

Enlargement of Cabinet. - Split in Democratic National Conference. - Trial of Sheikh Abdullah on Conspiracy Charges. - Political Developments in 'Axad Kashmir.'

The prime Minister of Kashmir, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, expanded his Cabinet on Jan. 1, 1961, to include Mr. Ghulam Mohammed Sadiq, Mr. Girdhari Lal Dogra, Mr. D. P. Dhar, and Syed Mir Qasim. The four new Ministers had all been members of Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed's Government until 1957, when they broke away from the ruling National Conference to form the Democratic National Conference, of which Mr. Sadiq became president. In its enlarged form the Cabinet consisted of 11 Ministers and four Deputy Ministers.

After talks with Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, Mr. Sadiq had issued a statement on Nov. 28, 1960, recommending that the Democratic National Conference should reunite with the National Conference, and calling for the unity of "all those who stand for the unity and integrity of Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India." He said that the Chinese threat to the northern border, besides the continuing difficulty on the Pakistani border, made it imperative that all patriotic forces should present a united front, whilst internally any appearance of instability provided an opportunity for communal and sectarian forces to operate. Referring to the allegations of corruption which had led to the split in 1957, Mr. Sadiq said that his talks with the Prime Minister had left no doubt in his mind that the latter was taking active steps to "give the people a clean and efficient administration free from the evils of red tape and jobbery."

The executive committee of the Democratic National Conference decided in favour of reunion with the National Conference on Dec. 5, 1960, by nine votes to five, with one abstention. The resolution was opposed by the general secretary, Mr. Ram Piara Saraf, who maintained that such a decision could be taken only by a full party congress. On its formation in 1957 the Democratic National Conference had been joined by 14 members of the State Legislative Assembly (one of whom returned to the National Conference in 1958) and two members of the Legislative Council; the majority of these accepted the executive's decision, but four members of the Assembly, led by Mr. Saraf, and one member of the Legislative Council continued to function as an Opposition party.

Following the split in the Democratic National Conference, the principal parties in Kashmir were as follows:

- (1) The National Conference, which held 65 of the 75 seat. in the State Assembly.
- (2) The Democratic National Conference, which has close links with the Indian Communist Party; there is no Communist Party in Kashmir, although the Communists are believed to have considerable support in Jammu. At the Indian Communist Party's congress in April 1961 Mr. Saraf was elected to the party's national council, becoming the first Kashmiri to sit on this body.
- (3) The *Praja Parishad*, which derives its support from the Hindu-majority areas of Jammu and is affiliated to the Indian *Jan Sangh*. It holds four seats in the Assembly.
- (4) The *Harijan Mandal*, a Scheduled Castes' organization which won one seat in Jammu in the 1957 elections.
- (5) The Praja Socialist Party, which unsuccessfully contested eight seats in Jammu in 1957; it dissolved its Kashmir organization in December 1958, but subsequently revived it with a view to contesting the 1962 elections.
- (6) The Plebiscite Front, the organization of supporters of the former Prime Minister, Sheikh Mohammed Abdullah, which advocates the holding of a free plebiscite on the future of Kashmir under U.N. auspices.
- (7) The Political Conference, a Moslem organization which demands the accession of Kashmir to Pakistan. It was seriously weakened in April 1960 by the resignation of its joint secretary, Mr. Mohammed Yusuf Shah, and three of its former presidents—Mr. Ghulam Mohammed Pattu, Mr. Munshi Moheddin Solati, and Mr. Abdul Ghani Wani—as a result of policy differences.

Other recent important developments in Kashmir are described below under cross-headings.

The trial of Sheikh Abdullah on charges of conspiracy to overthrow the State Government and facilitate the annexation of Kashmir by Pakistan opened at Jammu before a special magistrate's court on Oct. 24, 1958, the case for the prosecution being concluded on May 1, 1961. Sheikh Abdullah, who was arrested after his

removal from the Premiership in August 1953, had been released from detention in January 1958, but was re-arrested in the following April.

Accused with Sheikh Abdullah were Mr. Mirza Afzal Beg (Revenue Minister in Sheikh Abdullah's Government) and 28 other persons. [Mr. Beg was arrested with Sheikh Abdullah in 1953, was released in the following year, and founded the Plebiscite Front in 1955; he was again arrested shortly after, released in 1956, and re-arrested six days later, since when he had been under deten The other accused, only 13 of whom were in the dock, included two former Deputy Ministers, a former member of the State Assembly, and several former high-ranking officials; two of the accused had turned approvers, and nine were tried *in absentia*, including five Pakistanis alleged to be intelligence officers. After the High Court had rejected an application by Sheikh Abdullah for transfer of the case to another court, on the ground that the trial was not being conducted impartially, the prosecution opened its case on March 14, 1959.

The prosecution alleged that after his arrest on Aug. 9, 1953, Sheikh Abdullah had become determined to overthrow his successor as Premier, Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed, even if he had to enter into a conspiracy with Pakistan for the forcible annexation of the State. Through Begum Abdullah, who was allowed to visit him in Kud jail, and several others he had established contact with Pakistani agents, including Khan Mohammed Khan (one of the accused tried *in absentia*), who was alleged to be Pakistan's intelligence chief in Kashmir. In the middle of 1954 he had been joined in prison by Mr. Beg and Khwaja Ali Shah (a former Revenue Commissioner, who was among the accused), and they had also entered into correspondence with Pakistani officers. Outside the prison an underground organization called the "war council" had been formed, which had started a campaign of "hatred and disaffection" against the Government. After Mr. Beg's release he had founded the Plebiscite Front in August 1955, ostensibly to campaign for a plebiscite but in reality to further the conspiracy with Pakistan, and had had a secret meeting with a Pakistani intelligence officer, Sajawal Khan (also among the accused), at which it had been agreed that Pakistan should supply money and explosives.

The Plebiscite Front, it was alleged, had openly preached disaffection; sought to excite hatred against the Governments of Kashmir and India; inflamed communal feelings among Moslems; organized a volunteer force; and supplied military information to Pakistan. During 1957-58 groups of trained saboteurs had arrived from Pakistan on the orders of Khan Mohammed Khan, in order to spread panic, create disorder, and paralyse the administration; these had caused a number of bomb explosions, resulting in some loss of life and damage to places of worship, roads, and bridges. After his release in January 1958 Sheikh Abdullah had delivered a series of inflammatory speeches in which he had denounced the State Government as traitors, accused them of oppression and tyranny, and described Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed as a "sinful oppressor of Moslems and slave of infidel Bharat" (India); one of his speeches had been followed by a riot at the Hazaratbal shrine in which one man was killed and several people injured. To support its case the prosecution produced 226 witnesses, in addition to a large number of documents. One of the witnesses, Ghulam Mustafa, was stated to be an Indian intelligence agent who had acted as a courier for the conspirators for three years, photostat copies of the letters and receipts for money which had allegedly passed through his hands being produced in court.

All the accused denied the charges against them, and maintained during their examination that they were being prosecuted only because of their demand for self-determination for Kashmir.

In a long statement to the court, Sheikh Abdullah said on Aug. 11-13, 1960, that the charges against him were not only false but preposterous. In reply to the allegation that he had conspired to make Kashmir part of Pakistan, he quoted Mr. Krishna Menon's speech of Feb. 8, 1957, to the security Council [see page 15383], in which the latter had said: "I am prepared to trust myself to Sheikh Abdullah. I challenge anyone to show me one phrase uttered anywhere by Sheikh Abdullah where he says that he wants to become part of Pakistan." Sheikh Abdullah added: "I join Mr. Krishna Menon in this challenge even now. Let the prosecution produce a single statement or a single phrase wherein I have stated that I want Kashmir to become part of Pakistan." Throughout his life, he continued, he had struggled for one objective—that the people of Kashmir should be the final arbiters of their own fate. He repudiated the illegal methods imputed to him as "the negation of the ideals of my whole life," and pointed out that throughout the period of the alleged conspiracy, except for a few months, he had been in heavily guarded places of detention.

Mr. Beg also made a long statement to the court, beginning on June 1, 1961, in which he denied that Sheikh Abdullah had ever preached communal hatred, and contended that only a plebiscite could decide Kashmir's future. He maintained that Lord Mount-batten's letter of Oct. 27, 1947, accepting the instrument of accession established (1) that the accession was regarded as a disputed matter; (2) that its final settlement was envisaged through a reference to the people and not to any Assembly; (3) that Indian military aid was

sent to the Maharaja “to help his forces to defend his territory.” This wording, he suggested, proved that the accession was not complete, as otherwise the State forces would have become part of the Indian Army and the Maharaja's territory part of India. Declaring that “plebiscite was not only a pledge to Pakistan but to us also” and a “legal contract with full force of law fortified by morality and international sanctions,” Mr. Beg quoted statements by Mr. Nehru and other Indian leaders, and Security Council resolutions, purporting to show that the Kashmir Constituent Assembly was not competent to take decisions about the State's accession. He had founded the Plebiscite Front because he sincerely believed India's professions about a plebiscite, but it had later appeared that a plebiscite had become unpalatable to India's leaders, who wanted to finalize accession by “backdoor” methods.

The series of bomb explosions which began in Kashmir in June 1957 [see page 16135] continued throughout the next four years. Mr. Krishna Menon stated in the *Lok Sabha* on April 22, 1960, that there had been 229 bomb explosions in the previous three years, or one every four days, whilst Mrs. Lakshmi Menon (the Indian Deputy Minister for External Affairs) said on May 4, 1961, that there had been 90 cases of sabotage by Pakistanis in 1959, in which six people were killed and eight injured, and 98 in 1960, involving the death of four people and injuries to 19 others. A number of Pakistanis were sentenced to terms of imprisonment in Kashmir during 1957-60 on charges of alleged sabotage.

A number of measures aimed at the closer integration of Kashmir with India were adopted in 1959, the most important being the extension of the Indian Central Election Commission to the State, and the assimilation of the status of the Kashmir High Court to that of other Indian High Courts. The *Lok Sabha* passed on May 7, 1959, a Bill extending the provisions of the Accession Act to Kashmir, which made it possible to include the State in the preparations for the 1961 census. The regulation whereby Indian citizens entering Kashmir were required to obtain a permit was abolished as from April 1, 1959; persons intending to visit Ladakh and areas adjacent to the cease-fire line, however, were required to obtain a special permit from the Defence Ministry.

The Indian Supreme Court rejected on March 30, 1961, a petition challenging the legality of the provisions in the Constitution relating to Kashmir, which enabled the President to appoint representatives of the State to the *Lok Sabha* on the recommendation of the State Legislature. The petitioner had contended that the State's representatives should be chosen by direct election from territorial constituencies.

Lieut.-General Sir Hari Singh, the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, died at Bombay on April 26, 1961, aged 65.

Sir Hari Singh succeeded his uncle, Sir Pratab Singh, as Ruler of Kashmir in October 1925, and later carried out a number of social reforms in the State, including the abolition of child marriage. During the negotiations with Britain he was one of the leading delegates of the Chamber of Princes to the 1930 Round-table Conference in London. In both World Wars he made generous contributions to the Allied war effort, both in men and money, and in 1944 he was appointed one of the two Indian representatives in the War Cabinet in London.

Although advances were made during his reign in the administration of the State, and a Legislative Council instituted in the 1930's, he disregarded popular demands for greater democratic powers, and disturbances occurred on several occasions. In 1947, when Britain transferred authority to the Dominions of India and Pakistan and called on the Princes of India to adhere to one or other of them, Sir Hari Singh—whose State contained a large majority of Moslems but whose personal affinities were with India—first delayed his decision; however, when a movement for his abdication gathered strength and large numbers of tribesmen from the N.W. Frontier Province entered Kashmir in pursuance of what they claimed to be a “holy war,” Sir Hari Singh acceded to India and asked for help from the Indian Army. This was sent by the Government of India and led to the division of the State into an Indian-held and a Pakistani-held part, bringing the two Dominions to the verge of war. In 1948 Maharaja Hari Singh abdicated in favour of his son, Yuvraj Karan Singh, who was appointed Regent in 1949 and in 1952 was elected Head of State (*Sadr-i-Riyasat*). Sir Hari retained the title of Maharaja and a diminished share of the privy purse.

It was announced in New Delhi on July 8 that the Government of India had recognized Yuvraj Karan Singh as Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir in succession to his father, but that he had voluntarily decided not to use the title of Maharaja as long as he was the elected Head of State. Yuvraj Karan Singh would also inherit the property which his father had owned in his capacity as Maharaja (of which much had been bequeathed by Sir Hari Singh for charitable purposes), and there would be no reduction in his privy purse.

Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas, leader of the “Kashmir Liberation Movement,” announced on May 28, 1958, that the movement would organize a non-violent mass crossing of the cease-fire line by volunteers into Indian Kashmir, similar to the “march on Goa” by Indian volunteers in 1955. This plan was strongly opposed by

Mr. Firoz Khan Noon (then Prime Minister of Pakistan), who stated on June 2, 1958, that the Government would not hesitate to use force if necessary to prevent any breach of the cease-fire agreement.

Mr. Abbas was arrested at Rawalpindi on June 27, 1958, the eve of the proposed demonstration, and about 300 volunteers were dispersed by the police on the following day five miles from the cease-fire line; only 10 succeeded in crossing into Jammu, where they were arrested and detained. Released on June 29, Mr. Abbas was re-arrested later the same day when he tried to enter "Azad Kashmir"; a number of other leaders of the "Kashmir Liberation Movement" were also detained, including Mr. K. H. Khurshid (general secretary of the movement) and two former Presidents of the "Azad Kashmir" Government, Sardar Abdul Qaiyum Khan and Colonel Sher Ahmed. They were released on Oct. 15, 1958, after President Mirza had dismissed Mr. Noon's Cabinet; the new Government gave warning, however, that they would be dealt with under martial law if they reverted to their decision to violate the cease-fire line.

The proposed demonstration had been denounced as a "stunt" motivated by "political aspirations" by Sardar Mohammed Ibrahim Khan (then President of the "Azad Kashmir" Government), who was the leader of a group inside the Jammu and Kashmir Moslem Conference (the ruling party in "Azad Kashmir") opposed to that led by Mr. Abbas. The latter's supporters in the Moslem Conference executive, however, removed Sardar Ibrahim from his post on April 27, 1959, and elected Mr. Khurshid to succeed him. Sardar Ibrahim was removed from the party leadership by the executive in the following August, being succeeded by Mr. Abbas.

During the summer of 1960 a split occurred between Mr. Khurshid and the Moslem Conference leadership, following the former's announcement that "basic democracy" elections similar to those already held in Pakistan would take place in "Azad Kashmir," which would then have an elected President. On Sept. 16, 1960, Mr. Khurshid stated that political bodies would not be allowed to take part in the elections, as the concept of "basic democracy" did not recognize any political groupings. The Moslem Conference steering committee adopted on Sept. 26 a resolution demanding Mr. Khurshid's resignation; it denounced the decision to hold elections as a breach of his pledge on assuming office that he held himself responsible to the Conference, and of assurances by the Pakistani Government that "basic democracy" would not be introduced in "Azad Kashmir" without consulting Mr. Abbas.

Polling for the election of 1,200 members to 133 union councils took place in November and December 1960; former Presidents and Ministers of the "Azad Kashmir" Government (almost all of whom were supporters of Mr. Abbas) were forbidden to stand as candidates. It was subsequently announced that 1,200 more councillors would be elected by Kashmiris settled in Pakistan (600 by the 108,754 from Jammu Province and 600 by the 9,907 from Kashmir Province), and that the 2,400 councillors would form the electoral college to choose the first elected President of the "Azad Kashmir" Government and a new State Council. This decision was challenged by Mr. Abbas, who contended that the Moslem Conference, which had ruled "Azad Kashmir" since 1947, could not be removed from its position of supremacy by Mr. Khurshid, who was himself a nominee of and responsible to the Conference. Mr. Khurshid replied that he was loyal to the ideology but not to the organization of the Conference, which had split into three factions led respectively by Mr. Abbas, Sardar Ibrahim, and Mr. Yusuf Shah (another former President of the "Azad Kashmir" Government).

Mr. Qadir visited "Azad Kashmir" on May 5-7, 1961, for talks with Mr. Khurshid. A joint communique stated that Mr. Khurshid had said that his Government did not consider itself bound by certain provisions of the Indus Waters Agreement which were regarded as inconsistent with its rights; in reply, Mr. Qadir had "emphasized the international character of the treaty," and it had been agreed that "the matter should be left at the statement of the respective positions for the time being."

The annual session of the Moslem Conference, held in May 1961, elected Sardar Abdul Qaiyum Khan as its president and decided to organize a new crossing of the cease-fire line by 200,000 unarmed volunteers. In subsequent statements Mr. Khurshid declared that such action would be inadequate, and that the "Azad Kashmir" Government would send over 200,000 armed volunteers across the cease-fire line; he also emphasized the independent nature of his Government, and announced his intention of seeking arms "from any quarter."

At a press conference in Rawalpindi, Mr. Khurshid maintained that international treaties and obligations undertaken by Pakistan did not apply to "Azad Kashmir," and declared that his Government, which was "not tied to the apron strings of any bloc or big Power," would welcome aid from any country or bloc in "the liberation of Kashmir from Indian military occupation." Speaking in Karachi on May 22, he said that Pakistan's membership of SEATO and CENTO did not automatically extend to Kashmir, and that his troops were not available for the purposes of these pacts. He also declared that under the U.N. resolutions

of Aug. 13, 1948, and Jan. 5, 1949 the evacuation of Pakistani and Indian troops, the cease-fire, and a plebiscite stood together and could not be separated; if, therefore, a plebiscite did not take place, his Government could not consider itself bound by the cease-fire agreement. He added, however, that India had not "formally repudiated" a plebiscite so far.

The Moslem Conference's proposal to send 200,000 unarmed volunteers across the cease-fire line (Mr. Khurshid continued) was an "understatement," as a much bigger number were ready to launch not an unarmed but an armed movement. The movement launched in 1958 was not the type required now, as "it needs a stick to achieve the goal." The new Government, which would be elected in July or August, would be the competent authority to decide on this question, but in view of the people's feelings they would not be able to "resist the demand for action." His Government intended to demand from Pakistan the right of free transit for its arms supplies, and arms could come from any quarter. The new Government, when it was formed, would seek recognition from foreign countries; a Constitution for the State, however, would not be framed until after the "liberation of occupied Kashmir."

Commenting on Mr. Khurshid's speech, officials of the Indian External Affairs Ministry pointed out on May 23 that the cease-fire agreement was a matter entirely between India, Pakistan, and the U.N., and that the "so-called 'Azad Kashmir' Government" had no *locus standi*. The Indian Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon, gave warning on June 8 that if armed personnel crossed the cease-fire line "the Indian Army will give them a warm welcome."

At a press conference in Rawalpindi on Aug. 21, Sardar Mohammed Ibrahim called for an approach to the free nations for recognition of "Azad Kashmir." Claiming that a number of countries (unnamed) had shown willingness to recognize the "Azad Kashmir" Government as the "sole representative of the people of Jammu and Kashmir," he declared that it would be "realistic" if Pakistan also granted recognition, as she had done in the case of Algeria. Recognition should also be sought from Communist China, so that the Chinese commission which was expected in Pakistan for demarcation of the border might hold negotiations with the "Azad Kashmir" Government. Sardar Ibrahim maintained that recognition of "Azad Kashmir" would be commensurate with the U.N. resolution on Kashmir recommending a free plebiscite on both sides of the cease-fire line to determine whether the people wanted to join Pakistan or India.

The Indian and Pakistani permanent representatives at the U.N. sent a large number of letters to the security Council during 1958-60 on aspects of the Kashmir question, which are summarized below.

A Pakistani letter of March 28, 1958, protested against the integration of Kashmir's Public Service and finances with those of India [see page 16136], which it described as a further step towards the integration of Kashmir with India, in contravention of the security Council's decision that the future of the State should be decided by a plebiscite. The Indian representative, in a letter of April 24, 1958, reaffirmed his Government's view that Kashmir had been an integral part of the Indian Union since 1947; stated that the measures in question had been "taken in the normal course to secure administrative efficiency and proper audit control in the functioning of the Governments of the constituent States of the Indian Union"; and declared that "this attempt of the Government of Pakistan to seek to interfere in the internal affairs of the Union of India is obviously intended to cover up their continued violations of the resolutions of the security Council and the U.N. Commission for India and Pakistan."

The Pakistani representative alleged in a letter of April 11, 1958, that a "reign of terror" existed in Indian-occupied Kashmir; that thousands of people were reported to have been arrested; that the Press had been "completely muzzled"; and that a food scarcity had been deliberately created "to destroy the morale of the populace." An Indian letter of May 1, rejecting these allegations as "a travesty of the truth," counter-charged that for many months past Pakistan had been organizing "a deliberate campaign of subversion and sabotage, resulting in a large number of bomb outrages in which many persons were killed," and that in the interests of maintaining order the local authorities had been constrained to take action against those participating in these activities. Pakistan's "campaign of calumny," it alleged, was presumably meant "to cover up the reign of terror that prevails in the Pakistan-occupied area," where there were no elections of any kind, no Legislature, no independent judiciary, and no free Press, and where, according to a local newspaper, 10,000 people were facing starvation.

Following Sheikh Abdullah's arrest, Pakistan sent a protest to the security Council on May 6, 1958 [see 16211 C]. An Indian letter of June 11 protested against this action as "interference in the internal affairs of a constituent State of the Indian Union"; it also quoted reports from the British and Pakistani Press to show that Sheikh Abdullah had sought to inflame communal passions and to form a private army, and that leading Pakistani statesmen were openly advocating war against India. A further Pakistani letter (June 19, 1958) denied that Kashmir was a constituent State of India, and alleged that the Indian letter had taken parts

of sentences from different contexts and pieced them together to make them look like one quotation. An Indian letter of July 7 and a Pakistani letter of July 31, 1958, respectively denied and repeated the charge of misquotation.

The Pakistani representative informed the security Council on July 15, 1958, that his Government had arrested Chaudhri Ghulam Abbas and hundreds of his followers, although the arrests had caused widespread resentment in Pakistan, because it was determined to honour its commitments with regard to the inviolability of the cease-fire line. An Indian letter (Aug. 15), however, replied that Sardar Ibrahim had stated that only 40 people were under arrest in "Azad Kashmir," and alleged that the Pakistani Government was "encouraging" Mr. Abbas's movement.

In a letter of Aug. 7, 1959, the Indian representative protested against the proposal to build the Mangla Dam [see page 16135] in "Azad Kashmir," which it claimed was Indian territory. A Pakistani letter of Sept. 11, 1959, however, maintained that U.N. resolutions which both India and Pakistan had accepted laid down that the future status of Kashmir should be decided by a plebiscite, and that the assumption that the State was Indian territory was therefore wholly unwarranted. The Indian representative maintained on Oct. 29 that the U.N. resolution of Jan. 5, 1949, in favour of a plebiscite was supplementary to the resolution of Aug. 13, 1948, and that the consultations envisaged in the latter resolution were dependent on the ending of Pakistan's occupation of "Azad Kashmir," which had not taken place. A Pakistani letter of March 29, 1960, and an Indian letter of May 31 respectively questioned and reaffirmed this interpretation of the resolutions. The Indian representative informed the security Council on Nov. 12, 1959, that according to the Pakistani Press the "Azad Kashmir" Government had decided to sell all property in West Pakistan belonging to Kashmir State, the value of which was estimated at Rs.50,000,000 (£3,750,000). The U.N. Commission for India and Pakistan, he pointed out, had recognized the Kashmir Government as the only lawful Government of the State, and had refused to grant either *de facto* or *de jure* recognition to the "Azad Kashmir" Government; hence the proposed sale would be an "unlawful and fraudulent transaction." President Ayub Khan, speaking on March 17, 1961, at a press conference in London [where he was attending the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference], said that the Kashmir question had been brought up during his talks with Mr. Nehru—who was also in London and that he [President Ayub] had impressed upon Mr. Nehru the need to settle the problem between the two countries. This was a propitious time, he added, because he did not think that India would produce another leader of Mr. Nehru's stature, and problems like Kashmir could be solved if there was a will to do so. Relations between India and Pakistan had improved, some border difficulties resolved, and their leaders and officials had met each other in "a greater spirit of amity."

On returning to Pakistan, President Ayub Khan stated on March 22 that Pakistan would be prepared to consider an alternative to a plebiscite as a solution to the Kashmir problem, if such a proposal gave "reasonable satisfaction" to the three parties to the dispute—the people of Kashmir and the Governments of India and Pakistan. The Pakistani Minister for Kashmir Affairs, Mr. Akhtar Hussain, said on the same day that there could be no compromise on the Kashmiri people's right of self-determination, but that compromise was permissible in the manner in which that right was to be exercised, e.g. whether a plebiscite was to be taken on a regional basis or in some other way.

Mr. Nehru said in an interview given to the *Pakistan Times* on April 15 that India did not propose to take any initiative for a negotiated settlement of the Kashmir problem. At a press conference on June 30 he replied to a question about the Indian standpoint on Kashmir, and whether the idea of a plebiscite had been completely ruled out, as follows:

"I do not know if you have studied the Kashmir problem; there is a lot of hoo-ha about it. Meanwhile a good part—one third—of Kashmir is occupied by the Pakistan Army. I am not prepared to talk about Kashmir unless the Pakistan Army disappears from there. It is shameful and disgraceful, all this talk about Kashmir, when the very first thing about it is that eight years ago the security Council called upon the Pakistani Army to withdraw from there because, according to the security Council, they had wrongly invaded that territory. They do not withdraw, but go on talking about a plebiscite.... If they would compare the state of affairs in that part of Kashmir which they occupy with the other part, perhaps they will learn more wisdom as to how to deal with the problem."

Lieut.-General K. M. Sheikh, Pakistani Minister for Rehabilitation, States and Frontier Regions, discussed the Kashmir question and other aspects of Indo-Pakistani relations with Mr. Nehru in Delhi on July 8.

At a subsequent press conference General Sheikh said that Pakistan would not regard acceptance of the *status quo* as a solution, and could not accept the general elections held in Indian Kashmir as a substitute for a plebiscite. Asked whether the talks had started from the point made by Mr. Nehru at the latter's press

conference—that there could be no negotiations until Pakistan withdrew from the area occupied by her in Kashmir in terms of the U.N. resolution—General Sheikh said that, apart from the cease-fire, the resolution had laid down that not only should there be a demilitarization of Pakistani nationals, but that the bulk of the Indian Army should also withdraw; therefore, if Mr. Nehru had mentioned the withdrawal of the Pakistan Army, he should have mentioned also that of the bulk of the Indian Army. In reply to further questions, General Sheikh said that after the talks between Mr. Nehru and President Ayub in Murree there had been “a ray of hope” that the problem might be solved, but that later statements by some “responsible members of the Indian Government” had “completely obliterated it.”

As regards Pakistan's invitation to China to demarcate the border of Tibet and “Azad Kashmir,” which he said had been accepted by China, General Sheikh maintained that as Kashmir was a disputed issue Pakistan was as much justified in settling the border in the North as India was in discussing Ladakh with China.

During a visit to the U.S.A. in July, President Ayub Khan made further references to the Kashmir question, which were answered by Mr. Nehru. These statements will be summarized in a subsequent article on the presidential visit.—(Indian High Commissioner's Office, London - Government Press Information Department, Karachi - The Statesman, Calcutta - The Hindu, Madras - Times - U.N. Information Centre, London) (**Prev. rep. Kashmir Dispute, 17695 B; Democratic National Conference, 15906 E; Sheikh Abdullah, 16211 C; Azad Kashmir, 16828 C.**)

© 1931- 2011 Keesing's Worldwide, LLC - All Rights Reserved.