to co-operate.

President: It is a consideration and it has been a consideration but it is not a consideration that would influence a person like me. If I had been influenced by considerations like this, as Foreign Minister I would not have burst forward with a policy which anyone else would have burnt his fingers with. But it is a consideration which we have to keep in mind.

Question: One more question about the Indo-Pakistan war. There seems to be a feeling of uncertainty in the minds of some of the Pakistani Hindus of Sind who got left behind in what are now occupied territories. They may feel that because they did not leave, they may be considered collaborators and, therefore, in some difficulty or trouble later.

President: That will not happen and they know we have a broad outlook. They come from my province and I know some of them very intimately. And apart from that we have some other affinities. The last post which the Pakistan Army captured in the 1965 war in Rajasthan was called Bhuttowala. So we got people on the other side. We have got Rajput affinities also although first we are completely Sindis. Sind's culture is such that it absorbs all other cultures so we do not talk about these things; but I know them very well. I know the Thakurs. One of them is a Member of our Provincial Assembly. He is from our party. He stood by me in those difficult times when I was being persecuted by Ayub Khan. So there is no problem at all there, unless you have made some of them your agents. Then, naturally, we will have to take action against them; but otherwise, nothing doing.

Question: On the political front here, what kind of constitution do you see coming up? Now you have a combination in the interim state of the presidential and the parliamentary. The PPP is committed to the parliamentary form. Is there a general consensus on this?

President: Our problem really will be the quantum of autonomy for the provinces. If we had got started sensibly, we would have had a pattern of autonomy that your Union has. But as far as the system is concerned, parliamentary by all means.

Deliberately, at this moment of time, I have made some experiments. Not that we do not want a parliamentary system, but for thirteen years we did not have democracy. We did not have politics even. Now the question is I want to see how everything works in our conditions. So with this background we have kept a governor in the Punjab, for instance, who would otherwise have been the chief minister. In Sind I made chief minister the man who should be chief minister; and governor, the man who should be governor. I want to see how this combination works because there is going to be trial and error and a little bit of experimentation in this interim period. But again, I have sometimes a pattern in mind. And at this stage I would maintain a kind of presidential system, not because we want to create one because that is left to the Assembly. We just need to see how the whole thing works and that will help us in evolving the final pattern. But, essentially, parliamentary.

Question: At the moment you have a coalition government at the centre in the sense that Qayyum Khan belongs to the Muslim League. Originally, you invited the NAP and JUI to participate. Is that invitation to them still open with the object of reconstructing and forming a national government so that at the centre you have a national government to deal with the national problems that you face?

President: This again is part of the compelling events of which I have to take a broad outlook. In the National Assembly, the NAP has only seven seats and the JUI has seven seats altogether. Qayyum Khan's party has ten seats. We have 88, now 90 out of 146. we don't need a coalition or a national government from that point of view. But I have thought let us have some new traditions, although legally or politically speaking it is not necessary; but I said let us look at the bigger picture. So from that point of view I have given Mr. Qayyum Khan a post in the cabinet and the Interior Ministry, most important portfolio. In the same spirit I made an offer to the NAP and JUI and that offer remains, but I can't keep it open indefinitely. Work has to be done and I am keeping some ministries open. So it is up to them. I have given them the reasons I have given you. Secondly, it is to have liaison between the centre and the provinces. But I can't keep it open indefinitely. I believe there is a divided outlook on it. Some of them are interested, others are not.

Question: In yesterday's paper there is a statement by Mr. Wali Khan asking for a statement from the government about what happened during the emissaries' talks and that the opposition should be taken into confidence. Also to include the opposition in the coming talks but not as "decoration pieces" but as participants. This may solve your problem of carrying the whole country with you.

President: The primary responsibility lies on my shoulders and on my party. Even if I associate people in the cabinet or take them with me, it is not that I am not the president or we are not the majority party in the country. Since I have that primary responsibility to the people in all the decisions I have taken, I would also like to see that there is one man in the driver's seat driving the car with his hands on the steering wheel. I took our friends to the driving the car with his hands on the steering wheel. I took our friends to the driving the car with his hands on the steering wheel. I took our friends to the Soviet Union and China as a gesture of goodwill. It has never been done before in Pakistan. It did not mean that they enter into substantive discussions because that can be only done by governments. At moments only heads of states talk and those are really the decisive moments. I can't have some monkey sitting on my shoulder when someone says look, I want to have a word alone with you. It happens thousands of times. It happens all the time. It has happened to me when I was foreign Minister. But from that it should not be inferred that an elected leader is going to sell his country down the river. It is unfair. It is uncharitable. So I reject that suggestion. I don't reject it—it is internationally rejected. Even in the American concept of bi-partisan foreign policy does not mean that intricate negotiations are bi-partisan. At the height of the war, although Labour was in the Government, it was Churchill who was with Stalin and Roosevelt in the crucial Yalta talks.

Statement at a press conference at Rawalpindi on May 7, 1972

For quite sometime I have not met the press formally. I have found this meeting necessary as a number of important developments, both national and international have taken place in the past few weeks about which I would like to exchange views with you. You will recall that in my first statement on assuming office I said that our people had been fed too long on lies by previous its policy of keeping the people informed, whenever it is possible and whether the news is good or bad. We shall continue to do so.

In the space of a few weeks, at long last, Martial Law has been withdrawn, the National Assembly has met and adopted a Constitution for the country, Provincial Governments have been formed and provincial Assemblies have been convened and prorogued. These are satisfying achievements, and I can say with some satisfaction that acute political tensions have for the time being subsided and that our search for an equilibrium in the country is taking some positive shape. I repeat that these are no mean achievements but I would also like to warn the people that we are nowhere near the end of the road. I think we have emerged from the dark tunnel of tyranny but certainly the golden bridge is still far away.

Today I would like basically to talk about three matters; my impending visit to the Middle East and Africa, the state of relations between India and Pakistan, and generally the political events of the recent past.

I intend shortly to visit the remaining Muslim States of the Middle East and Africa to complete my personal mission to the fraternal Muslim States west of Pakistan. We can never forget that these Muslim Nations, bound to us by the imperishable link of Islam, magnificently stood by us in our hour of crisis. The purpose of this visit is exactly the same as my earlier tour to express our gratitude to the leaders and the people of these countries for the unstinted support they gave to a fellow Muslim state in our just and righteous both within and outside the United

Nations, to explain further to them the complex situation and problems we face, and to seek their continued understanding.

Many powerful forces have been at work in the Muslim States I visited earlier, and those I am going to visit, to bring about a change in their attitude and approach towards Pakistan. But our friends and brothers refused to forsake us. We are indeed thankful to them. We appreciate their concern for Pakistan. We fully intend to continue the profound dialogue between us, a dialogue of brotherly understanding to our mutual benefit.

When I assumed office, Pakistan was in danger of disintegration, the problems facing us were overwhelming. In the space of a few months, we have, with resurgent national spirit and with the sympathetic appreciation of our friends, made considerable strides. The understanding of the fraternal Muslim States west of Pakistan has immensely strengthened our position in our international relations. We look forward to their continued understanding and support, particularly as we are about to embark on the task of delicate negotiations within the subcontinent.

We are undertaking this mission before our meeting with the Prime Minister of India so that we can complete the task we had begun in January. There is no question of first and second tours. We would have wished to visit all these countries together in January but our circumstances at home did not permit a long absence. We hold all these States in equally high esteem. On this mission, I also intend to visit Ethiopia whose Emperor, Government and great people have given us vigorous support in the difficult days we have experienced.

The events of the last year have altered the focus of Pakistan. Though the people of South-East Asia remain of deep concern to us, we are for the moment removed from that area and our prime interest must inevitably lie in the region west of Pakistan, in West Asia and Africa, with brother Muslim States with whom we share so much in religious, historical and cultural terms. I touched upon this subject at some length in my address to the National assembly on the 14th April. For this reason I would not like to repeat the compelling reasons for us to concentrate our efforts in this direction.

Our national crisis is of such magnitude that it can only be successfully surmounted by inter-related domestic and international action. It is with this in mind that I am undertaking my mission to the Muslim countries to the west of Pakistan. I know I will have the blessing of the people of Pakistan for my mission.

The much awaited meeting between the emissaries of India and Pakistan was held between the 26th and 29th April at Murree and Rawalpindi. Mr. D.P. Dhar, Special Emissary of the Prime Minister of India, also paid a courtesy call on me.

As usual, certain quarters have seized upon these necessary negotiations to attempt to create confusion in the public mind. Apart from what is normally kept confidential in international dealings, and in this case not more than absolutely necessary, the people have been kept informed. The joint statements issued during the negotiations, and at their conclusion, are unambiguous and self-explanatory. Let me categorically state that there has been no secret agreement or understanding, there has been nothing contrary to our professed position.

The purpose of the negotiations was to formulate an agenda for the meeting between the Prime Minister of India and myself. Inevitably, other related matters were also touched upon, but without commitment. The agenda for the future meeting between the Heads of Governments has not been disclosed for the time being for the simple reason that we do not wish to spoil and confound the atmosphere through protracted public debate when such vital negotiations are on the anvil.

Speculation gives rise to distorted hopes and expectations. The last 25 years have been marked by this tragic experience. Substantive discussions will take place when the two Heads of Governments meet in June. Till then we will not be able to have a clearer picture of how the future of the subcontinent unfolds. It is patently premature to give a definite picture to the people at this stage. Mr. Dhar left on an optimistic note and yet only yesterday there were, unfortunately, serious breaches of the ceasefire in Jammu and Kashmir and near Lahore. We can neither be optimistic nor pessimistic. I can only state now that we

will approach the meeting with open minds, we will have to accept certain realities, but we can never accept dictated terms. We seek a durable peace, but we will reject one that is imposed. We are sensitively aware of our national interests and we will make every human endeavour to safeguard them. However, let us not forget, in only four months' time, that these discussions with India are being initiated because of the outcome of military events. There are certain inherent implications stemming out of a lost war. Otherwise why should there be so many prisoners of war in India?

The people repose their confidence in me, as demonstrated in the last elections. at every step, be it in normal times or in time of crisis, be it over an insignificant internal matter or an important international development, I am deeply conscious of the people's mandate. Then again, only a few days back, the National Assembly of Pakistan gave a unanimous vote of confidence in me. I am thankful to the people and the national Assembly for their faith in my leadership to steer the destiny of the country in these highly critical times. Delicate negotiations with India are ahead and we must be prepared for the necessary ups and downs. But I am confident that the cause of justice will finally prevail. This is our view, and it is shared by no less than 104 countries of the United Nations. I pledge to the people that at every necessary step, always at the proper time, I shall keep the people informed of essential developments in keeping with their confidence and trust. Without your help and support we cannot overcome the terrible legacy we have inherited. I hope and pray that, Insha Allah the people of Pakistan will finally stand vindicated in our future relations with India. We want peace with honour, and if this desire is shared by India, we will find the peace that has eluded us for generations.

There have been some inspired reports that the government has reached a "secret" agreement with the National Awami Party, Jamiatul Ulema-i-Islam (NAP-JUI) alliance. I wish to make it clear that we do not subscribe to "secret" agreements. We believe in taking the people and are at all times accountable to them. Now that the Provincial Governments have been formed, and the provincial Assemblies have met and been prorogued I think it is an opportune time to dispel unnecessary speculation and inform our people of the recent negotiations with the NAP - JUI culminating in the results you have witnessed.

In my 6th March broadcast to the nation, I said that we had entered into negotiations with the NAP-JUI to arrive at a political settlement which would help overcome the political tensions in the country. With this in view we also held discussions with other political parties. You are familiar with the terms of the settlement reached on the 6th March. You are also aware of the subsequent disagreements which arose. We maintain today, as we maintained then, that the terms of the 6th March accord were clear and unambiguous. But I do not wish to dig up the past, nor blame any individual or party. This is behind us.

However, I should like to emphasize that, even after the accord was broken we did not abandon our efforts. On the 8th April, we put forward a new “basis for negotiations.” We absolved the NAP-JUI from their commitment to give a vote of confidence in the Government and to approve the continuance of Martial Law till the 14th August. At the same time, we continued to respect the NAP-JUI coalition as the majority, however narrow, in the provinces of Baluchistan and the North-West frontier.

The NAP-JUI had wanted the choice of Governors in the Province of Baluchistan and the North-West Frontier Province on the contention that, in the circumstances of Martial Law, “Governors meant Government.” After the coming into force of the Constitution on the 21st April, and with the Provincial Assemblies to be convened on the 2nd May, their contention, if ever valid, ceased to have any relevance. However, in my quest to achieve national purpose and unity, which was and will always remain my supreme object, we resumed negotiations with the NAP-JUI coalition on the appointments of Governors in those two provinces. There was sufficient provocation for us to break these negotiations, but in the supreme national interest, with patience and diligence, we pursued our efforts to reach a settlement.

On the 26th April, a fresh tripartite agreement was prepared. I also addressed letters to the Governors-designate of the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. The agreement was signed on the 27th April and on the same day I received from the two Governors-designate confirmation and acceptance of my letters. The tripartite agreement, by two letters and the two letters of acceptance, copies of which are now being made

available, are self-explanatory and require no elaboration. The earlier documents and correspondence, including the basis for negotiations of 8th April, have already been reproduced. On the 1st May I also wrote to the Chief Ministers of the North -West Frontier Province and Baluchistan, copies of these two letters are also now being made available. All these documents are being published for public record and to set good traditions and conventions. This will also demonstrate that there was no secrecy for the sake of secrecy or for any diabolical purpose; nothing was done behind the back of the public. This, however, does not mean that it may not at times be necessary to keep certain matters confidential for a while. In this case we had to wait till the Governors were appointed and assumed office. A study of these documents, juxtaposed with the statements of others, will show our good faith and fidelity to national interest. **(see Appendices I to VII).**

I would like to point out that this is the first time in the history of the subcontinent that Governors have been appointed on the recommendations of opposition parties, governors who are neither non-party men nor members of the ruling party at the Centre. It has never happened before, neither in India, where in several states of the Union there are Governments formed by those not in the Central Government, nor in Pakistan. Nor for that matter, has it happened, to my knowledge, in any of the dominions of the Common-wealth which have the institution of Governors. This has been done as a gesture of good faith and confidence. However, it was made abundantly clear and accepted that this singular step taken in the grave national crisis did not set a precedent.

In the new agreement, we also went a step further by again offering two Minister-ships for the NAP-JUI at the Centre. The agreement clearly records that this offer was made “for the purposes of harmonious liaison between the two concerned provinces and the Central Government and also to strengthen national effort to overcome the exist ing crisis.” The offer was made on the 26th of April. Since then I have delayed completing the Cabinet at the Centre. The offer to the Nap-JUI was not, and indeed could not, be of indefinite duration. Instead of replying to this offer, press statements have been issued to the effect that it is not binding on the Nap -JUT. Instead of striving with us to

achieve national harmony, the Nap -JUI continues to strike a discordant note.

Though we do not flinch from confrontation, we do not believe in the politics of brinkmanship. We believe that all problems should be solved in a democratic spirit and with mutual confidence. We have consistently exhibited this spirit, even in the face of grave and continuous provocation. We shall continue to do so.

Interview with Mr. Piero Saraceni of Italian Television at Lahore on May 13, 1972

Question: Mr. President, that day, March 25, 1971, you were a leading political personality, the chief of the Pakistan People's Party, without government responsibilities and on that fateful day, you were in Dacca and you left on the 26th. I would like your eye-witness account of that day when the guns began to shoot all over east Bengal. What did exactly happen? How and why did it happen?

President: Well, that's a long story. Why it happened well, this question you can address to those who took the action, but I believe that they to the action thinking that political negotiations had broken down and there was no further possibility of political progress. I suppose under that assumption they struck. I was in East Pakistan at time to have political negotiations which the then president Yahya Khan was conducting with Mujibur Rahman and myself. We met for two days and we tried to come to a settlement but we could not make much progress. However, on the 25th night, we were in our hotel, the intercontinental and my party members were with me. We used to hold consultation, and late into the night, everyday. That was the routine. And we held these consultations in the hotel and I think we went to our rooms by 10.30 or 11 and I was about to retire, go to bed, when I was awakened by the sound of gunfire. My other colleagues, who were on the same floor, also heard the fire and they came to my room. That was about 11.30 I think. We saw that action was being taken, but, of course, intercontinental Hotel—have you been there?—is there and you can see the skyline in the distance. On the road itself we did not see any activity. On 26th morning at 7 o'clock, we left Dacca and came back here.

Question: The Pakistani leadership in which you have always had a very prominent position is accused of having pursued towards East Pakistan a policy of exploitation. It seems to me that the most reliable sources—and I have checked official Pakistan sources—tend to deny this assumption. Can you tell us why this unfair policy was not ruled out when its consequences clearly appeared in the permanent unrest of the Eastern Wing?

President: Quite right. Again I would say this question should be addressed to those who ruled East Pakistan for so long. We always struggled for a better social and economic order, and not only we struggled, but we made many sacrifices. We always maintained that the social system as it was a ruthless form of exploitation. The system again we inherited. It was neo-colonial. I know some people do not like the use of this word but it does operate in practice. We inherited a neo-colonial system and there were many other factors responsible for the perpetuation of this system. It has not really ended yet. It will take us some time to root it out. Can't be done in a day, but we have begun on the right lines. And if this had been done earlier, I am quite confident that the unity of the country would have been preserved. However, at the same time, although I admit that there was this exploitation and we have mentioned it in our party manifesto, but there is some kind of a polarization that does take place in a country. Northern Italy was accused of exploiting the South for a long time.

Question: Yes.

President: And you had to take some special measures to bring about relief and redress in the Southern part of Italy.

Question: When and how did you realize, Mr. President, that India and Pakistan were on a collision course as far as East Bengal was concerned?

President: Well, we have been on a collision course since the inception. From the beginning there has been a conflict and confrontation between India and Pakistan. But even before that, it was confrontation which led to the division of the subcontinent and since then we have had to face it in every facet of our life. But, of course, it was more concentrated in East Pakistan. Number of reasons, but then again, they took advantage of a number of our mistakes. If we had not committed the mistakes, they would not have been able to take the advantage.

Question: Last question. What is your opinion about the South Asian and international relationships taking place in the new framework of the subcontinent? In which direction will the South Asian and international balance be affected by the birth of the new Islamic Nation?

President: Well, that is difficult to reply now, especially today. We were in a state of flux, but now with the developments in Vietnam, we have almost fallen into the volcano. Heaven alone knows, what tomorrow might bring. We are facing a situation similar to what we saw during the Cuban crisis. It is a most unfortunate development.

Message of greetings to His Royal Highness Prince Jean, Grand Duke of Luxembourg on June 22, 1972

On behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan and on my own behalf I have great pleasure in conveying to Your Royal Highness, the Government and the people of Luxembourg my warm greetings and best wishes on the happy occasion of the National Day of Luxembourg.

Accept your royal highness the assurances of my highest consideration.

Interview with A.B.C telecast on May 14, 1972

Question: Mr. President, there have been reports that you may meet with president Nixon in Teheran after his visit to Moscow. Are those reports true?

President: No, don't think those reports are correct. I intend to go to Teheran but after President Nixon has left the country.

Question: Do you think a meeting with Mr. Nixon at this particular point would be helpful to you and your country?

President: It would always be helpful to meet the President of a great power, United States, but I think President Nixon has so many other problems at the moment that it would be better to allow him to concentrate on those basic problems which have suddenly come into the wake and he's confronted with them.

Question: Well, are you concerned about what's happening in Vietnam right now?

President: Naturally. Deeply concerned. We've always been concerned. Vietnam is a part of Asia and above all it's a human problem.

Question: do you think Mr. Nixon's solution or the acts he has taken now are correct?

President: I don't know whether that's the solution but he's taken certain acts and judging from past record and the past events of the Vietnam conflict, I don't think that such acts have contributed to the overall solution.

Question: Well, in spite of the current situation in the Far East, Mr. President, American long-range policy is one of disengagement. Are you concerned that United States may not honor its commitments to Pakistan in the future?

President: No, I think the United States will come to its own policy objective in the interest of its own national interests and its global interests and the United States is quite capable of taking care of her objective interests.

Question: Is it valid to suggest, Mr. President, that Pakistan is a valuable asset to the United States as long as the Russians wish to have a land route to the Indian Ocean?

President: Well, that's an over-simplification. I think that inherently people are valuable and if we approach problems on those lines I think the long-term interests of the whole world would be better served. We are a nation still of sixty million if East Pakistan separates from us. An extremely important part of the world. And all of these factors I'm sure are in the consideration of not only the United States but also the other great powers.

Question: There was considerable criticism of the Nixon Administration for their alliance with West Pakistan during the war last year. Would you anticipate a change with a new administration, notably a Democrat one?

President: No, I can't anticipate events that much ahead but I wouldn't say that there was an alliance between Pakistan and the United States Administration. United States Government took certain position. I think it took them sensibly, however, our complaint is that the alliance was broken rather than that an alliance was maintained.

Question: Well, on this show, Mr. President both Mrs. Gandhi and Mr. Rahman maintained that the big powers should leave the subcontinent alone and let them solve their own problems. Do you agree with this?

President: Well, it's nice for Mrs. Gandhi to say this now after the Soviet-Indian treaty of August last year and the advantages that India derived from it. It's all very well that after having taken the advantages to make such biased statements.

Question: You and Mrs. Gandhi presumably are going to the summit shortly together. It does appear that you've settled on

an agenda. Have you settled on anything else or are you simply going to go and begin talking from scratch?

President: Well, yes and no. talking from scratch is not possible with India and Pakistan. We've lived in the same subcontinent, we were one nation till 1947, we know our problems inside out. In the last 25 years we've turned Kashmir upside down, looked at it sideways and from all angles. So problems with new values and with a new dimension and with a fresh outlook, then, of course, in a way you're right. We'll begin from scratch.

Question: Well, as you yourself say, sir, you've turned Kashmir upside, downside, sideways for the last 25 year,. What is there in either party's mind at the moment which makes you think that Kashmir can finally be settled?

President: Well, you see the question is that when I say "we" I use the word loosely. If the principle of self-determination had not been violated and if attempts have not been made to overcome it, I think we would have found the settlement long ago. So to us the principle of self-determination is sacrosanct.

Question: Well, aside from Kashmir, Mr. President, what do you think is the most pressing issue between India and Pakistan at this particular time?

President: Kashmir really and a state of mind a change in the state of mind. I think to put it more metaphysically, a change in the state of mind, if that takes place, we can resolve, I think, the basic issue of Kashmir on established principles.

Question: Well, you have talked about a peace line instead of a cease-fire line. Just what do you mean by a "Peace Line"?

President: Yes, to lift the curtain and so let people come and go and let them see things for themselves here and let the Kashmiris go there and see things for themselves. After all, they're one people and for 25 years they have been arbitrarily held apart from each other.

Question: So you're suggesting that a plebiscite at the moment in Kashmir, which you've always insisted on before, is not necessary as a first step.

President: It's forerunner. But even otherwise in the past there were many forerunners to a plebiscite, appointment of a plebiscite administration and various other things. Well, since that procedure and that method didn't work, now I feel that if the curtain is lifted aside, all the barriers are broken between the two parts of Kashmir, there'll be more intercourse and more integration and thinking between the two people and basically for them to determine their future. So if the two sides of the Kashmir leaders and people get together, perhaps they will find an equilibrium.

Question: Shortly after the end of the war, sir, you expressed deep and constant concern about the state of the prisoners of war in India. There appears to be less pressure in Pakistan now about their immediate return. Is that true?

President: I'm thankful to the people of Pakistan. They have heroically responded to my patriotic call. When I came back everything was in a vacuum and in a state of flux and naturally the people were extremely agitated about this problem and they still are concerned. Obviously, they're concerned. It's a very big problem. It's a basic human problem involving about eighty thousand to ninety thousand people. But we went out to the families. I sent my party people, I sent our workers and tried to explain to them that they to be patient. These were the consequences of war of a lost war and the more they came out and agitated the more they would weaken their own position and their country's position. So I repeat, I'm very grateful to them that they have seen the point and they've exercised great restraint and discipline.

Question: Have you thought in your own mind how long it might be before they'd come home?

President: It's very difficult to guess. In normal circumstances one would say it's easy to guess because the war is over, there's a cease-fire, both sides want peace, there are Geneva Conventions, there are United Nations resolutions and so in normal circumstances they would have been back home.

But we're not dealing with normal circumstances. We're dealing with a difficult neighbor who I hope will become less difficult in her victory.

Question: So why is India holding your prisoners of war still?

President: Why does India do many things?

Question: Why do you think? A tactic? Hostage? A trading card?

President: Well, I would not like to say words which will spoil our future meetings.

Question: Well, is there any kind of a compromise or deal possible on prisoners? You only have a few Indian prisoners, they have 93,000. They've taken on awful lot of Pakistan territory during the war. You only have a little parcel of Indian Land. What kind of a way, what makes you think that you could possibly reach some agreement with India when your bargaining position seems to be very bad?

President: Bargaining position in those terms but not in terms if India tries to impose an unequal treaty on Pakistan. In that event, the whole of Pakistan will turn into an arsenal of defense.

Question: Mr. President, you have said that in the forthcoming summit you will not be dictated to. You've also said there are certain inherent implications stemming out of a lost war and that Pakistan will have her ups and downs. Are those statements contradictory?

President: No. it only shows that we will adopt a flexible posture, at the same time not compromise inherent fundamental principles.

Question: Are you fearful at all that India will try to place a one-sided settlement on you?

President: I don't think they will be all that myopic and I think they have also learned a lesson from the past failures and

how negative our enmity has been and how detrimental it has been to the people. So I think that they'll be little more constructive. And they are constructive, there'll be ample reciprocity from this end.

Question: You have been in office for about four months. You talk about a new democracy in Pakistan. Now there have been eleven regimes in Pakistan since partition. Why should the Indians now trust you?

President: I don't want them to trust me, I want our people to trust us. It's not a question of Indians trusting me. It's not a personal matter. Indians will have to deal with me because I am the elected leader of the people.

Question: may I phrase it another way? How can India look to a durable peace or for that matter how can you look to a durable peace after 25 years of as you yourself say, such negative relationships?

President: Because there has been a war and I didn't say a decisive war in the military sense but a fairly decisive war in the military sense.

Question: Mr. President, can we move to another matter? It's been said that Pakistan's recognition of Bangladesh is not a question principle but a question of timing. Would that be a fair statement?

President: It's both because if the people of East Pakistan really want to sever their connections from us permanently then that's a question of principle, that they want, the people want to part from us altogether, for all time to come and we cannot deny what they want. There the principle is involved. But we have to first find out if that is the correct position and we can't find out being a thousand miles away and having had no dialogue or communication with them. So that's why we must first meet their leaders and come to an objective assessment.

Question: Well, you seem to be getting into a position where it's impossible to have any kind of agreement. Mr. Rahman says no meeting with you till recognition, you say no recognition till meeting. How do you solve this?

President: Well, I think my good friend will take out the lollipop from his mouth and accept the realities and the logic of politics.

Question: It's been suggested he might be pushing you too hard.

President: So is he now reneging on that meeting?

Question: Did you and he have an agreement about a future meeting when he left Pakistan?

President: Certainly. He was extremely enthusiastic about it.

Question: So he now reneging on that meeting?

President: No, I don't know. I have no contact with him.

Question: He's also most insistent at the moment, Sir, as I'm sure you're aware about war crimes trials. Does that affect your recognition and what is your general view on his trials?

President: Yes, that's a more serious matter. It's serious not only because it's not the right thing to do but because we believe there's no analogy between Nuremberg and the situation here in the subcontinent as what happened. I do not go into all the legal aspects of it but, strictly from the practical point of view, it will just muck up the atmosphere. And you know our people are sensitive, Bengalis are sensitive. And these trials will go on and all sorts of things will be said, the press will play it up. I'm afraid it will take us to the point of no return.

Question: Well, Mr. President, you have warned of terrible repercussions if those trials are held. What did you mean by terrible repercussions?

President: I didn't say it in that sense nor in the sense of reprisals, in the sense that it will become almost impossible for us then to keep the situation under control and for the forces of sanity to prevail.

Question: Do you accept the view that Sheikh Mujib probably needs to hold some kind of trials?

President: Well, if that is his position after four months of having returned to Dacca as a hero, then I'm afraid he can't go on from one gimmick to the other.

Question: Do you feel any, to hold war crimes trials here at all? That has been suggested.

President: No. we won't approve that. But if there are people who have committed excess then we are prepared to consider taking legal action against them.

Question: Is this, final question on it, is his an issue upon which future relations between Pakistan and Bangladesh could founder?

President: I wouldn't like to put it that emphatically because I would like to keep all the doors and windows open for a settlement and I wouldn't like to take the Mujib approach of slamming one door after another. If we both start doing that then we'd be really in a quagmire.

Question: Well, Mr. President, what kind of a compromise is possible on the war crimes issue? there has been talk of possibly having token trial in Bangladesh which would satisfy everybody.

President: Why should, how can a token trial or any form of trial satisfy everybody? It won't satisfy us because a principle is involved. These people, they were defending their national territory and integrity and unity. They might have committed excess and we're not condoning those excesses. We are prepared to try some of them here under the ordinary law. So I don't understand how we can compromise on such questions.

Question: It is not difficult in Pakistan now, Sir, to find the opinion expressed that other than the moral loss of East Pakistan, that economically and politically it's good riddance.

President: Whoever says that to you couldn't really be a patriot.

Question: That's why I excepted the moral issue and said it was simply politically and economically that Bangladesh was a burden to this country and that you might do better without it.

President: I rally, I can't even think in those terms.

Question: Well, has Pakistan adjusted economically, politically and mentally to the loss of East Pakistan?

President: That's another matter. You have to accept the painful conditions and we have made, I think, sufficient efforts to find new accommodations.

Question: Well, what is you most pressing internal problem right now?

President: Internal Problem? Firstly, I would say that we have to consolidate political unity in the country. Secondly, take some strides in the economic field, establish the rule of law. We have now a constitution but interim one. We hope that we can get a permanent constitution and go back to the democratic rails firmly and I hope for all time.

Question: Mr. President, when you released Sheikh Mujib from imprisonment here in West Pakistan he claimed to have been so ignorant of the situation in the East that he could not make any binding or lasting agreements with you about anything. Is that correct?

President: Well, in the first place I didn't ask him to make any commitments. Whatever he said was of his own accord about our future relationship. Secondly, when I met him I did give him the salient features of what had happened. That was on the 27th of December. On the same day I gave him a radio and allowed him all the newspapers. I met him again on the 7th of January. By that time he must have had some idea of the situation and he repeated what he had said to me earlier before he left Pakistan for London.

Question: In the last four months here, Sir, you have spoken about relatively massive development for West Pakistan, increased aid to education increased aid to health, rebuilding the

Army, raising two new divisions. Where is the money going to come from?

President: Money will come, money will come down from the trees. Money will come with labour. Money will come with sweat. Money will come with good intentions. Money will come from the fat industrialists. money will come.

Question: Some people are suggesting that in fact you think money will come down from the trees.

President: No, don't.

Question: Well, let us be more specific. What about the Consortium? What about renewed aid from Britain, the United States? What about increased private investment here? It's all at an all-time low, I gather.

President: Never mind. I have been talking to the trees for a long time, ever since it became a popular song in the United States. But we'll get the money. And the Consortium I think is readjusting itself to our needs. If our intentions are good and we mobilize the people and the world knows that we are determined to get somewhere, the sympathy, the understanding will all come back into place.

Question: Well, the consortium has maintained all along that you had to take certain drastic economic and financial steps to buy your own house in order before they would resume aid. Do you feel that you have convinced them that you've taken these measures?

President: Well, we're taking these measures. We're taking these measures according to our own light and we cannot be dictated to on what should be done internally. That's been done for too long and we've got nowhere. Quite independent of outside considerations and advice we are taking steps which they think are the right steps. Sometimes they might think that we have not gone far enough but we judge our own situation according to our own light and according to our own conditions.

Question: You said, Mr. President, that there's need to rebuild the Army. You said more emphatically that you never

intend to disarm. Again, that could appear to some to be a contradiction between your search for a durable peace. Now is it a contradiction?

President: No, because United States made its best search for a durable peace when armed to the teeth. I don't say the analogy holds good for us but at the same time you can't disarm completely and yet undertake that search. Besides India, in spite of the events of last year, has increased her defence budget. I can't close my eyes to that factor. We're surrounded by important and interesting countries. We can't close our eyes to that factor.

Question: Those surrounding and interesting countries are Afghanistan, Iran, China. Are you worried about them?

President: Soviet Union. And if they want to be friendly with us we'll be more than happy to be friendly with them. But if they want to have relationships which increase our tension, we have to take precautions. But so far I don't think we have had any difficulties with these countries and I hope that we won't have any difficulties with them in the future. Principally, it has been India and if India begins to disarm sincerely and effectively, we won't allow that factor to be ignored by us because our conditions also need greater consideration on economic matters.

Question: Is there any possibility of a no-war pact?

President: I don't think that phrase "no-war pact" is a right one to use. It's been subjected to so many interpretations because it's been used by Indian and Pakistani leaders in a long debate stretching over 2 years so it's become a term of art. But fundamentally we're quite prepared to adopt a civilized course, which is to try and settle our disputes by peaceful means.

Question: Well, how do you do this, Mr. President? For 25 years there has been atrocities, there has been war between the peoples here. What has to be done fast before this thing will finally end?

President: I think I answered that question earlier by saying that on this occasion there has been some kind of a fairly

decisive military outcome and we take our roots from the debris of this war.

Question: Well, there was a recent border clash in the Kashmir area and there were reports it was more than a clash, that Pakistani troops actually occupied some positions that were occupied by the Indian Army. First of all, is that report true?

President: Well, now that you mention it to me I'm glad to get this good news after having lost so much territory, figure a little bit of territory, it comes as good news.

Question: Well, how do you stop this kind of thing from escalating?

President: Well, by respecting the cease -fire line, by withdrawing forces, by returning prisoners of war, by meeting soon, as soon as possible, by coming to some sensible settlement to settle disputes by peaceful means. But you can't do it on an ad hoc basis when the two armies are facing each other and when the prisoners of war are in India, when tension hasn't subsided.

Question: Back to the trading issue for a moment, Sir, Sheikh Mujib suggests, fairly strongly, that you may hold the Bengalis in West Pakistan as hostages.

President: No. He's talking through his nose or hat, whatever the expression is. We never do that.

Question: Much of your administration in the last four months has reflected the negative aspects of the last year on the previous regimes. What is in fact the difference in the nature of your regime and that of Yahya Khan?

President: Well, only a little difference. Yahya Khan's regime was composed of barbarians. Mine is composed of civilized people taking their roots from the people having had swept the elections, not imposed themselves on the country, not usurped power. That's the only little difference.

Question: And as you look even farther back now over the last 25 years, do you have any different view of partition?

President: No, not at all. No. my commitment to the two - nation theory is not a fleeting com mitment dependent on the vagaries of military adventures.

Question: Are you concerned, Mr. President, about any further partition of Pakistan? I know you have seemed to have averted a problem with your two northern frontier provinces. Do you expect any further attempts in further portioning the country?

President: Well, the problems in these two provinces are grossly exaggerated. People everywhere were unhappy. People were unhappy in East Pakistan. People in West Pakistan and every part of West Pakistan were, unhappy with 13 years of dictatorial and arbitrary rule. And your unhappiness took various shapes and forms. Some people just reconciled to it. They were going through a living death. Others tried to become extroverts. But basically its structure was against the system and it wasn't for independence of all the provinces of Pakistan. It took that form and shape in East Pakistan after complete frustration. If Ayub Khan had adjusted, himself to the democratic processor to the political processes we would not have been in this position. The first culprit before even Yahya Khan was Ayub Khan who refused to consider political settlement of political problems. And so if this had gone on, if Yahya Khan had gone on and if some other military general had come and there had been suffocation, complete absence of freedom and no participation of the people, then all of us might have become secessionists. So this problem of Baluchistan and Frontier is grossly exaggerated. They are patriotic Pakistanis and you'll find that in the days to come, the months to come, in the years to come, they'll make a most handsome contribution for the consolidation of this nation's interests.

Question: Would you like to sum up what you have said, Mr. President?

President: We want durable peace in the subcontinent. Peace for all time. For centuries our people haven't see peace and it's about time that we turned our backs to hostility and put our attention to the basic problems of the people. India and Pakistan, people of India and Pakistan, are too poor to afford the luxury of wars every five to ten years. We should depend on our

own resources, make our own country on the strength of our own efforts and not go begging to the world for assistance and aid and in the subcontinent fight every five to ten years. This doesn't make sense. But in order to have peace, we must have peace based on principles, peace based on justice and peace can be lasting only if it is based on principles, equity and justice. Otherwise an imposed peace will not work and so with all our hearts, with all our effort, with all our deepest faith in peace, we look forward to our negotiations with India in that spirit.

A.B.C: Thanks you, Mr. President, for being our guest on "Issues and Answers"

Address at the Quetta airport on May 17, 1972

Addressing a big crowd at the airport soon after his arrival from Larkana, the President said democracy can grow only if the people make zealous efforts for their economics well-being and protect the democratic principles.

The president said that he was an ardent believer in democracy and would do everything to promote and put into practice democratic traditions. It was in this spirit that parties other than the People's Party were associated with the Government. His party believed in principles and had great faith in democracy.

Recalling his past visit to Quetta four months ago, the president said that the political climate then was different. The country was under Martial Law and he had pledged to remove it, but some people said that the promise would not be fulfilled.

He also alluded to the apprehensions which were raised before his taking over as President and said that he would do justice to all without any discrimination.

The president urged the people to be disciplined and work hard to improve their standard of living. He said that the present Government was working round the clock for bettering the lot of the common man and bringing prosperity to the people. The Government, however, should be given some time in order to clear the mess left by the past regimes.

Speech at a banquet given in honor of Princes Ashraf Pahlavi at Quetta.

On behalf of the people of Pakistan, we welcome your Royal Highness to Pakistan and we all know princess Ashraf Pahlavi is no stranger to our country. She has come to Quetta on what I regard an important and significant visit.

In Pakistan we are trying to establish a sense of national direction and national consolidation. But there are many people and many forces opposed to this objective. I would be the last person to deny or hide facts from our people or from our Royal guest whom we regard truly to be one of us.

Today, while the whole of Baluchistan, all the people of this region were rejoicing over the visit of Her Royal Highness, while we all gathered here from Islamabad, from capitals of our provinces to accord her friends and compatriots a warm and tumultuous welcome reception, there are many forces working against this visit and this objective. Not our own forces, not our own internal forces because we are collaborating to salvage the debris that we had to inherit.

Nevertheless, I do not want to go into details but efforts were made to frustrate this visit and to make this visit not as successful as the people of Pakistan wanted it to be.

I want to assure your highness that our people, all of them, were eagerly, looking forward to your visit and are still eagerly looking to meet you, making acquaintance with you because they can never forget Iran. Your Government. His Imperial Majesty Shahinshah of Iran have stood by Pakistan since its inception in very crisis, in every difficulty and in every vicissitude culminating in last year's war which we had in the subcontinent.

So, I want to tell you that we with all our hearts welcome you to Pakistan on the soil of Baluchistan and that all our people want to see your visit there as a memorable success. We are determined, come what may, whatever the forces are, from

where they emanate that is not important, we shall frustrate their efforts, to bring any iota of misunderstanding between our two peoples because our two peoples are imperishably linked by geography, by history, faith, culture and race. So, come what may, they are determined to make your visit a success.

We will not allow these and forlorn conspiracies to succeed. I request the Government of Baluchistan to rally round, irrespective of the consequences. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Governor, I am determined to hold my public meeting on the 21st May in Quetta and if I had to hold it alone, I will hold that meeting alone. The whole effort has been to prevent that public meeting from being held on the 21st and on this I will stake everything, the prestige of my Government and my own personal prestige. And if it is a success we will all rejoice. If it is a failure, I will not go to Larkana. So I would request ladies and gentlemen to join me in a toast to Her Royal Highness Princess Ashraf Pahlavi and all our distinguished guests.

Reply to Princess Ashraf Pahlavi's speech at the Iranian dinner at Quetta on May 20, 1972

I am delighted to be here at the Consulate-General which we regard as our home. I am thankful for your hospitality. We cherish the warm relations between our two countries.

Tomorrow, your Highness, you will get an indication of the warm feelings which the people of Pakistan, the people of this province, have for you. It will be a face to face encounter which is the best way of judging sentiments. We look forward to tomorrow's public meeting with hope and expectations.

Speech delivered at a public meeting in Quetta on May 21, 1972

My dear comrades, elders, workers, farmers, students, labourers,

Let me first salute you and then salute the Princess of Iran. My dear friends, it is after a long time that I have come here in Quetta to address you. I have always been trying to maintain communication with you. Ever since the Pakistan People's Party has come into being, it has been our endeavors to keep a close contact with the people, we do not want that this contact, this relationship, is disrupted in any way. You will recall that I have, on other occasions, addressed the people of Quetta. During my election campaign, in my speeches, I told you that come what may, whether we get to power or form the opposition, our contact with the people of Pakistan, with the poor people of Pakistan, would not be lost. It is because I and my party have sprung from you. We cannot ever undermine the power of the people. The sun rises from the east and sets in the west. It is possible that the sun may rise from the west and may set in the east, but it is not possible that I lose contact with the people. So my dear comrades, I am really very happy that God has again given me an opportunity to address you and communicate with you so that we may come closer to each other. All this is because I and my Government believe in and respect the basic principle which is the supremacy of the will of the people. We believe that the demands of the people must be met. Now so long as the people are with us, so long as the poor people, the farmers, the workers, the students are with us, we would remain in power. But as soon as you go against us, we would not be in power. We want to be in power with respect and dignity and do not want to be called a government which is anti-people.

Now my friends, my proud people, my proud brothers, the brave people of Baluchistan, the great farmers and workers, you must listen to me. I am going to deliver an important speech important because we have to obtain your advice on certain internal problems, a kind of consent from the people. Besides, as

I told you earlier, we have amongst us today a very special guest, the sister of the Shahinshah of Iran, Princess Ashraf, with her team, that is why I will have to talk to you on some other important matters as well. But those foreign issues I would take up later. First, let me touch upon the internal problems, because unless we are internally strong and stable, unless we reform our home, unless we set it right, unless we advance internally, achieve happiness for our poor people, the foreign affairs and the issues which concern foreign policy would remain unsolved. The 25 years history of Pakistan bears witness that so long as we were not internally strong and our people, the poor people, were not backing the Government the foreign policy of Pakistan could never have a chance to succeed. It is for this reason that I intend to speak on our internal national problems, but I would not go into great details.

In the first place, let me tell you that after the birth of Pakistan the first 10 years are generally believed to have been democratic, but even in that period of democracy Baluchistan was not given the right to enjoy a democratic system. This province, which is part of Pakistan, which is on the map of Pakistan, the biggest province of Pakistan, not by virtue of its population but geographically, yes, this biggest province of Pakistan, did not enjoy democracy even in that era of democracy when there was (said to be) democracy in Pakistan and there was parliamentary system existing in East Pakistan, in Sindh, in Punjab, in the Frontier province. Even after independence, the parliamentary system and democracy were not introduced in Baluchistan. Even during those days there was no Assembly here (in this province). In those days there used to be a representative of the Central Government in Baluchistan, who was neither a Governor General nor a Governor, he was called Agent to the Governor General, which in other words meant, agent of the Central Government. Thus until the formation of one unit democracy was not introduced in Baluchistan. Throughout Pakistan, in all other provinces, it was (supposed to be) a democratic era but in this province democracy was not introduced. Later on, the One Unit Scheme was introduced in which the autonomy of all the provinces was abolished and one single province of West Pakistan was formed. It was known as the province of West Pakistan. The other province was East Pakistan. Now you people and your leaders fought against One Unit and your fight was not merely for democracy but for the

autonomy of your province too. You as people of Pakistan succeeded in this fight. In the days of Ayub Khan, I remember, that Ayub Khan had said that, come what may, he would not do away with the One Unit, that the One Unit was something sacrosanct (for him) and so he would not abandon it. But the people of Pakistan fought against the dictatorship of Ayub Khan, all the people of Pakistan not merely those of Baluchistan. People from all other provinces of our country in West Pakistan and in East Pakistan organized a very big movement against the dictatorship and struggled against it, and made sacrifices, many sacrifices. My young friends were in the vanguard of this struggle.

I remember that in the days of Ayub Khan when the movement was launched, when the leaders of Pakistan were arrested, and all kinds of restrictions were imposed, people did not abandon their leaders. The poor people, farmers and workers and the hungry people did not give up the principles which they were upholding and for which they were fighting. They carried on with the movement. They did not give up their principles. They kept the struggle alive and continued with it. The people of Pakistan defeated a personality like Ayub Khan by solidly supporting the struggle against him and they succeeded in their struggle. Now after the defeat of Ayub Khan we thought that that was the end of dictatorship in this country and that it was the beginning of democracy so that the Government would be handed over to the representatives of the people. But my dear comrade, power is never transferred to the people so easily. Do you know, that it means to have a people's Government? It is a Government by the representatives of the people. People's Government is not possible until the representatives of the people get to power. We were, therefore, under an illusion. We thought that with one blow, one movement, one sacrifice, we had finished with the dictatorship for ever and ever, that we had uprooted it (from our midst). But the tyrants were still perpetuating their rule through tyranny and oppression. They had no respect for law and were aiming at strengthening their dictatorship, although history of the world proves that such a thing is to ever-lasting. Now, what did you see? You did not see a people's Government coming to power. It were not the people's representatives who were selected to receive power, but another dictator was chosen, another commander-in-chief of

the Army was picked up to receive power in contravention for the law of the country, in contravention of the constitution.

Of course, the constitution was made by Ayub Khan. It was not our or your constitution. It was a constitution framed by Ayub Khan and he himself outraged his own constitution. His constitution demanded that if there was to be a change of the Government and the power was to be retransferred it was supposed to be the speaker of the Assembly who was to receive the responsibilities of the president. But Ayub Khan did not hand over the responsibilities to the Speaker. Ayub Khan handed over the authority and responsibilities of the Government to the Commander-in-Chief of the Army. Later on, after dictatorship of Ayub Khan ended the dictatorship still continued. Before Ayub Khan's dictatorship it was Ghulam Mohammad's dictatorship. Ayub Khan established his dictatorship after Ghulam Mohammad and he was followed by Yahya Khan's dictatorship. But you, we, our comrades, my party, this very party, everyone continued the struggle. All of us continued our struggle. They threatened us. They said they would assassinate us and that they would kill us and that they would put us in jail. But we said that we did not care because we were fighting for principles and that we would continue fighting for principles. We were fighting for the welfare of the people and their progress. We were fighting against the effects of poverty and destitution and for that we were not to grudge any amount of sacrifice. We were ready to make more sacrifices and if we were destined to receive bullets on our chests, well, we were prepared to receive them. This was the reason, this precisely was the reason why the struggle continues, the movement did not end and we fought that dictatorship. You can imagine that as far as my friends are concerned how such and how long they have struggled. I am speaking of my party. We struggled against Ayub Khan and after Ayub Khan's dictatorship ended there was a joint struggle and we faced the dictatorship of Yahya Khan. Let us keep in mind that no one can say that we did not face the dictatorship of Yahya Khan. You would recall that on 25th of March, 1971, Yahya Khan resorted to military action. He did not solve political issues through political methods. He used guns and tanks and army. At that time when we came back from East Pakistan we told him that if conditions remained as they were, Pakistan would be destroyed by November or December. I am not saying it now. I said it then to those people that if you would continue like this

and if you would use force and batons and bullets then you should abandon Pakistan because in that case Pakistan was not going to stay as a country. We said all this to them on 27th of March 1971.

But that was only part of my conversation. Later on, you would recall, that Yahya Khan was not agreeing to anything and in his arrogance and false pride he thought that he would find a solution for this problem through force and bullets. New later on when he was not listening, when he had shut his eyes and ears, we felt that it was our duty to warn him. Four months after that I had spoken for the first time at Sehwan and at Sehwan I said that those methods (of Yahya Khan) were absolutely wrong. That was to divide Pakistan. That was to destroy Pakistan. Then I delivered a speech at Hyderabad, and another speech on 1st of September, at Karachi, and in that speech at Karachi at Quaid-i-Azam's Mausoleum—that being Quaid-i-Azam's birth anniversary – I said, “O Quaid-i-Azam, the creator of Pakistan, be my witness, I am declaring today that if the existing methods continue and if this kind of Government continues to exist, and if we continue to behave with our own people the way we are behaving, then you be my witness that Pakistan will be dismantled and broken into pieces and nobody would be able to save Pakistan”. Afterwards I delivered another speech in Multan and by that time all of you witnessed the events as they happened.

Now if you have any doubts about what I am saying, I would only request you to go back home and refer to the newspapers of those days – newspapers of 8th, 9th and 11th September and of 9th October and read all that I had said in my speeches in Multan. Read it carefully and see that I did tell at that time that by November enemies of Pakistan would be in a position to take illegal advantage of the situation and would attack East Pakistan. That they would conquer East Pakistan and annex it with their own territories. Eventually, you did see all that happened (as I had predicted). But by that time the game was over, and nothing was left. The economy was shattered, all kinds of losses were incurred, all kinds of damages were done, all kinds of calamities had fallen. Precisely, at that time Yahya Khan summoned me from New York and ordered me to return and return at once. But when I returned what did I see? I saw that Pakistan, the biggest Muslim State, Pakistan of Quaid-i-Azam

and Mohammad Iqbal, your Pakistan, Pakistan of all Muslims, yes, their Pakistan had faced a defeat, a defeat of the magnitude which in the history of Islam the Muslims had never witnessed. Can anybody say that this was the defeat of the people of Pakistan? Who can say that this was the defeat as a system, a wrong, vulgar system. And this was the last defeat. At that time the shape of Pakistan had very nearly sunk and had I delayed my return for 2 or 3 days, perhaps Yahya Khan also would have gone and drowned himself in the nearest sea. So, when I returned I consulted my friends and companions. I said, "Comrades, what is your advice? We had made promises with our people. We had told our people that we would bring progress and prosperity in Pakistan. But when we were making these promises we did not imagine and would not have ever imagined that East Pakistan would be separated, or that the resources of East Pakistan and its strength would no more be with West Pakistan. When at the time of elections we had made these promises, we were giving people the concept of a united country and we were saying that this was a country of 13 crores of Muslims. This was an Islamic state in which we had made big promises with the people". I remember each one of those promises. You will not have to remind me of any of those promises. No, there will never be an occasion when you would be forced to say, "Well, Bhutto Sahib you had made promises with us, so now how about those promises? "Well, I am coming to that point, but first let me tell you that when we had made those promises the situation was very different from what it is now. It was basically a different situation. For one thing, it was one unified country in which we were living.

East and West were one. Our population was 13 crores. Our resources were common, and cessation had not taken place. Still I said to my friends and companions to advise me and I said that we could not keep our eyes shut, nor was there any point in hanging our heads in shame before our people. After all the people would ask as to what were we doing (to redeem the situation)? "Didn't you say that you would make Pakistan prosperous? Didn't you say that you would help the poor?" (they would ask). So I said to my friends, "What is left with us? We are not left with any money, any wealth or resources. There is hardly anything left with us. I said that all that was left with us were scattered pieces. What should we do now? It would take a long time to reform the national structure. It would take a long time to

stand on our own legs. "Perhaps later on it might be possible to fulfil our promises, but if we were to accept the responsibilities of the Government at that time we would lose our popularity. People would say that they were also liars and they also had made false promises with the people. History cannot excuse those who speak lies. Whether or not we are in power, whether or not I am President, I do not want that there should be a situation whereby one day history should give such a verdict and declare that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto also told lies to his people.

Now, therefore, my dear comrades, it was a very difficult decision. The enemies were watching us. They were not merely watching us, in fact they were ridiculing us. The Indian Chief of Staff was bragging that it was not the end. Conquest of East Pakistan was not the end. He promised to give to the people of India yet another gift within two months. The Defence Minister of India, Jagjivan Ram, was also bragging that the conquest of East Pakistan was an ordinary thing for the people of India. You know that whatever they were saying was not without good reasons. We were really in such a terrible mess. Ninety thousand persons, our brave soldiers, were taken prisoners in East Pakistan. Ninety thousand people mean four Divisions of Pakistan Army which were captured by India and to top it all was the conquest of East Pakistan.

India took advantage of our wrong system and our bad organization and she conquered Dacca and East Pakistan was separated from West Pakistan. Now what was left with us in West Pakistan? At that time in West Pakistan there was neither interim Government nor democracy nor the people's rule. There were only few persons who were ruling Pakistan. But my friends, few persons cannot run Governments. Four or five persons cannot administer a big country. For that political parties were needed. Friends and allies were needed. Look at the present Central Cabinet and look at the power of the Provinces. Had they (the Centre and the Provinces) not been our hands and wings how could we run our country at all? Now those two or three persons who were running Pakistan at that time, they did not care for Pakistan or for its progress. They were selfish people. They did not want happiness of the people of Pakistan and only cared for their own happiness. That was why India took 90,000 of our soldiers as her prisoners and when she occupied East Pakistan there was nothing left of what was Pakistan. People

were sad and dejected and there was misery and class hatred and provincialism and so on. People are now saying that injustice has been done to them. Wherever I go people say that injustice was done to them. Injustice was done to Baluchs, Pathans, Sindis, Punjabis and to everyone else. Now this was the situation in which we had to accept the responsibility of the Government, and the worst of all calamities was that the economy was totally damaged. Foreign debts had mounted up. I told my companions that our intentions were honest and that we would not let the people of Pakistan down. I said that when we promised to serve the people of Pakistan it didn't mean that we would only serve them when all was well and when conditions were favorable. In fact it was now that the nation was in trouble and when we had been placed in a situation similar to that of Dunkirk or even worse than Dunkirk, because those people (from Dunkirk) had fled away from Dunkirk and their ship was still sailing, while in our situation the ship was sinking. So it was in this situation that we were required to serve the people of Pakistan.

I am grateful to my friends and comrades for their kindness because of which we were able to bring the ship of the nation safely to the shore. Now I can say with pride that in four months the ship of the nation is not only brought ashore but it is a fact that none of the enemies of Pakistan has the courage to attack Pakistan. So my comrades, so far as the outside world is concerned, we have to some extent got a proper control of our foreign affairs and in the days to come we would have better control of the situation. And all this has been through your co-operation and kindness.

Now so far as the question of Provinces is concerned, you would recall that when I came in January to Quetta I had asked you as to why should you think that we were opposed to democracy? Why should we hate democracy when we have always been fighting for democracy? We were the creation of democracy. Had we not been the off-springs of democracy we would not have been so popular with you, and you would not have respected us at all. The fact of the situation was that we were confronted with such complex problems and surrounded by conspiracies, national conspiracies and international conspiracies. I, therefore, said that for God's sake give us some time. You had endured Martial Law for 13 to 15 years. Didn't you

have that much of confidence in me, to believe in me when I was saying that after a few months I would try to lift Martial Law? After all the biggest of all the targets and the biggest of all the victims of Ayub Khan's Martial Law and Yahya Khan's Martial Law was myself and my party. How could it be possible that I would be in favour of Martial Law? I had come to you with folded hands in Quetta and urged upon you not to be misled by the newspapers because most of the newspapers belonged to the Capitalists whom we had opposed.

That was why they had always been saying all kinds of things. They had been alleging that I would not lift Martial Law. To this my reply was that we would not only lift Martial Law but in Baluchistan we would accept the Government of the majority party of the Province. I said this in the office of the Pakistan People's Party. I also talked to the present Governor of Baluchistan who was not the Governor during those days. I told him, "Sir, I do not want to usurp your rights because if I usurp any of your rights today, you will usurp my rights tomorrow. If you are representing your Province we are representing our Provinces. Election was a question of victory and defeat. It is the consequence of election that one party wins and the other loses. Now, therefore, if you want democracy, you must follow the principles of democracy and accept the rules of democracy and respect them. I told him that we would not enter into any conspiracy with you or against you. I had assured him of all this, but I had asked him to give me some time because it was at that time that an international conspiracy was at work against Pakistan. He said that he was afraid that in a few days West Pakistan was also going to be broken into pieces. He said that East Pakistan was lost. It was a matter of days that Baluchistan would also be separated. The Frontier Province would be separated.

All this was foreign propaganda which was being carried out with a motive. This propaganda was not being carried out by pro-Pakistan elements. It was being carried out by the enemies of Pakistan. We gave thought to all that and showed patience and cool headedness and stood by our people. I said, "Sir, your majority is not that of your party alone. It was a majority composed of two parties which we would respect but for that I needed some time because we had to discuss things and enter into negotiations with some other people, who are against the

very concept of democracy.” Democracy cannot be averse to discussions and negotiations and it cannot be averse to patience. I can say it with pride that our discussions and negotiations continued in spite of all that some people tried to do against us and in spite of all their efforts to make us unsuccessful. We have proved true to whatever we promised do the people. We did not go back on our word although there were pressures of all kinds. You have seen that in this country where for 15 years Martial Law had continued, when Pakistan was one, when East and West were united at that time democracy was strangulated and Martial Law was allowed to perpetuate, although there was no justification for Martial Law during those days. When Pakistan was divided into two parts and when Pakistan’s economy was destroyed we had lifted Martial Law within three to four months, for the simple reason that basically we have always been against Martial Law. What we want is a people’s Government and we want that people should be able to raise their voice and that people’s power should prevail. We want that you should make progress. We want that you should rule. You have seen that we have fulfilled what we had promised. These speeches and public addresses, they are routine affairs. What is important, are our actions, more important than our words. So I said that Martial Law which I wanted to lift on the 14th of August may instead be lifted on the 21st of April. Why was I wanting (Martial Law) to continue up to 14th of August? Well, because I was trying for something, I might have failed or I might have succeeded in my effort, in which case this devaluation which we had announced might not have been necessary, because with the strong administration of Martial Law it was quite possible that we could have improved the value of our rupee. Our rupee had gone down in value. What we call a rupee, the world called it four annas because what you are getting at present for one rupee, ten years ago you were getting it for 4 annas. Not only that our rupee value had gone down abroad but even the estimation of our country had gone very low. I thought that in 3, 4 or 6 months we would increase our production and we would make progress and our economy would improve. I do not mean to say that had I continued with Martial Law until 14th of August we would have avoided devaluation of our money. No I would not tell you such a lie. All the same that was what I was trying to do. It was my aim that in the meantime we should resort to such strong measures that we could improve the value of our currency. Of course, I could not have said this in public. But it

was precisely for this reason that I said, for God's sake, have confidence in me. Now, had I said this in public the world would have thought that the value of the rupee was going to fall. I, therefore, said that I should be given some time and you said that you would not give me any time. That you were fed up. That you had endured for 15 years and were not prepared to endure any further. I, therefore, said, "O.K. if this decision, we submit ourselves to it because we cannot go against the decision of the people."

Martial Law was, therefore, lifted and after that Assembly was called to session. The country received an interim constitution from the Assembly. An interim constitution could not be given to the people even in the days of Liaquat Ali Khan after the death of Quaid-i-Azam, for 15 years. Neither in the days of Ghulam Mohammad, nor in the days of Nazimuddin nor Nohammad Ali Bogra nor Suhrawardy. God knows who all came and went away but the people did not get a constitution. Now an interim constitution has been received by the people which is the basic constitution has been received by the people which is the basic constitution and which has to be completed and finalised. It was upto you to decide about that. I would not want that it should be my decision. You would recall, the poor people of Baluchistan would recall that Auyb Khan declared, "I, Field Marshal Mohammad Ayub Khan, am giving you a constitution, a constitution to the people of Pakistan." I said that my struggle was for seeing the day when people of Pakistan were able to say that we are giving this constitution to our country. No single person has to give a constitution. It is you who have to give a constitution. It is for you to give us a constitution and we would accept it and respect it. Now, therefore, those who are representatives of the people should frame a constitution and it is my request that as the representatives of the people they should look at the history of Pakistan and see how constitutions have been treated and what sort of constitutions have been treated and what sort of constitutions they were. We do not want that once again there should be dictatorship. All those people who are sitting here, all those politicians who are sitting here, if they are your real representatives it should be their endeavour to see that the dictatorship does not return to Pakistan. But remember this is no easy matter. I warn you that if we do not show far-sightedness and if we are not cool-headed and if we do not resort to the policy of give and take and if we do not accept

the principle of negotiations and if we do not forget and forgive,-- then remember that there is every possibility that dictatorship will come back again. Some people say that dictatorship is buried for ever.

Now listen to me. You have not buried dictatorship for ever. Permanent and complete constitution, unless you have discipline and patience, unless you have advancement and progress, unless you yourself defend your rights, dictatorship would not be buried for ever. Now what happened in Quetta two days back? What was the need of all that happened? I am asking you what was the necessity of that? Slogans from one end, counter slogans from the other end, followed by pelting of stones, followed by bullets, and the result was that a poor man was killed.

I am a political being. I am not against slogans and speeches. In fact we, in the People's Party, have given three very important slogans to the people of Pakistan. They are: Islam is our religion; democracy is our politics socialism is our economy. Now we have given such slogans to the people of Pakistan, how then can we be against slogans? My dear comrades, for God's sake, be kind and understanding. It does not mean that you should raise slogans night and day so that when you get up in the morning, instead of starting your day with the 'Kalima' you should raise slogans and when you sleep you raise slogans.

Now our very special guest has arrived in Pakistan all the way from Teheran. You may not know that Princess Ashraf was supposed to go to Paris on a very important mission, but we said that there should be no misunderstandings (between our two countries) and we requested her to come to Pakistan and see for herself how popular she was (in Pakistan) and what goodwill we have for her in this country. We thought that it was no use sending reports from here and calling their Ambassador and informing him that such and such thing was wrong and such and such thing was right. It was better if she came here and saw for herself how the people of Pakistan respected her. Now, therefore, she is here. I am told, there was a tea party in honour of somebody, perhaps a Governor or a Minister, I cannot say for sure. And suddenly a truck came on the scene with people shouting one brand of slogans, and then came another truck with

people shouting another brand of slogan and all this ended in the death of a poor rickshaw-puller. What was his crime? What was the crime of that poor man? Nevertheless the destructionists were very happy. Such people cannot be the friends of Pakistan. They cannot be our friends. They cannot be friends of the poor people. Friends of any segment of our society. What they want is simply to see Pakistan surrounded with problems and miseries. In what words should I tell you that Pakistan is at present (almost) dismantled. It is being pushed into a corner now. They (destructionists) want to create misunderstandings between us and our special friends—Turkey and Iran. It is a big conspiracy, a very big conspiracy. Our people are poor and simple. They need education. I am telling you that in your innocence you should not be misled by these people (destructionists). I assure you that ever since Pakistan is created, ever since Pakistan is established, there has not been a single instance of Iran having not supported Pakistan. She has never done anything against Pakistan, never taken any step against Pakistan, or ever spoken against Pakistan. Had she done otherwise I myself would have been against Iran. But because from the very inception of Pakistan, Iran has been always supporting us and has always been on our side in every crisis and every war and when the Shahinshah of Iran has been standing shoulder to shoulder with us in every difficult situation, how can we be ungrateful to Iran? My dear comrades, my elders, my friends, I can assure you that I am not anybody's stooge. My entire struggle is a people's struggle. At the time when I was the Foreign Minister the foreign policy of my country was directed towards the progress and welfare of Pakistan. At that time two super powers were against my foreign policy and they conspired to sabotage it, but this did not frighten me at all. Now if I could not be frightened by super powers like America and Russia how can I be frightened by Iran? But remember, truth is truth and falsehood is falsehood. One has got to be on the side of and not against fairness and truth. One has got to adhere to one's principles. So now what does truth demand? What does history demand? The Iranian Government, the people of Iran, and the Shahinshah of Iran had never gone against Pakistan and have always been supporting Pakistan. For that you may refer to any international reports and the record of the Security Council. You may read the text of the speeches of Iranian representatives in which they have always supported the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Iran has always been in the vanguard of our support. Then in

1965 war when we were short of ammunition, we received a regular replenishment from Iran. Being our friend, Iran displeased India, displeased many others, and displeased the friends of India. We are not ungrateful people and cannot be ungrateful to Iran. If we start raising slogans against Iran how can there be any progress in our relations with Iran? How shall we be able to have friends and allies? We do not want to interfere with the internal affairs of Iran and similarly we do not want that Iran would interfere in our internal affairs. We would always have direct talks with Iran as our brothers, and there is no need to raise slogans. They have their leaders and we have ours. The two of us can sit together and behave in a responsible manner. But there is no need of raising slogans or brandishing batons. Honestly, I feel so ashamed because of these people (disruptionists) and I say to myself where our noble principles are. What etiquette are we following? How are we exhibiting our culture, our traditions our history? If we continue behaving in this manner where shall we lead ourselves to? Who would be on our side? Imagine that a country like India which had led the worst kind of aggression against Pakistan and which had been most cruel to Pakistan, it was or that very country that the disruptionists should be raising slogans. Iran which has always been supporting and helping up, against Iran in this city of Quetta, in this very city, slogans were raised! It was under these circumstances that I requested (Princess Ashraf) to come and visit Pakistan.

People say that Bhutto obtains the consensus of the people (in public meetings). Now if I do not obtain the consensus of the people should I obtain the consensus of the animals? And those who assert that they want democracy and believe in democracy those very people are criticizing me. This means that I should not seek the opinion of the people and against the people? It simply means that they do not respect you. It only means that those poor people who are sitting here in torn clothes are not supposed to be respected and must be despised! All those people who do not want to seek the consensus of the people are enemies of democracy. They are enemies of the people. Should I not know the will of the people? Who is objecting to this (let me know)? Is there anyone sitting here, who says that I should not obtain the will of the people and that whatever I am saying is incorrect? Well, I have great respect for all of you. After God almighty, people are the biggest force and except God Almighty, there is

no force bigger than people. So my friends, if I obtained the will of the people, I have done nothing wrong. I have committed no sin. Now let my brave people tell me if I should or should not obtain their will. Now I would obtain your will and if there is anyone who is prepared to stand up, yes, if there is any man who can stand up and say that the relations between Iran and Pakistan should not be good and if there is one single person who can stand up and say this I would quit my office. Is there any such person? Any foreign agent? So now stand up and say, "Long live friendship of Iran and Pakistan".

My comrades, my friends, there are a couple of important things which I have to mention, and after that I would take your leave. The first thing is that in Baluchistan you have your provincial Government, which is composed of NAP and JUI. Your Governor is sitting here, your Chief Minister, Sardar Ataulah Mengal, is also sitting here. I would like to say in their presence that in Pakistan, it is the first instance that the ruling party, which is the majority party and which has an overwhelming majority in the Centre and in the other two big provinces, I mean, Punjab and Sindh, where 80 percent of the people of Pakistan live, that party has created history, first example of its kind and when the majority party has removed its own Governors. The Governors belonged to our party, the Governor of Sarhad Mr. Hayat Mohammad Khan Sherpao, and the Governor of Baluchistan, Sardar Ghaus Bakhsh Raisani, who was not a member of our party but was supporting our party and was appointed by us because it was within the powers of Central Government to do so. All the same we removed these two friends of ours, the representatives of our party whom we had appointed our Governors in the provinces. We removed them and appointed Governors belonging to NAP and accepted the Chief Minister from NAP. The Governor is supposed to be the representative of the Centre, representing the President. Still such an office has been given to the NAP. You will not find an example of the kind in the history of this subcontinent. Neither in Pakistan nor in India nor in any other country where there is a Parliamentary system and a Parliamentary type of constitution. Here both the Governors and the Prime Ministers belong to the party which is neither in power at the Centre nor in majority at the Centre. Now even after this if people say that we are not cooperating and that we do not respect democracy or that we want one party Government then I leave it to you to give your own

verdict whether such a criticism is really justified. I openly declare here, and with pleasure, that we would support your Government and the Government of Sarhad. Whatever resources we have available at the Centre we would help you with those resources. We are not mean people. We do not grudge helping you. We do not want to perpetuate selfishly. We are for Pakistan. We do not want to establish our rule. We want that people should rule. We have no selfish motives. We have no vested interests. We have only one interest which is to build Pakistan and to uphold the honor of Pakistan. We have only one objective and that is to safeguard the honor and pride of Pakistan so that whichever Government is in office (with these objectives) we would co-operate with it.

Now it is my pleasure to announce here that in Baluchistan the Central Government shall establish a medical college and on that college the Central Government shall spend seven crores of rupees which the project would cost. Where would the Central Government get the money from? Well, God would help us in this. Now that settles the question of the medical college. As for the development of your province we have also doubled your development budget and that is that. May God bless you.

Interview with Australian Broadcastign Corporation in Quetta on May 22, 1972.

Question: Mr. Bhutto, you pass yourself as a radical politician a man for the peasant and the worker and yet you yourself come from a most wealthy and feudal background. When do you think you made the break from t radition and decided to become Bhutto the socialist and reformer rather than Bhutto the playboy and the reactionary.

President: Well, I wouldn't say so, wealthy families, land - were hold extensive lands, that's true, but there wasn't much water. So, I wouldn't categories myself among the most wealthy families as is sometimes done in the foreign press. That's not correct. However, the family background was conservative. It was feudal and the values were feudal. But at the same time, one gets educated, seeks knowledge to break such barriers and very early in my life was appalled by the poverty. I could not understand it, the great disparities that existed, especially in our part of the country. I couldn't reconcile myself to them. I would say I got attached to the concept of reform and revolution for Asia in my school and college days.

Question: Was your father alive to see the transition that you made?

President: We had many arguments.

Question: I wonder what he thought when he heard you denounce the power of the landlord group, the industrial group. Well, what did he think of that?

President: Took it cynically. And he himself was a politician, a politician who had a distinguished career in our country. He was Chief Minister of our province of Sind. He went to the Round Table Conference as a delegate: and he was a member of the Central Assembly, member of the Bombay Government. He himself knew politics and he had a tolerant approach to politics. He did not get easily alarmed and did not panic. He was very calm and collected person. We used to have many arguments. That's all.

Question: You mentioned cynicism, but I think you know that some of your critics say your radicalism is just a show and that you are as much a preacher of the establishment as Ayub Khan. What do you think of that?

President: No, God forbid. They came from a different establishment. Even if one is committed to the establishment, you cannot completely uproot yourself from your moorings. In China they had a Cultural Revolution fearing that people were going backwards. In the Soviet Union they have had similar problems. So I wouldn't deny the historical processes and the depth of the people's own roots. They go very deep. So it is in Australia. Everywhere. But change is inevitable. Change comes.

Question: But both Ayub Khan, and Yahya Khan when they started out, promised a better deal for the poor people of Pakistan. Now what do you think makes you different from these last two men?

President: It was a sort of ad hoc confused thinking. It was to do some little good so that they get populated and they remain in power, they remain in office, they get accepted. They were as naïve as the Fabian socialists were. They were wanting to be good men in inverted commas. But they didn't have a concept, an idea as to how this is brought about because they didn't have that background.

Question: Well, you yourself served as a senior Minister under both of those men and yet you.....

President: No, not with Yahya.

Question: Not with Yahya? You represented Pakistan in the United Nations.

President: Oh, that's when he was going, when he was about to fold up and he at the last minute informed the Government then that I was Deputy Prime Minister -designate. Because of the war we accepted that position and in the situation in which Pakistan was placed I would've accepted any position to serve my country because we were being subjected to aggression and I think you or anyone else would do the same thing.

Question: You don't think that perhaps you compromised your own position and your own principles by serving in any capacity with either of those men?

President: With Ayub Khan, of course, I was a minister, very much so. When Ayub became President as you have said so yourself, he gave good promises to the people and he said he had a plan and he did have some measure of reform. Superficial, but they were reforms. It was a break from the past that the landed aristocracy for the first time lost their lands. And there were some other reforms also. Education. He began well. Nobody can deny that. But afterwards the deterioration set in. and our differences also began to get wider and wider till the final break came and I left the Government.

Question: Now we hear from prescreports about your campaign for reform, your crackdown on the so-called 22 families, your reforms of the civil service and the Army and yet it does seem that those moves have met only limited success. Would you say that it's fair to call them a limited success?

President: It's too early to tell because my Government came into office only four months ago and we eventually have to stand on our record. We were in pieces, shattered. The economy was in complete bankruptcy. We had lost half the country. There was utter demoralization. So it wasn't an easy task. We have introduced the reforms. We will have to await the implementation. But the reforms are basic and nobody can deny that.

Question: Well, can you describe these reforms, the ones that you consider most urgent for your country at the present time?

President: Well, in the first place, land reforms which affect the mass of the people. And here we have given land to the peasants without any encumbrances. They didn't have to pay a penny. The lands have been taken away from the landlords without any compensation and where the lands were retained by the land-owners, they have to buy, to pay for all the things like seeds, fertilizers and taxes. The burden has been shifted entirely from the peasantry to the landed gentry wherever lands do

remain and the maximum holding now varies from 150 acres to about 300 acres.

Question: What about industry?

President: Just as you have land reforms, we've taken over, the state has taken over the basic industries and then we had labor reforms. We've done away with the managing agency system and we have nationalized life insurance.

Question: Can I interrupt you there? When you say you have taken over the basic industries, you haven't actually nationalized them but you've put in a managerial system. Is that correct?

President: Yes.

Question: But they're still allowed to have private stockholders?

President: Well, we couldn't pay compensation and we had to pay compensation. We could not do it.

Question: Frankly, Sir I've heard you described as a man walking a tight rope, a man who would like to do much more for his people and yet he has opposition from the establishment, the industrial elite and so on, would you agree with that characterization?

President: I took stock of the objective conditions, both external and internal, but there was no resistance from the industrial tycoons as such. There were little intrigues and things like that but basically they can't fight the Government because the Government has the backing of the people for what it's doing.

Question: Now it seems clear that your Government does, in fact, have the backing of the people, that is the first popularly-elected Government and yet it is a fact that you're only in power now by leave of the Army. Is there any chance of the Army intervening if they don't like what you're doing?

President: I don't think it is correct to say that I am here in office today by leave of the Army, looking into the future, if we messed it up, if we didn't make the parliamentary system work, if our constitution breaks down, then there's a possibility of the Army stepping in again. But for the moment neither are they physically in a position nor mentally is the Army interested.

Question: Mr. President, I've talked to many people about you and about the only thing they seem to agree on is that you're both a brilliant man but a very baffling man who seems to change policies, for example. You have been described as pro-China but now you seem to be wooing the Russians and the Americans. Is there any basic philosophy in what you do in all these changes or do you play things by ear? Are you a pragmatist?

President: No, I don't think about that. But I think that the fundamental principles that we uphold, not only as individuals but as a party because my party is a majority party and by virtue of that we're in office, we have a manifesto. We've gone by it. We've stood by our manifesto. I think the first party in Pakistan in the last 25 years who are implementing their manifesto. I don't think this charge is valid. It doesn't hold good. But there are objective conditions one has to take cognizance of those factors without changing your basic principles. These basic principles stand. Sometimes it becomes necessary to make adjustments and by making adjustments and remaining a little flexible I don't think that's the wrong thing to do. Because the basic thing is that the people must be happy and the people must be prosperous. They must stand behind the decisions or they must support those decisions. Now if the people are really at war and they want to lay down arms and stop confrontation because they feel the confrontation has gone on too long – 25 years, since Pakistan and India came to be and before that between the Hindus and the Muslims in the subcontinent and there have been three wars in these 25 years and the last one was fairly disastrous war, so the people can feel that it's about time they started reviewing their outlook, the happened in Europe as well. France and Germany had that kind of relationship. The allies at first were opposed to Soviet Union and then later on when the power of Germany grew, they started having second thoughts. Then Germany and the Soviet Union signed a treaty, then they broke that treaty. The Japanese and

the Americans were on good terms and there was Pearl harbour. The Americans and the Chinese had the best of relations. Then they were on bad terms. There was a policy of confrontation between China and the United States for such a long time. Even now the United States doesn't recognise China, yet Nixon goes to China after some period of time. These are events and where events move, men must move with the events.

Question: It does seem difficult to reconcile a very close relationship with China with an attempt to bring about a closer relationship with Soviet Union. Do you really think that a nation like Pakistan is going to achieve a balance in these friendships?

President: Yes. I don't think that there's any incompatibility because we have made it quite clear to the Soviet Union and to China that we want good relations with both of them, because both of them are our neighbors. And as such we're not involved in their ideological quarrels or in their quarrels of power politics. We have our own interests. If they weren't our neighbors it wouldn't have been necessary for us to have good relations with both of them because it's essential for a country to try and get along with its neighbors. And if you don't succeed that's a different matter. So it is really from that point of view that we want good relations with both our neighbors. With China we have a common frontier, a very difficult part, a very difficult part of the country up in the Himalayas, the Karakoram. And we can't say we would like to have our armies facing each other. Take India. There are tensions between our two people. We would much rather prefer that there were trade, intercourse and communications. Pakistan is separated from the Soviet Union. We have to have good relations with them. That's why we have to have good relations with Afghanistan. And we have made concerted efforts to improve our relations with these countries.

Question: There are reports that there is a great deal of co-operation between Pakistan and China and that you are looking for arms and equipment from China.

President: I would say we have had co-operation. We have made no secret of it. We have had assistance from China for quite a few years now. We are members of SEATO and CENTO. We have a bilateral agreement with the United States but since 1965 the United States has stopped supplying arms to

Pakistan. The Soviet Union at one point gave us a few arms. Then they stopped supplying us arms. Nevertheless, we don't get any arms from any other source. Resources are limited. So I don't think there is any harm if we get some arms from China.

Question: Just getting back to you personally. Sir, I've seen Press reports describing you as anti-American and yet I know that you yourself went to university in the States. Is there any truth to this that you may be anti-American?

President: It is not correct. Why should I be anti-American? American people have achieved great progress, great strides. They have made remarkable contributions to science, to technology, education, culture literature. So how can I be anti-American? But I opposed United States policy on many occasions in the past and I also don't like your policy assumptions in Vietnam. But that doesn't make me anti-American.

Question: You yourself were educated in America, then educated in England. You've had a hence to see both systems work. Does it leave you with any lasting impressions or lasting influences?

President: Yes, of course, I was impressed by the society in both countries and the progress their people have made in the standard of education both in the United States and England. They've got very fine institutions. Not only Pakistanis but people from all over the world have benefited from them. And of course in Oxford you have Rhodes Scholar and many Australians were there as my contemporaries. And they did very well both in sports and studies. In Oxford I think I was more happy, more tranquil, came out more when I was at Oxford.

Question: Sir, I don't want you to think this as insulting in any way and yet perhaps the criticism I've heard of you, it's alleged that for many years you've desired to become, the leader of Pakistan, that you changed your policy, that you are an opportunist. Now I'm sure you've heard that. Does it not disturb you?

President: No, many bad things have been said against me. This is not important. People have their ideas and their

notions. There are many people who would have bet their last buck that I'll never make it. So its rejoiced at my taking command of the national affairs and the common man, left to himself, would have given me this command much earlier. Soon after Tashkent, if I had been an opportunist, I would have done things interests and my country's future were involved. And it took a lot of rubbing to wear off the fact that after Tashkent I didn't jump into the fire because if I had at that time, Ayub Khan would be toppled. Looking at it now with the loss of East Pakistan and the intervention of Yahya, one wonders if it would not have been a good thing to be an opportunist at that time. But no, my people have wanted me to occupy this position and I have made no secret of the fact. One has to be honest and for a long time I had this feeling that one day I would be in charge of the affairs of my country.

Question: What does power mean to you, political power?

President: Power means to build, to construct, to wipe out the gutters, and the slums, to give education to our children, where they can't afford it, to help people being attended to in the hospitals, to help them make their best, come out in the world, be a part of the world which is happy and prosperous. And it means to build a monument.

Question: The Indians I talked to find that, at the time of partition, of course, you were a very young man then, but that you made some inflammatory speeches that tended to raise strife and tensions. Do you see any basis at all for a claim like that?

President: I was a student. I was in school and it was in Bombay and the Pakistan movement was on. I was a part of it. I did a lot of work in the Pakistan movement and Quaid -i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah himself on one occasion complimented me for my efforts. Although I never talked about it because I have seen in Pakistan so many people lay tall claims to how they made Pakistan. And I don't claim to have made Pakistan. People made Pakistan and the Quaid-i-Azam would agree to that. We have played our little parts and I don't mean to brag and I'm glad about it. But I did say things inflammatory to convince people.

Muslims in Bombay were on the defensive and it was only we who were trying to keep them safe, telling to let them organized.

Question: Did you yourself go to Pakistan immediately at the time of partition or did you stay on in India?

President: You see, I originally was in India because my province of Sindh was a part of Bombay province and it was separated from Bombay in 1937. But even after separation there were certain common institutions. As I said to you, my father was a Minister in the Bombay Government but later went to Sindh and the legislature was in Bombay. So we had to spend a lot of time in Bombay but we were all the time there in the capacity of representing the part of Sindh which was a part of Bombay presidency.

Question: In the speech you made to the National Assembly some weeks ago there was one phrase that struck me. You were referring to the history of the events leading up to partition and you referred to the grasping Hindus and the defiant Muslims. Now does that strike you in retrospect as being somewhat prejudiced?

President: It's a question of economic domination. You have to see the factors that led to Pakistan. Basically, they are over simplified in terms of Muslim and Hindu conflict but at the bottom of it certainly there was this idea of ridding ourselves of the economic domination of the Hindus. It's the kind of thing Mr. Mujibur Rahman has been talking about, the domination of West Pakistan, economic domination. And that was there in great abundance.

Question: Perhaps it's a little difficult for us in the West to understand that when you refer to a whole people, the Hindus, as grasping. It seems the same as what for instance the Germans said about the Jews, that they were all money - grabbing and so on.

President: It was a generalization and it wasn't meant to colour every individual with the same brush. It was a generalization which I could confine to the attitude of the ruling class and to the attitude of the Indian National Congress.

Question: Pakistan being a Muslim state, you yourself have no prejudices as such against Hindus?

President: No, I've never had them, never entertained them and people in India will tell you that. They know me. They know quite well that I've never had it and I'm glad I never had it and I hope I'll never have it in the future.

Question: Would you describe yourself as a particularly religious man in a sense?

President: Religious in the sense that I believe in God. I believe in God. I believe in Islam being the final message of God. I have got great reverence and respect for my religion but I don't believe in exploiting it, to perpetuate the abominable status quo.

Question: I understand that Yahya Khan opposed birth control on the grounds that the Quran opposed birth control. In the first place, is that true? Do you know whether that's true or not?

President: I don't think it's true but that is a matter which is subject to interpretation. You can argue greatly that there is prohibition or that there isn't, so I don't think there's anything in the Holy Quran against family planning as such but at the same time it can be argued both ways.

Question: Well, how would you describe yourself on moral questions like birth control, abortion and so on? Are you a liberal or a conservative?

President: Population pressure is very great on our people and we have to make efforts to control the growth of population. We are growing at the rate of 2 ½ to 3 percent and that's far too much. Very soon we will be eating ourselves at this rate. So if the people are made to realize the implications of the population explosion I think they themselves will also try to exercise discipline. At the same time the State has a responsibility and I don't believe that I would be our people if I shirked this responsibility.

Question: What about other social issues? For instance, we hear a great deal about the revolt of the young and so on. Are you disturbed by what you see in the young people today?

President: No, I'm not disturbed by it. It causes us concern but I've seen it. I've been in it in the sense that first as a student leader and then afterwards in the political life one had to keep in touch with this phenomenon and the students of Pakistan have always been kind to me. Sometimes they get angry but basically they're kind. So I have an idea of their thinking. This is a sense a world wide phenomenon that has taken place. But I see it also now settling down by and large, not only here but generally.

Question: Now we referred previously to the problem of "Bangladesh" which is, of course, inescapable for you. General Yahya Khan is now reaping most of the blame for that and yet the fact is that at the time Pakistani officials including yourself tried to minimize the degree of oppression, the Army's killings, the flow of refugees. It is because you perhaps didn't know what was going on or do you still believe that these excesses were exaggerated?

President: In the beginning we didn't know what was happening. We had some idea that the military had taken action but military takes action in many countries to stop secession. They use rubber bullets also. They use teargas. They put people into jail. They put people under house arrest. Military action is taken sensibly, simultaneously with political action and we thought that kind of thing was perhaps happening. Later on, we came to know that they didn't have a framework and they didn't have any political guidance and we protested. I myself made harsh speeches against it on a number of occasions but not that I, condoning the actions because even the figures given out and the stories that have been circulated, there is a great deal for exaggeration there. No doubt about it. Mr. Mujibur Rahman says three million people were killed. That's absolutely incorrect. That's a gross exaggeration but I'm not going to fight with him over that because he likes to exaggerate.

Question: General Tikka Khan who initiated the military action in East Pakistan is now serving as your Army Chief of Staff. Does that mean that you condone what he did?

President: No. general Tikka Khan is Chief of Staff because he's the senior most General after the one who left. Actually the one who left had superseded him and General Tikka Khan was senior to him. He's a respected General in the Army and there's nothing abnormal about the poor man. He's got a bad press and there's a CENTO meeting I believe soon in London and if the people of his level are attending on the military side, I'm going to unleash him on London very soon.

Question: Right now there's an inquiry going on into the Pakistan Army and civilians role in what happened in "Bangladesh" and I know that you hesitate to comment on that but at least you feel that General Tikka Khan has no place in an investigation of this nature.

President: He was interrogated by the Commission, Commission headed by our supreme Court Chief Justice and two judges of our Provincial High Courts. It's a high-powered justice Committee, Commission rather, and we're giving them all the facilities, whatever they want, all the papers, the records. Whoever is summoned to them is allowed to go there. I myself went there. They wanted to come to interview me. I said no, I'll come to you because you're the Commission. So, we're awaiting the findings of that commission.

Question: You have no idea, beginning for the moment, what the results of the findings might be? What type of disciplinary action might result from those findings?

President: I think the two are connected because if the Commission comes to the conclusion that it was unadulterated savagery and barbarism and unforgivable, unpardonable, naturally one will have to take cognizance of that and in that fashion. If on the other hand, they say that the intentions were good, it absolves the military. And for certain reasons excesses were committed and someone committed more than the others, then we will take those people to task.

Question: Does that mean that Pakistan itself might launch its own war crimes tribunal or war crimes trials?

President: I've already said that to Mr. Mujibur Rahman in my speeches and had it conveyed to him that we're quite

prepared to try people and there are laws for any excesses committed by them. But we didn't approve of them.

Question: It's been said that one of the reasons why General Yahya Khan unleashed the Army on "Bangladesh" was that you had refused to serve in a parliament that would almost certainly have been dominated by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. What do you say to that?

President: That's entirely incorrect, without foundation. What we said was that in order to frame a federal constitution two thirds of the country must agree to a federal constitution. As a matter of fact, all federated provinces must have a consensus on the constitution and that one province a thousand miles away could not impose a confederal arrangement on Pakistan because the six points of Mr. Mujibur Rahman were not federal., they were confederal. That is the position he took and we said that we are prepared to go to the Assembly without a consensus, without an agreement, provided Yahya Khan would waive the 120 day period for the framing of the constitution. Because we couldn't envisage anything in those circumstances when there was no agreement at all. One part was demanding a confederal arrangement and we were wanting a federation. So there would have been a deadlock and the Assembly would have been dissolved. That would have put us right back to square one. I only said that either we should have time to negotiate a broad consensus and failing that, the 120 days should be waived for the framing of the constitution.

Question: Let us be quite clear on this. Are you saying that you didn't in fact put a boycott by your party on the Assembly but you did in fact set up certain conditions which apparently Sheikh Mujibur Rahman found that he could not meet.

President: we repeatedly said that we were not boycotting, we were not boycotting. All we seek is a little bit of time to have negotiations and if that's not possible then the period of 120 days should be extended.

Question: Even though you're convinced that you acted properly, do you think what you did might have been an excuse or a point where Yahya Khan might have misconceived the situation and launched the attack that he did?

President: Well, then anything could have happened. If the intentions were that it was just an exercise, then if it were not this, then it would have been some other measure. If we had gone to the Assembly and certainly there would have been a deadlock in the Assembly, there's no doubt about it, it would have been the vibration that would have then sparked off some kind of trouble because trouble was always inherent in the situation. In 25 years, grievances had grown, democracy had been denied to the people in East and West Pakistan, and the conflict was getting larger and larger. We were becoming more and more irreconcilable, and we would have missed the chance to have brought about reconciliation. Then Yahya Khan also went about with a heavy hand, not only finally, but even otherwise. So this kind of a disaster was more or less inevitable but the magnitude of it naturally was beyond everyone's expectations.

Question: Well, looking now at the magnitude at what did happen, do you have any doubts that you acted in the way you should not have through that crisis?

President: We had no other alternative because you know we were also representing our people here, we had been given a mandate. Mr. Mujibur Rahman's party lost the elections here, not a single one of their candidates got elected. All of them lost their security deposits. And we had been determined that parliament was on the basis of certain promises and pledges and with certain understandings that the people had with us. Now could you go in that situation and agree to a confederal arrangement.

Question: Again on a personal note. I don't think most Australians realize this that it's said that you, in fact you, saved the life of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Now could you tell us something of the circumstances because they appear to be confused. Was there an execution order ready for the Sheikh?

President: Yes, there was confusion at that time. I was in New York and messages were coming to me, frantic messages to return immediately. I returned next day to the President's House where Yahya was and people were agitated. There were demonstrations. We could hear their noise outside. So in that situation there were no sort of routine office files around which

was could discuss across a table. And while relinquishing power, handing over to me, in the course of the conversation Yahya Khan said to me that it was a mistake for him not to have hanged him, execute him. I said what good it would do. Those were the words, I think, he used. And he said: "Well I'm quite prepared to do it now and then hand over", but I told him no, that would make me the cause of it. I wouldn't accept that. But that got me a little suspicious and by way for abundant caution, when I took over I passed orders and I said I wanted to see Mujibur Rahman safely brought to Pindi immediately. A helicopter was sent and he was brought and kept in the custody of our people but it is possible Yahya Khan may have done something silly like that. I think it is better to ask Mujibur Rahman that question because if there were any preparations going on he would be more aware of them.

Question: How do you see the future relationship between Pakistan and "Bangladesh"?

President: I hope we can restore our links and I do not define them. They are sensitive about these matters. I do not say the people are but the Government there is extremely sensitive to this. On the other hand, I believe the people in that part are more and more disenchanted with the state of affairs. That may be basically because of the problems they have but I feel they are having some preliminary second thoughts. I would not jump to any conclusions but this certainly means that in the future we can have good relations between the two parts. We can come closer. If we are making efforts to have good relations with India, why should we not try to have good relations with the people who were part of our country and have been separated by military conquest?

Question: In the last war there was a very fascinating alignment of big powers, with the Soviet Union supporting India and China and the United States supporting Pakistan. Do you see any implications of that sort of alignment for the future?

President: Not only for Pakistan but I think for the whole world. The world must sit up and take a lesson from how our country has been dismembered. What has happened to Pakistan. Can happen to any country of Asia, Africa or Latin America. The seeds of Bangladesh are in many parts of the

world. The world has to sit up and take note to see that this does not become a precedent.

Question: What about the American role? There seems to be increasing American support and Chinese support to each other on this issue. Do you think we will see more of America and China working together against the Soviet Union?

President: Yes, there was support from the Americans and Chinese but support with teeth inside the lips.

Question: There are reports that there is a great deal for Soviet naval activity in Chittagong. Some of the correspondents fear that this is the start of a permanent Russian naval base in the Indian Ocean. Have you any evidence to support this?

President: I have reports of that nature and I know that before Mr. Mujibur Rahman assumed office and responsibility, he had, I think, indicated something like that to some of the great powers. That is the story but I think you should ask him.

Question: What about the relationship with India without precluding anything that may happen at the future summit meeting? What do you see as the most pressing issues to be solved between Pakistan and India?

President: Indians will tell you that Pakistan's problem is the prisoners of war. I would have told you that two months ago but I must salute our people's courage because what I did was to literally contact everyone affected by the prisoners of war issue. sent my party workers, sent others, wrote them letters telling them to bear with us, to be patient. And today that problem is not the most pressing one. Two months ago I also told the Indians that they were mistaken if they thought that they could use it as a pressing problem. We would handle it, look at it squarely in the face and handle it. We did that. In any case, to keep human beings as hostages has diminishing returns. The war has ended. There is a cease-fire. Both countries want peace. They proclaim they want peace. They have the Geneva Convention, United Nations resolutions but India nevertheless keeps our men behind barbed wire but this is today no longer the most important test. In my mind the most important test is to find an equilibrium between Pakistan and India.

Question: Both you and Mrs. Gandhi seem to have gone great lengths to avoid making statements that might aggravate tensions. Do you see that there's hope of a reconciliation in the same way that the United States and the Soviet Union seem to have come to a stable relationship after the Cuban missile crisis. Do you think the war might accomplish that?

President: I think that's a good and a valid analogy and our point of view has changed. We must find an equilibrium but it must be found in its own good time and not in an unrehearsed way because that might upset everything. When I say in good time, I don't mean spin it out but in a decent period of time.

Question: I've heard this expressed by some Pakistan officials and I want to know your attitude. Do you have fears of Indian aggression? I know you don't agree with their policy necessarily but do you have fears of actual Indian aggression?

President: Aggression in the sense of an all-out war, no I do not have that fear. For a number of reasons India has already been given a bad name with the military conquest of East Pakistan. So they would not like to embark on another spree in a hurry.

Question: What about Kashmir which is obviously a long standing problem?

President: This question reverts back to Mr. Nehru's time. Take the right of self-determination. This commitment was given by both countries. However, as I've said, we have not given the people of Kashmir the right of self-determination. We can't take it away from them. It's their own inherent right.

Question: Well, what would you want to see if you could see anything? What could happen that you would like?

President: Basically, it is for the people to decide their future, and by that I don't mean that they should decide in favour of Pakistan or that is the only decision we would accept. We will accept any decision which is their. They'll invariably more of their own free will and accord.

Question: Well, how would you be sure that it was voluntary? Would United Nations, supervision be enough to convince you that it was a voluntary decision.

President: This can always be worked out.

Question: Do you feel any bitterness toward Australia for the decision that it took in early recognition of “Bangladesh”?

President: No, we’re not bitter towards the Australian and we’re not bitter toward England but they were not fully informed of the situation. We regret that.

Question: What do you see as Pakistan’s relationship with Australia? How do you see the two nations?

President: Good relations. Merely because of some situation it doesn’t mean that we will pick up and leave Australia. We have our mission there. We’ll keep it there. We’ll try and strengthen it. We’ll try and improve our trade relations.

Question: You’ll try to do this through the cricket.

President: Yes, of course that’s most important. Most of all you need it for developing good relations but in any case we have great regard and respect for the Australian people and we intend to increase our collaboration in all fields.

Question: Do you yourself see any role that you would like to see Australia play and not necessarily in terms of this country’s defence pacts but of mutual relations?

President: Defence pacts, we were in one too many. We were in CENTO and they deserted us military. So we are sensitive to defence pacts, I mean military arrangement, formal sense of treaties, but Australia is a part of Asia. So far this has not been the case. But you see some kind of metamorphosis is taking place in the thinking of your people on this matter.

Question: What is Pakistan’s position as far as SEATO is concerned?

President: As far as we are concerned, it is basically Mr. Mujibur Rahman's obligation because it is directed against China's expansionism". Look at the countries in the region, Australia, Philippines, Thailand etc. these countries recognized Mujib's Government prematurely so it is for Mr. Mujibur Rahman basically to decide whether there is going to be SEATO or not. Whether he is going to be in SEATO or in the Asian security pact or in both.

Question: What does it mean in practical terms? Are there no letters written from Pakistan to SEATO?

President: Well, more or less.

Question: What about the Commonwealth? When you took Pakistan out of the Commonwealth, was it out of pique or do you think it was a worthwhile gesture?

President: No, I think it was a considered decision. I had even written about it in a little book on foreign affairs a few months earlier. The time was fast approaching when Britain would go with Europe and unburden herself of Commonwealth obligations. From our point of view also, I think it was really becoming counter-productive. Just sit there and hear about the disputes of other countries and not being in apposition to do anything about it, with those disputes reflecting on us unnecessarily. There were a number of reasons why we decided to quit the Commonwealth and develop bilateral relations with Britain and other members of the Commonwealth. South Africa at one time was member of the Commonwealth and apartheid and South Africa's general policy was an irritant to everyone, and to Britain more than anyone else. Today's South Africa is not in the Commonwealth and her bilateral relations with Britain are excellent, better than ever before.

Question: Do you think the Commonwealth has outlived all of its usefulness or does it still have its use for some countries?

President: it has lost its basic usefulness but I would say that things like scholarships to universities, technological assistance and the like will be there. On a bilateral basis also these things can be maintained.

Question: Pakistan has taken, in view of political changes, a tremendous drop in population and military strength. What will be its implications for Pakistan in world affairs?

President: This part of the country is also important and its political importance cannot be denied. China is a neighbour, so are Iran, Afghanistan, India. Then all the developments that are taking place in this region -fast developments—so I don't think Pakistan's importance is diminished very much politically. Psychologically, yes, from 130 million people we are now 60 million.

Question: Psychologically in your own mind or the world's mind?

President: I think in the world's mind more but in our minds also.

Question: You don't have much chance of relaxation, but when you do have a chance, what are the things you like to do?

President: Now I don't have time for relaxation but even before it was difficult to really relax. There was a so much tension in the air and struggle. But, basically, it has always been reading. If I find the time in winter, shooting.

Question: One of Pakistan's difficulties in the past has been that people in power have interpreted actions as a threat to security which others might interpret as a threat to personal liberty which leads one to the question of maintaining a balance between the needs of the state and the rights of the individual. Now you recognize that problem. What is your outlook on it?

President: Yes, I recognize it in statistical terms and it is not that I want to compare my position with Mr. Mujibur Rahman's but in Dacca alone there are 30,000 to 40,000 people in jails. That is a long figure. In spite of all the problems and all the intrigues, internal and external, I think you can count on your fingers the number we have under detention.

Question: you think then we will not be hearing in the future that so and so was imprisoned in Pakistan because he

represented a threat to security the type of report that one usually hears?

President: The question is I do agree that in these reports the matter is exaggerated and that Governments use them or overuse them as an instrument of coercion. But our country has been dismembered and a country cannot be dismembered unless there are forces working inside the country against the integrity of the country.

Question: You yourself spent time in jail for your own political beliefs. Did that influence your own outlook in any way and perhaps made you more tolerant of the ideas of others?

President: I was not alarmed by going to jail. They picked me up at two in the morning and took me to another place in Lahore. I think I slept all the way in the car. I don't think one's mental outlook is involved.

Question: Did you suffer my mistreatment?

President: That I did.

Question: I just wanted to talk about your attitude towards Sheikh Mujib when you decided that he will not be executed. Do you think you were influenced at all by your own experience?

President: As far as Mr. Mujibur Rahman is concerned, I differed with him violently on political matters and in political views. At the same time, I have respect for him because he is a leader of the people. He has been able to mobilise people, command people's allegiance, loyalty. People sacrificed for his cause, made great sacrifices. So from that point of view as a leader of the people, anyone who is leader of the people, I respect.

Question: Pakistan has gone through a greater crisis than any nation can possibly do, being split in half and yet at the same time, these differences must have existed for a long time. Do you think there is a possibility of it becoming stronger in a way than it was before.

President: I am quite confident we will come out stronger but we would have come out stronger even if we were together. We have come out stronger now because the people are participating. People were denied this participation. That is why Pakistan became weak but now that we have released their energies as a people I am quite confident Pakistan will make an effective contribution.

A.B.C.: Mr. President, thank you very much.

Speech on Vietnam Conflict, on May 23, 1972

Mr. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto the President of Pakistan said in Karachi that Pakistan Government sympathizes with the aspirations of the people of Vietnam and have taken this stand on principles.

The Government and the people of Pakistan have stood by principles and followed the course of events on the basis of international peace and on the basis of removal of tensions. We have never waivered in doing our duty.

Addressing bankers, industrialists and businessmen at the State Bank and departing from the written text, he said, that we live in. Asia and are a neighbor of Vietnam. There have been some demonstrations in the country and the people have asked why the Government is silent on Vietnam.

“The Government is not silent on Vietnam. My party before coming in to power had expressed its stand on Vietnam. I have written many articles on the conflict in Vietnam. In my book “Myth of Independence” I have given people of Pakistan. Even after coming into office, we have taken a number of steps and every one known that a month or two ago I sent a Central Minister to Hanoi to hold discussions with the Vietnamese leaders. This was not done by previous regimes or Governments. Not only that, but recently in Rawalpindi I was asked by a Press correspondent whether there was a possibility of exchange of diplomatic relations between Pakistan and Vietnam. My reply was why not. The nation known that I have taken a position on principles on the question of Vietnam. We are neighbors. I have recently addressed a letter to President Nixon on the question.”

The President said that unruly demonstrations would not strengthen the cause of the people of Vietnam. The principal adversaries in Vietnam the two super powers instead of fighting each other were holding negotiations and President Nixon was on a visit to Moscow. These powers were certainly much more directly concerned that Pakistan. The President reminded the people that when Pakistan was being torn asunder there were hardly any demonstrations or protests abroad. He appealed to

the -people to take a rational view of the situation and not a indulge in unruly demonstrations.

“Certain circumstances have compelled us to follow a low key foreign. Policy for some time to come because we have to grapple with issues of the subcontinent. We have to make every endeavor for peace in the subcontinent, which has been denied to our people for centuries.

This is not a simple task and calls for undivided attention. When our people demonstrate in this fashion it does not serve the country, which has already suffered much. Half of the country has been dismembered. I am not against demonstrations, but the demonstrations must be in orderly manner. We have certain duties to discharge to our own citizens and those who live in Pakistan.”

Address to industrialists and businessmen at Karachi on May 23, 1972

This is the third occasion since January that I am addressing your community, with the lifting of the Martial Law, the promulgation of the Constitution, the installation of peoples representative Governments in the four provinces and the implementation of economic reforms, a new era of political stability and economic progress has started in the country. Today, I will tell you how I visualise the future developments and relationship in the economic and social fields in the country.

This Government assumed power in circumstances of military disaster and economic collapse. Five months back, we were confronted by a collapse of confidence, a lack of will and an absence of any sense of purpose in all segments of national life. This collapse was superimposed on a process of increasing discontent in the industrial workers. The labour management relations were extremely bad. The economy was stagnating, new investment wears negligible, and production and output were shrinking. Critical shortages of essential commodities had developed. Rising prices were effecting everybody, especially those in low income groups. It was against this background of confusion, disorder and despondency that I started making the various reforms as I felt that our political and social fabric would explode unless certain basic reforms were undertaken and a beginning was made towards creating a harmonious relationship among various sections of the people. In my view this was essential in order to rebuild and rehabilitate the nation and to reflect the new realities. It was impossible to let the previous norms govern us as they had created a society dominated exclusively by the profit motive, selfishness and exploitation. The industrialists and the business community did not show a sense of social responsibility and was blinded by the desire to make money quickly. They had forgotten that the interests of the nation should come before the interests of the individual without a sense of purpose and without an ideology. It was no wonder that malpractices, corruption and nepotism were prevalent everywhere. The government inherited this sorry state of affairs

but could not tolerate it even for a day, if we had to get quickly out of the climate of despair and work towards a bright future.

Of all the reforms, the most basic are the land reforms. The ceiling of land holdings is designed to bark up the concentration of landed wealth while the revision of batai system in favour of the tenant is intended to relieve him of the burden of certain traditional charges. At the same time, we have tried to preserve the incentives for the continuation of agriculture as an attractive and profitable vocation for the enterprising and the enlightened farmers. Subsequently, we decided to reduce the ceiling to resume a larger area for redistribution but this represents the final revision and no further changes in land ceilings will be made. The land reforms are only a party of our programme for revitalizing life in the rural areas by giving incentives and assistance to the small farmer so that he can produce more and live a healthier and a fuller life. Credit, provision of better seeds and more amenities are part of an integrated programme to improve the life of the small farmer who has been neglected by past administrations.

In the industrial field, the State assumed control over ten groups of industries. Within each group, the State took over the management of only the largest undertakings, leaving the smaller units under private ownership and control.

Apart from the units taken over by the State in these ten categories of industries, we have no intention to take over any other units or industries. I had given such an assurance earlier also but there has been some criticism that government had gone back on this assurance when it nationalised life insurance. This criticism is incorrect. Insurance is not an industry but is a commercial activity. There is a sharp distinction between industrial undertakings and financial institutions like insurance companies. The nationalisation of life insurance was done not only to reduce the concentration of economic power inherent in the interlocking of life insurance with the ownership of major industrial companies; it was also meant to protect the interest of policy holders. Following nationalisation, our preliminary investigations indicate that some companies were grossly mismanaged and did not have sufficient funds to meet their obligations to the policy holders. In the interest of such policy holders, Government has decided to guarantee the full sums

assured. Government is determined to run the nationalised life insurance companies with greater efficiency. You will have noticed that we have appointed professional experts from the insurance field itself to run the nationalised insurance companies. I expect them to discharge their new responsibilities efficiently. Only merit and hard work will be the criteria for their retention and promotion. Every effort will be made to expand life insurance coverage so that its benefits are available to all section of the people. All claims will be settled promptly.

Appropriate provisions have been made for payment of compensation in view of nationalisation of life insurance business. In so far as general insurance is concerned, we do not contemplate a change in the existing arrangement.

Another major reform relates to the corporate sector where we have abolished the system of managing agencies and made provision for representation of the interests of the minority shareholders. The abolition of the managing agency system was considered by the former Governments as far back as 1962 but the system could not be abolished due to the opposition of the entrenched vested interests. Thus, the managing and sole agents continued to skim the profits which should have gone to the shareholders and in the process the State was also deprived of its due share of taxes. These groups were self-perpetuating because the system of election to the Board of Directors made it virtually impossible for outside shareholders to get representation on these boards. The introduction of cumulative voting has changed the situation and the minority shareholders to get representation on these boards. The introduction of cumulative voting has changed the situation and the minority shareholders can now elect their own representatives. Financial institutions such as National Investment Trust, Investment Corporation of Pakistan and PICIC, which have a substantial stake in most of these companies as loan-givers or investors, can also now get one or more seats on the Board of Directors, thereby safeguarding their own interest as well as those of the small shareholders.

In the field of labour-management relations, we have protected the genuine rights of the workers. The labour reforms have introduced a new streamlined procedure for redressing the grievances of industrial workers. Disputes can now be settled

expeditiously. The share of workers in the annual profits has been raised. The new policy also provides for progressive has been raised. The new policy also provides for progressively more effective workers' participation in the management of industry, payment of bonus, better housing and work facilities, education of children of workers and expansion of the Social Security Scheme. The new labour laws recognise the rights of the employees as well as those of management. The practice of arbitrary dismissals has been eliminated and dismissals can now be made only for properly stated reason.

On the 11th of this month, I took the hard decision of devaluing the rupee. As a result of policies pursued in the past, the par value of the Pakistani currency had eroded with continuous speculation against it, both inside and outside the country. Since Independence the only time the exchange rate was changed was in July 1955. however, on account of lack of proper supporting measures, this could not improve the balance of payments situation and extensive physical controls on imports and to be introduced. In 1959, the Export Bonus Scheme was introduced which did help in increasing the country's export earnings, but at the same time gave rise to a number of distortions. The scheme was used over the years for de facto piece meal devaluation of the rupee. As effective exchange rates under the Scheme went on depreciating, the necessary financial discipline disappeared and investment decisions were made without due regard to the scarcity value of foreign exchange. The Scheme led to misallocation of resources and in fact favoured the less efficient industries. The sharp fluctuations in the prices of bonus vouchers frequent shifting of imports from one category to another, and changes in bonus entitlements, naturally created uncertainty and interfered with investment decisions, production plans and cost rationalization. The exchange reforms have ended all these uncertainties once for all and have created a stable framework for investment decisions. It should also create favourable conditions for the inflow of foreign investment. One of the biggest benefits of the new exchange would be to reduce malpractices, such as under-invoicing of exports, over-invoicing of imports and smuggling.

An exchange rate adjustment always involves certain immediate sacrifices in order to achieve long-term economic benefits. Such problems are faced by every country when it

devalues its currency and we are no exception in this matter. Devaluation may put pressure on the price of certain goods but we are doing all that is possible to maintain the price line in articles of everyday use, such as wheat, rice, vegetable ghee, cloth, kerosene oil and sugar. In other cases, the price rise will have to be neutralized by greater production and tariff adjustments. In the case of a large number of imported items their prices are already at a high level as they were being imported on bonus. Their prices should not be affected by the devaluation decision.

The major benefits which would flow from this bold surgical operation would be to increase the export earnings of the country and make it self-reliant in the not-too-distant future. A further benefit would be to reduce bureaucratic controls to the absolute minimum. We want to inject an element of freedom in the market and make imports and exports more or less automatic, without the importer and the exporter having to run to Government offices for permits. Permissions and quotas. The time and effort now spent by the business community in getting such permissions from the government offices could now be devoted to productive effort.

Reforms have also been introduced in the field of banking in line with the socio-economic objectives of the Government. In the past, the banks have shown a remarkable dynamism in extending the network of their branches and the scale of their operations in the country and abroad but failed to play their due role in broad-basing the process of growth and promoting a more equitable distribution of wealth. This was due partly to interlocking of banking and commercial interests and partly to the development strategies pursued in the past which were devoid of any egalitarian content. There is also evidence of considerable malpractices in the banking field and misuse of funds deposited with the banks. We have, therefore, introduced changes in the organization and management of the banks to meet more effectively, purposefully and equitably the credit and investment needs of the various sectors of the economy. The scheme is designed to regulate the operations of the banks through the State Bank of Pakistan in order to achieve in essence what a straight nationalisation of the banks would have achieved. Under the new regulations, the state bank will be empowered to remove directors of a bank and appoint administrations during the period

of such supersessions. Action under this provision will be taken in case of mismanagement for reasons to be recorded in writing. The State Bank will also be empowered to nominate a director on the board of directors of every private bank. To prevent the misuse of bank funds and to avoid excessive involvement in financing individual projects and parties, ceilings and limitations have been imposed on borrowings and advances from banks covering individual borrowers, banks' directors, their family members and the undertakings in which they are interested. Certain limitations have also been imposed on bank executives and employees.

A number of measures have been adopted to bring about a more equitable and purposeful distribution of bank credit. A National Credit Consultative Council is being set up under the aegis of the State Bank with representatives from the Government and the private sector which will pay special attention to the flow of credit to agriculture, to small borrowers, for non-traditional exports and for housing. To cover the risks involved, the state bank is introducing a scheme to provide guarantees to the commercial banks. It is expected that these controls will bring about a basic change in the policies and working methods of the banks.

Government accepts the pattern of a mixed economy for Pakistan—the existence of the private sector side by side with the nationalized sector in which private enterprise has an important role to play. The government - managed sector consists mainly of heavy and basic industries and the public utilities. Many lucrative channels of industrial investments remain open to the private sector. Even in the ten categories of industries whose control has been taken over, only the larger units have been brought under government control and we have no intention of taking over the smaller units. In the engineering group for which I visualize a very bright future, both in the internal and in the export market, there is a large number of small units producing tube well equipment, diesel engines, small motors, electrical gear and appliances, sports goods, electrical fans and light engineering goods. These are going to be the backbone of further industrialization of the country. They should feel free to expand their operation. They should have no apprehension that their units would be taken over by the State.

In fact, Government would provide them with facilities to increase their output and improve their quality.

In undertaking these economic and financial reforms, our objective is to create a social order which would be free from exploitation, but at the same time to create a social order which would be free from exploitation, but at the same time would reward the talented, the enterprising and the industrious. We have no intention of curbing the freedom of the individual to pursue his normal vocation. We accept that private enterprise has a role to play in the economic progress of Pakistan but we must rid the economy of concentration of economic power in the hands of a few and the exploitation of the many. Our aim is to regulate private enterprise in the larger national and social interests. Concentration of economic power in fact saps the vitality of the private sector itself by shutting out competition which eventually retards economic growth. The time has now come for private enterprise to realize that the best way of securing its future is to live up to its social obligation. If you want to live a respected and respectable life in this country, you must play the game according to rules which benefit the majority of the population. These rules primarily mean that you discharge your social responsibilities. You must give to the worker his just share, to the investor and shareholder a reasonable return, to the State all taxes due to it. You must co-operate with the Government in keeping prices at a reasonable level. You must produce more and increase productivity at all levels. You must not indulge in malpractices which have cost the country so much in the past. You must stop wasteful expenditure. You must allow newcomers to enter in the industrial field. You must eliminate all monopolies. You must not fix prices by collusion. You are at liberty to make reasonable profits as a reward for hard work and efficient use of talent and resources. I would welcome the profits of efficiency and hard work but I detest profits made through exploitation. I sincerely hope that you will follow the new rules and whole-heartedly accept the reforms and stop fretting about your losses, actual or imaginary, caused by them. On our part, I assure you that we have closed one chapter in the book of Pakistan. We would now like to embark on the next phase of greater production and industrial peace so that in these five years we can show to our people and the world the fruits of our labour, the results of our struggle and sacrifice.

The People's Party is a party of the industrial workers, the agricultural laborers and the small man. The interests of these people will continue to have the first call on our resources. We are determined to have an egalitarian society. We have tried to give a fair deal to the labor and what is even more important to give him a sense of dignity. We respect the contribution made by him in industrial and agricultural production. We are determined that he shall get a fair day's work. We have also ensured that he will deal with the employer on an equal basis and that his job is protected against arbitrary dismissal. On their side, labors also have a social obligation to the society. They must produce more and they must show discipline. The days of 'gherao' and 'jalao' are over and anyone indulging in them is not only damaging the national economy but also damaging the long-term interest of the labor. I expect labor to behave with dignity, discipline and responsibility and not take the law in their own hands. They must eschew violence. The new rules equally apply to labor. They should always remember that this is their government which will continue to do all in its power to further their interests and the welfare of their children.

The economic development of the backward areas of the country is very near my heart. I was very glad that members of your community were invited recently to Peshawar by the Government of North-West Frontier province. I welcome this approach and hope that you will similarly visit Baluchistan in the near future and start participating fully in the development of the backward areas.

Now that the Government has unfolded all the key elements of its socio-economic policies and removed the misgivings that might have persisted in the minds of investors and entrepreneurs about the role of private sector in the country's economy, time has come to reactivate the capital market by reopening the stock exchanges. The circumstances in which their closure was decreed in December last year are well known. It has been now decided to reopen the stock exchanges with effect from Thursday, 25th May, 1972. For obvious reasons, it will not be possible to resume trading in the shares of companies registered in East Pakistan and wholly located there trading in such shares will remain suspended. We have given serious consideration to the issue whether scrips of companies registered in West Pakistan but having some of their assets in

East Pakistan should be traded or not and have come to the conclusion that it would be best to let the market make its own judgment on these scips. A number of steps are being taken to promote savings and investment so as to restore strength to the shares market. We hope that investment activity in the country would revive quickly on the opening of the stock exchanges and this will assist significantly the process of normalization.

Pakistan has a bright future. God has been kind and has endowed us with many natural resources not given to others. We have already built an adequate infrastructure for industry and agriculture and our communications system is reasonably good. Our entrepreneurs have shown excellent initiative in the past. Our worker in the field and in the factory is robust and hard working. We now have a system of government elected by the people and answerable to them. The days of dictatorship and personal fiat are over. We can now work in harmony and co-operation and end every kind of exploitation. Let us build together a new and a prosperous Pakistan of which we and the coming generations could be proud. The challenge and the opportunity are there. Let us make a pledge that we will not fail in this task.

Press conference at the Lahore Airport on May 25, 1972

Gentlemen, Some time towards the end of next month, the long-awaited meeting between the Indian Prime Minister and us will take place in Delhi. This is not officially confirmed but you can take it that most probably the meeting will take place towards the end of next month. Now, this means that we have to prepare ourselves for important discussions, vital to the country's future.

It is not necessary for me to tell our people that under no circumstances vital national interest will be compromised. I do not see why the nation should compromise its vital national interests even after a decisive war which it has lost. However, it is inevitable that in the course of our negotiations we shall try to arrive at a permanent settlement, and find enduring peace in the subcontinent. We will have to examine each other's point of view and see what adjustments are necessary, what accommodations are necessary to bring about durable peace in the subcontinent. Now, this is no easy task. I will never try to think that I am capable alone of finding solutions. I am in consultation with my people all the time. I am in contact with them as much as possible. I have also held some discussions with leaders belonging to other parties. In the coming days, I will hold more consultations, more discussions with people of various schools of thought. I would like to know their point of view on all these vital questions. But, it is not only at my level that I should hold these discussions. I would like to see more views expressed by the press, by students, by leaders of other shades and opinions. In this connection, I do not see why the Provincial Governments should not consider holding some seminars amongst students and other people, have discussions on the various issues including relations with East Pakistan which they now insist on calling Bangladesh. What should be our approach, what are the problems that have arisen out of this conflict and separation. How should these problems be resolved. In other words, a time has come really for the whole nation to participate in the process of formulating the outlook for the whole people to decide whether we should pursue consultation even after the events of last year, what would be the exact impact on the nation as a whole, on its economy and what should be our attitude towards India. Are we

to live in the same subcontinent on the basis of modus vivendi or as implacable enemies, what would be the results of one or the other. So, I would be guided by the national approach and the national consensus on these questions. I have no personal stake in these matters. I have only the national stake in these matters and I believe that the nation speaks the truth; people speak the truth; common man speaks the truth. We have restored democracy. One of the virtues of democracy is not merely to hold assembly sessions or to give licence for abuse. The purpose of democracy is also to bring about the flowering of society and to know the inner thoughts of the people without fear. How they feel constructively, what their approach is towards various problems. So, the participation of people in these vital issues concerning the future destiny of the nation is of supreme importance. So let the people speak. Let them articulate the outlook and I know it would be done constructively and that thoughts will be generated, many ideas will flow which will contribute towards a clear thinking on these vital problems.

And I thought that before I leave on my mission to Muslim countries, I should tell you that we are in the process of giving deep thought to substantive and procedural questions affecting our future relations in the subcontinent with India. We might not always make correct evaluations but we attempt to make correct evaluations. In other words, we believe in trying to do the best job and not something superficial or ad hoc. We believe in going deep into problems, going to the heart of the matter. And now I feel that in order to go to the heart of the matter I require your assistance and cooperation to throw out these thoughts on the future in your editorials, discussions, articles, in talks on the radio and television, on the university campus and in various others forums. There are so many forums for intellectuals and for thinkers. In the old days, there used to be thinkers' forums, which did not think but I hope that some of our forums do think. So, I want the thinkers to give us their thoughts. We want food for thoughts and we will do our thinking at all levels. Whatever they are worth,, we want ideas from all sides constructively, in a spirit of dignity and in national spirit.

As far as my visit abroad is concerned, you know the background. This has been adequately explained but generally the emphasis is on the fact that on the last occasion I went out to thank the Muslim countries. I will again thank them. That is only

a part of the admission of the responsibility. Naturally, we have to thank them. We can thank them by sending telegrams also. This is not the only purpose. I am going there to hold discussions with them again because they belong to our part of the world. We have common destiny. They have, in some form or the other, similar problems and it is also thought consultations that we have to give them our point of view. If we do not give them our point of view, they will keep getting the other point of view i.e. "Bangladesh is a reality—it is a Muslim country bigger than Pakistan and that you must accept that this is a reality." Therefore, we have to go out and hold discussions with them, because they have so far supported our position and our outlook on this problem. It is necessary that we tell them why we believe that our position is correct. Since they have supported us it is our duty not only to thank them but also to hold discussions and consultations with them and to get their point of view on these matters so that before we go to India we have our own peoples' point of view clearly before us and we have the point of view of those Muslim nations also who share a common destiny with us and who have stood up with us to this day and taken position in conformity with our own position. We must have, in other words, as clear a picture as possible of our own outlook as well as the outlook of our friends, associates, neighbours etc. in this connection, as you know, I have already been to the Soviet Union and I have been to China. So, the points of view of these two great powers are also known to us. The point of view of the United States is also known to us as well as that of all the important countries of the East and West but the intimacy and the depth of discussions that have taken place between us and the Muslim countries naturally fall in a different category as such, it means real intensive discussions with them now, this is the position and when I return I hope that result will be a movement in our country in the direction which I am suggesting.

Please give your views frankly. We want frank views on the subject. Won't say realistic or emotional because I don't draw distinctions. A patriot gives his own feelings and his own thoughts and, on that basis, we look forward to your contributions.

Now, any questions would you like to ask?

Question: Sir, it will be probably 28th June when you will be going to Delhi?

President: Most probably. I said I have been away from Rawalpindi since 13th or 14th. So, I have not seen all the papers. I believe it will be some time then.

Question: Sir, recently the Soviet Ambassador called on you while you were in Quetta. Can you tell us something about that?

President: We had some discussion on the recent state of affairs in the subcontinent and then also we had some discussion on Vietnam, but primarily on the state of affairs here in our subcontinent.

Question: Whatever statements have been made by Indian leaders of and on during the last month or so, the impression here remains that preconditions are still being imposed. What is your impression, Sir?

President: The answer is 'yes' and 'no', because even if you say there are no preconditions you have them in your mind. Is it not so? So, it is not that they are coming blank to the conference table. They have a certain point of view, they have certain objectives and they will try to achieve them. We have also something in our mind and that is why I am asking for this kind of national outlook on the probe. We have also some, shape of things in our mind. We will hear them and I am confident in my mind that they will hear us to the extent where our basic interests are not compromised and we do not want their basic interests to be compromised.

Question: Kashmir will be one of the issues to be discussed there probably.

President: We have held discussions with them. Even yesterday I met one of them. I will hold discussions with them again but to take some -one is like bringing some one from Kashmir, and, that is a kind of provocation Isn't it?

Question: are you going to decide your attitude towards different problems of the subcontinent prior to your forthcoming visit to the African and Middle Eastern countries, Sir?

President: We will not take our friends by surprise. All aspects would be considered and I can assure you that our Government is not the kind of Government that will take friends by surprise. They will be kept informed by us at every stage.

Question: Sir, is there any chance of having greater alliance with Muslim Countries?

President: I think on this point our foreign policy has been very clearly spelt out. On a number of occasions I have expressed my views on alliances. I would respectfully request you not to put questions to me which have become part of our fundamental foreign policy

Question: It is about five months now that you set up Hamoodur Rahman Commission, and, initially it was to report within three months?

President: I have not to write the report. The Commission has to write the report. They asked for extension. It would not have been fair if we had not granted them the extension because they must not get the impression that they do not have the fullest co-operation of Government. If they need more time we are prepared to give them more time. It think the time limit is to expire in May, i.e. this month, but if they ask for more time we are prepared to give more time.

Question: As far as discussions with other political parties and leaders are concerned, are you going to hold bilateral discussions or you intend to hold some sort of....?

President: No, I will keep it flexible. You see it is much better if we meet amongst ourselves. On a conference table attitudes become more rigid. I will keep it informal. Sometime I will meet someone by myself. If he wants to bring one or two other's point of view comes out more clearly. On a conference table there is one eye to the papers outside, another eye to the party itself and the third one to various other commitments. So, it is better to keep such talks informal.

I have had a brief meeting with one of the political leaders in Lahore and I might meet him again and meet another again. This is what I intend doing but I cannot meet people whose president says one thing and shoes general secretary says another thing.

Question: Will this round of meetings start hen you return from Middle East, Sir?

President: Yes. We have a party, we have colleagues. I have told some of them that they should start having discussions and meetings.

Question: On your behalf?

President: Yes. Because our party's position is well known. We have the advantage that our point of view within our party is appreciated and specially by those who fall within the inner circle, and, my colleagues some of them know my point of view extremely well. Naturally, everyone has to do his work on division of labour. Therefore, I will be in touch with some of them.

Question: Would you like to name one of them, Sir?

President: No, no All of them.

Question: As far leading the discussion, is it necessary that being the majority party and the ruling party, you are to initiate the political discussion? Have you formulated some sort of initiative programme? What is your point of view about the summit conference, Sir?

President: I have a strong point of view but my point of view would be crystallized by the national outlook, by the general outlook and the general consensus because I am a preacher of people and I don't believe in the fact that people are wrong. People are right and, therefore, the final shape of our outlook will depend on what the people would dictate.

Question: Sir, if, for instance, a seminar is held and your party leader goes there and he puts forward your point of view.

President: I would not put my people in that position, because that would not be correct. Seminars are for students, there is no question of party being represented lawyers and journalists can be called to the seminars.

Question: But, don't you think, Sir, that there would be some sort of chase?

President: I do not consider that because, you see, I have a majority party. There may be some people who may be of one view and some of the other view. I do not think that there would be any difficulty and the advantage of consultation on such a big thing would far outweigh the fears that are being expressed.

Question: Sir, you said that some foreign power was involved in the Quetta incident.

President: I did not use the word foreign power. I spoke of some activities not confined to the boundaries of Pakistan. These activities could be of any nature. After all, I did not spell out any foreign power. You know there are Radio broadcasts and various other things. As newsmen, you know the broadcasts come from various places. I am not mentioning any particular country. We want to have the best of relations with all foreign countries, with all neighboring countries. We have the greatest respect for them. We respect their territorial integrity. We wish their people success we do not want to create misunderstandings. I do not see the necessity of anyone trying to ask a misleading question because misleading question would create differences between us and our northern neighbours. When we are anxious to improve our relations with our southern neighbours. I do not want to enter into provocative diplomacy.

Question: Sir, recently, there have been a number of cases involving labour unrest. What is your view about it?

President: Well, I do not like that. My party derives its strength from the working classes and it is our bounden duty to serve the interests of the working classes. At the same time it is essential for the progress of our people as a whole that there should be peace, industrial peace, industrial peace, and production should increase. The wheels of industry must start moving again. The nation should start moving. We should start

building up the country. We should have more houses, more schools, more factories, give greater employment to our people, give more attention on the workers problems. But it is also necessary that the people should work hard as a whole. I do not think I shall be breaking my election manifesto by saying that the perfect people should work hard. Right through the elections I kept saying that the welfare of the people depended not only on taking certain decisions or implementing those decision, but on hard work which was so essential for our progress and for our welfare.

Question: Sir, a controversy has arisen on the Drugs (generic names) ordinance, 1972, which involves about 55 crores of rupees worth of investment by the existing branded drug manufacturers. Sir, are you going to do something about it?

President: The matter has become more generic than generic names. We have to take some decision on it. I have appointed A SMALL Cabinet Committee to go into the question. Since I was out of Rawalpindi for some time I do not know that has been decided. As soon as I get back, I shall find out.

Question: Sir, you have announced various reforms. What about Administrative reforms?

President: We are working on that. We could not keep to this time limit. You know that before convening the National Assembly, we wanted some quick reforms so that they did not get bottled up. but Administrative reforms we could not. There are some Law reforms to come. We are working on that.

Question: Sir, do you think that the recent statements by the Foreign Office for the Afghan Government with regard to Pukhtoonistan is a, Volte face or a reiteration of their old stand which they have never given up?

President: I do not want to discuss this question in public. I would prefer to confine it, for the time being, to bilateral discussions.

Question: Is there any possibility of convening the National Assembly before its scheduled date?

President: There is no need of it. The national Assembly is meeting on the 4th of August. I doubt if very many decision would be taken by the 4th of August in the first place and, in the second place, if decisions are taken they would be worth debating in the National Assembly. How can the National Assembly be by passed? It is not possible. When I want consultations at the lowest level, at the village level, I would not like my party to be passed by the National Assembly. Secondly, National Assembly compromise, as you saw in the last sessions, an overwhelming majority of the people's Party. Before the last session was held, all kinds of kite flying was done and every night you dreamt of one more member of the PPP defecting to the other side. You know our party's position, but other leaders and other parties are being consulted. This was not done by previous Governments. We are going to hold consultations with them. We have got in our Government a member of another party, Khan Abdul Qayyum Khan. Already, Mr. Daultana is going as Ambassador to London. Then we have two provinces in which there is coalition between the NAP and the JUI. That leaves PDP and Jamaat-e-Islami, and from that point of view we have had discussion with PDP.

Question: Are any more people going out for the same mission as Mr. Daultana?

President: Any talented person, any one who wants to serve the cause of the country and is inspired by the ideals of the Pakistan People's Party is welcome to be considered for participation.

Question: Sir, your Law Minister recently told us that fundamental rights would be restored much sooner than the people expected?

President: It is simply not possible, because you know, and, you must appreciate the fact that there has been a war. There is an emergency. There is an emergency even in India. It is not possible to run the Government in this fashion when you are facing such a crucial test. When we had no emergency, when we had no crisis, there was Martial law for 13 years. But when Pakistan reached the height of its crisis, it was not possible to overcome it without the requisite machinery and the tools. If

you want the whole thing to blow up on everyone's face, then let us do it.

Question: Sir, the NAP Chief Khan Abdul Wali Khan has sought clarification on three points....

President: It was a gesture of our goodwill to make this offer. It was not the right of these parties to get representation in the cabinet under parliamentary Democracy. We made the offer in super national interest as a friendly gesture to show that we want co operation, and that we want to bring about better relations. But it is not their right, because we are the majority, if it is going to be interpreted as a right, then I am afraid it would not work. You ask for clarification and you ask for conditions when you want to assert your right. If it is my right, I am going to be given my full right, but when it is not a right, then you cannot impose conditions and seek clarification.

Message of greetings to His Majesty King Zahir Shah of Afghanistan on May 26, 1972

The Government and the people of Pakistan join me in extending to your Majesty, the Government and the brotherly people of Afghanistan warm greetings and cordial felicitations on the auspicious occasion of the National Day of Afghanistan. I am confident that the manifold ties binding our two countries shall be further strengthened in the years to come.

Please accept, Your Majesty, my best wishes for your personal health and happiness and for the ever-increasing progress and prosperity for the people of Afghanistan.

Message of Farmers on May 27, 1972

My dear peasants and farmers,
Assalm-o-Alaimum,

I am fully conscious of the fact that despite fully conscious of the fact that despite eagerness on my part I could not find time to converse and exchange views with you. You are well aware that I took over the administration at a time when the country was passing through a very critical stage because of war and various other reasons. So I had to devote all my time and attention to removing external and internal dangers. By the grace of Almighty Allah and the full est co-operation of the people conditions are now fast improving. Our caravan, Insha Allah, will reach its destination very soon.

My dear brothers, agriculture is the industry of our country. Our economic condition cannot improve without the development of agriculture. Despite drought conditions, lack of canal water and other difficulties you have made appreciable efforts to increase agricultural production which has greatly improved the nation's economy. I whole-heartedly congratulate you on your hard work and determination. I am confident that cultivators and land-owners would co-operate with one another and leave no stone unturned to increase agricultural production in the country.

You should be fully aware of the fact that production per acre in your country is very low and unless this production is increased, agricultural progress is just not possible increase in production per acre is possible only when you resort to modern methods of cultivation, use good variety of see and fertilizers according to requirements and instructions making use of the water in a judicious and appropriate manner. If the production is low, not only your efforts are nor fully rewarded but the economy of the country as a whole is also deprived of its full benefits. It is, therefore, essential that each and every cultivator should try his utmost to increase production per acre.

My dear peasants, the season for cultivation of Kharif crops has started. Cotton and paddy are two important crops of this season. The economy of Pakistan is to a large extent dependant

on these crops. These crops not only meet the country's requirements but also earn a lot of foreign exchange. Therefore, special attention should be given on the cultivation of these crops. I am confident that you will strive hard to increase their production.

My brothers, it is a matter of concern for your Government that we have to import a sizeable quantity of wheat from abroad despite the fertility of our land, the adequacy of water and the hard work that you put in day and night. This situation is by no means satisfactory. An agricultural country like ours should not only be self-sufficient in food but it should have met the food requirements of other countries as well. Your Government is determined to make Pakistan self-sufficient in food at the earliest. This is a question of national prestige for us all. I am sure that my peasant brothers would earn the appreciation of the world by meeting the food requirements of their beloved country through hard work and determination.

My friends, rise in the name of Allah and prove to the world that a Pakistani cultivator is next to none in the world and that he has the ability to make land yield its treasures.

Pakistani cultivators Zindabad. Pakistan Paindabad.

Inaugural message at the 4th session of Indonesia – Pakistan Economic and Cultural Co-operation (IPECC) on May 29, 1972

It gives me great pleasure to extend, on behalf of the people and Government of Pakistan and on my own behalf, a very warm and cordial welcome to His Excellency Dr. Adam Malik, Foreign Minister of Indonesia and his distinguished colleagues who have come to Islamabad for the fourth session of the IPECC Ministerial Council. I hope that their stay in Pakistan will be enjoyable and fruitful.

Indonesia and Pakistan are bound together in deep historical, cultural and religious ties. Peoples of our two countries have profound brotherly feelings towards each other which have been reflected in the past in a strong desire for establishing closer economic and Cultural co-operation between us. The establishment of Indonesia-Pakistan Economic and Cultural Co-operation organization (IPECC) in 1965 was indeed an attempt to provide an institutional framework for accelerating economic and cultural co-operation between our two countries for the common good of our peoples. The pace of this co-operation has remained somewhat slow in the past years. This really indicates that we should work together with renewed vigour to consolidate and further expand economic co-operation in areas which will respond positively and constructively to any proposal which may lead to establishing a strong basis for fruit full economic collaboration between Indonesia and Pakistan.

We have recently gone through a traumatic experience of foreign aggression against the sovereignty and integrity of our country. The political and economic consequences of this reprehensible development have been most grievous. We have been trying with single-minded devotion and determination to recover the lost ground and establish a viable political and economic system in the country. In the political field, we have already established democratic institutions and the Governments both at the Centre and Provinces are constituted by the elected representatives of the people. The National Assembly of Pakistan unanimously adopted an Interim Constitution

comprising all shades of political opinion in the country is presently working to prepare a permanent constitution for the country. In the economic field, my Government has initiated a series of policy measures to evolve an egalitarian society. Basic revolutionary reforms have been introduced in the fields of agriculture, education, industry, health and labour, and all these reforms are intended to improve the physical, cultural and economic life of the common man in Pakistan. We are determined to build a strong and prosperous Pakistan in which every one can share the fruits of economic development.

I am glad that Indonesia has consolidated and strengthened its economic position in recent years and is well on its way to establishing conditions of general economic welfare under the inspiring leadership of president Suharto. I wish to congratulate President Suharto, his Government and the Indonesian people for overcoming initial political and economic difficulties with dedication and determination. We rejoice in the prosperity and welfare of our brother in Indonesia.

I am confident that the fourth session of IPECC Ministerial Council will be able to take a fresh look on the progress of economic and cultural co-operation between Indonesia and Pakistan and will take appropriate decisions which will lead to early realization of the full potential economic and cultural co-operation between our two countries.

I wish the Council all success in its deliberations.

Message of greetings to Dr. Mohammad Taibi Benhina, the New Foreign Minister of Morocco on May 30, 1972

On behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan and on my own behalf I have great pleasure in extending to Your Excellency our heartiest felicitations on your assumption of the office of the Foreign Minister of Morocco. I am confident that the cordial and fraternal relations so happily existing between our two countries, will continue to grow in strength in the years ahead.

Address to Pakistani nationals in Jeddah on June 2, 1972

There will be no Tashkent. Unlike Ayub, I will not hop into a plane and go and sign something. We will take stock of the external and internal events and under no circumstances will we do anything which can, even remotely, compromise Pakistan's basic interests. Our problems are complicated. Those defeated and frustrated wise guys in Pakistan, who have taken upon themselves to render me advice, are inconsistent. What they say today, they go back on it tomorrow. One such person advised me on January 22 to recognize Bangladesh. He said this a day after Mujib had spoken in Dacca saying that there was no longer anything common between the East and West. And now when they think that there may be a faint possibility that we may do that, I am being told not to recognize Bangladesh. What is the moral? All that motivates them is a feeling of revenge and frustration. They have no principles. Who am I to recognize Bangladesh all by myself. I will only do so when the people want me to. The people are my only guide, my only masters and the only court in which I am answerable. Sometimes I am told that I should call the National Assembly. How can I ignore or by-pass the National Assembly. My party has majority there. They talk as if a settlement was to take place tomorrow. If I am going to Delhi on June 28, it does not mean that all matters will be decided in a day. We will talk and negotiate. Then I will come back to the people and take them into confidence and ask for their opinion and advice. I may even hold a referendum which is the greatest National Assembly. There should be no misgivings. These men of yesterday have no faith in the people nor are they their representatives. They have no logic, no rationality, only malice. One of them, who was kicked out of the presidency by the people and who then went into hiding, is now giving press interviews. He says we should not recognize Bangladesh. I ask him who sowed the seeds of Bangladesh? At a time when there were no Six Points and no movement for separation, he divided the railways and the PIDC between East and West. It was not demand of the people. Who incorporated the concept of two economies in the national development plan? What was the

purpose? When you have two economies, you have two politics and ultimately two countries. When I called for a debate on the Six Points, who stopped it from being held? Instead the Danda and the bullet were used to silence debate. And now when it is all over, such people are throwing up proposals from the privacy of their homes. I say let the people and their representatives decide. Let nobody mislead them. Again some of these types demand that I bring back the POWs. Well I do not have the keys to the camps in which they have been placed. We are trying. Give us time. Have faith and patience. We will negotiate and try to find a just solution to the present situation. We have inherited the legacy of the past. We are facing a difficult adversary. There are the results of a lost war. But we know how to defend Pakistan. Those handful of individuals who are attacking me are negative people, motivated by feelings of revenge. Had their politics been right, we would not be in the mess in which we are today.

To Indian leaders I say respectfully “please stop advising me”. At the AICC session the other day, some of them said Bhutto should do this and do that. I tell them “if you do not want a settlement then do not have a settlement but stop advising me. There is no need for that”. Indian leaders should be reasonable. We are their neighbours and we believe in being fair. We are trying our best to have peace with justice. If they think that because they have won the war, they can take any advantage of Pakistan, they should realize that it will not work. They also said that Pakistan should not support minority groups in India. Well, I have not set eyes on a Sikh for 25 years. As for Mizos and Nagas and what India says about Pakistan trying to support them, I wish India had followed the same principle herself in East Pakistan and not invaded it and committed aggression against it with its armed forces. I do not believe in intervening in the affairs of other countries. This is known to India and to the rest of the world. Pakistan had never been an aggressor. It was India who had military intervention in Kashmir, Hyderabad, Junagadh and East Pakistan. Whom is India trying to fool? India says it will not and does not interfere in Pakistan’s internal affairs. It say that it is doing nothing in some of our provinces. Well, India has done what it could but our people in these provinces are happy and satisfied. They are running their own governments and look forward to the future with hope. So what does India mean by statements of this kind? We want friendly relations between our

two countries. I think both our peoples wanted it also. There have been three wasteful wars in 25 years. But we do not want peace if it means compromising on fundamental principles it has been said that Pakistan should not support the Kashmiris right of self-determination. It was Nehru himself who supported this right and the entire world community. Remarks have been made in India that my present tours are in order to raise money. I want to tell them that we do not beg from our friends. We are a self-respecting nation. Such remarks should not be made. Some Indian leaders have also expressed fears of Pakistan arming itself. If their intentions are honest what are they afraid of. It has also been said that I change my stand everyday. I say in reply what can I do when I have to deal with such treacherous and undependable people.

Statement issued on June 10, 1972

I have returned to the country after a long voyage undertaken in the name of Pakistan, to report to our people the outcome of my mission, a mission whose success has been marred only by recent incidents of violence in the land. Who does not know, who does not understand the formidable challenge Pakistan faces? Is it not clear that a variety of inimical forces have synchronized their actions. We have to reckon with these forces.

I am not the head of a desk-bound Government without vision or feeling. We have not barricaded ourselves into isolation. We will not allow events to overtake us. We have done our duty with courage and determination to clear the debris. Every human endeavour is being made to salvage the situation. Take the journey I have concluded today. Apart from the physical strain it entailed, it was a hard mental and moral task.

It is tragic that a well-planned and well-timed intrigue should have been stage to undermine the successes that came to Pakistan as a result of this diplomatic initiative. Let the people judge. They are endowed with the finest commonsense. I appeal to them to use this inherent virtue of theirs to arrive at an objective assessment. They should ask, why now, of all times, should the labour situation have exploded in Karachi. The new labour policy introduced was widely welcomed, production was on the increase, as indeed, it must following the devaluation of our currency. A fresh confidence was returning to a bruised nation. And now, in the process of this march forward attempts are being made, at this very time, to halt the wheels of industry. Everyone knows what will happen if there is industrial depression. Prices will soar, there will be further unemployment, unrest and strife, there will be disorder and chaos. Can a country which is torn with dissidence and unrest, make an economic breakthrough or even hope to survive if this is to be the performance, if this is to be the approach to a total crisis? Please search your minds and hearts for an answer to this question.

I can tell, and there is no doubt in my mind, that the trouble in Karachi is not accidental, neither the language issue nor the

strife in labour. It has been master -minded and coordinated to cast its long shadow on the negotiating table in Delhi. The implications are obvious for any country in our predicament. We need not look far to see what other nations do in such circumstances. We need only to look at our neighbour and adversary. Has India not got language problems? Has India not got chronic unemployment? Has India not got illiteracy, want and hunger? But for the time being the people of India have set aside their domestic quarrels to concentrate all their efforts and energies to assert their advantage against Pakistan in the critical days lying ahead. We need to exercise national discipline and responsibility to advance our national interests at the negotiating table.

Let us look at the labour situation. We have the highest respect for our working classes. We have their mandate and their support. It was the Pakistan People's Party which was the first to articulate their problems and raise the banner of social revolution. We consolidated the forces of labour and we led them to victory. How can we work against their interests? How can we be opposed to their just demands? The people must think and consider. They must clearly understand and identify the forces which are working against them and against Pakistan at this decisive hour.

On another front, the same forces of darkness have triggered off all over against the same controversy. Who now? Why at this time again? What is the purpose? You will recall that in my Sanghar speech I made the position on language clear and the people accepted the principle I had laid down. The constitutional position is well known to the perpetrators of disorder. Urdu's position has been spelt out and the position of other languages has also been delineated. There is no genuine controversy. There is no genuine fear. But why are processions being taken out in the streets and language defence fronts being formed? Certainly not for the sudden love of a language. Discerning observers will not that the passions being whipped up are artificial, devoid of any sincere desire to save one or the other language from dying. Everyone knows that there is not heart to any language, national or provincial. All will flourish side by side.

I am pained to have to say these things, but look at what has happened. I have come back from this journey strong and resolute in spirit because we have won laurels for Pakistan. Everywhere we received support for Pakistan's position. In country after country, people and governments rallied for our just cause, assuring us of their solidarity and promising to stand behind us. There was deep jubilation in my heart because I know that we had vindicated Pakistan's position and that we could go to Delhi strengthened in our resolve for a durable peace with equity. But two days before I was to come back, there were these ugly incidents in Karachi. These incidents synchronised rather precisely with my return. They have sought to set our success to naught. They have tried to cut our hands, the limbs of Pakistan, those who are responsible for these tragic events would like us to face India, weak, divided and dissent ridden. We will not be brow beaten nor will we succumb to agitational politics. We are in the midst of a crusade for a New Pakistan. We will not permit anyone to stand in our way. Let me put everyone on notice that we will carry our cause with determination to the end.

I appeal to the people of Pakistan to think dispassionately, analyse with maturity the mischief of forces that are at work against us. These are not imaginary elements. They have been at work against Pakistan since its inception. True they have succeeded in the recent past but we will not allow them now to succeed in their efforts to complete the liquidation of Pakistan. This will never happen.

If the negotiations at Delhi are to succeed on the basis of the principles which we hold inviolable, then, my dear countrymen, you must always keep in mind that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

Now let me inform you of my visit to the Middle East and Africa. This tour was undertaken, as I have explained before, in continuation of my visit to eight countries of this region in January. These countries stood by Pakistan and in doing so upheld the principles and values of the Charter of the United Nations and Bandung. These countries continue to abide by the General Assembly Resolution of 7th December and the Security Council Resolution of 21st December, 1971. one hundred and four member states of the United Nations supported the

principles of Territorial integrity and non-intervention. Although I tried to cover many countries., it was simply not possible to visit all the countries that boldly supported Pakistan's position. This does not, in any manner, mean that we hold them in less esteem or regard. We are equally thankful to them.

In the course of our discussions in all the capitals , we explained the dynamics of the new order we have established and the gigantic task of reconstruction we have undertaken. Also conversed in depth was the situation in the subcontinent in the context of our forthcoming discussions with India. I am happy to inform you that everywhere our viewpoint was appreciated and we received understanding and support on our basic position. This can be seen from the joint communiqués and statements issued in all fourteen capitals.

Our first stop was Abu Dhabi. His highness the Shaikh was with us only last month and the warm reception accorded to us was in keeping with the close and fraternal ties which bind the Union of Arab Emirates and Pakistan. His highness reaffirmed the solidarity that characterizes our relations. The same day, we visited Kuwait and were greeted with brotherly regard. Our discussions were wide ranging and symbolic of the existing identity of views between us.

The next day, we traveled to Baghdad. We were accorded a warm welcome by President Hasan Al-Bakr and his Government. It was after more than a decade that contact at this level was renewed with Iraq. The discussions held were valuable. Our stay was further enriched by a visit to the sacred shrines of Baghdad, including the Mazars of Hazrat Gha us-ul-Azam, Hazrat Imam Abu-Hanifa, and the Kaemain.

We then proceed to the Lebanon an Arab country where the people for two faiths, Islam and Christianity, maintain a sagacious understanding and unity. We were treated with gracious hospitality, and also understanding was shown for our position on fundamental issues.

Our next stop was Amman. King Hussain and the people of Jordan accorded us a touching welcome. In the spirit of Islamic brotherhood they have shared our difficulties, and expressed their support for Pakistan.

In Saudi Arabia the King traveled to Jedda to meet us. We not only received warm hospitality and wise counsel but also had the satisfaction of a pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina.

My sojourn in Saudi Arabia was one of the greatest experiences of my life, as in the life of any Muslim. I went to the two holy cities to seek spiritual strength and to pray for the future well being of Pakistan and our spiritual strength and to pray for the future well being of Pakistan and our people. It was indeed a great honor to have been admitted within the portals of the Khana-i-Kaaba. It is only once a year that they are opened. King Feisal, who is a pious Muslim, sensing the deep yearning I had to enter the Holy of holies, ordered that the doors of the Kaaba be opened to me. I prayed, in all humility, for our people, for strength and for Allah's blessings in the difficult days that life ahead. We went to the Masjid-i-Nabvi to offer Friday prayers and Allah, in His magnanimity, saw fit to permit a fallible individual like me to stand and pray from the Mehrab where the Prophet of Islam (Peace be upon him) stood and prayed. Later we were allowed inside the Rauza-i-Mubarak of the Holy Prophet.

That I should have been chosen for these penultimate honors in the life of a Muslim, is a vindication of the people's will, the people who have elected me to lead them and serve Pakistan.

After completing the Middle Eastern tour I was the first Head of state with ours and with which we are determined to have ever-increasing contacts based on principles which unify the Third World.

Our first stop was Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia. This fraternal country has not only stood by us but its leadership and people clearly desire closer political and economic links with the people of Pakistan.

The next country on our itinerary was Ethiopia. Here we were given a splendid and colorful welcome. I found my discussions with Emperor Haile Selassie most illuminating. He is a wise and experienced ruler who attaches great importance to principles of international conduct without which the world community may well dissolve into anarchy and chaos.

We then traveled to Khartoum in the Sudan. Under their leader, President Numeiry, the brotherly Sudanese people have upheld our cause and are keen to develop ties in all fields, a desire we warmly reciprocate. Sudan's support to us is reinforced by their dedication to the ideals of Islamic unity and social justice.

We then flew across the continent to Lagos, capital for Nigeria, the largest nation in Africa. Having known attempted secession and its consequences, she attaches great importance to international principles of sovereignty and integrity of nation states and non-interference. I found my talks with General Gowon and his colleagues most valuable.

Conakry the capital of the Democratic Republic of Guinea was our next stop. We received a most stirring and spontaneous reception from President Ahmed Sekou Toure and his people. Apart from valuable discussions, I also had the honor of addressing a large assembly at the People's Hall where President Toure not only showed the warmth of his feelings for Pakistan but also spoke eloquently for the rights of oppressed people every where.

The last country visited in Africa was Mauritania, the only other Islamic Republic in the world. We received warm and generous hospitality from President Daddah and the people. Our talks were friendly and fruitful.

We turned homewards thereafter and reached Izmir, in Turkey. Here I presided over a conference of our Ambassadors in the Middle East and Africa. This was an occasion to share views and to give broad directives for our current foreign policy.

I had a brief but valuable meeting with President Cavdat Sunay and his colleagues at Ankara, and then reached the hospitable capital of our fraternal neighbor, Iran. As everyone knows in Pakistan the Shahinshah is a sincere friend and well-wisher of Pakistan. He is familiar with our problems. My talks with him were extremely useful. Apart from reviewing the situation in the subcontinent, we also discussed the problems of the region and possibilities of still closer co-operation. He apprised me of President Nixon's visit to Teheran.

I missed no opportunity of addressing Pakistani Communities. I informed them about the situation at home and the many reforms introduced by my Government. I also urged them to maintain the trust placed in them by their country of residence through loyalty and hard work.

For a variety of good reasons I undertook this journey. It was necessary to meet and consult friends and neighbors on the eve of our crucial negotiations with India. To sum up the accomplishments of our mission, I would say that all the countries we visited upheld the United Nations and Bandung principles, reaffirmed their support for the U.N. Resolutions of 7th and 21st December, 1971, reiterated their support for Pakistan, condemned aggression and foreign intervention, and demanded the withdrawal of troops and the return of POWs in accordance with the Geneva Conventions and the United Nations Resolution.

While our friends abroad lent us full support, certain elements at home have suggested, directly and by innuendo that the agreement, if any, that is to take place at Delhi has already been reached. Can anything be more absurd? These allegations come not from the people but from a coterie of dissident and disgruntled individuals of yesterday. I consider it an insult to take seriously these charlatans.

We are the creation of the people and we have their trust. We have established in Pakistan the principle of accountability and we have implemented this principle at every step. Our actions have been and will remain subject to the judgment of the people. We will, as we always have, carry out their mandate.

The negotiations with India are not going to be easy and we should have no illusions. I have pointed out repeatedly that we have to face the aftermath of war. We lost half our country and nearly 90,000 of our men are in Indian POW camps. No disengagement has taken place, in fact, there have been serious incidents on the borders. I have expressed the people's feelings for a peaceful settlement based on equity. The search for peace is hard and arduous but circumstances make it necessary.

An effort is being made, sincerely and with courage, to settle our differences with India at the conference table. For the first time the people are being taken into confidence and kept fully informed. For the first time realism is coming into play as against political deceit. We seek peace and we will make our contribution to the achievement of this peace. A peace built on principles and not on the changing exigencies of power politics. People speak of political realities but political realities change only principles are permanent.

To those who allege that we are already committed to the outcome of the forthcoming negotiations with India, I say I have no commitment except my commitment to the people and to the supreme interest of Pakistan.

Coming back to the internal situation, I have summoned the Governor and the Chief Minister of Sindh to meet me with their officials for a through run-down on the situation. I need not assure labor that I have always kept and will continue to keep their interests uppermost. I will also call the custodians of the languages so that we have no misunderstanding on either side.

I grieve for the bereaved families of those who died at Karachi. Money cannot make amends for the irreparable loss of invaluable human lives. Nevertheless, compensation will be paid to the families of all those who lost their lives. A judicial enquiry will be held. All genuine demands will be met. I will do all that is required. But, my dear workers, will you not listen to me and stop gheraos and jalaos? Please do listen to me because I speak for you and your children. Sons of the laboring classes, the day of judgment awaits all of us. I tell you as your friends, as your brother to harkens to my appeal. Believe me, your interest is supreme.

I did not struggle for the people of Pakistan to see this day of Pakistanis killing Pakistanis. I did not leave for foreign lands to see trouble behind my back. I will not permit fratricidal violence. At the same time as the Head of State, I cannot but do my duty to see that the forces of anarchy and chaos do not hold sway.

I shall also all the student leaders and the representatives of labor. I shall summon editors and intellectuals. I must meet all sections of people before I leave for India. With all my friends

and brothers, with all our youth , we shall have a dialogue to settle every problem in the collective interest.

Let us trust each other, stand together and move forward to build Pakistan.

In the end I would like to thank all members of my entourage, both officials and non -officials, the journalists who accompanied me and the crew of the Pakistan International Airlines which did a splendid job. Without the help and co - operation of everyone this journey of hope and fulfillment would not have been possible.

Interview with Peter Grubbe, Editor of German Weekly Magazine Stern on June 15, 1972

Question: The last time I was up here, was in Karachi, in the beginning of October and met your unfortunate predecessor. One of the things, I was quite surprised to hear Yahya say to me was, do you know Willy Brandt? And I said well, by chance, I knew him "well". So he said: "You know if you see him, give him the message that we would very much implore him to mediate, to try to mediate with this problem". I said I will certainly pass on the message. We printed this story. I had a feeling then Yahya was really getting desperate, he didn't know where to go. I came back with the impression he was lost.

President: He was a loss to us but that's all gone now.

Question: One of my colleagues called Mrs. Gandhi the steel butterfly, and I think it's quite an apt description. She is an extraordinary person. I knew her father quite well. I would like to sit underneath the table and listen to your conversation with her because it will be one of the most fascinating encounters. What do you expect from it?

President: It's difficult to tell. I haven't had a meeting with Mrs. Gandhi for a long time, not since she was Information Minister. My country was not dismembered and the situation was entirely different. Now it's difficult to forecast. It depends so much on what is in their mind, what they want, what their objectives are.

Question: What are your ideas for the future policy, for the future position of your country? I mean, looking back, when India led the neutral group you had the alliance with the United States. Then you let that slip and you played quite a role in getting connections with Russia. I remember when you were a Minister doing an oil deal with the Russians for Pakistan. You have good relations with China. What do you envisage? First, would you agree with me that Asia or this part of Asia, is now dominated by the rivalry between Russia and China?

President: I wouldn't say dominated by, but certainly it has come very much under its shadow. They have their differences, ideological differences and geographical disputes. All these factors certainly have their say in the situation.

Question: What is your idea of the future role Pakistan could play in this? There are a number of possibilities. You could be the power which curbs India. India, is perhaps on the way to becoming the superpower for Asia.

President: Going back to history, some countries who tried to do so were stopped after the Second World War and in Europe there was a great deal of tension and confrontation. Things didn't crystallize in Europe as such and as far as Asia is concerned, THERE WAS NO Yalta for Asia. There were at the time some vague questions about the role of China and Chiang Kai-shek and giving India independence or having British guard position in the Indian Ocean. There is no blockade in Asia as you had a blockade in Europe-first political and when they tried to break it, you put the military blockade. Well in Asia there is no legal blockade, no international or political blockade, so the road is free and whoever then has the tenacity, the courage, the vision and takes the necessary gambles, makes progress.

On the one hand, the Soviet Union is pursuing a diplomacy of initiative and confidence in Asia, giving to the world what she has, she attaches as much importance to Asia as to Europe. On the other hand, historically speaking, the United States Administrations successively especially the democratic administration, have always given the impression they're more interested in Europe and less interested in Asia. As far as Mr. George Ball was concerned, he couldn't give a damn what happened in Asia. The United States has Asian interests too because she's a Pacific power, but the center of gravity has been the east coast looking to Europe and not the west coast looking to Asia. So with the background plus the Vietnam exhaustion and the breaking of so many assumptions of United States policy, the mood of the United States, her policy vis-à-vis the Soviet approach, appears to an outsider as a more passive approach. As for China, she is building herself, past, China has exercised great restraint and all her efforts have been to break her isolation but with dignity. China is still building herself. United

States is getting exhausted and the Soviet Union is neither getting exhausted nor feeling her role to be unnatural in Asia.

Question: That's right. Now there are two possibilities. If you succeed, if Indira Gandhi and you were to succeed in doing what Germany and France have done after the last war, that would mean that South Asia, India and Pakistan, could find a base to work together. South Asia or the subcontinent could become a centre of power or a conglomeration of power in its own right.

President: These possibilities are clearly there but not in such precise shape, but the possibilities are there. In the first place, the Franco-German détente or collaboration came after a terrible war. Our war was bad but it was not as terrible as the war that took place in Europe and, of course, the European society was technologically more advanced and you could make effective use of your collaboration. As far as we are concerned, let us face it that we are both underdeveloped countries and we are both heavily dependent on foreign assistance. Our people have not yet entered the modern world in the sense of its totality. So you cannot make an exact analogy between the Franco-German situation and the Indo-Pak situation. I would venture to welcome collaboration with India and our whole effort is going to be to have a new era between the two peoples on the basis of mutual self-respect. But we must also be objective and consider whether this collaboration is going to immediately render powerful economic results or whether it's going to be a long process. The process is bound to be long because we're under duress and, secondly, we can't make a complete dash and reach the top straightaway because our relations have been so bad that we can only go slowly, slowly, step by step. Our economies also would not be able to stand the strain of a sudden onrush of collaboration. All these factors have to be taken into account. If there is a possibility of Indo-Pakistan collaboration leading to some genuinely viable factor, it will not be a thing of tomorrow.

Question: If you find a solution the Indians would certainly, especially Indira as I know her, insist that Pakistan recognize a certain leadership of India. Did you see in a December issue of the Economist a picture of Indira as empress of India. That's how she wants it?

President: Well, she can't get it, because we want friendship, not leadership, we have resisted great power hegemonies. We have resisted the hegemony of the United States. We have resisted the hegemony of other powers. We threw the British out. Internally, our leadership has fought two terrible dictators. We have risked our life, we've gone through a struggle, and we are not going to take anyone's leadership. Neither are we going to take the leadership of the United States, nor the Soviet Union, China and, above all, we are not going to take leadership of India. Friendship, in the fullest measures, yes.

Question: Aren't you afraid the Chinese will make use of you against India?

President: That depends on us because if we are going to be stupid and allow ourselves to be used by foreign powers, then if it's not China it might be somebody else. But our experience in dealing with China since 1950 when we recognized China is not this.

Question: Mr. President, one of the things which will come up at this conference and one of the subjects you will not be able to avoid, neither you nor Mrs. Gandhi, is the question of Kashmir. You said in an earlier interview that you insist on self-determination. In many ways you're in the same position as Adenauer was after the war. Of course, you have less industrial resources than we had, but at least, one can compare. So what is your position on Kashmir.

President: If I am in the same position as Dr. Adenauer – and to strike a personal note here, he was extremely fond of me. I was a very young Foreign Minister and I had many meetings with him and he was very kind and he got to like me very much. I respected him deeply as well. But you see you have answered my question already. Willy Brandt is showing flexibility because Adenauer did not show it. So you have to have an Adenauer in Germany to produce a Willy Brandt. You would not have produced a Willy Brandt if you had not had an Adenauer. I am in the position in which Adenauer was. Well, some Willy Brandt abandoning principles. These adjustments become principles. There is a new climate in Europe there's a new necessity. At one time the Russians when they got up in the morning, before they brushed their teeth, they called you revanchists, when they went

to sleep they called you revanchists, when they put the light out they called you revanchists. The Russians are not calling you that any more there's collaboration. Things are settling down and as a result of it, Mr. Brandt can now make a principle out of the use of Ostpolitik.

Question: Mr. President, to come to something else, the problem of un-employment in the Third World is becoming the problem of the 70's. it is also one of your biggest headaches. How did you see your country dealing with it?

President: Yes, we have a serious economic problem on our hands and we have taken some steps. We'll take more steps to rationalize our economy to have a proper functional relationship between the public and the private sections, to mobilize resources, to have a proper taxation system and to have public works programme for development and employment.

We have only recently devalued our currency massively. And these are measures to show that we're trying to put our economy back on the rails. Of energetic manpower, more energetic than in other parts of our region – and hard – working people. They take to the machine easily and they don't take long to get their hands used to machines, to tractors. They're good innovators. For instance, in my country we are producing surgical instruments which are used even I think in your own country and they're distributed all over the world. And it's not easy to make things of that kind, things like surgical instruments. It's very difficult. They make them in small houses. You think that it's some little hut in which some poor people are living, who's not even having anything to eat and you go inside and they're making surgical instruments. We have hard-working people, we have resourceful people and they take quickly to new ideas. And then, of course, we have our resources, our cotton for instance. We are increasing our cotton production.

Question: Mr. President, I agree with you, but this is something which is very little known abroad. If you could only succeed in making this known to Europe. If you see how many factors, have gone over to a place like Singapore, not only Rollex, but also Siemens. Number of German Factories are not producing the Rollex camera in Germany any longer but only in Singapore.

President: But it's known in Britain because the Pakistanis living in Britain are the most hard-working people there.

Question: I know them I've lived for ten years in London.

President: They're very hardworking.

Question: But this is very little known is Germany. I mentioned this in my first book under the chapter heading "The Passions of Asia". It was the account of a trip down Pakistan.

President: That's what we've been called for a long time but I think now you might change your chapter after the last war. It's not the fault of our people, it's the fault of the situation we got into with two or three mad generals running amuck and they gave our whole country a bad name.

Question: yes, but I mean your country does not have as bad a name as we had after our war. We got out of it but what will, of course, make it difficult to persuade German businessmen, for instance, is their impression that things are still uncertain here. They're liable to think well, how do we know how it is going further. Is this one of the reasons also why you travel so much abroad.

President: No I have traveled abroad because our point of view has to be put across. As I said, we have had such a bad image. That has to be corrected. That's one reason. The second reason is that some countries stood by us with great fraternity and a sense of great solidarity and it's not right that before I go to India I should not go and have consultations with them, thank them and exchange views with them. I did that in January. I went to some of the Muslim countries but the rest I could not visit. We felt and, I'm sure, they felt that. It is only right morally to go there and complete the mission.

Question: But generally you would be willing to receive foreign investment to put up factories.

President: Yes. We have for this reason not nationalized or put into the state enterprise any of the foreign companies that are in Pakistan.

Question: In the first place, especially around Karachi, corruption was really bad. In Latin America, it's even worse. The whole of Asians learning, Africa is learning very fast. One sets the impression that you are trying to curb corruption.

President: Yes.

Question: It is extremely difficult. So far you have tried to persuade the people to bring their money back from Switzerland or wherever they have it.

President: You've got to put a few of them in jail for a few days.

Question: Some people say you're a socialist, I wouldn't consider you one from what I've read about you. I would say you have an inclination towards the social democrats you're standing up for social reforms which might lead to difficulties in certain sectors?

President: I don't think so. I think every country has its own conditions and we are fully in control of the situation.

Question: You have taken measures. You have announced, for instance, land reforms. So you have two opponents. You have the right-wing people who say they wouldn't dream of giving one square yard of land and you have the ultra left, who say they do not want a part of it, they want it all.

President: We are quite prepared to deal with both of them even if they collaborate with each other. But we can't do anything insensible and upset the whole equilibrium. Our reforms, objectively speaking, are basic and sensible. They go deep in breaking the feudal stronghold. I have said repeatedly that all we can do is to set the pace and to do the right things. I can't nationalize all the land. It's not possible. Tomorrow, if someone wants to do it, let him try. At the same time, I can't allow bigger estates to remain I must cut them down so that production increases and the feudal power is eliminated. I think both the objective will be met, the elimination of feudal power and the increase in production. The farmer will be happier because we

have transferred all the burdens on the land-owner burdens of taxation, of providing fertilizer, of seeds. And those people who get the land, are getting it without any payment because we've offered no compensation to the land-owners. I think that's a big measure of reform. The world doesn't come to an end with one reform. If that reform is proper and successful, on that you can build other reforms. But no one can sweep the boards clean in one go.

Question: Don't you fear agricultural production will go down.

President: No, that has not been our experience. That has not been the experience anywhere in the world.

Question: Chile is making this experiment. Cuba has the same experience. Chile ran into deep difficulties because they handed land over and they slipped. Do you think you can avoid that?

President: We'll avoid that.

Question: The big land-owners can use machinery, the small ones can't.

President: The small ones do it more intensively. We had land reforms in 1958 and although those land reforms were not as big as these, we have seen that the frame who gets the land works much harder on it. The land-owner with what he has got left uses tractors and tries his best too. So I don't think we have a problem there.

Question: And when you give the land to the farmers , in the beginning they need some money. Do they get credit?

President: Yes, we see to that, of course. We give them credit.

Question: How much time will you need to put the country back on its feet?

President: Five years, constitutionally speaking. So I have to try and do everything in these five years but it will take longer.

Basic problems, I think, we'll be able to tackle in these five years, but to build Pakistan according to our dreams, I think is a ten to fifteen-year process. Mujibur Rahman is determined to stay in office for 25 years. I have no such ambitions but I have got this constitutional period, so I have set my goals on the basis of this constitutional mandate. My tenure in office democratically given to me is five years. I will try my best to do whatever I can in these five years.

Question: I hope that you make it through. I also hope that you have the courage which many leaders have not, who do not tell their people what is needed. Are you willing to go and tell the people quite openly everything? For instance, if you come to an agreement with Mujib, are you going to go to the people and tell them?

President: We can never by-pass the people.

Grubbe: Thank you, very much, Mr. President.

Address to student leaders at Murree on June 18, 1972

Student leaders of all shades of opinion assured President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto of their complete support and co-operation with regard to the forthcoming negotiations with India beginning on June 28.

The President spent more than two hours with the student leaders and held frank and detailed discussions with them.

This is the first time in Pakistan's history that the students have been associated with important national matters at the highest level.

The president assured the students that there was no question of compromising on fundamental issues. The president said that Pakistan believed and was committed to the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir and could never abandon its stand. He said that it was for the Kashmiris to decide their own destiny.

The President said that peace was desired by the people of both countries and war was futile. But peace, he emphasized, must be a peace with honour a peace among equals.

The students pledged their full support to the President in his efforts to bring a durable peace to the South Asian subcontinent. They said that a handful of people were trying to mislead the nation and spreading discontent and sparking off wild speculations. They said that the students were determined not to be misled by such people.

Address to MNA's and MPA's at Murree on June 18, 1972

The president met a large representative group of legislators for more than an hour. He listened to their views on the forthcoming summit and explained to them in detail the various questions that are likely to come up for discussion.

The president said that there could be no question of accepting a compromise on fundamental principles. He emphasized the need for standing together, in order to emerge successfully through the present situation. He said that the Government would never by-pass the people nor the National Assembly. No decision would be taken without their consent.

Address to Ulemas at Murree on June 20, 1972

“The whole nation blesses your mission of peace to India and stands behind you”, a large gathering of eminent ulemas from all schools of thought told president Bhutto in Murree.

You represent our aspirations and pride, our ambitions and our hopes, they told the president. We have placed our destiny in your hands and accepted your leadership because you will not let us down, nor bargain on national honour, they declared.

President Bhutto, visibly moved, said I am only a servant of the people. I go to India with your permission and with your prayers. It is not or me to make decisions because I am only an individual. It is the people who will decide. It is the national will which shall prevail.

The president said, my heart is filled with the love of Islam and I prayed to God to give me the strength to come though these negotiations with Pakistan’s flag streaming high. I will never accept the slightest abridgement of principles.

He said that he had been thrown-up by the people and their voice was his voice, their collective will, his will. There will be no horse-trading with India, he said.

One religious leader after another stood up and blessed the President and congratulated him for having performed Umra. “It was God’s will” the president replied, h is voice tinged with emotion. Then the added, as I stood in the House of God, a soul in ecstasy I prayed for Pakistan, for the blessings of Allah and His guidance, for strength and light, for the benevolence of God and His protection. I prayed from the depth of my soul and with every fibre of my being.

Address to Educationists at Murree on June 21, 1972

President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto told a group for educationists that Pakistan will not waver from its commitment to the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

In an hour-long exchange which ranged from the forthcoming negotiations with India to the problems of education, the President explicitly stated his position on fundamental questions expected to come up during the Simla summit. He said he would make a bold and sincere search for peace and for an answer to the problems which had bedeviled the relations between the two countries since independence. He spoke of a modus vivendi and of the necessity to find a new equilibrium in the subcontinent. Principles, he emphasized, were sacred and could, in no circumstances, be compromised. He was hopeful that within that framework, provided there was goodwill and imaginative statesmanship on both sides, it would be possible to bring a durable peace to the South0asian subcontinent.

When asked about Bangladesh, the president said, it is a question which I will not raise or allow to be raised on the soil of India. He said it was a matter between the people and leaders of East and West to decide. He again emphasized that he would take no decisions on his own. I will come back to the people. I will go to the National Assembly because only the people are sovereign. Only their will shall prevail”.

The president, in reply to another question, said that there has been no contacts between the people of this part and those of East Bengal. “We have to know their minds. We have to know how they think and feel before we can decide what form our future ties will take, he said.

The President also took the opportunity to discuss with the educationists the problems of campus disorder, falling academic standards, better employment conditions for teachers and modernization of syllabi. The teachers said that the political involvement of the student community had become a matter of

deep concern. They also expressed their satisfaction with some aspects of the education policy.

One of the teachers attacked the present system of examinations and pleaded for a more meaningful teacher -pupil relationship. He said, among teachers, one was pained to see cliques and petty intrigues. There appeared to be premium on incompetence. The class room, he added, has become un - interesting and meaningless to the students. The president remarked that it was his impression that the students no longer read much. The teachers agreed with him. Libraries are full of un-drawn books, one of them commented.

Another point made was that the syllabi were not in tune with the times. Changes were made without a reference to teachers. The teachers also spoke of the left-right polarization that was being witnessed among students. The president advised the teachers to handle these problems on their own initiative and as far as possible not involving the administration.

The point was made with great emphasis on the discriminatory treatment being meted out to Government employed teachers in the matter of service conditions. The teachers criticized the concept of a separate cadre for educationists. They insisted upon being included in the national pay scales.

In conclusion, the president assured the teachers of the high priority he attached to the profession of education. He said that he was determined to give the teachers dignity, security and full protection, as should be done in any egalitarian and progressive society. Take your profession as a national mission to bring about the great change that we have struggled for, he told them.

Message of Greetings to His Royal Highness Prince Jean, Grand Duke of Luxembourg on June 22, 1972

On behalf of the Government and the people of Pakistan and on my own behalf I have great pleasure in conveying to your Royal Highness, the Government and the people of Luxembourg my warm greetings and best wishes on the happy occasion of the National Day of Luxembourg.

Accept your Royal Highness the assurances of my highest consideration.

Address to Lawyers at Murre on June 23, 1972

President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, declared to a gathering of eminent lawyers that the only pressure he recognized was the pressure of the people of Pakistan. "As far as I am concerned all foreign pressure are irrelevant."

The president said that the questions of "Bangladesh" and of concluding a settlement with India was not an election issue. it was an issue of destiny. As such, he could not ride roughshod over the people's wishes. Finally he declared, it is the nation's views which are going to prevail, not mine.

He reiterated his determination to take the question of the recognition or otherwise of "Bangladesh" to the National Assembly which, he added, was the only recognized and democratically accepted forum for ascertaining the national will.

The president said that India had no locus stand in the matter. It is for the leaders of East and West to get together and decide what form our future relations will take, he added. He said it seemed that India would prefer a continuing estrangement between East and West. If we turn our backs on our brothers in the East, other forces will step in, he remarked.

He said he was a creation of the people and had arisen from them through a popular struggle. The people are my only source. How can I betray them and their trust? He said that since the people had chosen him to lead them, it was his responsibility to show them the way, provide them the leads but it is an inter-mixture because I am basically subject to the people's will, he remarked.

The President said that while it was essential to build the nation's morale, morale was not chauvinism, as some people were trying to make out. He said that there was no question of accepting an unequal or bad settlement because a bad settlement could never work, Why should I, an individual, accept the odium when the people are with me and wish me a negotiate a durable and honourable peace, he stated. I do not wish to be

judged harshly by history. My only loyalty is to Pakistan and I will live and die for it, he said.

One man, the President said, can destroy a country, but one man cannot rebuild. Without the support of the people, I am powerless, he stated.

Message to the people of Murree on June 23, 1972

As I leave Murree after more than 10 days, I wish to greet and thank the people of Murree for their kindness and hospitality. More than anything, I thank them for their forbearance, because I am conscious of the inconvenience my stay must have caused them. No matter how informal one wishes the arrangements to be, a certain degree of formality, involving security cordons and traffic block ups does, for obvious reasons, creep in. I do hope the residents of this beautiful hill place and the visiting holiday makers will have understood and put up with it.

May I also say that I came to Murree not because I wished to escape the sweltering heat of Rawalpindi, but because I wanted to be away from all routine activities in order to devote myself fully to the crucial matters that had to be considered in depth and detail before I proceeded to India for negotiations. Anyone who is familiar with the routine working of Government will know that it becomes impossible to avoid inessential work and activity if it is based in the capital. I wanted time to reflect, time to think and I wanted to avoid being inundated by a host of minor problems and the ever flowing stream of files and papers which find their way to my desk. In Murree, I tried but I did not succeed in avoiding the files.

You must also have noticed the very large number of visitors and public representatives with whom I concerned. Obviously, it is not possible for to see everyone. I can only see so many people in a given day and no more. You will bear with me when I say that no matter how many people I do manage to see, there will always be a backlog of those whom I was unable to receive. That does not, of course, mean that my desire to meet them all was any less – it is a question of time. My intention was to meet as many people as possible from all walks of life in order to hold discussions with them and get enlightened on the crucial issues facing Pakistan. I went through this process with every good intention. I, therefore, hope that everyone will understand the inherent limitations and that nobody will take it a

miss if I was unable to meet a particular individual on this occasion. As far as I am concerned, all citizens are equal and deserve the same respect and attention.

Once again I thank the people of Murree for their hospitality and may the summer of 1972 bring you much happiness.

Address a the graduation parade at the Pakistan Naval Academy in Karachi on June 24, 1972

Chief of Naval Staff, Cadets and Midshipmen,

I am happy to be with you to review your passing out parade and address you on this auspicious occasions. I congratulate you on your excellent turn out and drill.

I am particularly happy to see young officers from the brotherly countries of Saudi Arabia, Libya, Bahrein and Oman. It is our privilege and, indeed, duty to extend whatever help we can to our Muslim brethren. I am confident that, on completion of their training, they will be able to fulfill the missions assigned to them.

Your commanding officer has referred to my interest in the Navy, Although, I do confess that I have special feelings for the sea and sea-farers, but even if it was not so, I can assure you that my Government – unlike some of the previous ones – would not neglect the maritime requirements of our country the continued progress, prosperity and well being of our people depend almost entirely on the economic development plans on which we are embarked. To support and sustain these plans we must trade, and, as you well know, all our external trade will continue to be carried by ships. Therefore, increases envisaged in our sea-borne trade and merchant ships are indispensable elements of our economic development. Besides, the sea also provides the surest, safest and most economical communications between Pakistan and her friends and neighbors.

Our national interests, in peace and in war, rest heavily on the safety of sea -communications and uninterrupted flow of goods. The safeguard these interests, the need for a balanced and modern navy is undeniable.

Our Navy is small. While we are doing everything within our limited resources to enhance its capability, we must make up in quality and sophistication what we lack in quantity. For, in the final analysis, it is the quality of officers and men which is the single most important factor in any fighting service. It is not unusual for Muslims to fight against heavy odds. The people of Pakistan have been doing so ever since the inception for our country and even before.

To the officers passing out today, I would say that everything possible is being done and will be done to train and equip you for the task ahead. Your mission in life will be to man and use to the best advantage the sophisticated and modern equipment of the Navy that we are in the process of building. You will have to work continuously with devotion and single mindedness to accomplish your sacred mission. Your service and your country expects a great deal from you. I am sure that by the grace of Allah, you will not be found lacking.

I wish you all the very best of luck.

Discussion with labor leaders, students and prominent citizens at Karachi on June 25, 1972

In a frank exchange of views with top labor leaders president Z. A. Bhutto said that the entire spectrum of labor problems was under his personal scrutiny and he was closely watching the industrial lockout situation.

Beside the labor leaders the president also held a series of meetings with representative groups of students and the intelligentsia in continuation of similar meetings to elicit have views of the people on the forthcoming summit and other matters of fundamental national importance.

The President told the labor leaders that he had been deeply pained at the recent happenings in Karachi in which many precious lives were lost. My anguish is as great today as it was when I first learnt of what had happened. He said, he wanted industrial peace so that Pakistan could grow and prosper. He was always deeply mindful of the problems facing the working classes and would not permit any injustice to be done to them.

Talking to the student leaders the President said, that there was no question of by-passing the national Assembly in the matter of recognition of "Bangladesh" or any other matter of fundamental national importance.

He told the students that they should not allow issues such as language to divide them. We must live together if we are to survive, he said. The president added that there was no real controversy on the language question. The place of the national language and regional languages had been clearly laid down. Those who were trying to divide the people today on this issue had ulterior motives.

All languages, the president said, should co-exist and flourish together. He told the student leaders to persuade their

followers not to fight among themselves. You are the new generation, he said, if you cannot learn to remain united, what will become of Pakistan? The president asked.

The president's meeting with a representative group of the intelligentsia was characterized by frank and fruitful discussion. The president was assured that he was going to India with the entire nation behind him. We trust your Judgment and your ability to negotiate an honorable peace with India. We know and believe that you will not do anything to damage the national interest. You have the people's confidence, the intellectuals told the president.

The President said that every issue would be referred to the people through their elected representative. The only durable peace was a fair peace, the only kind of peace he would make a determined search for. He said that the task before him was grave but he had no doubt that with courage and determination and national unity, Pakistan's difficulties would be overcome. We will proceed cautiously, step by step. I am sure we will not falter, he added.

The president said that within the framework of fundamental principles there was plenty of scope for give-and-take, provided there was a genuine willingness on the part of India to find a lasting and fair settlement.

Statement at a press conference held at Karachi on 25, 1972

Gentlemen, I am very happy to meet you after such a long time. The Chief Minister and the Governor of Sindh told me before I came here that you feel that there has not been enough contact between us and we have not met for a long time. Both suggested that we should meet at Karachi. It is my pleasure to meet you. We are old friends. If I have not held a press conference in Karachi this does not mean that I have forgotten my friends.

I have spoken a great deal on basic problems that face us, problems about which I have talked in Murree, and I have given interviews to a number of foreign correspondents and that was being deliberately done to put all the mosaic pieces together.

Here also this morning, I had productive discussions with students and labor leaders and other people whom you generally call intelligentsia. We talked about our relations with India, talked about East Pakistan or Bangladesh, I do not know what you prefer to say, but Dacca authorities should be more precise so that both the points of view are covered. And I told them what I have been telling others and now I tell you that I leave for Lahore tomorrow. We are in Lahore for two days and on the 28th morning at about 11:00 we leave for Chandigarh and from Chandigarh to Simla.

I know that whatever the political difficulties at home, I feel, I am convinced that I am going with the blessings of all of you, the whole nation and this is a matter of great satisfaction to me that we might fight at home, tear hair apart and get angry and excited with each other about there are moments like this, the present one. I know I have your blessings and I have your good wishes and this means a great deal and I believe this means more to me than any things else. And I can assure you, I am from you I belong to you. I cannot do anything which is not in the interest of Pakistan.

I have said that as far as any fundamental decisions are concerned which I feel might be of controversial nature, those will not be taken. Those, I will come back to Pakistan and report to you but finally report to the National Assembly of Pakistan. National Assembly with all its limitations is the only democratic procedure from which you can get a people's verdict. And we will go to the National Assembly when it is convened on the 14th August and we will place the fundamental problems before the assembly. After that we can meet Indian leaders again. Why should this be the first and the last meeting? I could not understand the logic of it when at Tashkent the argument was used that clear the decks and do everything here and leave nothing for the future. No one can put a full-stop to history. You can put commas or semicolons but last page of history is never written.

We can continue discussions with India. From our discussions we will see the Indian attitude. If they want to live in peace, we want to live in peace. Step by step, build every achievement towards peace and build the edifice on that basis. We are prepared. Why does India want guarantees from Pakistan for peace? It is Pakistan which needs guarantees from India. India is the bigger country. India is a more resourceful country. India's military machine now has become formidable. Smaller countries have suffered from Indian attacks again and again culminating in 1971. It is we who need assurances.

You might ask me why I do not call the assembly before. The point is that I will come back to Pakistan in the beginning of July and like to meet Mr. Mujibur Rahman and that will also be sometime in July. We will try to arrange a meeting because immediately after I come back to Pakistan I have to be a short time at home having discussions, and attending to other internal matter. Either in the middle of July or at the end of July I will meet Mr. Mujibur Rahman, I hope. This is our effort. The Assembly will in any case meet on August 14. So it fits in very well with the anticipated developments in the matter. And I repeat again I will discuss in India, Indo-Pakistan problems, short term as well as long term. As far as Bangladesh is concerned, I have made the position quite clear that these are matters between us and the leader of East Pakistan. They do not concern, strictly speaking, India although of course there are overlapping considerations, but they essentially concern us and

the leaders of East Pakistan. We are prepared to go to Dacca but if they do not think it is right and if Mr. Mujibur Rahman does not want to come here, we can meet anywhere. It is a pretty big world. I am prepared to meet him anywhere to discuss our relationship a kind of relationship that we discussed between 27th December and 7th January, 1972, after that we will come to Pakistan and the Assembly will be called. As we go to the Assembly, we go to the people. This is the position.

Message on Launching of integrated Rural development programme on June 25, 1972

In my directive to the provincial governments and the central government Ministries concerned I had emphasized the importance of the integrated Rural Development Programme to make our country self-sufficient in food and to earn badly needed foreign exchange to build up our shattered economy. So far we have tried many plans under the Basic Democracies system, village AID, Agricultural Development Corporation but they have failed due to various reasons. To my mind the main cause of all these failures was poor execution. Probably integrated Rural Development Programme is our last hope to improve the economic position of our vast majority of small farmers and thus improve the quality of life in villages, afford employment opportunities, reduce the gap between the urban and rural areas so that the people living in the villages may participate with their colleagues in the cities with pride in political, social and economic life of the country.

I am very happy to learn that the four provincial governments have prepared their plans on Integrated Rural Development with necessary modifications to suit their own conditions based on the recommendations of the Integrated Rural Development Committee and in the light of my directive. The necessary amount has also been budgeted in the Annual Development Programme and provincial governments are all set to launch the programme on 1st July, 1972 simultaneously.

I would like to point out that no amount of money would be adequate to make the programme a success unless we change our approach and start the programme with dedication and missionary spirit based on the principles of self-reliance, self-financing and full accountability. In the past very good programmes have been formulated but they failed because no one was made accountable for the success of the programme. I would, therefore, appeal to all concerned to make the very best use of our limited resources and evolve a mechanism whereby every functionary in the field not only gets a sense of

participation but feels the responsibility to produce the results against which his performance would be judged either to be a rewarded or fired.

We cannot afford the luxury of sophisticated methods and equipment which require pumping of unlimited amount of money. We are a poor country. Therefore, our approach must be simple, unorthodox, practical and maximum efforts be made to use unconventional methods based on human ingenuity to achieve our goals. Example should be set by the Government functionaries and no one should feel ashamed to do the manual work in the field alongwith our farming community.

In order to affect the economy there must be a full integration at the lowest level and very close co-ordination between the integrated Rural development Programme and the works programme. In fact the works programme should prove a catalytic agent to enthuse and inspire the rural population to help themselves. All nation building departments, functionaries, farmers, scientists and private sector should form a well knit team marching towards a common goal. This is only possible if we all work with a national spirit without inter-departmental jealousies, frictions, prejudices and without caring as to who gets the credit.

The programme has been based on Shadab Pilot Project where continuous experiments should be carried out so that it acts as a mother institution to feed all other projects. The Central Ministry of Food, Agriculture & Underdeveloped Areas should play a predominant role in policy guidelines, follow up actions, co-ordination and evaluation. This may require some changes in the organization and functions of the Ministry particularly because integrated Rural Development Programme can go a long way in developing such areas in the four provinces but the special attention must be paid to Baluchistan and NWFP. This may require sponsoring by the Central Government some special projects in these provinces.

I would also like to appeal to the private sector and other national and international agencies concerned directly or indirectly with the development or agriculture to extend all possible help to make this programme a success. The participation of private sector in Shadab Pilot Project is quite

encouraging but there is a need to expand their activities in all the projects in the four provinces. The private sector can participate in various activities to diversify and commercialize agriculture such as mechanized farming, transportation, warehousing, construction of cheap houses, agro industries, supply of inputs and marketing operations.

We will know the pivotal role which credit plays in the development of agriculture. Apart from the agricultural development bank, I hope all other commercial banks would join in the programme. As far as the Agricultural Development Bank is concerned there is a need to reorientate the role of this bank so that it takes part in the development for agriculture in the real sense. I shall address the bankers, private sector, scientists, industrialist and the farmers in this regard in the near future.

No one can deny the necessity to educate our farmers about the programme. Therefore, there is need to organize well coordinated programme through various media i.e. Radio Press, Television, Seminars not only to pool and integrate our thinking but also to motivate every one with full sense of participation. The programme must be expanded gradually but farmers must feel the impact by the end of Kharif this year. I have already repeatedly emphasized that no programme should be thrust from the top. The people from the rural areas - must make their own plans according to their felt needs under their own leaders and this is where the local bodies set up will help in encouraging the local leadership.

At this stage when the programme is well poised to be launched on 1st July, 1972, I urge everyone concerned with the programme to go ahead with full confidence and courage to meet the challenge. You will be judged by the results that you produce.

Message to General Hafez-Al-Assad, president of the Syrian Arab Republic and Mr. Suleman Franjeh, President of Lebanon, on June 26, 1972

Last weeks Israeli raid across the border of Lebanon resulting in loss of valuable human lives and injuries to innocent civilians and abduction of Lebanese and Syrian Officers has deeply shocked the Government and people of Pakistan who once again reiterate their solidarity with the Arab brethren in their struggle against Zionism we strongly condemn this dastardly act which would surely be deplored by all peace-loving peoples throughout the world. We hope that in the discharge of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security the Security Council would condemn these acts of aggression, secure release of officers and adopt effective measures to prevent Israel from again disrupting peace in the region.

Address at a Meeting of MNA's and MPA's of Punjab at Lahore on June 26, 1972

If I can walk out of Tashkent I can walk out of Simla. Buti will never be party to national dishonour.

The President said that sovereignty lay with the people, and only their will shall prevail. He said that he would not sign anything nor come to a decision on fundamental questions without a direct reference to the people through heir elected representatives in the National Assembly.

He reiterated that the decisions which may have to be made in the coming months will be the de cisions of the whole nation and not of an individual, even though that individual already had a full and complete mandate from the people to negotiate peace with India.

It is not a party question. It involves he destiny of the nation. Procedural and routine matters, he added, could perhaps be settled in his meeting with the Indian leaders but go fundamental or basic issues will be decided except in the National Assembly.

The President said that he was hoping to meet Sheikh Mujibur Rahman some time in J uly anywhere. He said that various friendly countries had offered their good offices in this regard, including Great Britain. UAR and Indonesia.

The meeting, which the President described as the last and the most important of the session he has been havi ng with a cross-section of leaders of public opinion, was significant for the complete identity of views expressed by the leaders of all the opposition parties in the Punjab Assembly.

One after the other, the opposition leaders to do up to express their complete and unreserved faith in the President's leadership and his ability to conclude an honuorable peace with India. On behalf of their parties they assured him of their total rust in his judgment. As one of them said, the nation can have no

more competent advocate than yourself. You go with our blessings and our prayers.

The opposition leaders said that irrespective of party affiliations they had accepted the Presidents leadership during these difficult times. They told him that the nations honour and destiny were safe in his hands.

Address to the nation on June 27, 1972

Tomorrow I am leaving for discussion with the Prime Minister of India. I want to take this opportunity for talking to you, fellow citizens, my brothers and sisters. I want to share with you the problems which confront us. I want to share with you our hopes for the future.

We are going to India in circumstances which are but a part of the tragic legacy we inherited. The war we have lost was not of my making. I had warned against it. But my warnings fell on the deaf ears of a power drunk Junta, they recklessly plunged our people into war and they involved us in an intolerable surrender which lost us half our country. The Junta did not know how to make peace nor did they know how to make war. Four divisions, fully equipped, were surrendered into enemy hands within fourteen days of the conflict. Over 90,000 of our people are now in enemy hands.

A first-class fighting machine had become dispirited and degenerated through continued involvement in domestic politics. Degeneration and a lack of national purpose had seriously affected all our institutions and all our attitudes. The country was on the edge of a political, economic and moral collapse.

This is the tragic situation with which we have had to deal. We have come a long way from those dark December days. Our people have been revitalized. Our Armed Forces are, under new leadership, recapturing the motivation which made them the finest in Asia, our economy is on the road to recovery.

Some disgruntled men of yesterday have the temerity to question why we are going to India. Were they asleep last December? Do they think that we should not seek the return of our prisoners of war? Do they suggest that we should allow Indians to continue their occupation of two tehsils in Sind and one in the Punjab? Do they think that we can remedy the

situation by going to the Moon? We must go to India to talk about these matters just as the Indians earlier came to Pakistan.

The past 25 years has been as era of confrontation and war in the subcontinent. With what result to the peoples of the region? They remain among the poorest most un der-fed, illiterate, ill-housed and disease-ridden in the world. It has been a heavy price and the heaviest has been paid by the poorest in the Last.

The people of Pakistan sacrificed everything, including political and economic progress, in order to build the defences for confrontation. Those who gave their blood and tears for Pakistan had to wait a generation for the advent of democracy. We had lost our hopes for the future. We have lost the largest part of our country. The history of the last 25 years makes pitiable reading.

All this must change. We must concentrate our efforts on serving the people, on introducing an era of economic growth. This does not mean that we will reduce the strength of our Armed Forces. The defence of our motherland will continue to be of supreme concern to us, but we will have to reorientate our outlook to build a new, strong and vibrant Pakistan.

The people of Pakistan must see some prosperity and progress—they have endured much hardship and sacrifice, they have suffered too long. They have a right to the chance to realize the dream which inspired the creation of Pakistan. To provide such a chance we are going to India in search of a durable peace in the subcontinent. We hope that the Indian leaders share the same sincerity of purpose.

I believe that we should give peace a chance. For nearly three decades we have quarreled while the rest of the world watched us with cynical amusement. In order to find a modus vivendi, to live as good neighbours, we must have a dialogue. That is the civilized method. The Americans are meeting the Chinese at the level of Chief Executives. At the height of the Vietnam war, peace negotiations continue. And the U.S.Soviet summit took place in Moscow at a time when war clouds were thickening.

We believe in listening to the other point of view, in making and demanding adjustments where adjustments can be made without compromising fundamental position. One reason we have failed over the years is because of the basic unwillingness to discuss issues with each other. Let us exercise this option now in our search for peace with honour.

Peace certainly cannot be imposed and yet remain durable. It must be equitable and acceptable to both India and Pakistan. It is an inherent contradiction to think that a one-sided settlement can only lead to durable peace. It can never be lasting. It can only lead to continued instability and war. This is the lesson of history.

The Treaty of Versailles which ended the First World War in Europe attempted to impose a humiliating peace on the German nation. In 15 years it was overturned and a few years later the world was submerged in a massive and bloody conflict without parallel. If we do not learn from history, we will never learn.

To achieve durable peace in the subcontinent, the existing obstacles must be removed. The consequences of the last war must be eliminated. Our prisoners of war and civilian internees must be returned, and withdrawals of the Armed Forces must be arranged forthwith. As far as the authorities in Dacca are concerned, there must be an end to the talk of war trials: and a responsible attitude must be shown towards the non-Bengalis, and the Bengali federalists, allowing them to live as honourable citizens, free from persecution.

The issue of the prisoners of war is of the most immediate concern to our people. Tens of thousands of families have been deprived of their fathers and husbands, sons and brothers. Your government has taken every measure to alleviate the hardship this has caused, but no amount of moral and material support can provide a substitute for the absent ones. Our people have shown fortitude in the face of their affliction, and, if necessary, will bear with continued separation. But India has no justification, moral or legal, for continuing to detain our men. She has flagrantly violated the Geneva conventions by holding our people prisoner for 6 months. If by doing this, the Indians think they can force us to accept humiliating terms of peace, they are mistaken.

As I have repeatedly said: “We will not barter principles of state for human flesh.”

In total violation of the resolution passed by 104 member States of General Assembly of the United Nations on 7th December, 1971 and by the Security Council on the 21st December, the Indians have refused to comply with the demand for withdrawals. How can peace be achieved unless the fruits of aggression are first relinquished? Nearly one million of our people have been rendered homeless by the continued illegal occupation of our territory. This is not the way to establish durable peace. The Indians must without further delay arrange for withdrawals of the Armed Forces.

By a curious exercise of logic, they say that they cannot return our Military personnel, nor can they withdraw from our territory, without first arriving at a permanent peace settlement. Surely, this is putting the cart before the horse. It is only by the return of our people and the withdrawal of Forces that we can hope to pave the way for a permanent peace.

The Indians would also have us abandon the right of self-determination for the people of Jammu and Kashmir. But how can we, it is not our right that is in question. It is right —the birthright of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The principle of self-determination is universally accepted. This right of the people of Jammu and Kashmir has been enshrined in numerous resolutions of the United Nations and acknowledged by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, the father of the present Prime Minister.

It is for the people of Jammu and Kashmir to assert or abandon their right of self-determination. It is for us to adhere to principles. We will not forsake our principles, whatever the consequences.

The Indians also seek a readjustment of the international frontier between our two countries to remove “irrationalities,” as they term it, but in effect to acquire more territory. Are they not satisfied with the seizure of Hyderabad, Junagadh and Manavadar, with their occupation of Kashmir, with the dismemberment of our country? By peace do they mean further

expansion? There can be no peace at the expense of our sovereignty.

Peace in the subcontinent depends on justice and goodwill. The people of Muslim Bengla have truly been through a terrible ordeal. Perhaps more than anyone else, they require a period free from strife in the Land and build it anew. This they can do by putting behind them events of the recent past. I do not believe that talk of war trials and the ill-treatment of non-bangalis and Bangali federalists can in any way contribute to peace in the future. Instead of moving forward, such measures lead back into they past, a past which has been only of a negative and destructive nature.

The people of Muslim Bengal are our brothers. Together we fought for our independence. Today we are estranged, but need this estrangement be permanent? This is something we have to settle with the leaders of Muslim Bengal. It concerns our two peoples. India has no locus stand in the matter. This I have repeatedly stated. It cannot be settle on the soil of India.

I hope to meet Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and then put the outcome of our discussion to the people through the elected representative in the National Assembly. In fact, there is no question of by-passing the National Assembly in any matter of fundamental national importance.

The task which lies ahead in our discussion with India is not an enviable one. But we cannot escaps from it. The people of Pakistan have reposed their confidence in me and I must fulfil the duty I owe them. The un animous vote of confidence in me passed by the National Assembly confirmed and reinforced my mandate from the people.

The crisis from end to end is not of our making. You and I warned against it. But now it is there in its fullest force for you and me to confront. I ask you to put yourself in my place. For a moment think that you are me. For I am indeed yours, in war and in peace, in distress and in joy.

Fellow citizens, ask yourself what you would do if you were in my place—further destroy Pakistan, or endeavour to make it?

How would you negotiate if you were seeking to reconstruct Pakistan.

If we are determined to make Pakistan, and vindicate national honour, you will have to exercise wisdom and patience. Slogans are wonderful but in their own place. There is a time for slogans and there is a time for reflection. There is a moment for chauvinism and another for restraint.

While the people have always seen fit to place their trust in me, I too have always reposed my confidence in them and sought their guidance and inspiration. It is for this reason that before undertaking the present mission to India, I have consulted a wide cross-section of people to explain the situation and seek their views.

Some individuals have said that there was no necessity for my holding these meetings as I am armed with the mandate of the people. But I remain firmly convinced that a dialogue with the people is a continuing process. Too long they have been denied this dialogue, and we only have to look back to December to see the results.

In the last two weeks I have talked to leaders in every field, to elected representatives, politicians of every shade of opinion, Ulema, intellectuals, editors and journalists, lawyers, teachers, students and labourers. I have also met the commanders of our Armed Forces. For the first time in the history of Pakistan, representatives of all sections have been involved in matters of vital national concern at the highest level.

I have undoubtedly gained from these exchanges as I hope have those who participated in them. The consensus that has emerged will guide me during our discussions in India.

It is heartening to know that as I go to India I carry with me the prayers and support of our people. You may rest assured that I will never let you down. I have never failed you. I shall never fail you. I hold as a sacred trust the faith and confidence you have reposed in me.

Apart from the people of our country, I have also consulted our friends and neighbours abroad. As part of this process, I

have also visited peking and Moscow, and recently sent a Special Envoy to these two capitals.

As you all know, my last Mission took me to 14 countries in the Middle East and Africa. This was in continuation of my earlier visit to eight Muslim countries in January.

The support that has been shown both at home and abroad will immeasurably strengthen my hands in negotiating terms of peace. Let no one doubt that these terms are still to be negotiated.

A final settlement cannot take place in the forthcoming negotiations with India. A decision on fundamental issues can only be taken by the people through their chosen representatives. I am going to hear what the Indian leaders have to say. I shall put our views to them. I hope we shall find some common ground for a lasting peace. I hope we can set the tone and the pace for a lasting modus vivendi.

Whatever proposals are made, they will remain dependent upon the will of our people. Whatever the outcome of the Simla meeting, its acceptance or rejection will not be for me alone to decide but for the whole nation, by you who are listening to me tonight.

The history of relations between India and Pakistan is indeed melancholy. It is one of missed opportunities and distrust. It has cost the people of the subcontinent. If the Indians reciprocate with sincerity, I believe, we can make a new beginning.

The search for peace is long and arduous. We cannot in one stroke wipe our past bitterness and suspicion. We cannot clear the heap of history in one heave. We have to move forward step by step. And at each step sincerity on both sides will be put to test.

We are prepared to discuss, now and later, about all issues within the framework of principles. There have been negotiations in the past with India right from 1947. there can be negotiations in the future. Discussions in the past may have failed to resolve

the issues. But so has the alternative—war. And the failure of talks, you will agree, is less costly than that of war.

It is better to talk directly than through intermediaries. With this in view, we are prepared to resume diplomatic relations with India. After all we did not break diplomatic relations in the 1965 war, and our Ambassadors continued at their posts till the conclusion of the last war.

For that matter it will be of mutual benefit if we reopen communications, letters and telegrams can be exchanged, over flights can start again. And it would no doubt be of benefit to the people of the region if a measure of trade were resumed in good time after due deliberations.

But this is anticipating. We have made many gestures to India, we have offered a hand of peace and, in token, the unconditional release of the Indian prisoners of war in our custody. Surely, it is now up to India to demonstrate her desire for peace in deeds rather than words. But so far India has not made a single constructive gesture to herald a new era in our relations.

We desire peace but not at any price. We desire peace but not at the expense of our principles and honour. Let no one doubt this axiomatic proposition. I repeat we seek a just and honourable peace, a peace at the service of our people.

We have a difficult task ahead, a task made all the more difficult by certain forces at work in Pakistan. It is not coincidence that just before my departure, labour and language troubles should erupt in Sind. And what has made those individuals who were calling in January for the immediate recognition of 'Bangladesh' say in June that in no event should recognition be accorded? Who is trying to create dissension in the reborn unity of the nation?

They are not patriots. They are not friends of Pakistan. They are not friends of our people. They merely pose as patriots and friends of the poor. In truth, they are enemies of the people. They have plans afoot to make trouble during my absence and after my return. But you and your Government will not allow these anti-people elements to succeed in their nefarious aims.

We will crush them with the power of the people. We will not permit anyone or anything to play with our Pakistan, Insha Allah. Nothing can stop us from together building a new and vigorous Pakistan. Nothing can stop us from keeping our appointment with destiny.

The challenge is there both for you and for me. Shall we grasp this moment or shall we let it pass? I declare to this new generation of Pakistan that with your trust and confidence in my judgement, we shall cross the broken bridges and reach the mountain tops.

I beseech you in the name of Allah and in the name of Pakistan, to give me your prayers and your good wishes. With your support I cannot fail.

Pakistan ZIndabad

Speech at the Lahore Airport on June 28, 1972

I am sure I am leaving for India with your blessing. You know that from the very first day it has been my fundamental principle that on all basic issues I must consult my people and that every step that I take, should have the consent and support of my fellow countrymen. For this very purpose I have given you the trouble of coming here today.

I meet the members of my party in the National and provincial Assemblies practically every day. We hold Cabinet meetings and exchange views. These things go on every day. I am not addressing them today. My speech is not directed towards them. Today, I am addressing the general mass of the people—the poor people, the workers and peasant. I am doing so because it is my conviction that only your decisions are correct. The people who are in power and those in the opposition, generally have some political motive. Those who are running the economy and those who are holding jobs and those who are holding high appointments, always have some interests. The poor people have none. Their only interest is the self-respect of the nation, the survival of the nation, the dignity of the nation and the progress of the people. Therefore, correct decisions always come from the general mass of the people. We, who are in the Government, and those who are in the opposition, always take one view according to the rules of politics. Some one sitting on one side says one thing while the others on the other side, quite another. The correct direction is generally given only by the people. Therefore, before I leave for Simla I want to tell you two or three important things.

The first is that after the cease-fire, on December 17, when I returned to Pakistan from New York, and when I took the oath of office of the President on December 20, the questions about our prisoners of war, our future relations with India, the issues of Kashmir and East Pakistan (Bangladesh) loomed large before us. There were problems all around, in foreign affairs, in internal affairs, in the economic field and on the constitutional plane and there were problems of Martial Law and Democracy. But as I leave for India today the main problems that face us are. What

kind of relations should we have with India —what kind of life should we lead on this subcontinent? These are basic issues.

The second important question is that of the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir. Do we still uphold this principle or do we, after three wars, need some kind of settlement?

The third question is that of East Pakistan (Bangladesh). Apart from this, there is the issue of our prisoners of war and many other allied questions. But these three or four issues are the most important ones. We have to consider them and we have to review them and we have to find some kind of solution for these questions. The first is, as I have repeated in every speech, that I shall make no important or basic decision in Simla nor have I any right to do so. I have no power to take a decision. It is true that you have voted for me. You have voted me and my party into power with a large majority. You have reposed your trust in me. Besides, the national Assembly has given us its vote of confidence and passed a resolution to that effect. In addition the three Provincial Assemblies have also passed resolutions of confidence in us. But despite all this, I count for nothing. It is you who count in the scheme of things. I am not that kind of person who would go to Simla and decide some basic issues without your permission. But how will you give me that permission? I cannot go to every man's opinion. Democracy has taught us only one method and no one devised a better method than this up-till now. That method is that you should place these basic issues before the members of the National Assembly for decision. They are the ones you have elected, it is they who will take a decision on basic issues. The National Assembly means you, the people of Pakistan.

The decisions that you will have to make would be; what kind of future we want. Do we want confrontation to continue despite the lessons of three previous wars which resulted in greater poverty, misery and want. If you say that this is the kind of life you want and that you would remain poor and that we do not want to make any progress and that the same policy of confrontation should continue, then it is your choice. But if you feel that some change is needed, that there should be peace with honour and dignity, peace with respect for principles and that we should lead a peaceful life and should also make

economic progress and that they (Indians) should also make economic progress that our relations should also take on a new look, then this decision also will have to be made by you. Decision –making rests in your hands. The very essence of democracy is that such decisions are not to be taken either by one individual or by a government, or by a Junta. These decisions, being basic and fundamental, are the ones that you alone will have to take. So far as the question of recognition of East Pakistan is concerned, as I have said in every speech and told everyone who has met me including my friends and members of my party and those belonging to the other parties, that this is a decision for the National Assembly to take. If you say “no” to this then it is no, whatever way you may decide. I only wish to point out that this decision too will be made by the National Assembly. Let us, therefore, be in no hurry about it. (Responding to the clamour “on, no”) I know you have said “on”. If everyone says “on”, then I cannot say “yes”. But this is no ordinary issue nor is this an easy decision to make. Therefore, you will have to think a great deal before arriving at a decision. If you want to be emotional, well, I am not against being emotional. The most emotional person in Pakistan is myself. But emotions alone will not do. We shall have to rely on both emotion and sense. We shall have to consider the whole situation dispassionately. We shall have to ponder over the consequences of our decision. What would be the consequences if we recognize Bangladesh and what would happen if we do not? Therefore, the real debate shall take place in the National Assembly is to meet on August 13 where every member shall be free to speak on this issue. there will be no time limit.

You will listen to all debates and all discussions in the national Assembly. You will listen to all arguments in favour and against. Therefore, there is no need for hurry. This is the question of your destiny, matter -that will affect your future, indeed the future of the coming generations. I repeat, therefore, that the final decision shall be taken by the National Assembly.

When I make this announcement once again, I do not mean to criticize anyone. This is no time for criticizing any one. However, I regret to say that some people are using it as a political weapon. They allege that there will be another Tashkent and that I will only put my thumb impression on a formula that has been decided and accepted earlier. This is a wild charge.

Why should there be another Tashkent and that I will only put my thumb impression on a formula that has been decided and accepted earlier. This is a wild charge. Why should there be another Tashkent? I was there at Tashkent. I was the Foreign Minister then. If I did not accept Tashkent when I was the Foreign Minister and if I could walk out, I can also stage a walk out at Simla. Why should I agree to a Tashkent. What right do I have? What authority have I to agree to Tashkent. Only those people can agree to a Tashkent who do not have national consensus behind them and who are not from the people. I am the product of a democratic system. My power and my honour is in your hands, under no circumstances can a people's representative, a national representative take a single decision against the interests of the people. If I did not commit treason against the nation at the time when I was only your Foreign Minister and not your President, and when you had sent my party to the National Assembly with such overwhelming majority why should I agree to a Tashkent now? There shall be no Tashkent under any circumstances. Yet, we will try to ensure fair decisions—decisions based on justice, decisions that will not go against the interests of our country. There is need for decisions that will not go against the interests of our country. There is need for decisions, but for correct decisions only. No decisions harming the interest of Pakistan will be acceptable. Neither will there be any secret agreement. We are not the kind of people who will enter into secret agreements. We are the product of a democratic system. Those who derive power from democracy do not enter into secret agreements.

To allege that all decisions have been taken in Moscow already and we are going to Simla only to affix our thumb impressions on these agreements is a fantastic lie. There is a limit to everything.

If all decisions have been taken in Moscow, then why did I first tour eight Muslim countries, and later fourteen countries of the Middle East and Africa? After all Russia has many friends and allies there. I do not want to mention them. But I go there and request them that they should support us on Kashmir, and on the issue of East Pakistan, i.e they should not recognize it for the time being. If we had signed some secret agreement in Russia, then her allies and our friends would have told us, why are you telling us all this? You have already signed an agreement there.

Would Russia not have told these countries already that this man has signed agreements in Moscow. In that case countries would have told us “why do you ask us not to recognize Bangladesh for the time being when you have already agreed to this in Russia”? if we had come back from Russia after signing secret agreements, then the countries I have visited would have definitely come to know of this and recognized the Bangladesh by now.

As far as the question of Kashmir is concerned there can be no compromise on the issue of the right of self-determination because this right belongs to the people of Kashmir.

There is no question of a confederation either. Why should we agree to a confederation at all? Let us first run our own federal Government India or with any other country. When we are opposed to any confederation with our own friends, our great friends, then why should we confederate with India? But the question is that twenty-five years have elapsed and in these 25 years there have been three wars which have decided nothing. The greatest sufferers in these wars have been the poor people.

There all now strive for progress and I do not think there is a single there, whatever his party, who may say that maximum efforts should not be made for restoring peace in the sub-continent so that our people could lead a peaceful and honourable life. India too, is brimming over with poor people and we want them also to progress. That is one of the main reasons behind my visit to India.

I have spoken to you very frankly, even though these things should not have been discussed in public. The basic facts that I have presented before you are the same two or three important issues. You will have to decide on these. There have never been any secret agreement nor will there be any in future. And, there is no question of a confederation whatsoever. Nevertheless, we shall do our very best to ensure progress and restoration of normal relations between India and Pakistan with honour and national pride. There will never be a compromise on basic issues. Under no circumstances will I betray you. Why should I deceive my people? Why should I misguide my country? Every since my school days, when I was 15, I had worked for Pakistan.

How can I let down the people of Pakistan and endanger its integrity. After all I have served Pakistan since the age of 18.

I am your and you are mine and, Insha Allah, the people would triumph. Pakistan shall be victorious.

Have your confidence in me. Do I have your confidence? If so, raise hands. (Audience raise hands). Do I go to India with your blessings? (Audience say 'yes 'yes' and raise hands).

Message to his holiness Pope Paul VI on June 29, 1972

It gives me great pleasure to extend to your Holiness warm greetings and felicitations on the occasion of the ninth anniversary of the coronation of Your Holiness. I also avail myself of this opportunity to extend to Your Holiness the assurances of my highest consideration.

Message to Mr. Giulio Andreotti, new Prime Minister of Italy on June 29, 1972

On behalf of the Government and people of Pakistan and on my own behalf, I have great pleasure in extending to Your Excellency our warmest felicitations on your assumption of the office of prime Minister of Italy and the formation of Your Excellency's Cabinet. I wish Your Excellency every success in your high office. I am confident that the friendly relations so happily existing between Pakistan and Italy will be further strengthened under Your Excellency's guidance. Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

**Message of greetings to Lt. General Josep
Mobutu, Congolese President, on the
National Day of the Republic of Zairo
on June 29, 1972**

The Government and the people of Pakistan join me in extending to Your Excellency the Government and the people of the Republic of Zairo warm greetings and felicitations on the auspicious occasion of the National Day of the Republic of Zairo. I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

Appendix I

Text of Tripartite Agreement signed on April 27, 1972

President's House, Rawalpindi, 26 April, 1972

- (1) This agreement will remain strictly confidential until formal announcement is made on the agreed date. Any speculation in this regard will be contradicted until the formal announcement.
- (2) We are offering two Minister at the Centre to Jamiat and Nap for the purposes of harmonious liaison between the two concerned provinces and the Central Government and also to strengthen national effort to over come the existing crisis. There is no other reason for it. It must be accepted or rejected in its totality as it stands.
- (3) No controversy is to be opened such as the one now being raised regarding the emergency posers which was specifically agreed to in the March 6 accord and which are now constitutionally accepted.
- (4) Drafts of letters to be addressed to the Governors of Baluchistan and Frontier are being handed over today and the confirmation letters must be received by me as soon as possible. I can take no further action until receipt of letter of confirmation.
- (5) Taking all my important engagements into account I will be able to swear the Governors on the 30th April in Karachi or the 1st of May in Rawalpindi.
- (6) There will be a joint press conference addressed by Ghulam Mustafa Khan Jatoi, Minister for political affairs, and Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Khan Bizenjo to explain the agreement and answer questions so as to remove any possibility of any misunderstanding and misinterpretation like the one that arose on the accord of March 6th.
- (7) This means that the Central Government is agreeing to:
 - (a) Recognize that NAP and JUI are majority parties in Baluchistan and Frontier and on this assumption.
 - (b) Appoint Governors for Frontier and Baluchistan on the recommendation of other parties, which is going to be for the first time in the history of the subcontinent. This is a departure from tradition, convention and constitution in view of the grave

national emergency facing Pakistan and in good faith to consolidate national unity. This, however, does not set a precedent as the constitutional position is quite clear and has been accepted by NAP and JUI.

In addition to these major accommodations made to satisfy the demands of JUI and NAP, the Central Government is offering one Central Minister from Nap and another Central Minister from JUI to NAP and JUI to come into the Central Cabinet in order to ensure smooth and harmonious liaison between the Centre and the Provinces and to strengthen national unity.

As already agreed, the Governor from Baluchistan will be Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo and from the NWFP Arbab Sikandar Khan.

Sd/- Zulfikar Ali Bhutto Chairman, Pakistan People's Party 27 th April 1972	Sd/- Mufti Mahmood 27-04-1972	Sd/- Khan Abdul wali Khan 27-04-1972
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

Letter to Mr. Arbab Sikandar Khan

President's House, Rawalpindi 26 April 1972

Dear Arbab Sikandar Khan,

Discussions are coming to a close on your appointment by me as Governor of the North West Frontier provinces. This is the first time that the Head of the State is appointing a Governor who is neither a non-party man nor a member of the ruling party at the Centre. I am making this experiment in good faith and in the quest to achieve national purpose and unity which is my supreme object. The Governor will, of course, hold office during the pleasure of the President, as provided in the Constitution.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to make clear certain matters regarding the North-West Frontier Province.

(i) The Provincial Government should take steps to ensure that all inhabitants of the province, both local and non-local, receive equal and fair treatment, and that the non-locals are not in any manner harassed.

(ii) The Governor as Agent to the President should ensure the maintenance of peace and tranquility in the tribal areas. The agent should also ensure that the existing constitutional and administrative arrangements in respect of these areas are maintained. There should be no attempt to bring political influence to bear on the tribal MNAs who are at present completely loyal to the Government, as indeed they have throughout in the past remained attached to the Central Government. This includes the fact that there should be no extension of political activities of any kind in the tribal areas, and no political party should be allowed to extend its influence or activities in these sensitive areas.

(iii) Under the existing arrangements with the central Government, political agents and commissioners of the Divisions who are responsible for the administration of the tribal areas can only be transferred with the prior

consultation of the Central Government, the Ministry of States and Frontier Regions. There is to be no change in these administrative arrangements. The agent to the President shall continue to be directly responsible to the President for the administration of these areas. As in the past, the Political Government in the province shall not have a say in these matters. Furthermore, the agent to the President shall carry out fully and faithfully the policy directions and any other instructions that he may receive from the Central Government from time to time in respect of these areas. Please note this is a reiteration of the past and existing position and not in any way a new stipulation.

(iv) No attempt should be made by the Provincial Government to take steps with regard to matters that fall within the constitutional jurisdiction and competence of the Central Government, for example, in matters of external trade, cultural and economic ties or any other negotiations or contacts with any foreign power, without the express and prior approval of the Central Government. Foreign relations must not be allowed to get complicated by adverse actions or statements.

(v) No major policy decisions taken by the Central Government recently, for example, land Reforms, action against Government officials under Martial Law Regulation No. 114, and the taking over of the management of some industries, can be upset in any way. The administrative framework instituted for the implementation of these decisions should not be disturbed and in fact its smooth functioning should be ensured.

(vi) Tarbela Dam, a major development project of national importance, is being financed and executed by the Central Government. As it is located in the north West Frontier province, however, the provincial Government shall continue to ensure the maintenance of law and order in the project area and a smooth labour management relationship.

(vii) Some major hydro-electric power stations are located in the North West Frontier Province. They are being run by WAPDA. Every effort should continue to be made to ensure

that there is no disruption in the proper running of these power stations or in the transmission / distribution of power from these stations.

(viii) Every effort should be made to preserve national integrity. Fissiparous tendencies are not only harmful to the nation but also affect our international relations. Therefore, movements like the Azad Pakhtoonistan movement, however nebulous, should be firmly put down, and not be permitted to affect our relations with foreign power, particularly friendly neighbouring countries.

(ix) Civil Armed Forces are centrally administered forces and perform a vital function in the protection of our borders and in the administration of tribal areas. No political party or activity should be allowed to subvert the loyalty of the Civil Armed Forces.

(x) With the change of Government in the province, the provincial government should ensure that there is no victimization on political grounds, either of officials, politicians or political workers, there should be no political vendettas as this would not only affect the law and order situation in the province but would have serious national repercussions. As governor you will represent the Central Government and not be influenced by party considerations or affiliations.

I expect to receive your cooperation in these and other matters and would like to wish you every success in the smooth running of the administration of North West Frontier Province.

Finally, I would like to have your confirmation of this letter before proceeding with your appointment.

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-
Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto
President of Pakistan

Letter to Mir Ghaus Baksh Khan Bizenjo

President's House, Rawalpindi, 26 April, 1972

Dear Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Bizenjo,

Discussions are coming to a close on your appointment by me as Governor of the Province of Baluchistan. This is the first time that the Head of State is appointing a Governor who is neither a non-party man nor a member of the ruling party at the Centre. I am making this experiment in good faith and in the quest to achieve national purpose and unity which is my supreme object. The Governor will, of course, hold office during the pleasure of the President, as provided in the Constitution.

I would, therefore, like to take this opportunity to make clear certain matters regarding the Province of Baluchistan.

- (i) The Provincial Government should take steps to ensure that all inhabitants of the Province, both local and non-local, receive equal and fair treatment, and that the non-locals are not in any manner harassed.
- (ii) No attempt should be made by the Provincial Government to take steps with regard to matters that fall within the Constitutional Jurisdiction and competence of the Central Government, for example, in matters of external trade, cultural and economic ties or any other negotiations or contacts with any foreign power, without the express and prior approval of the Central Government. Foreign relations must not be allowed to get complicated by adverse actions or statement.
- (iii) No major policy decisions taken by the Central Government recently, for example, Land Reforms, action against Government officials under Martial Law Regulation No. 114, and the taking over of the management of some industries, can be upset in any way. The administrative frame-work instituted for the implementation of these decisions should not be disturbed and in fact its smooth functioning should be ensured.

- (iv) The Sui gas installations are located in the Province of Baluchistan. They are of national importance. Every effort should continue to be made to ensure that there is no disruption in the proper running of these installations or in the transmission / distribution of gas from Sui. The provincial Government shall continue to ensure the maintenance of law and order in the Sui area and a smooth labour-management relationship.
- (v) Every effort should be made to preserve national integrity. Fissiparous tendencies are not only harmful to the nation but also effect our international relations. Therefore, movements like the Azad Baluchistan Movement, however nebulous, should be firmly put down, and not be permitted to affect our relations with foreign powers, particularly friendly neighbouring countries.
- (vi) Civil Armed Forces are centrally administered forces and perform a vital function in the protection of our borders and in the administration of Tribal areas. No political party or activity should be allowed to subvert the loyalty of the Civil Armed Forces.
- (vii) With the change of Government in the Province, the Provincial Government should ensure that there is no victimization on political grounds, either of officials, politicians or political workers. There should be no political vendettas as this would not only affect the law and order situation in the province but would have serious national expressions. As government you will represent the Central Government and not be influenced by party considerations or affiliations.

(viii)

I expect to receive your cooperation in these and other matters and would like to wish you every success in the smooth running of the administration of Baluchistan.

Finally, I would like to have your confirmation of this letter before proceeding with your appointment.

Yours Sincerely.

Sd/-

Zulfkar Ali Bhutto
President of Pakistan

27th April 1972

Appendix-IV

Letter of Acceptance from Mr. Arbab Sikandar Khan

27th April, 1972

Dear Mr. President,

I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter of April 26, 1972, and have pleasure in confirming that I accept its contents.

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-

Arbab Sikandar Khan

Appendix-V

Letter of Acceptance from Mir Ghaus Baksh Khan Bizenjo

27th April, 1972

Dear Mr. President,

I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your letter of April 26, 1972, and have pleasure in confirming that I accept its contents.

Yours Sincerely,

Sd/-

Mir Ghaus Bakhsh Khan Bizenjo

Appendix-VI

Letter of Sardar Ataullah Khan Mengal on his election as leader of the Provincial Assembly of Baluchistan

President's House, Rawalpindi,

My Dear Ataullah Mengal,

Please accept my congratulations on being elected as leader of the Provincial Assembly of Baluchistan. I know your province well and have great respect and affection for its brave people. I know the problems of Baluchistan and I am deeply interested in the progress and well being of this backward part of our country. I can assure you that you will have the fullest co-operation of the Central Government, notwithstanding party attachments and considerations. Please do your utmost to better the lot of the people and respect their genuine rights and aspirations. I might add here that I have taken special measures to promote the welfare of the people in Baluchistan even before your Government was formed. This policy will be continued with result determination.

With best wishes,

Yours Sincerely,
Sd/-
(Zulfikar Ali Bhutto)

Sardar Ataullah Khan Mengal,
Chief Minister-Designate, Baluchistan
Quetta

**Letter to Maulana Mufti Mahmood on his election as leader
of the Provincial Assembly of the NWFP**

**President's House, Rawalpindi
1st May, 1972**

My Dear Maulana Sahib,

I was happy to learn that you have been elected as leader of the provincial Assembly of the North-West Frontier Province. Please accept my congratulations. I would like to assure you that on my part you will receive genuine co-operation from me for the progress and well-being of the NWFP, a province which, like the rest of Pakistan, is very dear to me. There are many backward regions, there is shameful poverty. I have traveled widely in your province and I am aware of its problems. Whoever might be hold office in your province my heart will always be with the people. There will be no difference whatsoever in my attitude to the rights and aspirations of the people of the NWFP. Even before your Government was formed I had taken special measures to promote the welfare of the people of your province. I am determined to continue supporting them enthusiastically.

Yours Sincerely
Sd/-
(Zulfikar Ali Bhutto)

Maulana Mufti Mahmood,
Chief Minister-designate NWFP,
Peshawar