

Marching Towards Democracy



A collection of articles, statements and speeches

1970-1971

By

ZULFIKAR ALI BHUTTO

Reproduced in pdf form by
Sani Panhwar

Marching Towards Democracy

INTRODUCTION

Ayub Khan left as he came—in chaos. He wrote to General Yahya Khan on March 25, 1969 that he was resigning and asked him to do his constitutional duty. Under his own Constitution of 1962, Ayub Khan should have addressed his letter of resignation to the Speaker of the National Assembly. Instead, he chose to send it to the Commander-in-Chief of the Pakistan Army. General Yahya Khan took this as a mandate not only to restore law and order but also to take over the country. He was soon to say that he was wearing four caps, those of the Commander-in-Chief, the Chief Martial Law Administrator, the Supreme Commander and the President. The Supreme Court was later to declare that he was a usurper. But this was too late. He had already brought disaster to Pakistan, resulting in its dismemberment.

In this third and last volume of *Politics of the People*, the text of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's speeches literally speak for themselves. They show how he accelerated the march of the people towards democracy, how he articulated his party's electoral manifesto, how he exposed the old-style politicians and frustrated their attempts to mislead the people once again by presenting themselves either as the sole interpreters of Islam or as the custodians of the ideology of Pakistan. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's style was new. He presented to the people a programme that was directly connected with their living conditions. In an idiom they could understand, he explained to the people the substance of his socio-economic reforms. He made an issue of Islamic Socialism which Quaid-i-Azam himself had declared as his programme for the people's welfare, an issue that had been kept carefully under the covers by politicians acting as self-appointed custodians of both Islam and Pakistan's ideology.

Despite the Yahya regime's opposition to the Pakistan People's Party, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's party-men swept the polls in West Pakistan. Because of the substance and style of the presentation of the party programme, and the fact that the successful candidates were drawn from all classes, instead of the traditional feudal or propertied urban classes, the result in effect was a revolution funneled in through the polls.

This volume contains many of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's campaign speeches. It really is a volume of record because each branch of the Pakistan People's Party, which organised meetings where the Party Chairman spoke, wanted to be properly represented in *Marching Towards Democracy*. We have tried to accommodate as many as possible, fully aware that by so doing we were allowing much repetition to filter through the editorial sieve. But then this is a book of record. And repetition for Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was necessary because in his case the campaign

was conducted largely by word of mouth. He had no newspapers that would cover his speeches without distorting them. Television and radio was barred to him. The only way out was to go from place to place, explain his programme in the context of local conditions, expose the inconsistencies of his opponents, arguments, and expound his views on the situation as it developed from day to day.

This task was as heavy as it was hazardous. He campaigned tirelessly and fearlessly. There were attempts at assassinating him. He took them in his stride. From the icy cold of the hills to the scorching heat of the deserts Zulfikar Ali Bhutto went to meet the people face to face and to talk about their problems; and in turn to be seen and sized up by the people. It was also a programme of political education. One of the main lessons was that the people were sovereign, that they should vote not on the basis of tribal ties but for political programmes, not for their traditional masters but for those who would serve the common man. This message carried conviction. The voters discerned its sincerity and their response was to vote overwhelmingly in favour of the Pakistan People's Party and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto himself was returned to the National Assembly from no less than five constituencies.

**Launching the Election Campaign
Public Speech in Nishtar Park,
Karachi, January 4, 1970**

The workers are in jails. They should be set free. They are not at fault. They are only fighting for their demands. My very first demand is that those workers and students who are in jails should be set free. We are launching our campaign from Karachi. This is not our first campaign. We have struggled already and overcome many difficulties. We have been in jails. The Pakistan People's Party will always side with the people, and with the poor workers and the peasants and the students.

By people of Pakistan I mean the majority of this country, not a few families, and neither a small minority. We are the people of Pakistan. The people are my round table conference. The Round Table of Ayub Khan comprised only a few individuals who were conspiring against the people, shutting them-selves up in rooms. That is why we did not join the Round Table Conference. Our politics is the politics of the masses. It is politics of the open. The Round Table Conference was a deep conspiracy against the people. Ayub Khan wanted to sabotage the people's struggle. He wanted that the movement against him should fizzle out. That is why he summoned the Round Table Conference. He did not want to surrender power. He had government officers at his back. The capitalists, the feudalists, the army and the police were supporting him, but the people were not supporting him. Ayub Khan thought that he could hoodwink the people. That is why we did not join his Conference. We were with the people and could not have betrayed them. The people had made sacrifices. They had struggled against dictatorship.

Time has shown that our decision was in the interest of the people and that of the country. If we had joined the Round Table Conference, the movement would have failed. Ayub Khan would not have decided to hold elections. Nothing could be gained from the Round Table Conference, neither elections nor the decision on adult franchise. He had only conceded the parliamentary system and the other leaders wanted that I should call off the movement. He was a hunter but I am a better hunter. He could trap others but failed to trap Zulfikar Ali I escaped the trap because I did not want the people to be trapped. I shall always remain with the people.

I want to discuss the three main principles of my party. The first and foremost principle of the People's Party is that Islam is our religion. We shall lay down our lives for the sake of Islam, not only in Pakistan but wherever such a sacrifice is needed. My dear friends, we are all Muslims and have struggled for Pakistan

against the Hindus and the British. Our first and foremost principle for which we will fight will be Islam. I can assure you that if the Pakistan People's Party had been in power and there had been a war in the Middle East we would have helped the Arabs. That would have been in keeping with the spirit of Islam and its honor. When I spoke in the Security Council, India's Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, who is being complimented these days, left the Security Council. If I did not have the spirit of Islam and if I were not a servant of Islam, I could not have done it.

Gentlemen, please give me a patient hearing. I am going to say some thing very important in Karachi, something about the war, something about Tashkent. In this great city I shall relate a story. I have tolerated enough for the last three and a half years. Many spokesmen of the Government and others have been saying that I have nothing to say about Tashkent. This is a very important issue and should be discussed only at the right time. In politics there is a time for everything and one should calculate the need of the hour.

But first of all, I would like to discuss the principles of the Peoples Party. As I have explained, Islam is our first principle, and then comes democracy. We have struggled for democracy. The people of Pakistan have struggled for democracy. In democracy the people are represented and their opinion carries weight. That is why the people of Pakistan want democracy and we have struggled for it. This struggle was not against our religion. There is no conflict between our religion and the principles of democracy. There is no party in Pakistan which does not stand for democracy. If democracy is not against Islam, the principles of equality are also not against Islam. That is why we say that our economy should be based on socialism. My dear brothers and sisters, if there was any conflict between Islam and socialism, I swear that we would have rejected socialism. I am a Muslim first and need no certificate from any party to that effect. Has politics in Pakistan dropped to a level that a Muslim should dub another Muslim as a '*kafir*'? If you want to look for '*infidels*,' you may go to India. If you call a Muslim a '*kafir*', you do a great disservice to Islam.

I am sorry that it is being said in Pakistan that there are certain '*Islam Pasand*' parties and the others are anti-Islam parties. How can anyone be anti-Islam in Pakistan? Who says so? Who has the audacity to say that we are against Islam? The people who had opposed the Pakistan movement, the Nawabzadas who opposed the creation of Pakistan, are telling us today that equality is against Islam. There is as great a stress on equality in Islam as there is on democracy. These people who demand the parliamentary system of the British and fundamental rights as enunciated by the Europeans, do not regard them anti-Islamic. How can they call the principles of equality unIslamic? Equality is the

basis of Islam. If democracy is hot against Islam then how is equality, which is called socialism in English, against Islam?

If our Quaid-i-Azam had been opposed to Islamic Socialism, if he had rejected socialism I would have followed him, but he stood for Islamic Socialism. We have to follow the lead given by our Quaid and not that of Pandit Nehru. Allama Iqbal had also pleaded for socialism because he believed that it was not in conflict with Islam. So did Hussein Shaheed Suharwardy. He also demanded socialism. When Mujibur Rahman talks of socialism he is not dubbed as a "kafir"; but when this humble man talks of socialism they say that Islam is in danger. This is nonsense. Islam is not in danger. Islam can never be in danger. It is the capitalists who are in danger. Now that capitalism is in danger they say Islam is in danger. Islam which is the religion of the people of Pakistan can never be in danger. Why has this question been raised in Pakistan? When the Quaid-i-Azam made this speech in Chittagong or when he spoke in the Constituent Assembly or in Bombay why was he not contradicted and told that he was speaking against religion? They did not tell the Quaid-i-Azam that he was against religion, but they did oppose the creation of Pakistan. Now they are opposing Islamic Socialism. My dear brothers, please note that the same people who opposed Pakistan are now opposing Islamic Socialism. This is only because they did not want Pakistan. They are still opposed to Pakistan and want to weaken it. That is why they say that they are against Islamic Socialism. I say that if you are against Islamic Socialism, you are against Pakistan.

My dear friends: Pakistan cannot progress under the present system. It cannot become a strong country if poverty and misery are on the increase. Pakistan can progress only if the people of Pakistan progress. The present position is that the plight of the common man is most miserable. There is large-scale unemployment. If the people fall sick they cannot get treatment in hospitals. How can Pakistan progress under these conditions? That is why this party demands economic change because without economic change there can be no progress in Pakistan. So far as socialism is concerned it is a programme for economic progress, just as democracy is a political programme. If we can be good Muslims by demanding democracy there is no reason why we cannot be as good as Muslims in Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and the Sudan and in Algeria. All these countries are Islamic countries and they have adopted a socialist pattern of economy. Why can't Pakistan do the same? If socialism had been against the interest of Pakistan our Quaid-i-Azam would not have said that he believed in Islamic Socialism. Why are different interpretations of the Quaid's speech being given? Another question often asked by the critics is why did the capitalists not oppose this idea when Quaid-i-Azam declared his intention to introduce Islamic Socialism? The reason was that at that time their system was not in danger. That is why they accepted what the Quaid said.

After the Quaid-i-Azam, Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan also came out in favour of socialism. Presenting the 1947 budget in the Indian Parliament, as the Finance Minister of the Interim Government, he revealed himself. The Quaid-i-Millat himself called that budget, a poor man's budget, the peasant's and the laborer's budget. That was why Hindu industrialists opposed his budget. Then you can read the speeches of the Quaid-i-Millat delivered by him in America. I am talking to you impartially. I have spoken to Begum Liaquat Ali Khan and requested her to comment on this issue because the Quaid-i-Millat was her husband. I told her she knew that the Quaid-i-Millat believed in Islamic Socialism and she should explain the real position. About three days ago I again met Begum Liaquat Ali Khan and spoke to her on this subject. She confirmed my impression.

If the Government wants they can enforce any system. If they can pass laws about the laborers they can pass any other law. But then they should not call themselves impartial. Do they think they can speak about anything they want to because there is Martial Law in the country? They should have some regard for their pledge that they are impartial. If they are impartial, why do they issue a statement every day against socialism? They say that they are the referees. What types of referees are they when they themselves try to score a goal?

It is being said now that the socialists should behave otherwise this country will be turned into another Indonesia. A million Muslims were killed in Indonesia. The blood of one million Muslims was spilled. Ninety per cent of Indonesians are Muslims and a million lost their lives. We are not going to allow the same thing to happen in Pakistan. We shall defend the lives of the citizens of Pakistan. Please listen carefully. It is the first time that I am speaking on the subject. What happened after the death of so many Muslims in Indonesia? Was a friend of Muslims replaced by another friend? I believe that what Soekarno did for Indonesia could not have been done by anyone else. Our opponents are happy at the fall of a person who came to the rescue of Pakistan at a very critical juncture. Ayub Khan had written a letter to Soekarno and when our emissaries look that letter to Ahmed Soekarno he said that whatever arms were needed by Pakistan will be provided. Some of his colleagues who are included in the present Government of Indonesia objected to it. They were of the opinion that Indonesia should not side with Pakistan against India because Pakistan was a member of the Commonwealth and had never helped them in their struggle. They said that there was no precedent for such assistance and that Indonesia should not send her submarines. Soekarno ignored this advice and offered all his submarines and planes to Pakistan. I am surprised to note that some people have forgotten that great Mujahid and proclaim with pride that they will change this country into an Indonesia. We can never forget that great revolutionary who led the struggle for independence for Indonesia and helped this country at a critical juncture.

My dear friends, please pay attention, I am going to tell you something very important. There was a time when Ayub Khan told me that if we could defend East Pakistan, our armies could break through to Delhi. He repeated this many times. He told me that this was the only hitch in the way otherwise we could launch a struggle for Kashmir. Later, when we went to Washington, Mr. Robert McNamara talked to me at a dinner in our Embassy and asked me how we would defend East Pakistan in case of war with India. He admitted that we could advance in the West.' I asked Ayub Khan to explain to me the military strategy and he repeated the same theory. I told him that if East Pakistan could be defended then perhaps we could face India. He refused to believe that.

I have kept quiet for three-and-a-half years and disclosed nothing to my brothers and sisters but now the time has come for Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to go and knock on every door and tell everybody what happened behind the scenes. I will not contest the elections on trifles. I shall follow the Martial Law Regulations. I will not say anything against any party. I shall talk only "about fundamentals. I'll only talk about matters, which concern the nation, the people, the Muslims and Pakistan. I had told Ayub Khan that the defense of East Pakistan was not difficult. Later, the Government of India tried to test our strength in the Rann of Kutch and committed aggression against Pakistan. Ayub Khan thought they were very clever and that is what he told me. He said that when Dr. Khan was the Chief Minister of West Pakistan, India had captured Bhabet and we had done nothing. I told him that Dr. Khan was dead and we had to teach India a lesson. Everybody knows that our valiant forces did teach India a lesson in the Rann of Kutch. We could have advanced as much as we had wanted. Ayub Khan thought I was sentimental. I told him that I was not sentimental and that he should allow me to carry out my policy. But he accepted a cease-fire and took the matter to the International Court of Justice. He declared that he was a friend of India. The result was that we lost territory which rightly belonged to us.

There was a time when our military commanders had requested two divisions. This was refused. Later, they said they should be allowed to raise at least one division, but that too was not allowed. The Indian Prime Minister had threatened an attack on a front of his own choice. Our Finance Minister had enough money for industries but refused to allocate funds for the raising of two divisions demanded by the army. Later, even Ayub Khan opposed the move. If the two divisions had been raised, the situation would have been different today.

**The Change in Foreign Policy
Public Speech, Liaquat Gardens,
Rawalpindi, January 17, 1970**

I am glad to have this opportunity of meeting you again. You will recall that I was also here in this city when the Round Table Conference was being held. I had then announced at a public meeting right here that would in no case participate in that conference, for it was a deep conspiracy against the people. And the only objective of its participants was to extend their support to dictatorship. Time has proved my decision to be correct, because the politics of the People's Party is the politics of the people. It is not politics behind closed doors. We believe in seeking guidance from the people. We value their sentiments.

Today, we hear other friends of ours from the opposition saying they would also give up backdoor politics and instead try to know the people's views in the open. Ironically, these very people had hailed the Round Table Conference as if it were in the interest of the people. They pleaded for the conference and participated in it.

As it is, no single individual has routed the monster of dictatorship. It was forced to surrender as a result of the struggle by the people at large: peasants, labourers and students. The victory was of the people, not of &e politicians. These people sat behind closed doors when dictatorship was supreme. -Now they have come out again claiming credit for the struggle for the restoration of democracy, but only the people have emerged victorious. Dictatorship cannot be thrown out by drawing-room politics.

Today, we are passing through a new age, different from the past. While I would like to congratulate the people on their achievement, I must tell them that the past has become a part of history. We must now move ahead and face new challenges. We have to look forward to the future. It is after ten months that politicians and political parties have been given the opportunity to go to the people. President Yahya, in his broadcast speech on 28th November, announced that for the general elections political parties will be freely allowed to conduct their mass-contact programme. As for the People's Party, the people alone are its asset. We have no financial resources, nor do we have newspapers. We are glad to have 'his opportunity of meeting the people directly.

As you know, we are being criticised in a rather base manner, I must repeat and remind you here that the People's Party has three basic principles. Islam is our religion. We are Muslims and we are proud of that. You know I have not only

served Pakistan but I have also served Islam in the Middle East. Allah will decide on Judgement Day how best I have served the cause of Islam. I only want to warn you not to be misguided by false propaganda. Pakistan is a country of Muslims. It is difficult to imagine any opposition to Islam in Pakistan, although capitalism, feudalism and exploitation are certainly in danger. That is why Islam is being exploited shamelessly* but only to misguide the people. It would be a most unfortunate day in the history of Pakistan when a person would have to obtain from a certain political party a certificate that he is a Muslim.

My dear friends, I would say it was nothing else but Islamic sentiment that made me announce in the Security Council that we would fight for a thousand years for the liberation of Kashmir.

We are first Muslims and then Pakistanis. Unlike "Islam Pasands" we not only like Islam, we love Islam. These "friends" of ours threaten to make Pakistan another Indonesia. You know what happened there? A million Muslims were killed. We will never let that happen in Pakistan. Perhaps, they feel proud of issuing such a threat. Perhaps they have forgotten the day when during the 1965 war, the Indonesian President, Soekarno had helped Pakistan despite the fact that at that time Indonesia was herself in a state of war with Malaysia. She supplied arms to Pakistan. As soon as we sent a message for help, Dr. Soekarno responded to our call like a brother. He offered everything he had.

Dear friends, our foremost principle is: Islam is our religion. We are prepared to offer any sacrifice for the glory of Islam.

Our second principle is democracy. The people of Pakistan have struggled and have shed their blood for democracy. The fact of the matter is that in a democracy the people rule. We insist on democracy, for it is provided in Islam. We have agreed to the parliamentary system because it is a democratic system, although Islam does not envisage the parliamentary system. It was given by the British who ruled us for two hundred years. So, how did the parliamentary system become Islamic? Our opponents do not oppose this system although they have inherited it from the British. Rather they have vowed to struggle for it. Well, we too accept this system. We do believe in making the best of modern scientific and social developments. There is no conflict between Islam and democracy. In democracy there is freedom of expression, the courts of justice are independent, and there is government by the people. But they feel offended when we speak of the poor, the peasants and the labourers. The fact of the matter is that in Islam, socio-economic equality or Musawat has been given the highest priority. The Prophet (peace be upon him) emphasised the importance of Musawat. We shall, therefore, bring about Musawat. No power on earth can stop us.

We have no hidden personal motives in our struggle for Musawat. We are working for the good of the people at large. This being our goal has only earned us the animosity of the capitalists and the imperialist countries. We have confidence because the people of Pakistan are behind us. We are in the right, so we will succeed in eliminating poverty from the country.

I have traveled all over the world. If countries like Iran and Egypt can introduce free education and medical care, why should a great Islamic country like Pakistan not be able to do that? Why can't the people educate their children? Why can't the sick get admission to hospitals? Why do their children go to bed hungry? Why can't their dead even have shrouds? Is it because the 22 families are in possession of the country's wealth?

Pakistan was not made for these 22 families to amass wealth. The people have been fed on false promises for the last 22 years. After all there is an end to patience. It is now running out. We want a change in the economic system in order to improve the lot of the people. A constitution or parliamentary system will make no difference unless the whole economic fabric is changed. Talking about democracy sounds good only in politics, but, for the progress of Pakistan and the prosperity of its people, it is imperative to end the exploitation by the 22 families. That is why we call for the setting up of a system, within the framework of Islamic principles, which would benefit the masses. A country with an economically backward people can never progress. Our opponents don't object to capitalism and feudalism, but they are averse to socialism. Is it because socialism provides some good for the millions of poor and oppressed people of Pakistan? Capitalism, as you know, has already devoured almost all banks, insurance companies and factories. This does not bother our friends; when the poor talk of bread, clothing and shelter they reject it as un-Islamic.

My friends, had Islamic Socialism been against Islam, I would have never talked about it. The Quaid-i-Azam would not have talked about it. The Government of Pakistan itself has published a collection of the Quaid-i-Azam's speeches in which, on page 103, is included a speech he made in Chittagong on 26th March 1948. The Founder of Pakistan had said then, "When you say that Islamic Socialism will be introduced in Pakistan, you only represent my sentiments and the sentiments of millions of people."

Only recently, an elder-politician of ours, who has announced his retirement from politics, but still participates in it by issuing rather longish statements, has said that by using the words Islamic Socialism, the Quaid-i-Azam meant something different. Let's examine this argument. Was Quaid-i-Azam not conversant with English? As a matter of fact, these people only criticise the

wisdom and foresight of the Quaid. Who else can be more authentic about the Quaid than his old colleague, Mr. Ispahani? In his TV interview on 30th December, which was recorded but not telecast, Mr. Ispahani made it clear that the Quaid-i-Azam wanted to introduce Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. Mr. Ispahani was asked to drop this pan of his statement.

Even Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan spoke about Islamic Socialism. When in 1946 he presented his budget before the united India Parliament, the whole Hindu press described it as a socialist budget, and advised the Congress Party to accept the demand for Pakistan. Islamic Socialism is Musawat and we shall introduce it in Pakistan. I assure you we will lay down our lives for the glory of our religion and for the betterment of the lot of our people. I am prepared to sacrifice everything, even the lives of my children.

Was Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan not killed because he wanted Islamic Socialism? His death is still shrouded in mystery. What a shame that the help of Scotland Yard was sought to solve the mystery of his assassination! The mystery is still unsolved.

It is our duty to carry forth the principles and objectives of the Quaid-i-Azam and Quaid-i-Millat. I am not afraid of being killed for my determination to follow them or to act on their principles. In fact, the Quaid-i-Millat fell victim to a bullet here at this very place. If Islamic Socialism was his crime, I too would be willing to face bullets for it. Come on, fire bullets at me. I am prepared to die for the sake of the people.

The time is coming for you to take decisions. We will abide by whatever you decide, for we know the people always take the right decisions. This will be the first time that they will have the opportunity of taking decisions. We are sure, while casting your votes, you will remember who can serve your cause. We are also sure you will not be duped or allured by temptations.

My dear friends, while in Karachi I made some comments on the war between India and Pakistan. I have been quiet for three-and-a-half years. It was said that I had nothing to say. Actually conspiracies have been hatched against me both within and outside the country. Attempts have been made to finish me. I have kept quiet, knowing that a time will come when the people will find out for themselves. What I endured during these past three-and-a-half years is a long story. Thank God, I faced up to- this oppression and torture. Unlike some others I did not flee the country. Now that the Ayub days are over, I appeal for your cooperation and help.

I would like to say something about our foreign policy. Let me start with 1962, the year of the Indo-China war. Both India and China were close friends until then. India had been supporting China in world polity, while relations between Pakistan and China were strained because Pakistan was a member of SEATO and CENTO. It was subservient to a great power, on whose help it wholly depended.

Our foreign policy was a chained one. The country was being run under a dictatorship. A single ruler was the be-all and end-all of everything. The press was not free; so Ayub was pursuing a rather arbitrary policy. Not only China but Russia too was against Pakistan. We had indifferent relations with the Muslim world. I don't know where the opposition leaders were at that time. When I became Foreign Minister, I vowed that relations with our Muslim neighbor, Afghanistan, would be improved. For a big Islamic country like Pakistan, it was imperative to have cordial relations with neighboring Muslim countries.

You may remember that when the Indo-China war broke out in 1962, Ayub Khan was busy sight-seeing in Hunza. In fact, a picture of his was published in the newspapers showing him riding a mule. The Himalayas were rocked; the Chinese shadow was lengthening to envelop Assam, the American Ambassador was on his toes in search of our President, but during the most crucial days Ayub Khan was in Hunza. That was the time when we could have done something to liberate Kashmir. That was an important occasion. India had pulled out all her troops from occupied Kashmir. Kashmir had no troops at all. It lay bare. Any action by Pakistan would have ended the Kashmir issue forever and that action would have been in conformity with justice. World opinion would then have given its blessings to such an action.

But do you know what our great mule-rider said at that time? He said, "We don't want to take undue advantage of the situation," as if we were planning a dacoity. What justification was there to be afraid of world opinion? The U.N. would have had no right to say anything because it had itself failed to settle the Kashmir problem. It has also not been able to have its resolutions on Palestine implemented.

My friends, the U.N. is nothing but a big fraud, a fraud against the weaker nations. Nations take their own decisions. No objective can be achieved easily. Surmounting difficulties is a way of life with daring nations. They overcome all obstacles in their way. However, all this is possible only when leadership is not cowardly. We lost a golden opportunity. Even Indian newspapers expressed their surprise. It is a fact. I am not disclosing any secrets. All this has been published in Indian newspapers.

My friends, I had sensed a definite change in American policy at the time of the 1962 war. We failed to fashion our foreign policy in accordance with the dictates of times. The late Mohammad Ali Bogra tried a little, but death did not allow him time. Later, I tried to effect a change in the foreign policy in the interests of the country. I knew that America will put pressure on Pakistan in order to win India's friendship and that this will encourage India to commit aggression against Pakistan because it has never reconciled itself to the existence of Pakistan. So the U.S. policy changed. I had very little time and the circumstances were not in my favor. Our great dictator, Ayub Khan, had shut his eyes. He was simply not prepared to see a change in the situation. He was insistent upon maintaining friendship with the United States. I had great difficulty in persuading him to see reality and reason.

As you know, Pakistan had universal support during the 1965 war. The Indian Prime Minister himself had to confess that India was isolated in the world. Egypt, which did not allow our Prime Minister Hussain Shaheed Suharwardy to land at the Cairo airport, and the whole Arab world, which used to support India, came out openly in support of Pakistan. China, where once pro-India slogans were raised, issued an ultimatum to India during the September war. Russia, which had never accepted Kashmir as a disputed problem, stressed the importance of resolving this problem. Latin America, the Middle East and the whole of Asia were with Pakistan. Only Malaysia and Yugoslavia were with India. And the Kashmir issue which was no longer being mentioned in joint communiqués, once again came to light. Indonesia gave all help and Pakistan will never forget the help given by Iran.

This change in our foreign policy was brought about after I became Foreign Minister. But just a year after my separation from Government, Ayub Khan strained our relations even with Iran. When both the U.S. and Britain were presenting a trade boycott resolution against Pakistan at the United Nations, President de Gaulle of France announced that his country would veto the resolution. It is a historical fact. But it is a pity that Pakistan extended her hand of friendship first to those countries which had supported India against us. No need was felt at all even to thank France; the French Foreign Minister complained about it later. On the other hand, President Ayub only phoned the British Premier Wilson and President Johnson of U.S. In Pakistani newspapers, however, it was reported differently that both Johnson and Wilson had telephoned Ayub Khan.

Although I was his Foreign Minister, Ayub Khan was not willing to send me to the Security Council. So, when I reached New York, American newspapers, while expressing their surprise, wrote that Ayub Khan had assured the American Ambassador that he would not send me to the Security Council.

I have been a victim of misleading propaganda for nearly three years. But I have been quiet till now. If you find that I have failed to serve the people, I am accountable to you. I shall honor your verdict. I shall face all difficulties. I am determined to continue serving my country. It is sometimes alleged that I am an Indian national; at others it is contended that I have usurped the rights of tenants. Well, I am here before the court of the people. I invite my accusers to prove their case here. Was I sent to jail as a reward for my service to the people? Absolutely inhuman treatment was meted out to me in jail. After all, I am a human being. I must now acquaint the people with facts. I have had enough of torture.

Dear friends, it was said that since I was needed more at home, there was no need for me to be sent to the Security Council. My young friend, Syed Muhammad Zafar, was sent to the Security Council. But he phoned back saying that I should be sent there. He said circumstances were critical; he himself was a novice and that Bhutto knew those circumstances better. In spite of the fact that the war was on, and only two days ago the Indians had reported that the Gujerat Chief Minister was killed when his plane was shot down, an announcement was made on the radio that I had left for Karachi on my way to New York. Even the pilot of the plane expressed his anxiety at this announcement, apprehending that Indian planes might follow us in an attempt to kill their enemy number one. So we had to change the normal flight plan of our plane. We took zig-zag routes and prepared to leave for New York immediately. In New York I was told that I was not supposed to make a speech, for a decision was being awaited from Rawalpindi. I was supposed to read it over to the Council. This related to the cease-fire.

My dear friends, as you know I told the Security Council what was done to Pakistan. I told them about the plight of the Kashmiris. This speech, I was told, was liked very much. But I did other important things also for the nation. In the coming 10 months I will throw more light on these vital national affairs. I will talk about Kashmir and about national integrity. In Karachi I hinted about the Rann of Kutch and promised to say more about this in Rawalpindi. Today, when I reached the Chaklala airport three persons met me. I was told not to say anything about the Tashkent Declaration in Rawalpindi, because it came under the purview of the Official Secrets Act. But I will not be scared by threats. I must apprise the people of facts.

The people are my round table conference. Already I have abandoned power in the interest of national sovereignty. I just do not care for power. I am fully conversant with the Official Secrets Act. After all, I have been the country's Foreign Minister and I have various law degrees. I know what is right or wrong.

There is a plot to silence me, and even to prevent me from saying things which do not harm the national interest. The Ayub era is over. I can tell the nation what harm Ayub Khan has done to the country, provided I am allowed to do so.

I plan to call a meeting of my party soon. If the meeting allows me to talk about these matters, I shall do so. However, if my party does not allow me, I will quit politics. What good is there in politics if I cannot talk to the people? The people alone are the source of my strength. No one can stop me from going to them.

Politics of the People
Public Speech at Jinnah Park, Peshawar,
January 18, 1970

I remember that our campaign against Ayub's dictatorship was launched from this city of brave people. We held a meeting in Peshawar on 5th November, 1968. Earlier, we had held meetings in D.I. Khan but the campaign was started from here. I delivered a speech at Hyderabad on 21st September which Governor Musa replied to on 10th October. I started my tour of this area ten days later. Many people said at the time that nobody could topple the Government of Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan had everything. He had power and the Basic Democrats, the capitalists, feudalists, government officers, the army and the police. He had permits in his pockets and was occupying his chair by repressing the people. He was so firmly established that he wanted his son to succeed him. Because of him the country had to face a lot of humiliation. I had promised that the people would succeed. There is no power greater than the power of the people. That is why when the majority of the poor people of Pakistan, the peasants, the workers and the students launched a struggle from Khyber to Chittagong, Ayub had to go. The whole nation rose against his dictatorship. I did not defeat the dictator; it was the people of Pakistan who defeated him.

You will recall that five days after my speech. Field Marshal Ayub Khan came here and also made a speech. You know that he failed. You will also recall that he was fired upon. When the shots rang out, our great Field Marshal fell flat on the ground and took cover. My dear friends, I believe that life and death are in the hands of God but I can assure you that if Bhutto had been involved in such an incident, he would never have fallen flat on the ground.

I have already said that the victory against Ayub Khan belongs to the people but when there was dictatorship in the country and the students were laying down their lives in Rawalpindi and Dacca and other places, where were these leaders who are now trying to lead us? Everyone is posing as a lion while in that hour of trial they all proved to be jackals. Now they claim that they fought for democracy. Some of them were sitting in England and others had locked themselves in their houses. All of them agreed that they could not fight against Ayub Khan. The people fought against Ayub Khan and I was with them all through the struggle. Official pressures and ultimatums did not prevent me from siding with my people. I have been with the people of Pakistan and I will never tell them to go ahead and offer sacrifices while I watch them from the side-lines. When the campaign against Ayub entered the decisive phase, these other leaders also came out of their holes. You will recall that there were many among them who declared that they will not hold talks with Ayub Khan. They promised to

the people that they will never talk to Ayub Khan. Later, when Ayub Khan gauged that the movement was going to succeed, he summoned a Round Table Conference. His plan was to sabotage the movement. He did not want to give up power. His only object was that the movement should fail. He was in power and had plenty of money. These gentlemen who had done nothing to promote the movement joined the Conference. This Conference was against the people of Pakistan. These leaders joined hands with Ayub Khan and started a new conspiracy against the people. The same people had declared that they would not talk to Ayub Khan. They criticized me for not joining the Conference. If I had gone to attend the Conference, the movement would have petered out. Ayub Khan wanted to entrap me but I did not leave the people. When these leaders were attending the Round Table Conference behind closed doors, I was with you. That was my round table conference.

What has been the politics of our politicians? It has always been a sort of round table conference. Ever since the Quaid-i-Azam died and the Quaid-i-Millat was assassinated, the round table conference has been going on. Never has the people's politics been allowed in the country. The politicians have never tried to secure the confidence and co-operation of the people. That has been their mentality. They have been trying to keep the people away. Their time is now over. Now the politics of the people will decide the future of the country. Politicians of the old school are very experienced, but their experience is confined to conspiracy and intrigue. Now they say they will come to the people, but they stayed away from the movement and later they went to join Ayub's Round Table Conference.

Gentlemen, it is a matter of great regret that during the last 22 years there has been no constitution in the country. It is a blot on the political life of our country. There have been three constitutions during the last 22 years. I would say almost three because when the first constitution was ready, Mr. Ghulam Mohammad dissolved the Constituent Assembly. These constitutions did not work because the people did not have any hand in framing these constitutions. If the people had been given a chance to share in the framing of these constitutions there would not have been a tussle, because the people's verdict is final. What a disgrace it is that Pakistan which is the largest Islamic country has not been able to have a workable constitution during the last 22 years. Our first and foremost duty is to frame a constitution and I promise you that we shall fully co-operate in the framing of a constitution within 120 days. We shall work day and night and put in our best efforts to formulate a workable constitution. A constitution is the fundamental law of the land. It will be our endeavor to strengthen the country through democracy. We do not want that democracy should ever be endangered again. We have struggled for democracy during the Ayub regime. We believe that democracy is the people's government and the people have the right to

make or unmake the government. Moreover, the government is responsible to the people in a democracy. That is why we shall try our best to give the country a good, workable democracy.

At the same time we believe that unless the economic system is changed no constitution or democracy can help the country. For us this is a fundamental question. We want to banish poverty and misery from the country. It is sad that even after 22 years, we find people who talk only in the context of provinces. My dear brothers, you must avoid this trap of parochialism. If a Pathan is hungry and his child is dying of hunger, there is no difference between his hunger and the hunger of a Punjabi or a refugee. There are many big landlords and industrialists, but they never fall out among themselves. A Punjabi industrialist does not fight with a Pathan industrialist. They co-operate and try to instigate the common people against each other. I want to repeat that the poverty and the misery of a Punjabi, Pathan or Sindhi are the same. We have declared that we will co-operate in the formulation of a constitution. Our only difference with the other leaders is that they support the capitalists. They believe in retaining this system which has sucked the blood of the people. When we say that we want to change this system it is said that Islam is in danger. How can Islam be in danger in Pakistan? This is a Muslim country and we are all Muslims. I say Islam can never be in danger. Islam is an eternal religion. It can never be in danger.

It is not Islam which is in danger; it is the rich people who are in danger. Those who had opposed the creation of Pakistan, those who had called the Quaid-i-Azam a '*kafir*', those who issued '*fatwas*' against the Kashmir war those who had written against Pakistan, are saying that Islam is in danger. You can read their speeches. After all, 22 years is not a very long period. There are many people who are still alive and who remember. When the struggle between the Hindus and the Muslims was going on and when the Quaid-i-Azam was fighting for Pakistan, these people were with the Hindus and the British. They were opposed to the Quaid-i-Azam. Now they tell us that Pakistan is in danger and that they are struggling for its integrity. They are the same people who opposed Pakistan throughout and who were sorry when it was created. They tell us that they want its progress. When we talk of the people's welfare they say that it is against Islam. They have always been against Pakistan. Now that it has come into being they cannot say that they are against it. If they stand here and say that they are opposed to Pakistan, the people will not forgive them. Their ideas have not changed and they declare that whatever they said in 1940 and 1945 and 1947 has proved true.

They have not accepted Pakistan. Their efforts are to weaken Pakistan because that is the way to destroy it. They are now opposing Pakistan through other efforts, through the backdoor. They are hypocrites and liars. They have now

changed their manifesto. You should recall what their manifesto was ten years ago. They held that feudalism could not be abolished and that industries could not be nationalized because it was against Islam. Now they want to nationalize capital and abolish feudalism. But all this has a hollow ring. In fact, they do not want to abolish capitalism. They only want to deceive the people. If their objectives are to end capitalism and feudalism, they should co-operate with us but these are not their real objectives. They are propagating that the People's Party and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto are dangerous.

New fronts are being formed. A front was formed in Sindh. They declared in their speeches that they wanted the end of One Unit. One Unit was dissolved by the President on 28th November, but this front is still there, it is clear that the front had not come into existence against the One Unit but to protect the capitalists. These are the people who brought the politic? Of this country to this pass, they betrayed the people. The troubles of the common man increased. We want the economic conditions of the country to be changed, so that you live a comfortable life and your children get education. I have seen the whole world. I have seen in other countries that education and medical treatment are free. Why can't this be done in Pakistan? This can be done in Pakistan through an economic change. Our friends call this '*kufr*.' There are many Muslim countries which are socialist. Have they ceased to be Muslim? Why is this question being raised in Pakistan? It would be a sad day if a party tells us that we are not Muslims. Those who had opposed Pakistan, those who had sided with our enemies, are our real enemies.

My dear friends, the fact is that without the progress of the people there can be no progress in Pakistan. There can be no prosperity if the people are hungry. Under these circumstances Pakistan can never progress. We want to establish equality in accordance with our religion. Equality is absolutely in keeping with our religion, just as democracy is in accordance with Islam. All these leaders want democracy and we accept that Islam contains the principles of democracy. At the same time the parliamentary system of England is nowhere mentioned in the *Hadith* or the *Quran*. This system has been given to us by the British. They fought against the Muslims and enslaved the Islamic countries, not only in the subcontinent but also in the Middle East. If the parliamentary system which we have inherited from the British, who ruled over us and exploited us, is acceptable, why is the equality of Islam not acceptable to these gentlemen? The parliamentary system was not founded in Peshawar, Lahore or Dacca. It originated at Athens and the British introduced it to us. They called it parliamentary democracy and our friends have accepted it. We would welcome the parliamentary system and we will help in its establishment. We will not impose it. The decision must come from the people.

Quaid-i-Azam upheld Islamic Socialism. He supported it before and after the establishment of Pakistan. Our opponents cannot deny that. That is why they opposed the Quaid-i-Azam because he wanted Islamic Socialism, because there was to be equality in Pakistan and these people did not want equality. A gentleman who has retired from politics but keeps on issuing lengthy statements, has admitted that the Quaid-i-Azam did use the term "Islamic Socialism", but that he meant something else. How do they know that he did not mean what he said? He was a politician, a lawyer and our leader. These people should have had the courage to oppose him after the establishment of Pakistan as they did before. I can tell you that their conspiracies to save the capitalists will fail and the people, the workers and the peasants will triumph.

These reactionaries are afraid of the people's awakening. The people know what their rights are and how to achieve them. The fronts against the people will fail. I promise that we will side with the people and will always be with them. The success of the Pakistan People's Party is not the success of Bhutto but of the people. We have taken the path of the people and will always side with the people who are bound to succeed. We shall never come through the backdoor and a day will come when I shall be able to garland the people. General Yahya Khan announced on 28th November that political activity will be allowed from 1st January and political parties will be permitted to take their programme to the people. The nation will then decide its future. General Yahya Khan also promised that there will be no curbs on the press, radio and television. After 22 years people have been allowed to exercise their choice for the first time. You have to decide very important issues. We want that the elections should be held in a free atmosphere. That is our demand.

**Basic Issues are Economic
Public Speech at Mardan,
February 25, 1970**

My party and I are thankful to you for having joined our procession today – a procession that was historic in its size and significance – and for coming to this meeting. This successful procession and this large meeting would not have been possible without your co-operation. I am particularly grateful to my sisters of this region for their presence at this meeting.

Our message is for the whole of Pakistan. Our politics is an open book. It is the politics of the people and of principles. We don't believe in round table conferences. We don't hate conspiracies hiding in drawing rooms. Politics in Pakistan has not been the people's politics after the death of the Quaid-i-Azam and the martyrdom of the Quaid-i-Millat. Ghulam Mohammed illegally dissolved the first Constituent Assembly. This was followed by the formation of an illegal Constituent Assembly. One of our politicians claimed that he struggled against Ayub Khan, but he cooperated with the little dictator Ghulam Mohammad. Ghulam Mohammad and Ayub Khan were both dictators. One was small and weak, while the other was big and strong. Politics since that period has been the politics of a few. It has been the politics of a few capitalists and feudal lords. We don't believe in such politics. We want the politics of the peasants and the laborers. I refused to join the Round Table Conference because it was a conspiracy against the people. Ayub Khan wanted to sabotage the people's movement through that Conference. Ayub Khan was afraid of the Students, the workers, the peasants and the people of Pakistan. He was supported by the capitalists and feudal lords, the Basic Democrats, government officers, the police and the army.

In spite of this the people of Pakistan fought against him. The students gave their blood and the workers faced him bravely. Ayub Khan wanted to sabotage the movement at all costs. It was with that end in view that he invited us to the Round Table Conference. I believed that if I joined the Conference it would be a betrayal of the people. Ayub Khan had set a trap for everybody but I eluded him. If Ayub Khan considered himself a politician I too understood his politics.

When these leaders were sitting in the Round Table Conference, I was having my conference with the people outside. You people are my round table conference. I shall always side with you and die with you. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto will be with you at every step, at every turn and on every front. Ayub Khan made long term plans. He wanted to nominate his son as his successor, but the people of Pakistan defeated his dictatorship and history will record what was the role of the

People's Party in this struggle I do not make lofty claims, Pakistan is not my empire. We are your servants I stepped forward and told you to march ahead declaring that we would collectively defeat the dictator. If you went to jail I also went to jail.

The objective in defeating Ayub's dictatorship was that we wanted democracy- All the parties want democracy because that means the rule of the common man. People don't have any voice in a dictatorship. There is no difference among the parties on the question of democracy. We all want a constitution as well. We shall try our best to form a constitution because it is the fundamental law of the land and a sacred document. We cannot say right away that the constitution can be finalized in four months or not. After the Assembly is elected it will be clear within ten days whether a constitution is possible within four months or not. If every party sticks to its stand and is not prepared to compromise, a constitution will never be possible within four months.

Even if a constitution is framed within four months, the basic problems of Pakistan will not be solved. The basic problems are economic problems, the problems of poverty and misery. If you are dying of hunger you cannot eat the constitution. If your children cannot get education the constitution will not serve as a school. If you do not have money for your medical treatment the constitution cannot be used as a medicine. I do not mean to say that we do not need a constitution. We want a constitution and we will make our best efforts to have one. Our only differences with other parties are on economic issues. On the one hand, we have parties which want the status quo. These parties uphold the capitalist system. Then there is the Pakistan People's Party which declares that this system will have to go. This system has sucked the blood of the people. It is an anti-people system. The 22 families have usurped the entire wealth of the country. They have looted the people.

Our manifesto declares that the basic industries will be nationalized. The other factories will remain with the owners. Our manifesto is based on Islamic Socialism which means Islamic equality. The anti-people parties are not concerned with the people's welfare. They do not want to end capitalism and poverty. They consider such actions against our religion. They say that our religion is a complete code of life and there is no scope for any other 'ism' in it. We also hold that our religion is a complete code and we are prepared to lay down our lives for the sake of our religion. We are Muslims and we are proud of it. My Creator knows the truth.

We shall serve the cause of Islam, not only in Pakistan but wherever Muslims live. If I did not have the sense of honor of a Muslim and if I was not a true Muslim I would not have been able to face India resolutely. We are Muslims first

and foremost. Who says that equality is against our religion? Equality is the message of our religion. Islam succeeded because of this message. You can also consult the Holy Quran. The Pakistan People's Party will never enforce a law which is against the principles of Islam. We say that Islam is a complete code of life but our opponents say that there is no scope for equality and Islamic Socialism in Islam.

They keep on repeating that Islam is a complete code of life but they talk about the parliamentary system of democracy at the same time. Where is this parliamentary democracy provided for in Islam? This system was introduced 10 us by the British who were the most dangerous enemies of Islam. They ruled over this country for over 200 years and exploited it and its people. Islam is not in danger. The capitalists and their supporters are in danger. We are all Muslims and this country was established for the Muslims. How can Islam be in danger in a Muslim country? When the British and the Hindus opposed Islam tooth and nail and also opposed the Quaid-i-Azam, our opponents were with Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and Subhash Chandra Bose. They opposed Pakistan to the last. They opposed Pakistan even after its establishment. Now they tell us that Islam is in danger. Who are these people? They are the same people who opposed Pakistan. The Quaid-i-Azam was on one side and these gentlemen were in the opposite camp. They declared him outside the pale of Islam. They also issued an edict against the first war in Kashmir. Now they are worried about the ideology of Pakistan. These people want to weaken Pakistan to make easy the task of our enemies. These people are against the progress of the common man. Gentlemen, you should study the speeches of the Quaid. He himself had declared that Islamic Socialism would be introduced in Pakistan. The Quaid-i-Millat also had said the same thing. I am not the first person to say it.

Twenty-two years have elapsed since independence but the people have not seen any prosperity. How miserable is the lot of the people! Their wages are low and the cost of living high. How can the poor make both ends meet? We want to stop this exploitation and to free you from your shackles. We want an atmosphere of freedom for the development of our national personality.

We have to face the capitalists and their lackeys. I can assure you that the people will be victorious in the end. It is a difficult path but there is no reason for disappointment. Victory is yours and the people of Pakistan will reach their destination. Our country has everything. Its people are brave and it has all the resources. If there can be free education in other countries, why should it not be so in Pakistan? If there is inexpensive medical treatment, and food and shelter available to the people in other countries, it can be done in Pakistan too. All we need is the right kind of economic system. That would be my endeavor. That was the endeavor of the Quaid-i-Azam, Allama Iqbal and Liaquat Ali Khan. We are

following the principles of Islam. We are working for the welfare of Pakistan. I shall always be with the people and never side with the capitalists and the feudalists.

The Pakistan Peoples Party is your party and you have to strengthen it. People from Khyber to Karachi are with the People's Party. I have always served you. I gave you a popular foreign policy and liberated it from the chains of imperialism. You can compare us with the others. Have our opponents ever had contacts with you? When did they go to jails with the people? Their politics has been closed-door politics. Their time is over. They have never worked for you and they cannot serve you now. There are parties which have existed for 40 years but have done nothing for you. You have tried all of them.

Ayub Khan had told me that I could be sent to any country as an ambassador. He offered me mills, sugar mills or jute mills; whatever I wanted, but I told him, "No, I don't want any mills. I want to serve the people." Ayub Khan corrupted the political life of the country through devious methods. One of them was to issue permits to politicians for setting up mills. Those who received permits never criticized him. The people's hatred increased. Now again the politicians and their relatives are being issued permits. If the elections are to be free and the Government has to remain neutral, this practice should end. These permits will be used in the elections and will be sold in the market. There is a defeated politician of my area who betrayed the country and has always an immoral stand in politics. He has also received a permit. There is another Minister who has issued permits for mills to his relatives in Karachi. These permits should be confiscated. That is the demand of the people.

Socialism is Islamic Equality
Speech at a Public Meeting at Gujrat,
March 1, 1970

You have taken a lot of trouble today to attend this meeting. You have taken even more trouble by participating in the procession which started from Jhelum and terminated at Gujrat. It was a historic procession. The procession would not have been a success without your efforts and co-operation. I thank you on behalf of my party. I feel that I did not deserve such an honor.

You will recall that this is not my first meeting in Gujrat. When the Pakistan People's Party came into being and the people launched a great movement, a meeting was held in Gujrat. It was two-and-a-half years ago. That was a very critical time. I would say that time was accursed because there was a dictatorship in the country. We were being told that a new party would have to be established because the other parties were not prepared to face the dictatorship. The new party was expected to do so. A year-and-a-half later my friends and I decided that we should establish a new party. The other parties were already struggling against the dictatorship in a peaceful and constitutional manner. They could never have succeeded through that method. A movement was required and sacrifice was needed. I believe that sacrifice without an objective are meaningless. But if sacrifices are offered for a definite objective, for principles, for liberty and for ending exploitation, they are bound to bear fruit. That dictatorship could not be crushed through speeches and without a mass movement. Ayub Khan thought that he would rule as long as he lived. The constitution imposed by him certainly protected his position very well against those who wanted to fight him according to his own rules. A new party with a new philosophy, a new manifesto and a new democratic leadership was needed. We established the Pakistan People's Party against this background.

My dear friends, Pakistan came into being 23 years ago. How have you lived your life during these 23 years? What is the state of affairs in the country? The fact is that the people have lived a miserable life. Nothing has been done for the sake of the people. Their lot is the same as it was before independence. People will have to be liberated from their chains. That is why a new party was needed and that is why we established a new party. We have named it 'Pakistan Peoples Party', a party which belongs to the people. This is not my party. This is the party of the masses, the peasants and the workers. This is your party. If this party succeeds, the people succeed, and if it fails, it will not be I alone who will suffer but the people of Pakistan will suffer. Please remember that no party has served the cause of the common man during the last 23 years. No party has suffered for you. You can yourself see how difficult your life has become. Our party is a party

of the common man. We do not want the common man to suffer and we shall succeed with your help and co-operation.

This is not the first occasion that I have come to Gujrat. When I formed the party against big odds and when Ayub Khan was trying his best to crush my party with all his might, supported by government officers, the capitalists, the monopolists, the feudal lords, the police and the army, we held a meeting at Gujrat. It was done in the face of opposition from a great dictator. I remembered Gujrat when the elections were nowhere in sight. Now the elections are drawing near but I have not come to you because of that. My party is not the type to contact the people only during the elections. We shall always be in contact with you, elections or no elections. I came to you at a time when the doors to elections were closed. I had come to organize you against Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan tried to disrupt my meetings through government officials. If our meetings were disturbed at Gujrat, we went to Hyderabad. If we could not hold a meeting at Hyderabad, we went to Peshawar. But Ayub Khan had no way out. Where is Ayub Khan now? He cannot be seen anywhere. It is very easy to use force while in office but it is very difficult to face the people.

My politics is not personal politics. When we launched a great people's movement against Ayub Khan many leaders were hiding somewhere. When the tyrannical rule of Ayub Khan was over, these leaders jumped into the open to take advantage of the situation. These leaders are proclaiming that they will defend the ideology of Pakistan. In fact they have always opposed Pakistan. The politics and the policies of my opponents are for their personal ends and they have come out to mislead the people. You may ask them what they did during the last 22 years for the people of Pakistan. They have done no service to the people. They have been tried and their time is over. This is a new era. You can see the change that has taken place in the world, but our country has not moved from where it stood at the time of independence. Leaving aside the western countries you can take the example of eastern countries like Turkey and Iran which are our neighbors. You can also take the example of Egypt. They give high priority to education and even adults are provided for adequately. People can easily get employment. The basic necessities of life like food, clothing and shelter are provided to everyone, but in Pakistan prices are shooting up everyday. Articles of daily use like milk, meat, salt and cloth are becoming dearer, but there is no corresponding increase in the income of the poor people. The capitalists and the mill owners are making a lot of money. What is the fault of the workers, the peasants and the students? Why are the workers in jails? Why are not the feudal lords and capitalists in jails in spite of indulging in smuggling and black-marketing?

They want us to believe that the poor are destined to suffer, that providence did not want them to have any money. My dear friends, there is no suffering in your destiny. There is no exploitation in your destiny. Your condition has to be changed. If the children of poor workers and peasants can get free education in Egypt, Iran and Turkey, the poor children in Pakistan, and the orphans should also be given free education. If a peasant or a worker in Pakistan falls ill, he cannot get proper medical treatment. There is no room for him in hospitals. If the present economic system based on exploitation could be brought to an end, the poor worker would have more hospitals to go to. If the economic system is based on equality and justice, there will be prosperity in the country. The senior officers of the Government who are our servants and are called secretaries are drawing fat salaries. They are enjoying all sorts of facilities. But what about those at the lower rungs? Their salaries are so meager that they cannot make both ends meet. This situation can change if our intentions are clear. The country can prosper if the worker, the peasant, the poorer classes and the junior government servants are given their rights and provided with more houses and better and greater facilities for the education of their children. I promise my people that if the PPP achieves success, we shall increase the salaries of subordinate officials.

So far as the question of a Constitution is concerned, we want that there should be a constitution in the country. We shall give priority to the framing of a constitution. A constitution is badly needed. We want to frame a practical constitution. If other countries can formulate their constitutions, why can we not do the same? The Pakistan People's Party will make every effort and will offer full cooperation in this regard. The People's Party believes that a constitution can be framed within 120 days if we are all united. But first the assembly is to be elected and its political pattern studied. Only then will we be able to form an opinion whether a constitution is possible or not. But even if a constitution is framed, it alone will not solve the problems of the people. We do want a constitution, but by itself it cannot solve your problems. We want democracy because the people of Pakistan have struggled for democracy but democracy alone cannot solve your problems. You have already seen democracy. Now some people tell us that they want a parliamentary democracy. We agree with them. We also want a parliamentary democracy, but by itself it cannot solve the people's problems. The coming elections are going to be the people's elections. You have to take the final decision. These elections will not be held on the basis of the caste system. We are contesting these elections on the basis of certain principles. Our foremost principle is that unless capitalism and exploitation are ended the problems of the people cannot be solved with the help of the constitution and a parliamentary system alone. We want a change in the economic system. Our opponents are those who have sucked the blood of the common man. Our objective is to bring their hegemony to an end.

We are all Muslims. We want to raise the prestige of the Muslims. Pakistan came into being as their homeland. I have firm faith that Islam can never be in danger. Pakistani Muslims are staunch Muslims. Islam will live forever. Islam was given to us by Allah and His Messenger, and the people of Pakistan have full faith in it. I have served the cause of Islam more than my opponents. You may remember how I upheld the cause of Islam when I was Foreign Minister.

If I did not have the love of Islam at heart I would not have spoken the way I did in the Security Council. Even now the Indian Government says that anybody may go and talk to them but not Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. They know that I shall never agree to anything against the interests of the Muslims of Pakistan. India is opposed to us because we are Muslims. The Indians have always opposed Pakistan because they believe that if there were no Muslims, the subcontinent would not have been divided. The British and the Hindus opposed Pakistan till the end. When Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah was struggling for Pakistan, the gentlemen who now claim to be the leaders of Pakistan were opposed to him. Now they tell us that the Pakistan ideology is in danger. You may ask them where were they when Quaid-i-Azam was fighting for this ideology? When did they favour Quaid-i-Azam? They issued edicts against him and called him an infidel. They opposed the Quaid-i-Azam and Pakistan till the last moment.

These are historical facts. It does not lie in their mouth to tell us that the ideology of Pakistan is in danger. They had sided with Gandhi and Nehru against the Quaid-i-Azam. After the establishment of Pakistan they could not pursue their nefarious designs openly. They want to weaken it. They know that if Pakistan does not prosper, it will be easier to destroy. It is a new method of opposing Pakistan. They know that the might of Pakistan will increase when the people of Pakistan prosper. If the people continue to be Poor, Pakistan cannot progress. The welfare of the country lies in the welfare of the people. In order to bring into being a strong Pakistan, the people of Pakistan must be strong because in their strength lies the strength of the country.

I was telling you that these so-called leaders opposed the ideology of Pakistan. We want that the people should decide and we shall accept their decision as to what change has taken place during the last 22 years in the constitutional political and economic fields. Many excesses have been committed and the people have been betrayed. When the people's rule is established I shall show you how to solve the constitutional, political and economic problems but the decision lies with you, because only that party can win which is supported by you. We can never be against our religion. We are all Muslims and God Almighty is a witness to it. We recite the '*kalima*' of Islam. If some people do not regard the followers of socialism in the country as Muslims, they are damaging the cause of Islam. These are only a few people. They are the lackeys of

imperialism. Many of them are people who called Quaid-i-Azam a '*kafir*'. I am not against all of them. Some of them are my friends. They have also supported us and want us to succeed. I am talking of the few who are the agents of capitalists. They issued *fatwas* against King Amanullah Khan in Afghanistan, against Ataturk in Turkey, against Nasser in Egypt and against Soekarno in Indonesia and above all against the Quaid-i-Azam and the Quaid-i-Millat. They never wanted to serve Pakistan. Their efforts are directed towards weakening Pakistan, but the people of Pakistan have awakened now, and their designs are bound to be frustrated.

The question is what is socialism? My dear friends, it is nothing but Islamic equality. I am not the first to raise the slogan of Islamic Socialism. Quaid-i-Azam was the first to use this term and remember that he was the one who founded this country. My dear brothers and friends, it was the Quaid-i-Azam who declared in his speeches that Islamic Socialism would be enforced in Pakistan. He said it in Chittagong. Islamic Socialism means Islamic equality and, my dear brothers equality is a cardinal principle in Islam. Equality is the message of our Prophet. The Khulafa-e-Rashedeen based their governments on this principle. The people who are opposed to equality are not serving the cause of Islam. They are serving the cause of capitalists and mill owners. We have to establish only one industry and that will be the industry of Pakistan. This is not my saying. It was said by the Quaid-i-Azam. But you have to decide whether you want Pakistan to progress or not. I shall not question the faith of any capitalist. You can yourself judge who is a Musalman and who is not. You can ask the students, the labourers and the peasants as to who served the cause of Islam and of Pakistan and the Arabs. Every one of them will tell you that I always upheld their cause.

You can ask our enemies, the Indians, whether Bhutto is justified in his claims or not. I give you my word that if the people's rule is established in Pakistan, the Indian Government will dare not pursue its policy of annihilation of the Muslims in India. You are Muslims and will continue to be Muslims. The People's Party wants to serve the people. We want to bring an end to your troubles, to your miseries and 10 the tyranny under which you are living. To serve our Muslim brothers, we want to enforce the system which our Quaid-i-Azam envisioned.

At this critical juncture of our political struggle, I call upon you to rise and to reject leaders put up by capitalists. Your condition can never change if these capitalists' agents continue to be your leaders. You have to decide which way you want to go. You have to choose between a just system and a system of exploitation. Islam is our religion and code of life. May I ask the parties who say that Islamic equality or Islamic Socialism is against Islam, why they support the 1956 Constitution? Is it an Islamic constitution? The Holy Quran is our

constitution. The 1956 Constitution is not the Quran for us. This constitution was framed on British lines. Why do these people regard the 56 Constitution as a means of their salvation? When we call for Islamic Socialism, they say that Pakistan is in danger that Islam is in danger. Every Muslim in Pakistan is with us and by the Grace of God we are going to face all our opponents. What we need is the support of the people. Our destiny is clear and we are bound to achieve it. I repeat that we are bound to succeed.

I shall always side with you at all times. My politics is the people's politics. My leadership is a democratic leadership. There is a party which opposed Quaid-i-Azam and was proud of opposing him. They say that the country is in danger. I say that they are in danger. Islam or Pakistan is not in danger. The people of Pakistan can defend their country. The people of Pakistan have crushed a dictatorship. Our opponents are the people who strengthened the hands of the British. They are the imperialists who are weakening Pakistan. They are conspiring with India against the interests of Pakistan. They can never succeed. The people of Pakistan cannot tolerate that Pakistan should be weakened. The people of Pakistan will thwart their destructive designs.

The people of Pakistan will not tolerate the continuous occupation of Kashmir by India. Many atrocities are being committed in Kashmir. People who say that there can be no solution of the Kashmir problem are wrong. Please remember that a time will come when the people of Kashmir will hoist the Pakistan flag over their territory. The Kashmir problem is not dead because 22 years have elapsed. It can never be dead. We are all concerned with it. It is a question of our faith. We shall never allow this problem to die. We are upholding the right of the people of Kashmir on the basis of the principle of self-determination. We shall never allow India to continue to occupy Kashmir. Please remember that if we surrender Kashmir today, we shall have to surrender Pakistan tomorrow. When the people's government is established we shall solve all these problems.

Today, labor leaders are in jails. The students are in jails. They should be released because the elections are drawing near. The permits being issued to the politicians and their relatives should be cancelled. These permits are a form of political bribe. It was Ayub Khan who first issued permits to politicians and this was the best political bribe during his regime. Every politician accepted permits for establishing mills. We do not want any permits. We stand for the people, for a proper constitution, for the solution of the Kashmir problem. We demand fundamental rights. People who accept permits cannot serve the common man. They will only watch over their personal interests as they have always done. That is why the people demand that no permits should be issued to the politicians, otherwise the elections cannot be held in a fair and impartial manner. These permits must be cancelled.

India's Attack on Pakistan

**Speech at a Public Meeting at Mochi Gate, Lahore,
March 8, 1970**

I am extremely grateful to you for coming here to hear me speak. You will remember that about a year ago I had said here that dictatorship can no longer remain in Pakistan. So the people of Pakistan have defeated dictatorship, and if anyone ever tries to re-impose it, we will launch a struggle against him. When the anti-Ayub movement was on, some people thought it was difficult to topple Ayub Khan's dictatorship for he had at his disposal all government officers, military, police, capitalists, feudalists, Basic Democrats and a big political party, which has now been split into three parts, plus, of course, the radio, television and the press. Some people thought no one could dethrone Ayub's government as long as he was alive.

Ayub Khan wanted to make his son the President after him, but as you have seen, the peasants, laborers, students, and other sections of society launched a great movement against Ayub Khan and his dictatorship, against corruption, oppression and bureaucracy, as a result of which he had to relinquish power. The success of the popular movement, like the one we launched and won, has few parallels.

Generally military dictatorship is dethroned by a military revolution. But our country has been an exception. The credit for ending dictatorship goes to our people, and they deserve all the tributes that can be paid to them. Nevertheless the People's Party made a contribution to the struggle to dislodge dictatorship and this is known to all.

You will recall that in my speech in Hyderabad on 21st September 1968, I said that the people had turned against the dictatorship of Ayub Khan, that one last push together would topple over his edifice. It was your victory. In your victory the role of the People's Party was not insignificant. When the movement against Ayub Khan's despotism was at its height, and Ayub Khan sensed the danger, he proposed a Round Table Conference. It was a big conspiracy against the people's movement. I had then said that Ayub Khan should talk to the politicians openly rather than behind closed doors. I don't believe in closed-door politics. I believe in politics in the open. That is why I had said in Lahore that the people alone were my round table conference. I had advised my politician friends not to talk to Ayub Khan for it was he who first sent them to jail, and was now maneuvering for a Round Table Conference with them. But these people very submissively participated in the Conference which was a big conspiracy against the people.

My dear friends, our politics was confined behind closed doors after the deaths of the Quaid-i-Azam and Liaquat Ali Khan. Why did our politicians become members of the second Constituent Assembly when Governor General Ghulam Mohammad had undemocratically dissolved the first one? I promise to you that the Pakistan People's Party will end politics behind closed doors and introduce in the country, the politics of the people.

It is extremely deplorable that the country's political and economic problems have not been settled during the last 23 years. The reason is that the people have never been consulted on any problem. Only a few politicians and capitalists had the monopoly over each and every thing. But let it be known that from now on the people alone will take all decisions. The elections are to be held soon. The people's problems have not as yet been solved, for there have been no real elections so far in this country.

My dear friends and fellow-workers, the people come to my meetings because I tell the truth. I am not a hypocrite. I have given the country an independent foreign policy. I have served my country and have successfully confronted the enemy with the help of the people. I have defeated dictatorship. My party has given the people a manifesto and an economic programme in accordance with their wishes and aspirations. Therefore the people will continue coming to my meetings, Insha Allah.

One of the 303 civil servants retired by Yahya had sycophantically boasted to President Ayub Khan that he would finish me within three months. But both we and Ayub Khan could not end Bhutto and his campaign. Similarly, when the popular struggle dethroned Ayub Khan, some people said that the popularity of the People's Party and Zulfikar Ali Bhutto had ended. Let it be known to my friends and foes that Bhutto cannot be finished, for the people of Pakistan are with him.

My dear friends, we want elections. And elections will be held. But do remember that elections alone cannot solve our problems. It is no big job merely to elect members to the Assembly. We have already had two Constituent Assemblies. Now another one is to be elected. We too want a constitution for it is the fundamental requirement of a country. However, a constitution cannot give a home to the homeless, nor can it clothe the naked or feed the hungry. Nor can it become a school for your children, nor can it be a hospital for treatment. A constitution is not an end in itself but it is a must. We will try our best to frame a constitution within the specified period of 120 days. And there is no doubt that others too want a constitution. As far as religion is concerned, we are all Muslims. Pakistan is based on Islam and is a homeland for Muslims. We want democracy just as others do. There is no difference of opinion on this. If at all

there is a difference, it is on the economic system. On the one hand, there are people who want to maintain and preserve the capitalistic system in the country, while on the other, there are those who are struggling for the establishment of a people's government, the introduction of social justice and a just economic system. The supporters of the capitalist system contend that they are in favor of the Islamic system and accuse those wanting to change the present system of doing un-Islamic acts. However, it is incorrect to say that to end the present capitalist system is against the ideology of Pakistan; I want to tell such people that the elimination of poverty and misery is not contrary to Islam or to Pakistan's ideology. Had it been so, this country would not have come into being at all. We would never have pledged in our manifesto to eliminate poverty, if this were an un-Islamic act.

Dear friends and brothers, our party has three guiding principles. Islam is our religion, democracy is our polity and socialism is our economy. These principles are in no way against Islam and the ideology of Pakistan. We are all Muslims. That is why I say, Islam is our religion. Islam has taught us democratic principles. Hence democracy is our polity. Islam envisages Musawat and teaches equality among human beings. Therefore, Islamic Musawat or Islamic Socialism is our economic programme. We are not against Islam. We believe Islam is a complete code of life. However, our opponents argue that although Islam provides for democracy, it does not envisage Musawat. They support parliamentary democracy. I would like to ask them: where is parliamentary democracy in Islam? Which *Quranic* verse makes mention of parliamentary democracy? Which *Hadith* of the Holy Prophet has supported parliamentary democracy?

Parliamentary democracy is a British institution. Muslims did not invent it. If our opponents consider Quran as a complete code of life, then why are they demanding parliamentary democracy? Similarly, if the Holy Quran is a beacon of light for the Muslims, and if it includes all laws, then why are these people harping on the 1956 Constitution? Where is the 1956 Constitution provided for in Islam?

I call upon my opponents to stop being hypocrites, not to mislead the people and to learn the virtue of being consistent. If they speak of parliamentary democracy and the 1956 Constitution with reference to Quran, then why do they object to my calling for a change in the economic system in line with Islamic Musawat? I am a Muslim and I denounce other Muslims who use our religion as a cloak to hide their anti-people activities.

My dear friends, we are proud of being Muslims. God Almighty knows we are His followers. Who are these people to issue *fatwas* against us, these stooges of

imperialists? People like them in the past, had had issued *fatwas* against Amanullah Khan. Mustafa Kamal, Sir Syed, Quaid-i-Azam and Iqbal. Today, they are issuing similar fatwas against the people of Pakistan. They are fake ulemas. I have great regard for genuine ulemas. I respect them. However the people will set right all the paid fatwa-givers, for by issuing edicts against the Muslims they have only done service to the '*kafirs*'.

Well, if at all these so-called ulemas were looking for '*kafirs*' they should have searched for them from among the enemies. Pakistan is a homeland for Muslims. I say, where had these fatwa-givers gone when the Pakistan Movement was in progress?

You should know that during the Pakistan Movement, these people were with Gandhi, Nehru and Patel instead of the Quaid-i-Azam. They should be ashamed of it. They should feel ashamed of having been with our enemies. Now these people cannot openly dare to oppose Pakistan. They have been conspiring to weaken Pakistan on one pretext or the other. However, I assure you that their conspiracies here will be foiled as they were at the time of the creation of Pakistan.

Friends and fellow-workers, it is an irony that those who had opposed the Pakistan Movement, are now talking of the Pakistan ideology and of "danger to Islam." I ask, is the Pakistan ideology or Islam so weak that they should be in danger? I believe Islam has never been in danger, nor will it ever be. Islam is not in danger. Pakistan's ideology is not in danger. If at all there is anything in danger it is the capitalists, feudalists and their agents who have been having sleepless nights. Well, they will continue to have sleepless nights. We will, Insha Allah, change the present economic system.

When we speak of Islamic socialism, these people get anxious, although they actively support capitalism and feudalism. I don't know why they are averse to the people's "ism".

My dear brothers, I have seen virtually the whole world. People all over the world have made tremendous progress, but the conditions of our people are going from bad to worse. Their miseries are always on the increase. A particular class has been sucking their blood. People are dying of hunger. How can we tolerate these circumstances? Some people talk of Pakistan's ideology. I will tell them what Pakistan's ideology means. The basic object in the establishment of Pakistan was that the people should progress and prosper. Their children should be given free education and the poor patients should be treated free. Everyone should get food, clothing and shelter according to his needs. So this is what the

Pakistan ideology means and this also is the message of Islam. And I only want to put into practice the message of Islam.

Pakistan's ideology means that Muslims should govern Pakistan to make it a prosperous country. There should be no corruption and injustice. It is not Pakistan's ideology that a few people should have a monopoly over government and wealth at the expense of the people at large who are left to suffer the worst economic difficulties and denied any say in the running of the State. You can't call that the ideology of Pakistan. Ideology means service to the Muslims of Pakistan; well, not only that but also the protection of the Muslims in India, which is possible only when Pakistan is made strong and stable.

My dear friends and colleagues, unless the lot of the people, the laborers, peasants and the students is improved, no constitution, no matter what type, could ensure the security of Pakistan or the protection of its ideology. We want to change the present economic system on the basis of Islamic Socialism. This is, in fact, the message of the Quaid-i-Azam, who had established Pakistan. The Quaid wanted to introduce Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. It is not a mere slogan of mine. Those who are opposing Islamic Socialism today had also opposed the Quaid and dubbed him as a '*kafir*'.

My dear brothers, while addressing a public meeting in Chittagong on 26th March 1948. The founder of Pakistan had said:

"When you say that Pakistan should be established on such basis of social justice and Islamic Socialism which stem from human equality and brotherhood, you are only representing the true feelings of millions of Musalmans. Similarly when you demand equal opportunities for all, you are expressing my views."

My friends and brothers, these are the words of Quaid-i-Azam. Had the Quaid not been the champion of Islamic Socialism, he would not have raised this slogan. We only want to follow the Quaid-i-Azam in order to strengthen Pakistan. The Quaid-i-Millat, Liaquat Ali Khan, was also a supporter of Islamic Socialism. At the Punjab University Ground, Lahore, on 25th August, 1949, while addressing a large gathering, he had said:

"But I would like to tell the big landowners that their days are over now. Pakistan was not made for a few people. We had not sacrificed the blood of millions of people only to protect the capitalistic system or a few capitalists."

We hear a number of "isms" being mentioned these days. But we believe in only one "ism", and that is Islamic Socialism, which in brief means everyone has an equal right to be provided with food, housing, clothing, education and medical

facilities. Countries failing to provide these facilities can never make progress. The economic system which was evolved for us 1.350 years ago, still holds good. As a matter of fact whatever system you adopt, you will ultimately have to revert to Islamic Socialism, no matter what name is given to it.

My dear brothers, I am not telling you stories. I have in fact presented before you extracts from the speeches of the Quaid-i-Azam and the Quaid-i-Millat. Like then, Hussein Shaheed Suhrawardy also wanted to introduce Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. Is all that against our religion? Can you put up with the present state of affairs? We will change the whole complexion of our country with Islamic Socialism. Everybody will be provided with food, clothing and shelter according to his need. We can make this country great by practicing Islamic socialism. And we shall do that. I will remain with you at all stages, on all fronts, all the time. I will strengthen this country even if I have to sacrifice my life. We will make a Pakistan as visualized by the Poet of the East, Allama Iqbal, and for which the Quaid-i-Azam had struggled. We believe in a strong, great Pakistan, rather than a weak one. And as you have seen in the 23 years of Pakistan's existence, corruption, oppression, and economic exploitation have been reigning supreme here. Today the prices of essential commodities of life have soared sky-high.

My dear friends, how regrettable it is that the students and laborers without whose help we could not have succeeded should now be locked up in jails. Had I been a ruler of this country, I would have kissed their hand instead of detaining them. I would have served them and elevated them. I demand that the Government should release the students and laborers. I am not pleading for the release of Students of any particular faction. I demand the release of all students. To me all students are equal. They are a source of strength to me. They are my brothers.

My friends and colleagues, I assure you that our nationalization programme will begin as soon as a people's government is established. Some people are trying to set up a joint front against us with the co-operation of other political parties. These people claim to have created Pakistan and of working closely with the Quaid-i-Azam. They call themselves the soul of Pakistan. Who then are they making a united front with? The people who had opposed Pakistan and who were expelled by the Quaid-i-Azam from the Muslim League? Such a front is against the people. They are not friends of the people. In fact they have been frightened by the people's revolution. They shall not succeed in their mischief. We don't believe in any front. My party will not join any political party in setting up a front before the elections. The people are my front! You are my front for you have been, you are and you will remain with me. And I am proud of having you with me. We don't believe in maneuvering, or in politics of collusions. We believe in politics in the open. If there arises a need for a front, it will be set up

for constitution making, after the elections. We are with the people. If we lose, the people will lose. Remember, if the People's party is ever harmed, the people will also get harmed. And if our party succeeds, this will be the success of the people.

My dear brothers, there was a front, but that too is crumbling now, for those who formed it say they did not know before that G.M. Syed will also co-operate with the supporters of Six Points. The known fact is that G.M. Syed has been supporting Six Points since July of last year. When Sheikh Mujib came to Karachi, G.M. Syed gave a party in his honor and there he announced his support for Six Points. I have political differences with G.M. Syed, but no personal differences. When he invited me to join his United Front, I refused saying that my politics was based on a national outlook. I told him I wanted to serve the whole nation. True, I was born in Sindh, but I am a Pakistani, and all Muhajirs, Bengalis, Punjabis, Pathans and Baluchs are brothers to me. Mine is a popular politics. Those who entered into an agreement with G.M. Syed knew that he was a supporter of Six Points. Despite that they joined hands with him. This front was a great conspiracy against the progress and prosperity of the people of Pakistan. It was an attempt to perpetuate the capitalistic system.

I now come to foreign policy.

You know how harmful and incorrect a foreign policy Pakistan had before I became Foreign Minister. We had been completely isolated from the rest of the world. Pakistan's foreign policy had chained the people. We had no free will to go anywhere. We had to obey what the U.S. ordered us to do. Our relations with Russia, China, Afghanistan, and many Asian, Latin American and East European countries were bad. Our policies were those of SEATO and CENTO. The U.S. Ambassador could keep Pakistan's policy in line with Washington's. If he wished Pakistan's foreign policy to toe a particular line during the Suez war, Pakistan obliged him. However, Pakistan's foreign policy became independent when I became Foreign Minister. Yes, I say I made some contribution in liberating it. Our relations with Russia, China, Afghanistan, East European countries and the Third -World improved. RCD brought Pakistan, Iran and Turkey close together. So, if I can serve you abroad, as a Foreign Minister, I can serve you better within the country. If, with your cooperation I can defeat the imperialists outside the country, then all of us can jointly defeat the imperialist agents inside the country.

My dear brothers, I am 42 now. And I am proud of three things. First, that I gave an independent foreign policy to the country and supported the people of Kashmir in the Security Council when India attacked Pakistan secondly, with

your co-operation I defeated dictatorship in this country. Thirdly, I delivered the message of Islami Musawat in cities, towns, and villages, and from door to door.

My dear friends and brothers, before the war broke out between India and China in 1962, India had boastfully claimed that she had a neutral policy and friendship with all. Indians and Chinese were then described as brothers to each other. India then had friendship with Russia, America, China, Asia, and Africa and with almost all countries of Latin America. But when war broke out between India and China, changes took place in the foreign policy of all countries of the world. Pakistan's foreign policy also changed. The Sino-Indian war rocked the Himalayas. It was time for Pakistan to gain some advantages. But on a critical occasion like that, our head of state went to Hunza. When the Chinese forces entered Assam, he was riding a mule and shooting with a camera. Later a British Minister Duncan Sandys, and an American special envoy, Averall Harriman, flew into Rawalpindi. They proposed that Pakistan hold talks with India on the Kashmir issue. Ayub Khan should have realized then that India would not settle the Kashmir problem. When India reeled back from China, she became amenable to talks with Pakistan on the Kashmir question; although you have seen that it has not as yet been solved. We must keep this experience in mind. India is practising the same tactics in relation to the Farakka Barrage. She does not want to settle this problem either. She only wants to play for time. She wants to see conditions in Pakistan deteriorate further in which case, she thinks, this problem will be difficult for us to press.

My dear friends and colleagues, our stand on Kashmir has been that the issue be resolved on the basis of self-determination. Then we shifted to demanding "a meaningful decision." Afterwards it became "a just and honorable solution." I say that no solution of the Kashmir issue would be acceptable to us other than on the basis of the right of self-determination.

India says that Kashmir is her integral part. The Indian Foreign Minister, Sardar Swaran Singh, told an American delegate in the Security Council that Indo-Pakistan relations could not improve so long as Bhutto remained Pakistan's Foreign Minister, nor would there be a settlement of the Kashmir problem. I said if I was an obstacle in a settlement of the Kashmir issue, I was willing to commit suicide but let the issue be solved. I separated from the Government, but the Kashmir problem remains where it was. In fact, India is being run by usurpers and exploiters. The Kashmir problem cannot be solved unless we confront India. Some people say I want war. I do not want war. But I do not want a defeat either. We will confront India at every step in order to make her see reason.

My dear friends and brothers, the systematic Indian aggression against Pakistan began when on April 8th 1965, she bombed Koting and moved her famous

Brigade into action in NEFA against China. Later, Shastri declared Kanjarkot as Indian territory and demanded that Pakistan vacate that area. Actually not only Kanjarkot but also the whole of the Rann of Kutch area belonged to Pakistan. Earlier, India had occupied the Chhad Bet area she had two objectives in doing so. First, she wanted to find out how Pakistan would react. Secondly, she wanted to test the strength and depth of relations between Pakistan and China. With the blessings of God Almighty our forces resolutely confronted the enemy and inflicted a heavy defeat on her. Fierce fighting was going on in the Rann of Kutch area and at a time when our single division was poised to annihilate India's two divisions and two brigades, Ayub Khan stopped our forces from continuing the war, although they were advancing.

On 27th December 1963, the hair of the Holy Prophet was stolen from the Hazrat Bal Shrine in Occupied Kashmir. The people of Kashmir rose against the Indian Government. They were persecuted. Many of them were killed. Then in 1964 India made an unsuccessful attempt to occupy the Chakrot area of Azad Kashmir. In 1965, she occupied the Kargil area of Azad Kashmir but she had to vacate it on the intervention of the Security Council. In May, 1965, a new wave of oppression against the Kashmiris began in Occupied Kashmir. Seventeen people were killed. 1,926 injured and 419 were arrested. Sixteen newspapers were banned. But disturbances went on increasing against the Indian rulers. On 8th August, 1965, the Kashmiris rose in open rebellion against Indian oppression. India alleged that 7,000 'Mujahideen' had entered Occupied Kashmir from Pakistan. But I ask how could Pakistan's Mujahideen enter Occupied Kashmir in the presence of six divisions of the Indian Army along the cease-fire line? In fact, the Kashmiris themselves had started that movement because they had been persecuted. Scared of the Kashmiri people's struggle, the Indian forces completely burnt two of their villages in the Rajoun area. The U.N. representative in Srinagar General Nimmo, contradicted the Indian allegation that Pakistanis had entered Occupied Kashmir. In spite of that India bombed a Pakistani village Awan Sharif, on 23rd August, as a result of which 25 Pakistani civilians were killed. On 24th August, India occupied Tithwal, and on 25th the Haji Pir Pass. Pakistan retaliated against these attacks on 7 September and occupied Chamb.

However, when Indian forces were busy committing aggression against Pakistan, Ayub Khan was playing golf in Swat. I reached Risalpur from Rawalpindi by plane, from where I went to Mardan by taxi. And from Mardan I hired another taxi to reach Swat. From the Wali of Swat I learnt that Ayub Khan was playing golf.

I told him. "Mr. President, India has continually been committing aggression against us. Please order our armed forces to retaliate." Ayub Khan replied rather

casually, "Yes, Commander-in-Chief Musa Khan came to me yesterday. I have given him instructions. You better talk to him." I said, "Mr. President, what purpose would my talking to him serve? Whatever decision is to be taken, you had better take yourself." At this Ayub Khan said, "All right; you go, I will be coming later."

Then I went to the residence of the Wali of Swat. I had to wait for the President for one hour, during which he changed his dress. I told him if we failed to react to Indian attacks, she would occupy Azad Kashmir and also attack Pakistan. Hearing this Ayub Khan got worried and said, "All right, we will talk it over at dinner." I told him again that if we did not retaliate, our country would be destroyed. The Wali of Swat supported my view. Addressing himself to Ayub Khan, he said, "Your Foreign Minister is right in saying that we must retaliate against Indian aggression." Ayub Khan said, "Well, you go now and tell Musa to take suitable action for retaliation."

I came back to Rawalpindi and told Musa about the President's order to retaliate against Indian aggression. On this Musa Khan said he would himself talk to the President. Finally, when our brave forces were ordered to retaliate, they strongly confronted the enemy. They continually kept advancing and eventually were only four miles from Akhnour. Had the Pakistani troops occupied Akhnour and cut off Jammu from there, six divisions of the Indian Army would have been completely cut off.

Our present provisional President, Yahya Khan, who was witnessing a tattoo show at that time, had told me: "We should occupy Akhnour." I said, "Well, do so." Yahya Khan was in charge of that front and he wanted to occupy Akhnour. But then Ayub Khan ordered that the army should retreat to protect borders along Lahore and Sialkot.

General Yahya Khan had assured Ayub Khan that Pakistani troops would occupy Akhnour before the Indian army could reach the borders of Lahore and Sialkot. Pakistan's High Commissioner in India, Mr. Arshad Husain, had endorsed this view. But Ayub Khan did not agree to this plan.

My friends and brothers, our brave forces were ready to advance on 23rd September. China had given an ultimatum to India. She helped us for which we are grateful to her. Iran supported us. Hats off to the Shahinshah who is our guest these days. To Turkey we are grateful. President Soekarno had told me, "All my forces are yours. Take all that we have and protect Pakistan." We suffered a heavy loss on the Khem Karan front. Our brave forces twice reached near Amritsar's suburbs. But on both occasions they were called back. General Yahya Khan, Air Marshal Nur Khan, and the present PAF Chief, Air Marshal

Rahim, all of them wanted to teach India a lesson. But Musa Khan and Ayub Khan were frightened. And right at that time I was saying at the Security Council that we would fight for a thousand years.

My friends and brothers, before the war was over, President Ayub Khan had promised to the British and American representatives that he would not send me to represent Pakistan at the Security Council. But the Law Minister, S.M. Zafar, phoned the President from New York that Bhutto was badly needed at the Security Council. I told the President. "I am the Foreign Minister I am accountable to the people. So I should go and represent Pakistan there. Even China has withdrawn her ultimatum; so why do you stop me now from going there?" After a day-long discussion, I was allowed to go to New York at 7 p.m. And immediately after that, my departure was announced on the radio although it is never done during a war. India wanted to destroy the plane in which I was traveling. But with the blessings of God Almighty, she could not do that. Next morning, at 9 O'clock I reached New York. I called a meeting of the Pakistani delegation, and asked them whether or not I should make a speech. The Pakistan Ambassador in the United States reacted in the negative. Our Permanent Representative at the U.N. also opposed my making a speech. I told them that I had to convey the voice of the Pakistani people to the nations of the world. I said I wanted to tell them what injustice and treachery had been done to Pakistan.

My dear brothers, you know how I in the Security Council spoke about your struggles, sufferings and sacrifices. You triumphed. Your brave forces beat back the enemy. The people made sacrifices. They will always triumph!

After the war, Ayub Khan went to Washington and met President Johnson who frightened him, threatened him and forced him to his knees. I was pained to see the President of a brave nation being so easily browbeaten.

My dear brothers, we had stood up to the enemy. But Ayub Khan gave in. I was extremely pained. Ayub Khan was a selfish man, he was corrupt, he betrayed the nation at Tashkent. What do you ask me about Tashkent? Ask Ayub Khan. I was the one who opposed the Tashkent Declaration. He signed it.

The Incident at Sanghar
Public Speech at Gabole Park, Karachi,
April 12, 1970

I was looking forward to this opportunity to visit the poor and downtrodden area of Lyari and speak here about local and national problems. The Pakistan People's Party is your own party. You have formed it and it is the duty of the party to serve your cause and to bring prosperity not only to Lyari but to the whole country. I spoke in Gabole Park in 1964 when I was a Minister. It was a very small meeting. I am an ordinary citizen now but today the gathering is mammoth. I am an ordinary person who wants to serve you. I do not want to become a strong man or self-conceited or intolerant.

We want to build Pakistan. We do not want to destroy anything useful. We want to launch a movement for constructive work. We want to coerce no one. Instead, we want to win your hearts through love and service. Whatever the conspiracies against us, whatever the plans against us, we are not going to be scared off. We are with the people, shall continue to be with the people at every stage, through every trial. My dear friends please remember that there is a Sanghar in Lyari today. In fact, the whole of Pakistan has been turned into a Sanghar. Whatever plans our opponents may make against us and whatever the number of murder threats or murder attempts, we shall continue to fight them with the help of the people. This is my solemn promise to you.

You must have come to know through the newspapers what happened at Sanghar. This was not the first incident of its kind. There was a regular battle in Sanghar with guns and rifles. Our opponents were occupying bunkers and were sitting in trees with their rifles. The attack was carried out at about noon. The Deputy Commissioner and the Superintendent of police of the district never informed us about this conspiracy. They must have had knowledge of the fact that people in large numbers, armed with rifles were coming from far off places since the night before to ambush us. The arches erected for our reception were hacked down with hatchets. Our people reported the matter to the police at 2 a.m. and complained against excesses. The Superintendent of Police told them to come later in the morning. Our workers again went to the Superintendent of Police after a hours and told him that people in large numbers were coming into town they were afraid there might be bloodshed.

We were at that time in Shahdadpur which is eleven miles away. We left Shahdadpur at 10.30 a.m. in a procession. When we reached a place miles from Sanghar the district officials came to us and requested us to go to the Rest House before holding our meeting. They said they wanted to make some arrangements

in the meanwhile. We accepted their request to go to the Rest House. I must make it clear that the route we were on also led to the House. The Deputy Commissioner asked us to stay outside the city. On outskirts of Sanghar the pickets set up by our opponents were stronger. We had in fact been surrounded. There was no question of our halting on the

Now we could not have gone to the Rest House because we were rounded from all sides. Later, we learnt that even the Rest House had surrounded. Then they opened up. My friends and colleagues saved me. Government later told the Press that Bhutto had been requested to on his way to Sanghar but he did not. I say this is a white lie. How could we have stopped on our way to Sanghar? We could not have gone to Rest House either, because it too was surrounded. Why did they want us to go to the Rest House? When we moved towards the Rest House a hail of bullets was fired at me. I was in a motor car but I came out because I wanted to face death bravely. I started walking forward and told my opponents that I was standing before them and that they need not fire on my friends and colleagues. I was Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and they could shoot me. They started firing again. My friends fell upon me and I had a very narrow escape

The Press has reported that the firing took place after I had left Sanghar. This is absolutely wrong. This is a lie. Now we are being asked to prove who was responsible for the firing. On the one hand, they are issuing absolutely baseless press notes alleging that I was escorted to a jeep. I never sat in a jeep. My friends put me in a Dodge but that car was also fired upon and a bullet missed me by inches. Many bullets hit the car in which I was sitting. The press notes are false. In spite of this they want us to cooperate with the enquiry committee. We had demanded that the enquiry should be absolutely and should be conducted by a judge of the High Court. How can the executive enquire into the misdeeds of the executive? That is why the working committee of the People's Party had demanded that the enquiry should be conducted by a high court judge. The present government is not impartial. The speeches of people backed by the Government are being widely covered but my statements are blacked out by the press. When I held a press conference in Karachi an order was given that it should not be covered on television. May I ask who gave this order? This is not impartiality. I repeat that this government is not impartial.

I know many people since the time I was a Minister. General Yahya has now been elevated to a very high position. The General said in Rawalpindi on 31st March at a press conference that he has four caps, that of Head of the State, Chief Martial Law Administrator, Supreme Commander and Commander-in-Chief. Yahya Sahib, may God bless you with a fifth cap too. Mr. President, the whole nation is bareheaded and you are playing with four caps. Why is this system of exploitation being perpetuated? Why are these injustices being done?

The President should take into consideration the fact that none of these four caps have been given to him by the people. It was the people who launched a movement and faced a dictator. That dictator was much stronger than Yahya Khan, He had come in to power eleven years ago when there was much less political consciousness in the country. The parliamentary system had failed for reasons that are well known. The politicians had no following. Ayub Khan had long conspired to usurp power. Then he introduced the Basic Democracies system and strengthened his position through 80,000 hand-picked Basic Democrats. He enforced an undemocratic constitution but it was a constitution. He also had the support of a party, whatever its worth. He had huge amounts of money at his disposal. He had to control only two provinces which was comparatively easier through two governors. He was supported by the army, the police and the bureaucracy. In spite of this when the people launched a movement, the dictator was brought down. This is a great achievement which should never be forgotten by the present rulers or by those who may come in to power tomorrow.

I am saying it in good faith that the lessons of history should not be forgotten. Don't forget that Hitler, Stalin and Mussolini are no more but the people of Germany, Russia and Italy are very much there. Similarly, the people of Pakistan will always be there. This is no accident but a principle of history based on truth.

My party believes that it will win over the people by serving them honestly. I know President Yahya Khan and understand his decisions. I had a meeting with him on the 11th in Karachi in which he assured me of his impartiality. But I want to point out that his government is not impartial. One of his ministers is a representative of the rightist Jamaat-e-Islami. How can this government be impartial?

Recently an Islamic Conference was held at Jeddah in order to establish an Islamic Secretariat of the Islamic countries. You have seen that Egypt, the Sudan, Libya and Algeria did not participate in this conference. Turkey also abstained from joining the Secretariat. I am told that Iran also opposed it. This means that the Muslim world has been divided but our minister declared on arrival in Pakistan that the conference was a great success.

If this conference has been successful it simply means that its purpose was to create a division among Muslim states. You will recall that not long ago as Foreign Minister of Pakistan I attended many international conferences. You will recall the Casablanca Conference. You will also recall that during the 1965 war with India the entire Muslim world supported us. It included Algeria, Libya, the Sudan, Iran and Turkey. We can again secure their support but it requires a lot of

political insight which is a rare thing. International politics is a very intricate game and very tactful handling of international relations is required to gain that support.

I was telling you about President Yahya Khan's claim that he is impartial and our view that his government is not. He has repeated his promise, in his speech on 28th March, that his government will remain impartial. I want to point out to the President that the Government must show impartiality in practice. The members of his government should not be allowed to make objectionable speeches. The plain truth is that the representatives of Jamaat-e-Islami are present in the Government. How can this government be impartial? It has been further proved by the Sanghar incident that the Government is not impartial. I must declare, however, that we shall remain in the political field irrespective of the fact whether the Government is impartial or not. We are bound to win, however intense the opposition by Ministers who are partial. Victory will be ours because the people are with us.

My dear friends please remember that there can be no acceptable decision without the people's support. Whether the elections are held or not, whether the constitution is framed or not, the people's verdict on the constitutional, political and economic matters is what matters. The Pakistan People's Party is the party of the masses. It is your party and it represents your feelings. There is no difference between you and me. My voice is your voice. When I say that no constitutional or political questions can be solved without the agreement of the Pakistan People's Party, I only represent your feelings. The people of Pakistan from Karachi to Khyber support the Pakistan People's Party because this party belongs to the common man. The success of this party means the success of the common man if one Bhutto is assassinated, a thousand Bhuttos will arise. If I am killed, the people of Pakistan will carry on this democratic struggle.

My dear brothers, please remember that the solution to our problems lies in hard work. There is no short cut to it. Every government which has come to power has tried to make us believe that they would find an easy solution. There have been innumerable schemes and plans to unify the people but none has been successful. The fact remains that it is a very difficult task. We have selected for ourselves a path which is full of difficulties but that is the only way to solve our problems. You can see the situation prevailing in Pakistan. You had struggled for freedom but your difficulties are increasing every day. Here in Lyari drinking water is not available. There are no playgrounds. The lease question had not been decided although Ayub Khan had promised during his election campaign to grant permanently leases to the residents, of Lyari. Six years have elapsed since that promise but you have not been granted leases in spite of many

resolutions and meetings. It was done only yesterday because I was to deliver a speech here today.

I had announced on the 3rd that I shall speak to my brothers and sisters in Lyari on the 12th. As a result of this announcement you were granted this lease after six years. It was done not because of me but because of your power. I do not see any difference between my power and yours. A football match is being played in Lyari today so that the people should go to see that match and not come to my meeting. I say if they have to play football let them play against us. If they want to play cricket we are prepared to play cricket with them. We are already facing them in the political field.

We talk of the people's problems. Ours is a revolutionary party. It is our solemn promise to the poor and oppressed people of Lyari that if the Pakistan People's Party comes to power we shall change the face of this locality. These are no false promises. These are no mere election stunts. These are my promises as a Muslim and a Pakistani. You will recall that I had promised to give you a free foreign policy. I fulfilled that promise. I promised you that we would defeat dictatorship and remove Ayub Khan. With your co-operation, we toppled Ayub Khan. Now it is my promise to you that we shall, Insha Allah, change economic conditions and root out poverty and misery from the country.

My dear friends, many people say that this cannot be done. I say that if this can be done throughout the world why can't it be done in Pakistan? Leaving aside big powers, you have only to look at our neighboring countries. You will realize that they have made tremendous progress. We do want the constitution to be framed because it is the fundamental law. We do not regard the constitution as sacred. You cannot eat the constitution if you are hungry. The constitution cannot provide you daily bread and shelter. There is no difference so far as the question of constitution is concerned. We shall make every effort and work day and night to frame a constitution within 120 days. With that object in view we shall participate in the elections, provided the people permit us to do so.

I had said that we shall take action against some people; of course, we shall fix the corrupt officials, the imperialists, the blood suckers, those who want to sell Kashmir, those who want to separate East and West Pakistan, those enemies of the country who betrayed the people of Lyari. If I die, you will fix them on my behalf.

The President's Legal Framework Order is said to be based on five principles: Islamic ideology, integrity of Pakistan democracy, provincial autonomy and progress. But that is not the end of the matter. They will have to be discussed, defined and demarcated. There has to be agreement on the quantum of

provincial autonomy, and on how to decide whether a proposed measure is against Pakistan's integrity or Islamic principles. The elections will be contested by several parties with diverse programmes. The Legal Framework Order is a new starting point. Let us hope that the electoral race will be impartially supervised and that the same set of rules will apply to all. The constitution will be framed by the representatives of 120 million people. If the principle of democracy is included among the principles of the L.F.O., the decision of these representatives should be final. It will be against the spirit of democracy if the President has the power to reject the decision of the people's representatives.

The Main Issue is Equality
Public Speech at Campbellpur,
April 19, 1970

The Pakistan People's Party is not so old. It is a new party. It came into being only three years ago, but you have seen that this party has gained a lot of support during the last three years. What is the reason for its success? One reason is that the Pakistan People's Party is a party of the masses. It is your party. Its politics will always be the politics of the people. This party will always stand by you. I can never forget the fact that I did not have the support of the big people. The party could not trot out well-known persons. No big landlords, jagirdars, maliks, sardars and sheikhs were with us, but you were with us. Our support was from the poor labourers and farmers. When we launched the campaign against Ayub Khan, the big people, the capitalists did not support us. On the other hand, Ayub Khan had everything on his side. He had the support of people with well-known names, the big landlords and the capitalists. The entire government machinery was at his command. The government servants, the police and the army were with him. He held power in the country and could use the big stick well. He could send the people to jail. He had full control over newspapers, radio and television. He had so many ministers. Then there were the Basic Democrats. He had his political party. This party had huge amounts of money at its disposal. They could issue permits for the setting up of industrial units, and they could bestow lands on those whose support they wanted.

Ayub Khan was a dictator and had all the power in his hands. There were many other parties, much older than the People's Party. These parties had been in existence for a number of years but they did nothing against Ayub Khan. Now they are claiming that they launched the campaign against Ayub Khan. They cannot pass any judgment on this issue nor can I. Judgment will be passed by history and by you.

Our party has progressed because its first and foremost principle is to have contact with the people. We may have to fight anyone. We may have to endure hardships but we cannot give up this principle: As I have said we did not have the support of the important people nor that of government servants, the police or the army. We were empty-handed but we launched a political campaign which no other party could have done under similar conditions. We came to you directly and secured your support. We stood by you and you stood by us. I see no difference between the people of Pakistan and the Pakistan People's Party. They are one and the same. The progress of this party is the progress of the people. If any harm comes to this party you should regard it as a loss to the people of Pakistan. The old parties which have utterly failed and which have

done no service to the country during the last 23 years are forming fronts and entering into alliances. Those who were opposed to one another are joining hands and forging united fronts. It is because they see that the people are awakened now and that there is a political party which believes in the people's politics. This party has direct contacts with the masses. The politics of these old parties has never been the people's politics. Their politics was that of sharing the spoils. They used to hatch conspiracies in closed rooms and the ministries changed hands. This was not the politics of the people.

The first Constituent Assembly was dissolved by Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad. This was an illegal act but there was no public outcry. The politicians should have demanded general elections. Instead, they went and joined the second Constituent Assembly. This Assembly was not elected by you. The members did not come through your votes. In fact you have never exercised your votes to elect a national assembly since Pakistan's existence. How did these governments come into being? How were these persons elected? They never went to the people because their actions were against the interests of the common man. Their effort always was to form governments through the intrigues of a few capitalists and politicians. These people manipulated the formation of governments and formulation of laws. They never asked the opinion of the common man because they did not believe in the politics of the people.

These same persons went to the Round Table Conference of Ayub Khan. We can forgive their old misdeeds but why did they go to the Round Table Conference of Ayub Khan? It is because they did not want to go to the masses, because they did not believe in the people's politics. They were the persons who declared during the movement against Ayub Khan that they would never talk to Ayub Khan but when he extended an invitation to them they went rushing to Rawalpindi to attend the Round Table Conference. What was the purpose of holding this conference? The idea was that Ayub Khan should stay on in power. He was not prepared to give up power and these persons who clamored for democracy hurried to join the Conference.

What was the attitude of our party? We declared that decisions should not be taken by the Round Table Conference but by the people of Pakistan. We did not join the Conference because it would have been a betrayal of the people of Pakistan. Our youth had shed their blood in this movement. The workers had come out of their mills and the farmers had stopped ploughing their fields. This was a people's movement and we could not have betrayed its cause. We did not go to the Round Table Conference because we knew that its object was the continuance of Ayub in power. It meant the perpetuation of the Basic Democracies' system and the old order. We did not join the Conference because

we believed that all decisions about the constitution or policies or the economic system should be taken by the people. Only such decisions can be valid and lasting.

We do not want another round table conference. We want a conference of the people. The people's views should provide the basis for the constitution and whatever political structure is to be built should be shaped and supported by the will of the people. Similarly, the economic system of the country should also be formed according to the wishes of the people. You should never worry about the threat to our party from fronts forged by political parties opposing us. The people should form a united front comprising the workers, the tenants and the students. That IS the ideology of this party. This party will always stand by you and will never betray you.

The second reason why the People's Party will succeed is that it has given you a people's programme in writing and it has proved its sincerity. You know that my political life is spread over a brief period of ten to twelve years but it is entirely different from the careers of the old politicians. During this period, I have kept my pledges to the people. My first promise to the people was to give them an independent foreign policy. Ayub Khan's policy was damaging for Pakistan. It got us into many difficulties. Pakistan had earned the hostility of the neighboring big powers. The very integrity of Pakistan was endangered. Our foreign policy was subservient to the dictates of one big power. The 120 million people of Pakistan were made to act according to the wishes of this big power. Certainly, this was not the Pakistan of Quaid-i-Azam's dreams. Quaid-i-Azam wanted a free Pakistan where the people's will would prevail. He wanted a strong Pakistan with an independent foreign policy.

The foreign policy pursued by Ayub Khan was totally wrong. I was determined that our foreign policy would be independent. When I was Foreign Minister I fulfilled this promise, by the Grace of God, and with your support. Pakistan developed friendship with Russia, China and the Middle Eastern countries. Later governments have declared time and again that Pakistan has a very good foreign policy. Even the enemies of Pakistan acknowledge that Pakistan's foreign policy is very good. This foreign policy was initiated in my time and the old foreign policy was discarded. That policy was not in keeping with the wishes of the people. During the war with India I served the country to the best of my ability. I need not go into details as these events are known to the nation.

Another promise I made was regarding the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. I had declared that we would defeat this dictatorship. With the help of God Almighty and through your struggle we were successful in keeping this promise. Now our promise with you is that, God willing, we shall eradicate poverty and hunger

from Pakistan. With your co-operation we can certainly banish poverty and hunger from this country. The troubles of the people can certainly be brought to an end. Why is it that the people of Pakistan are suffering from so many miseries? There are ways and means of bringing this state of affairs to an end. But the intention to do so must be honest and the method realistic. It has been done in other countries. There is prosperity in other countries. People get food, clothing, employment and free education for their children in other countries.

Unfortunately, in Pakistan, even after 23 years of freedom, the poor are suffering and almost all our industrial wealth and financial resources are concentrated in the hands of 22 families. Now our entire struggle is directed only towards one end and that is a fundamental change in the economic order. On the one side, you will find arrayed against us political parties which are the stooges of capitalists whose cause they have served for 23 years. They are the people who have brought the country to the verge of destruction. On the other side, you will find pitched against them, the Pakistan People's Party. This party declares that it will not put up with tyranny, oppression and will bring to an end this corrupt system.

The most important question, rather the only question which is important to us, is the question of the economic system. There is no difference of opinion so far as the question of the constitution is concerned. Everyone wants a constitution. We also want a constitution because it is the fundamental law of the land and this country cannot exist without a constitution. We promise that we shall strive hard for a constitution and a people's constitution will be framed which will be a workable constitution. The difference arises only on the question of eradication of poverty because we believe that if the people are dying of hunger, the constitution cannot serve as food and satisfy their hunger. If the people need clothing, the constitution cannot be worn as a garment. Similarly, a constitution cannot by itself be a substitute for a house or employment. We have already tried two constitutions in 23 years. I hope that the third constitution will be more realistic.

That is my most earnest desire and prayer. But a constitution will not solve all your problems nor will the elections solve all your problems. Elections have been held previously. India has had several general elections but you know that the people in India are still poor.

Let me repeat that a constitution will be framed but the constitution alone will not solve your problems; elections will also be conducted but they alone cannot serve all purposes. I have told you that elections have been held in our neighbouring country, but the plight of the people in that country remains as deplorable as here because they also have the capitalist system. The same system

prevails in Pakistan. When Quaid-i-Azam struggled for Pakistan he aimed at undoing the capitalist system. Quaid-i-Azam did not want the capitalist system of India to prevail in Pakistan. That was a system being practised by the Hindus. When you joined the struggle for Pakistan it was not merely for the partition of the subcontinent. The ultimate objective was that the hateful system of exploitation should be abolished. The Muslims of the subcontinent made innumerable sacrifices only with this object in view. You can see that the system which is a legacy of the British still prevails. You have suffered under this system for the last 23 years. The troubles of the people have increased while they struggled and sacrificed to enjoy the benefits of liberty. They wanted to benefit from freedom but, my dear brothers, what comforts have you seen after independence? Your troubles continue to be the same. In fact, they have increased. That is why I say that a mere constitution will not serve any purpose unless the economic system is changed radically.

We have to bring down some people who are sitting at the higher rung of the ladder and we have to raise the status of the down-trodden poor. That is our struggle and we have given you in writing our three principles. You can see that there is no scope for cheating. Those who have cheated you have been exposed. You know very well what promises were made to you during the last 23 years and what was done. Nothing has been done. You have to compare their achievements with our performance. They will never give you anything in writing. They are only paying lip-service while we have put everything down in black and white. We are with the people of Pakistan and shall not betray them under any circumstances.

We have declared in our manifesto that our first principle is, 'Islam is our religion.' This is the most important principle. Islam is our religion and we shall lay down our lives for its cause. We are prepared for any sacrifice in the name of Islam. I am imbued with the spirit of Islam. That is why I declare that there can be no danger to Islam from my party. My faith is that Islam is an eternal religion. It appears very strange to me that some persons repeatedly declare that Islam is in danger. Who are these people? They are the people who opposed Pakistan and who opposed the Quaid-i-Azam. They opposed Pakistan till the last moment, and even after it had come into being. Now when they have seen that Pakistan has come to stay they are saying that they were never against Pakistan. You can look up their books in which they have written against Quaid-i-Azam. Now they say that Islam is in danger but during the Kashmir war they issued fatwas against it. They called Quaid-i-Azam, "the Quaid-i-Kufr." When people were dying for Pakistan in the struggle for its achievement, these "leaders" were siding with our enemies. When the struggle was in progress against the Hindus, the British and the Congress, where were these people? They didn't feel that Islam was in danger at that time. But when Pakistan came into being and when

Quaid-i-Azam emerged successful they began to say that Islam was in danger. When we were pitched against the real enemies of Islam, Islam did not appear to be in danger to them. Now in a Muslim country they are dubbing the Muslims as 'kafirs.' A Muslim himself becomes a 'kafir' if he unjustly declares another Muslim to be an infidel.

You live in Pakistan. You and your children and your elders offer prayers, your friends offer prayers, you believe in God Almighty, you recite the Holy Quran. Do you see any enemies of Islam roaming around like guerrillas? If you do not feel any danger; then how can there be any danger to Islam? A danger can be seen or felt if it exists. Only recently in Sanghar we could sense the danger before we were shot at. Have you sensed any danger? If there is a flood or a calamity or pain it can be felt or seen. Why are they propagating that Islam is in danger? Islam certainly is not in danger. Of course, the capitalists, the thieves and the exploiters are in danger.

The second principle of the party is that democracy is our polity. There are two types of political structure, democratic or dictatorial. Ayub Khan's rule was a dictatorship and you struggled against it. The people of Pakistan struggled for democracy. A true democracy is a people's government because it is the people who make or unmake governments. We all believe in democracy and shall struggle for it. There are also two types of economic systems, one based on inequality which is called capitalism and the other based on social justice which is called socialism. In capitalism, a few people exploit the labor and the hard work of the poor. The workers produce and the capitalists enjoy its benefits.

Our third principle is that our economy should be based on equality which is a cardinal principle of our religion. Islam was the first to give the message of equality to the world. Anyone can study the life of the Holy Prophet as also the lives of the Khulafa-e-Rashedeen. They based their lives on the principle of equality. We are fighting for the same type of equality because it brings an end to poverty, hunger and exploitation. It enables the worker to enjoy the fruits of his hard work. That is the only solution for your Poverty and Islam has taught this lesson to the world.

I am not the first one to demand Islamic Socialism. It was Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah who called for this system in his speeches. The great Quaid who brought this country into being demanded Islamic Socialism. Nobody can deny the fact that Quaid-i-Azam had promised to promulgate the system of Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. The first Prime Minister of the country, Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan, announced the same programme. This was later repeated by Mr. Suhrawardy. If it had not been a principle of our religion, Quaid-i-Azam would never had said that he wanted equality. We demanded

equality because it is one of the principles of our religion and because it is one of the promises of our Quaid-i-Azam.

It is also a remedy for the poverty and deprivation which are the major problems of this country. You can very well see the achievements of other systems. Under this system the poor have not progressed. Only the 22 families have progressed. The number of mills and banks and insurance companies has increased but so has our poverty. You can take stock of your plight. Don't you want to educate your children? Are not the people of this country hard working? Are the people of this country lazy? No! they work day and night in the fields. Presently, they are busy reaping the wheat harvest in blazing sun and scorching heat. The workers are toiling day and night in the mills. Don't they deserve a comfortable life? Don't they feel pain and misery? Don't they have any ambitions? What is the condition of the majority?

If you want to serve the cause of Islam I advise you to serve the Muslims. The position of the Muslims of Pakistan is that they cannot provide proper education for their children. When they fall sick, they cannot provide medical aid for themselves. They have no money to fall back upon. The people are starving. How can such conditions be allowed under Islam? My objective is to serve the people.

We are not introducing any system opposed to Islam. We do not want the systems of China or Russia or any other country. Our opponents want to adopt the British parliamentary system and call it Islamic democracy. If the parliamentary system of the British can be called Islamic democracy, socialism can be called Islamic equality. If the coining of the term, "Islamic Democracy" does not go against Islam, the term "Islamic Equality" also is not against Islam. When we say this our critics declare that we are opposed to a parliamentary system. Our manifesto says we want a parliamentary government. The point we raise is why our opponents are so selective; seeking the cover of Islam for something that is essentially a framework for a constitution and rejecting the end result which is social justice? Why do they object when we call it Islamic equality or Musawat.

When we talk of equality, when we talk" of eradication of poverty and hunger, when we say that we want to bring everybody at par; they say that it is against Islam. It is not against Islam. The people are bound to succeed come what may. The common man will triumph and that day will certainly dawn over Pakistan when poverty, hunger and exploitation will cease to exist. The day will come when the people are victorious. We are with you; we shall stand by you till our death. You will see that exploitation ends, that the tribulations of the common

man will be no more. That is our struggle and we shall carry it forward till success is achieved.

**A Long March for People's Rights
Speech at a Public Meeting,
Abbottabad, April 19, 1970**

As you all know God Almighty sent 124,000 prophets to the people of the world till such time that religion was completely revealed. During that period, there could be a danger to religion. We believe that with the appearance of the Last of the Prophets (peace be upon him) the revelation of religion was complete. Had there been any danger to Islam, Mohammad (peace be upon him) would not have been the Last of the Prophets. We can safely conclude that there is no danger to Islam at all. That is the one reason why no more prophets will be sent to the world. This is an article of faith with us because our religion is a complete code of life and God Himself is its protector.

Leaving aside the religious aspect of this question, I wish to call upon you to use your common sense. May I ask you a simple question? How many of you living in this country feel any danger to their faith? If Islam had been in danger, you would have palpably felt it. You are living in Pakistan. There is nobody in this country to preach anything against religion. Nobody comes to your homes to prevent you from offering your prayers. Nobody has ever asked you not to have faith in God Almighty or not to recite the Holy Quran. None has preached against performing Haj. There is no such party in Pakistan. When the fire is kindled, the sparks are visible. If there is flood, the water can be seen all around. If a storm is blowing, it can be seen. Because you do not feel any danger to Islam, it is proved that there is no danger to Islam. In fact, there can be no danger to Islam in Pakistan because it is a Muslim country. There are no enemies of Islam in Pakistan.

When the Quaid-i-Azam was struggling for Pakistan, when blood was being spilled and when people were making sacrifices for the cause of Pakistan, these so-called defenders of Islam were not in the ranks with Quaid-i-Azam. The nation was passing through a critical phase and the Hindus and the British had joined hands in a big conspiracy against the establishment of Pakistan. Our enemies were siding with Nehru, Patel and Gandhi. When we took on our enemies, these people advised us against the establishment of Pakistan. At that time, they dubbed the Quaid-i-Azam as a great infidel. During our struggle against the enemies of Islam, these people were against the Pakistan movement. What right do they have now to tell us that Islam is in danger in Pakistan? No, none at all! Islam is not in danger in the present circumstances. It is the capitalist system which is in danger.

We declare that democracy is our polity. There are two types of political systems, the democratic and the dictatorial. You have struggled against a dictatorship and defeated it. Dictatorship is one man's rule. It is not a people's government. That is why you were opposed to it. We were with you during this struggle. That is why our second principle is that democracy is our polity.

In so far as our third principle is concerned, it relates to the economic problems of the people. This, in fact, is the basic problem. This problem concerns you and in order to solve it, we demand Islamic equality. Equality is one of the basic principles of our religion. The English term for musawat is 'socialism' We do not want to fight on the question of terminology. However, I am not the first one to commit the crime of using this term. It was the Quaid-i-Azam who first used it. You can consult the relevant books. You will find that the Quaid-i-Azam declared that Islamic Socialism would be established in Pakistan. Later this was repeated by Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan as well. I want to make it clear to my Pakistani brothers that so long as the solution to your poverty is not found, this country can never progress. There has been no progress during the last 23 years. The reason is that the capitalists ruled the country. Just as dictatorship is hateful in politics, similarly capitalism is hateful in economics. If democracy is not opposed to Islam, equality too is not against Islam. Everybody knows that there is no parliamentary system in Islam. But Islam is based on equality. Why do our opponents ignore this? Whose cause do they serve?

The People's Party is your party. You have formed this party. We are with you. We have never cheated you. When I first appeared on the scene I had promised you an independent foreign policy. The previous policy, formulated by the imperialists and followed for 12 years was detrimental to the national interest. This policy was against the integrity and sovereignty of the country. Pakistan became the laughing stock of the world. Even small countries of the world made fun of us. When I assumed office as Foreign Minister, I said that the foreign policy of the imperialists was totally wrong and I promised that we would formulate an independent foreign policy.

We established good relations with the countries we had ignored. Our relations with Afghanistan were very strained. We did not have good relations with Russia and not much contact with China. When I went to Russia in the capacity of Minister for Natural Resources, I concluded an agreement there which initiated a phase of good relations with that big power. Later, we developed the best of relations with China. When we fought a war against India, countries from Algeria to Jordan supported Pakistan. We did not have an Islamic Secretariat at that time! Recently, when the question of establishing an Islamic Secretariat was raised, many Arab countries refused to have anything to do with it. During our war with India Shastri himself declared that India had been isolated. All these

changes took place when I was Foreign Minister. My foreign policy was the people's foreign policy. During the war with India, I spoke in the Security Council and declared firmly that we shall fight India resolutely. It was at this meeting that Swaran Singh left the Security Council. I had said that we were not afraid of India because we were fighting for a just cause. Ayub Khan was afraid of India. He used to take out a map and show to us the size of India. He used to point out that India was a big country and had a large population and immense resources. I used to tell him, "Ayub Khan Sahib, please roll up this map. We will fight India."

During my short political life, this was my first promise which was fulfilled. May I ask the Islam exploiters, whose careers range from thirty to forty years, what have they done for this country? What services have they rendered to Pakistan that they have the courage to offer themselves again for public office? They should stay at home and take some rest now. There is a right time for everything, for marriage, for life and death. Similarly, there is an age which is right for politics. Their watches stopped in 1950. Ever since they have been taking them to the watchmaker for repairs, but they have failed to make them tick.

The Peoples Party is important not because I founded it, but because it is your party and always reflects your opinion and demands. It will never betray the people. I fulfilled the first promise by giving the country a new foreign policy. The second promise fulfilled was to confront India, and stop its aggression. My third promise was to launch a campaign against dictatorship. We were ready to make all sacrifices. We were prepared to go to jails and to do anything needed for the overthrow of the dictator. We formed a revolutionary party and launched a campaign against the dictator. Now, all other parties are claiming that they started the campaign against Ayub Khan.

They never launched any struggle against Ayub Khan. How could they do it? They were all afraid of him and trembled at the very mention of his name. They accuse me of siding with Ayub Khan. Of course, I was with Ayub Khan when the people accepted him and when he had promised that he would work for the progress and prosperity of the country. When he betrayed the people, I left him.

These parties never struggled against Ayub Khan. My dear brothers and sisters, you have to decide this. When Ayub Khan had been toppled, these people came out and started claiming that they had done this and done that. I say that the last blow to dictatorship was delivered by the people. Until the people rose against him, workers left the mills, the peasants their fields and the students their studies, the dictator could not be defeated. The surprising thing is that supporters of Six Points also went to see him. I think that it was the first time in history that a people defeated a dictatorship. It was possible because we sided

with you during this struggle. We did not ask you to go and fight and spill your blood while we watched the outcome of the struggle. We were with you in all the phases of the struggle. I had to go to jail and to suffer imprisonment in the Mianwali and the Sahiwal jails. You were my strength at that time. Now our promise is that we shall uproot this corrupt system which has promoted poverty and deprivation in the country. We shall bring this system to an end and establish people's rule.

I am very well aware of the fact that this is going to be an arduous, struggle. A lot of sacrifices will be required to secure the people's rights. We need a long march. When I say that we would undertake a long march I am dubbed as a communist. I say that the first long march in history was undertaken by Imam Hussain.

My dear brothers, please remember that it is going to be a hard struggle, but we are bound to succeed. You have learnt a lot during 23 years of independence. You have never enjoyed any benefit from this independence. Other countries have progressed and prosperity prevails in them after independence. Why is the situation in Pakistan different from that? In Pakistan, it is not animals but human beings who live here. This is not a slave country. Why should poverty and hunger keep on spreading in this country? This certainly is not God's will. It is because of the wrong capitalist system. A patient needs the right type of medicine for treatment. If the wrong medicine is given the malady will not be cured. The stooges of the imperialists can clearly visualise the danger ahead. This system increases the prosperity of the capitalists who go on establishing one mill after another. Their mills are increasing in number every day. We are not afraid of them. We have to establish only one mill and that is the mill of Pakistan.

That mill will be established. It will be established in accordance with the dream of the Quaid-i-Azam and all those who supported the Pakistan movement. The people who tell us that the Pakistan ideology is in danger, are themselves in danger. The problems of the people have to be given full attention. The common man's miseries have to be ended. We are not afraid of sacrifices. I do not understand why they are afraid of our speeches. We are not afraid of their speeches. They may deliver speeches anywhere. We talk about the people's problems and suggest measures for their solution. It is because we belong to the people. If I had spoken at Sanghar, it would not have resulted in a revolution. But they are afraid of my speeches because I am your voice, the people's voice.

Our party stands for three principles. We shall always side with you. We shall never betray you. We shall fight for the promises that we have made. We have given you our programme. Our very first principle is that Islam is our religion. This is the most important principle. We are proud of the fact that we are

Muslims. We shall wage a 'jihad' for the cause of Islam, not only in Pakistan but anywhere in the world, if required. Our holy war will also be against poverty.

We say that if you want to serve the ideology of Pakistan, do not pay mere lip-service to it. The ideology of Pakistan means that the Muslims of Pakistan should do their duty to Muslims who are in trouble anywhere in the world. If Muslim blood is being mercilessly shed in India, you cannot just wring your hands. If atrocities are being committed on the Muslims in the Middle East, you will have to do something about it. If the People's Party had been in power and if there had been a people's government in Pakistan, it would not have allowed India to get away with the killing of Muslims in Ahmedabad.

I call upon the Government's stooges not to take undue advantage of the situation and exploit the oppressed people of Pakistan. This Government is temporary. I want to inform them that a strong people's government will be established in Pakistan and it will call them to account. The ideology of Pakistan is that the Muslims of Pakistan should progress and the Muslims of the world should be helped whenever they need help. It is ironic that the persons who had opposed Pakistan are trying to teach us the ideology of Pakistan. The truth is that we are all imbued with the spirit of Islam. If we did not have the prestige of Islam dear to our hearts, we would not have declared that we would fight for a thousand years. How can a Muslim be against Islam? This is a baseless accusation which does not make any sense. If Islam were in danger, the people of Pakistan would have felt it. Gentlemen, do you feel that Islam is in danger? These people have some cheek telling us that Islam is in danger. When the enemies of Islam were trying to weaken the Muslims, these persons were siding with them. They were siding with the people who called the Quaid-i-Azam, "Quaid-i-Kufr." They are not only opposed to us; they were opposed to the Quaid-i-Azam too. They also issued edicts against Allama Iqbal. They do not issue edicts against bribery and exploitation. We respect the 'ulema' who are true religious leaders, but when they interfere in politics and sing their discordant tunes, we cannot accept them. They did not spare the Quaid-i-Azam. Those who called the Quaid-i-Azam a "kafir", are themselves the greatest of infidels.

Our second principle is that democracy is our polity. As I have explained politics is of two types, the politics of democracy and the politics of dictatorship. Dictatorship means one man's rule against the people, while in a democracy the people form the government through general elections. We believe in democracy. Economic systems are also of two types: the capitalistic system and the system of equality. We believe in equality. We are opposed to capitalism just as we are opposed to dictatorship. Our religion stands for equality. Islam was the first religion to give a message of equality for everyone. That is why we want

that Islamic equality should be established. Poverty and hunger cannot be stamped out without adopting the principles of equality.

I spoke about Tashkent in Lahore on 8 March. I quoted from certain books. During my recent tour, I had been told not to say anything more than what the Government had already made public. It was with this in view that I read out from the books but even this was criticized. I have nothing to add to what I have already said in Lahore. Whatever I can add can come when a people's government has been established in Pakistan. Presently, you should ask Ayub Khan. This question can be put to me when a government is established in Pakistan which openly discards and tears up the Tashkent Declaration, but if messages continue to be exchanged on the anniversary of the Tashkent Declaration, I cannot divulge anything. When the people resolve to launch a campaign against the Tashkent Declaration, I shall lead this campaign and point out the blunders committed in this Declaration. I have done my duty in Lahore and it was not possible for me to say much and explain how hard I tried to avert this Declaration. Even an Indian author has written that I tried to prevent this Declaration while they were very happy about it. I can only say that this Declaration is against the interests of Pakistan.

Gentlemen, I have explained to you that Islamic equality is called socialism. Our opponents say that it is against Islam. I say that equality is not against Islam. Some of the 'ulema' have declared that there is no equality in Islam, but there is justice in Islam. Even if we accept their stand, may we ask what justice demands? Justice demands equality. If the people are denied two square meals a day, if there is poverty and hunger, if the children are deprived of education, then it is not justice. It is equality which is in keeping with justice. Socialism is an English word and our friends are allergic to this English word. This struggle is against exploitation and capitalism. We do not want that the system of oppression should continue. This is the message of socialism or equality. The Quaid-i-Azam himself used this word. If you do not like the English word 'socialism', we can substitute it with Islami Musawat. When Liaquat Ali Khan, the first Prime Minister of Pakistan called for Islamic Socialism, why did they not declare that Islam was a complete code of life and that socialism was not needed? I accept that Islam is a complete code of life, but then why do they keep on repeating the demand for the 1956 Constitution? The Quran is our constitution. Why talk about any other constitution?

The parliamentary system is not mentioned in the Holy Quran. No verse of the Holy Quran or a saying of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) mentions the parliamentary system. Is it Islamic or not? This system was formulated by the British who ruled this country and who were our enemies. When it comes to a question of equal distribution of wealth and the eradication of poverty, our

opponents declare it to be against Islam. If there is no Islamic Socialism in Islam, then there is no Islamic democracy either. If they want Islamic democracy, then Islamic Socialism is also needed. If the politics is to be that of the people, the economic system should also be of the people. The condition of the Muslims is deteriorating every day. If they want to serve Islam, they should serve the Muslims. They should enable the Muslims to get education. There should be hospitals for them. They should be provided with clothing and shelter. The majority of the Muslims is becoming poorer every day while these leaders keep on repeating that Islam is in danger. This is no service to Islam. Service to Islam lies in service to the Muslims. That is Islamic Socialism. Our opponents cannot accuse us of cheating the people or of committing excesses. We cannot be charged with exploiting the people or for having misled them. That is the reason for this propaganda that we are endangering Islam. Islam cannot be in danger because it is an eternal religion.

We may have to launch a long struggle and offer innumerable sacrifices, but the people's rule will be established and we are bound to triumph.

Equality without Justice
Public Speech at Mansehra,
April 20, 1970

You will recall that during the Ayub regime I came to Mansehra. Our party was a new party at that time. We didn't have much support. There were no capitalists or landlords with us. Ours was a new party, which had come into existence against big odds. We didn't have many resources at our disposal. Ayub Khan wanted to destroy our party. He was the dictator of the country and had everything at his command. He had government servants, the police and the army at his beck and call. The capitalists and the landlords also sided with him. He had the support of Basic Democrats. We had promised you a struggle against the dictator. That was the wish of -the people and we carried it out. The situation in the country was alarming at that time. I had given my word in Mansehra that we shall form a popular party which would stand by the people. This promise has been fulfilled. You can compare the achievements of this party with other parties. You are well aware of the fact that other parties did not face up to dictatorship. It was only when the dictator had been defeated, when the elephant was wounded and brought down that these insects came out of hiding and started boasting about their struggle against dictatorship. The people know who was with them in the struggle.

My dear brothers, we had promised that we shall together fight against dictatorship. Prior to that I had promised you an independent foreign policy when I was Foreign Minister of the country. I fulfilled both these promises. Now, my third promise is that we shall establish Islamic equality in this country. This simply means that we shall end poverty, hunger and misery in Pakistan.

My dear brothers, our party stands for three principles. Our first principle is 'Islam is our religion' for which we are prepared to sacrifice our lives. If we did not have Islam dear to our hearts and if my heart was not full of the Islamic spirit how could I have faced the Indians in the Security Council? This is a Muslim country. It came into being because we are Muslims. When this country came into being and when Quaid-i-Azam struggled for it, where were the people who are now declaring that Islam is in danger? They were not with Quaid-i-Azam. They were against him. In fact, they were with Gandhi, Nehru and Patel who were the enemies of the Muslims.

During British rule and the struggle against the Congress, these gentlemen supported the Congress and the British, not the Quaid-i-Azam. When we were fighting against the enemies of Islam, they did not declare that Islam was in danger. It is now that they have come to realise that Islam is in danger. After the

establishment of Pakistan, Islam appears to be in danger to them. How can Islam be in danger in a country where the Muslims are in majority? Do you feel any danger to Islam in Pakistan? Where is the danger to Islam? Who has advised them against offering prayers or reciting the Holy Quran or to give up their religion? Islam cannot be in danger under any circumstances and anywhere because it is an eternal religion.

Please don't fall prey to false propaganda. Our opponents have nothing solid to say against us. They opposed Quaid-i-Azam and supported the Hindus. They cannot now concede to you that they are the people who actually exploited you and stood in the way of your progress. Of course, they themselves have prospered but they have ruined the country. For you they created miseries and inflicted poverty upon the people. They have betrayed you during the last 23 years which is not a short period. Every nation aspires to be free during her slavery because it wants to prosper and progress. The progress of a nation means the betterment of the lot of the common man. In Pakistan, the majority of the people, the workers and the farmers are becoming poorer every day. Our opponents who are responsible for this state of affairs and have exploited the common man will never accept the responsibility for their misdeeds. They can only try to cover their exploitation behind the slogan of 'Islam in danger.' They never can explain how Islam is in danger.

We do not want any foreign system to be introduced in Pakistan. We do not stand for the Russian, the Chinese, the British or the American system. We want a Pakistani system. We shall serve the cause of Islam and enable the Muslims to prosper. Today, Muslims are dying of hunger. The prices are up and income down. Bribery is rampant. The situation is worsening. How can the cause of Islam be served under these circumstances? We want to serve the cause of Islam by enabling the Muslims to prosper and progress. We want the children of the poor to be educated. We want to establish hospitals for the treatment of the poor. We want to provide housing for the common man.

Of course, we want that a constitution should be framed, but we have tried two constitutions already. We will again frame a constitution but a constitution cannot by itself satisfy the hunger and the need for education. If you do not have anything to eat you cannot eat the constitution. If you have nothing to wear, you cannot wear the constitution. The constitution cannot give you employment or housing or education. It cannot be a substitute for a mill, a house, or a school or a hospital. It is only a fundamental law.

We stand for this fundamental law, but it alone cannot solve problems. The two constitutions tried during the last 23 years could not do it. A third constitution will be framed because it is a legal requirement. There is no difference of opinion

or conflict in so far as the question of constitution-making is concerned. We all believe in democracy in politics. We have struggled against dictatorship because we want to establish the people's rule. We all want a constitution, but at the same time we want to eradicate poverty and hunger from the country.

Other countries have constitutions and democratic systems and they have also made progress. We want it too. Our country has not progressed because of a corrupt system which gave monopoly to a few capitalists. Unless capitalism is controlled the country cannot progress. We want Islamic equality in the country which simply means equality of opportunity. It does not mean that everybody will be of the same physical stature and shall have the same colour of the skin. It only aims at bringing to an end the disparity in the opportunities available to the people. If my son has a right to education, a poor man's son also has the same right.

This is equality, Islamic equality. This is the message which Islam gave to humanity. It was our religion which gave the principle of equality to the world. Please study the life of the Holy Prophet and the lives of the Khulafa-e-Rashedeen. This was the object of Islam and that was why it spread from one corner of the world to the other, from Europe to Asia, because it stood for equality. Now when we demand equality in accordance with our religion, our opponents say that it is against Islam. How can it be against Islam? If it had been against Islam, Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah, the founder of Pakistan, who was the greatest opponent of the British and the Indian National Congress, would not have desired to establish Islamic equality. Was he an enemy of the Muslims of Pakistan? He had declared that Islamic Socialism would be established in Pakistan. If our opponents are not against democracy, why are they against socialism? They use many English words like 'dictatorship' and 'constitution'. If we use the English word 'socialism' for musawat, why do they take exception to it? There is no parliamentary system in Islam for which alone they are clamouring. If parliamentary democracy is not against Islam, socialism, too, is not against Islam.

We haven't invented a new term. It is not a creation of our imagination. It was the Quaid-i-Azam who first used this term. Later, Liaquat Ali Khan also used this term. You can study the books of the Quaid-i-Azam, the Quaid-i-Millat and Allama Iqbal. You will find that this word has been used by them. There is nothing new in it. It is the sayings of the Quaid which we want to follow. There are many other Islamic countries where the system of Islamic equality prevails. Are they all 'kafirs'? Islamic Socialism has been adopted by Algeria, Egypt, the Sudan, Libya, Iraq and Syria in their own respective ways. Similarly, we shall have to adapt it in Pakistan according to our circumstances. Just as these

countries continue to be Muslim, Similarly we shall also remain a Muslim state because we are a Muslim people. The cry of 'Islam in danger' is a mere slogan of the capitalists' agents. These people are the stooges of the capitalists and they want to protect their interests. They have done nothing during the last 23 years. They have only served the cause of the capitalists who established mill after mill in the country. What is the plight of the people? Islam will be served only if the people of Pakistan, who are Muslims, are served. This is going to be our endeavor.

Our party stands for three principles that Islam is our religion. We stand for democracy because it brings in people's rule. We stand for everything which has popular supports. Our politics is the politics of the people. We are with you and we shall always be with you. We will ever betray you. Our politics is not the politics of Ayub's Round Table Conference. It is not the politics of the old politicians who have failed you, who never came to you, who never asked your opinion. They confined themselves to their drawing-rooms and framed their constitutions without the consent of the people. We declare that we have no right to sit in round table conferences and decide the fate of the people. The people will themselves take their decisions which will be valid. This is the reason why our party has gained immense popularity in the three years of its existence. You know we are not going to betray you and that we do not make false promises. I promised to give you an independent foreign policy. I fulfilled that promise and gave the country a foreign policy which was free from all shackles. Even my opponents praised this foreign policy. Our previous policy was that of the capitalists who were the stooges of the imperialists. That is why they framed a policy which served the interests of the imperialists. We brought this to an end and gave the country a popular foreign policy. We were with you and served your cause.

Later, we called upon you to struggle against Ayub Khan and join bands with us. I said this when I was last in Mansehra. We fulfilled this promise too and by the Grace of God and with your help defeated dictatorship. We also promised to fight against India bravely and we did fight against India bravely. Now I am giving you my word that we shall give you a constitution and establish a democratic system, but our special effort-will be to end the system of exploitation and capitalism. I am sure that you want to live an honorable life. You struggle hard because you are all workers. You are reaping your wheat harvest these days. You work day and night. You have every right to enjoy the fruits of your hard work. It is against justice that the wealth produced by you should be usurped by some other people.

This system needs a change; otherwise the very existence of Pakistan will be in danger. You can never prosper unless this system is changed. Poverty and

hunger cannot be eradicated unless the system is changed. The capitalists are conscious of the fact that we have launched a popular movement. We are not afraid of them. We are with the people and we shall lead them to the promised goals. Whatever we say is in accordance with the will of the people. That is why they are afraid of my speeches. If I had spoken in Sanghar heavens would not have fallen, but they tried to prevent my speech in Sanghar, It is because I speak the truth, because I represent the common man's feelings.

We have a popular programme. You will see that I do not criticise any party in my speeches. I do not attack anyone personally while my opponents have been speaking against me. They have been abusing me, but I have refrained from telling you all! I know about them. Let them utter all the lies that they want. You have two parties here in your area led by two Khans who carry on personal attacks against each other. We are not concerned with their accusations and counter-accusations. We are concerned with our own programme. By the way, how many Muslim Leagues are there in the market? And how many NAPs? Strange are- these people that while they criticise us, they continue to be divided themselves. This is only increasing our power and it will go on increasing because we have presented a practical programme according to the needs of the hour. Their watches stopped in 1950, but they want to serve the people. You can imagine the type of service they are capable of rendering.

Our party is your party because you have formed it and supported it. People from Karachi to Khyber are with this party because we talk of their problems. We shall never betray them, just as we have never betrayed them in the past. We have served them. Therefore, they are with us. Please strengthen the hands of this party because it is your party. If any harm comes to this party, your interests will be harmed. We want that your children should receive free education as far as possible, as far as our resources permit. The wealth and resources of the country are in the hands of 22 families at the moment. Unless this situation is changed, you cannot progress and you cannot be provided with everyday needs. We are not against private property. Those who say that we will abolish all private property, the small shops, the small factories and small land-holdings, are totally wrong. This is baseless propaganda.

What we want is that the big businessmen, the capitalists who own innumerable mills, should be subject to curbs and the people at the lower rung of the ladder should go up. That is our objective. We have given our programme in a written manifesto because we are not making false promises. We could very well say that we shall confiscate all property, but this is wrong. It will be against Islam, against the interests of the country. We do not want this. We only want to nationalize large factories and mills. Their wealth will be used for establishing schools and hospitals. Unless this is done, the equality of Islam cannot be

established. We have proved that equality is not against Islam. These people who are afraid of us, who are afraid of the awakened masses, who do not want a change in the abominable status quo, are leveling these false charges at us. They are the people who proclaim that there is no equality in Islam. They say that there is only justice in Islam. I say, what does justice stand for? Justice stands for equality. It is no justice that one individual should own thirty mills while another should starve. An equitable distribution of wealth is in accordance with the principles of justice. This is the only programmed and objective before us and with your support we are going to achieve it.

Their Watches Stopped In 1950
Public Speech at Dera Ismail Khan,
April 23, 1970

You will recall that when I came to your city during Ayub Khan's regime, ours was a new party. We didn't have much support. We didn't have the support of any capitalist, jagirdar or zamindar. It was a new party with little resources. The party had come into being against big odds. Ayub Khan was determined to annihilate this party. He was the dictator of this country and had all the power at his command. He had government servants, capitalists, jagirdars, the police, and the army on his side. He also had the Basic Democracies' system. We had given you our word that we would fight against this dictator. This was in accordance with the will of the people. We stood by our word and defeated the dictator.

Ours is a party of the masses. We shall always stand by our people at every turn and in every phase of the struggle. We shall sacrifice anything for the cause of the people. Many atrocities were committed during the dictatorial reign of Ayub Khan. Police was used against us. We were attacked. We were even fired upon. You will recall that our popular party was founded at a convention at Hyderabad on 21st September 1967 but the revolution started from D. I. Khan. This was a people's movement. We were with the people during this movement. We did not seclude ourselves in the drawing rooms issuing instructions to the people. We declared that there had been no progress in Pakistan that no prosperity had come to Pakistan. Our opponents did not want us to launch a people's campaign. Theirs was a politics of intrigue behind closed doors. They never tried to contact the people or to assess their opinion. They were afraid of the people. They wanted to keep the people ignorant and downtrodden.

You will recall that Ghulam Muhammad had illegally dissolved the first Constituent Assembly. He did not have the power to dissolve a sovereign assembly, but he illegally did it. These people did not come forward then. They did not try to awaken public opinion. Instead, they allowed the formation of a new constituent assembly, which started its session in Murree. This was not a democratic way of doing things. This constituent assembly had not been formed by the people. The Constitution framed by it failed because of this reason. This assembly was also a kind of round table conference Ayub style.

Later, when the movement was launched against Ayub Khan, he repeated the same performance. Instead of going to the people, he convened a Round Table Conference. Ghulam Muhammad had called his round table conference a constituent assembly. Basically, there was no difference between the two. The constituent assembly of Ghulam Muhammad did not seek the opinion of the

people. Similarly, Ayub Khan also ignored your opinion. People rose against him, laid down their lives and made sacrifices, with the result that Ayub Khan was toppled. Whom did Ayub Khan consult? He did not consult the labourers, the farmers, the students or the people. He talked to the politicians only, the same politicians who had declared during the movement that they would never talk to Ayub Khan. They had said this during their speeches while I was in jail, but when Ayub Khan invited them; they rushed to attend the Round Table Conference.

I did not attend the Round Table Conference because it was a conspiracy against the people. Ayub Khan did not intend to give up power. He did not call the conference with that object in view. He only wanted to sabotage the movement because the labourers had come out of their mills, the students had come out of their schools and colleges and the cultivators had left their ploughs and fields. The whole nation unitedly had come out against him and declared that the struggle against the Government would continue till the end. He was afraid of nothing else except this movement. He had the support of government servants, the police, the army and the Basic Democrats. It was only to sabotage the popular movement that the Round Table Conference was convened. When these people were intriguing against the common man in locked rooms, I was holding my round table conference with the people outside.

The People's Party has become very popular during a short time. The other parties, which are thirty, forty or fifty years old, have been left far behind. Why has this new party attained so much popularity? You can see that the Muslim League of the Quaid-i-Azam, which brought Pakistan into being, has been, divided into three factions. These parties are out-of-date. Their methods cannot work in modern times. Their methods are against the concept of popular democracy. There is a wave of awakening sweeping through the world. These people are oblivious of modern trends. Their watches stopped in 1950, but they are still in politics. They say that they want to serve the people. They have been in power for a very long time but they did not serve the people. They never came to the people to assess their opinion. They never wanted to have any contact with the people because they hated them. Ayub Khan also hated the people. He had come into power without the consent of the people and that is why a movement was launched against him. We had full faith in the people and we were with them. We called upon them to co-operate with us in the movement against the dictatorship. The other politicians did not believe in this method. They used to come and make speeches occasionally, but they would not have been able to remove him. He had been in power for a decade and was thinking of nominating his son as his successor. He did not feel any danger from these politicians. They used to come sometimes and hold small meetings and make speeches but in the

evening they used to go to the district officials and apologize for what they had said. That was not the way to fight against a dictatorship.

Because we were with the people and we believed in the politics of the masses, the people co-operated with us. We burnt our boats and came into the open. That is why we were successful. Ousting the dictator was not the only promise which, I fulfilled. Prior to that I had fulfilled many other promises. One of them was to give you an independent foreign policy. What was the foreign policy prior to my becoming Foreign Minister? The whole world laughed at it. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru used to make fun of the foreign policy of the largest Islamic state of Quaid-i-Azam's Pakistan of 100 million people. Our foreign policy did not carry any weight. It only represented the wishes of a great power. Our government carried out the orders of America despite the fact that they were against the interest of Pakistan. America used to dictate our decisions in the Security Council. That is why the people of the world laughed at our policy. Pandit Nehru used to compare his foreign policy with that of Pakistan with contempt.

When I assumed charge of the Foreign Ministry, I promised that we would undo the foreign policy of the capitalists and the imperialists. I wanted to introduce a people's foreign policy. Then you saw that our foreign policy was changed fundamentally. We continued to have good relations with America and resumed our broken relations with Afghanistan. Treaties were signed with China about the border adjustment, which was in our interest. We extended a hand of friendship to Russia with whom we did not have any relations at all. We developed very good relations with the U.A.R. and other Arab countries as also with the countries of Latin America and Asia. The result was that during the 1965 war, the Indian Prime Minister had to say, "We have been left alone because the world is with Pakistan."

Constitution Not Final Goal
Public Speech at Kohat,
April 25, 1970

When we came to you during Ayub Khan's time, I promised you that we would form a new party, which would be your party. We had to form this party because we wanted to serve the cause of the common man. We had given you our word that we would always side with you during your trials and tribulations. I had said during that speech that together with you we shall fight resolutely against dictatorship in the country. At last, a strong public movement, a revolutionary movement emerged and dictatorship was toppled. Throughout we have been with you, even when elections were nowhere in sight.

We formed a party not to secure permits or ministerships. Our purpose was to work for the people and to serve the country irrespective of whether there were elections or not. We have to do constructive work. Our programme is the welfare of the people. We have formed a party to enforce democracy and the people's rule. We are not after votes. There have been elections before. There have been governments and constitutions. We shall strive our Utmost for a constitution. Our object will be to give the country a people's constitution. With that end in view, we will fully co-operate with anybody, but we want to point out that a constitution alone cannot solve the problems of Pakistan. You must know that elections and constitutions by themselves are of no use. I am making this clear so that you may not ask us after the elections why your problems have not been solved. That is why I am repeating everywhere that elections and a constitution are not the final goals.

What we need is a fundamental change in the economic system. The present economic system is based on oppression and exploitation. There is no difference of opinion in so far as the constitution is concerned. All the parties want a constitution. There can be no difference of opinion on the question of democracy also. Everybody is agreed about the restoration of democracy.

The difference between us and our opponents pertains to the economic question. On the one hand, you have those parties and leaders in Pakistan who want to support the capitalists' system, dominated by the 22 families. Let us not pay any heed to them. On the other hand, we stand for a system of equality which should bring exploitation and oppression to an end. How can the people who support capitalism come to you and say that they want an exploiter's system to continue? They will not call for a people's system. They are shielding themselves behind the slogan that Islam is in danger. This is a white lie. Where is the danger to

Islam? If there had been a danger you would feel it. If there is a flood or storm, you feel the danger. You are all Pakistanis and Muslims. Do you feel any danger to Islam? Who has come to you and asked you to give up your religion? Who has asked you not to offer prayers? Is there such a party in Pakistan? There is no danger to Islam in Pakistan because it is a Muslim majority country. Pakistan had come into being for the sake of Islam and Muslims. When the struggle for Pakistan was being launched against the Hindu Congress and the British, what were our opponents doing at that time? I fully believe that there can be no danger to Islam because it is an eternal religion.

Islam is a complete religion. It cannot be in danger because our Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was the last of the prophets. Why was he the last of the prophets? It was because through him religion had been revealed completely. There is no possibility of any danger to Islam. The very concept of Mohammad being the last prophet negates the possibility of any danger to Islam.

It is quite clear that there is no danger to Islam. The people who are now crying themselves hoarse that Islam is in danger sided with the Hindus and the British against the Quaid-i-Azam. When the Muslims were really in danger these people were not to be seen among the ranks with the Quaid-i-Azam. On the other hand, they were the followers of our enemies. As I have told you, they cannot come to the poor and oppressed people to propagate their real intentions of sucking more blood. They cannot explain their favouring capitalist exploitation. That is why they are raising the negative slogan of 'religion in danger.' I have made it abundantly clear that there is no danger to Islam.

We are all Muslims and we want to serve the cause of Islam. May I ask how we can serve the cause of Islam? We can do it only if the Muslims progress and prosper. If the majority of Muslims is rotting under the capitalist system, it is not in accordance with the divine laws. It is because of the capitalist system that the condition of the people is deplorable. We are going to fight this system. We shall put the equality concept into practice. Our people want to live a full life. They want their country to progress. Are they not human beings? Don't they work hard in the fields and factories? You can see even now that women, children and men are reaping the harvest under the sun. The labourers are working day and night in the factories for very meagre salaries. There is no limit to their exploitation. Our opponents want us to believe that Islam is in danger. What strange people they are! May I ask them whether the people in Egypt have become infidels? Has Nasser become a 'kafir'? What about the people of Libya, the Sudan and Algeria? Are all of them 'kafir'? Was Soekarno a 'kafir'? Why did he come to the rescue of Pakistan? It was only because we were Muslims.

It is said that equality is against the ideology of Pakistan. What is the ideology of Pakistan? It does not stand for a few people usurping power and protecting themselves by repeating the word ideology on a rosary. Those who had opposed Pakistan are talking today of the ideology of Pakistan. They did not serve the cause of Islam or Pakistan. Instead they weakened it. They opposed the Pakistan movement. The ideology of Pakistan does not mean that we should capture power and then forget the people. It stands for protecting the Muslims wherever they are in danger. What do our self-styled custodians of Pakistan's ideology do when Muslims are massacred in India? What did they do when the Jews were perpetrating atrocities on the Arabs in the Middle East? We believe in the ideology of Pakistan. We want to serve the cause of Islam by enabling the people of Pakistan to solve their problems. You will recall that when I was in Government, I believed in confrontation with India. We fought resolutely against India when she attacked Pakistan.

The way I advocated the cause of the Middle East in the Security Council and other international forums has been widely appreciated by the Arabs of the Middle East. We believe in the ideology of Pakistan and that the enemies of Islam have to be countered wherever they are, even outside Pakistan. Our opponents are the enemies of Islam and they are bringing a bad name to Pakistan. There are many among them who are trying to plead that Pakistan is not in a position to fight against India. They show us the map of India and try to prove that India is invincible because it is a very big country. We know the strength of India. We are not worried about her size. We believe that being in the right we can fight India. If Vietnam can face America, we can certainly face India. I can assure you that if I had been in power and if there had been a people's government in this country, no one in India would have dared touch the Indian Muslims.

The present discussion and controversy does not pertain to the question of democracy or constitution. The difference of opinion is confined to the economic system. Our opponents say our economic reform is against Islam. They tell us that there is no equality in Islam? We have proved that our programme is in consonance with the spirit of Islam. The principle of equality is a fundamental principle in the Islamic system. Can we prove it from the life of the Holy Prophet and the lives of the Khulafa-e-Rashedeen. We can prove it from the Holy Quran. We can prove it from the early history of Islam. We can prove it from the fact that when Iraq, Syria and Egypt were conquered, Hazrat Umar did not allow any serfdoms to be established in those countries. We have proved that Islam stands for equality. There can be no justice without equality. It will be injustice to allow the existence of big capitalists along with destitutes. Justice can be done only by establishing a system of equality and that alone is our objective. There are some people owning mills sitting right on top of the social ladder. We want them to come down some rungs. There are others who are starving and living in misery.

They have nothing. We want to push them up. That is what is meant by equality and that is going to be our endeavor.

Again, our opponents shout from the rooftops that Islam is a complete code of life and cannot be patched up with any other system. I say that we accept this fact but then why do these gentlemen who oppose the system of Islamic equality want a constitution? If Islam is a complete code of life, we do not need a constitution. They keep harping on the 1956 Constitution. Why do they do that?

There is no need for the 1956 Constitution. Why are they crying for the parliamentary system? If equality is against Islam, why do they want a constitution based on the parliamentary system? This system is not mentioned in the Holy Quran. They cannot justify it from the Holy Quran or Hadith. They are contradicting themselves by declaring Islam to be a complete code of life and then demanding a parliamentary system. While talking of democracy, our opponents accept the parliamentary system. Does this not affect their belief in Islam as a complete code of life. It is only when the question of equality is raised that they say, "No, it is against Islam." I want to tell you that I am not the first one to talk about Islamic equality. You can consult your history, and you will see that it was the Quaid-i-Azam, the founder of this country who promised it in his speeches before the establishment of Pakistan and afterwards. The same promise was repeated by the Quaid-i-Millat, who was the first Prime Minister of Pakistan and who was also one of the most important leaders of the Pakistan movement. He was a friend and colleague of the Quaid-i-Azam.

We are only against capitalism which we do not want. We want the 'ism' of the poor. Ours is not a battle of words. We want to end exploitation and the oppression of the poor. We want to end poverty and misery. You can see that the whole world is progressing. You can listen to the radio and read the newspapers. You have been independent for 23 years but your dreams have not come true. You have only witnessed the tribulations of freedom. The system which is a legacy of the British still prevails. Muslim capitalists have replaced Hindu capitalists. This is not liberty. True freedom will come only when the people progress, when the common man prospers.

Our opponents are joining hands against us. They are conspiring to oppose a new party. It is because we have come to you with a message that rings true. They know that our voice is your voice. They know that we are not going to betray you. They also know that we fulfilled our promises in the past.

We know, it is going to be an uphill task. It is no easy thing to bring about. We shall have to launch a long march because we want to bring about a fundamental change.

My dear friends, unless we are prepared to undergo trials and tribulations, no basic question will be solved. Our path is going to be a difficult one, but the people of Pakistan can never be defeated. I did not go to the Round Table Conference, because it was a conspiracy against the people. The politicians who had declared that they would never talk to Ayub Khan rushed to the Round Table Conference when Ayub Khan conspired to hold one. We believe in the people's politics. They don't believe in the people. They have no contact with the masses. That is why they went to the Round Table Conference. Secretly, they assured Ayub Khan that they were with him. My party is the party of the poor, of the workers and the tillers of the land. This party has served the people and has emerged successful through its trials. This party has given a new line of action to the people.

The Legal Framework Order was announced on the 28th of March. We shall have to consider our position in the light of this order. Some of its provisions need very careful consideration. We shall have to review our decision to contest the elections. We wanted to contest the elections because we wanted a people's assembly which should be fully sovereign. Under this order the sovereignty of the Assembly has been curtailed. We shall have to consider whether we should join such an assembly or not. What Pakistan needs is a change. It needs a fundamental change. Unless there is a basic change, we cannot render any service to the people or to Pakistan. I call upon you to strengthen the hands of our party because this is the only party which is with the people.

A People's Economy
Public Speech at Bannu,
April 26, 1970

I am very happy that God has given me this opportunity to come here and to speak to you. I am thankful to you that you have taken the trouble of coming to this meeting in this scorching sun.

The Pakistan People's Party has not come to you today to beg for votes. Elections have been announced only recently. That is why the other parties are holding meetings and trying to contact the people. But when the elections were nowhere in sight, when there was no question of asking for votes, when there were Basic Democracies in the country, when adult franchise had not been granted, when Ayub Khan ruled as a dictator, it was then that we came to you. We believe in being with the masses to solve the constitutional, social and economic problems of the people. We believe that such problems cannot be solved without your co-operation and advice.

My dear friends, Pakistan has been independent for 23 years. It is a very long period. Much could have been done during this time, but you can see that there has been no progress at all. It is not only in Bannu that poverty and deprivation have increased; elsewhere in the country the situation is no different. The poor people are being exploited. They are living in a most deplorable condition. God did not will that poverty should prevail in Pakistan and that the people of Pakistan should remain backward. Pakistan did not come into being for that purpose. The state of affairs in Pakistan is dangerous, miserable and terrible. The political parties in the country have never tried to assess public opinion. They have never tried to consult the people. You can see that many constitutions failed because they did not have the support of the common man. The 1956 Constitution was not framed according to the will of the people. The first Constituent Assembly which was elected by the people was dissolved by Governor General Ghulam Muhammad, undemocratically. A new Constituent Assembly was formed by one individual. The members of this Assembly were not your representatives, not directly elected by you. They formed a constitution of their own liking. This constitution could not have worked because the people had no hand in its making.

This constitution failed. Later, the 1962 Constitution was introduced by another individual. This constitution was framed by one person only. The constitution itself opened with the words, "I, Field Marshal Muhammad Ayub Khan," so and so, hereby give this Constitution ... This constitution failed. Our politics worked on similar lines. They failed because they were not the politics of the people.

When the Pakistan People's Party was formed, we promised that this party would always remain with the people. It will ask your opinions and will follow your advice. It will represent your wishes. During the campaign launched against Ayub Khan, we were with you all the way. If you went to jails, we also went to jails. If you faced bullets, we also faced bullets. It was not a question of votes. The elections which have now been promised are nothing new. We have had elections before but elections cannot bring our problems to an end. We have tried constitutions in the past. A new constitution is to be made now. We shall try our best that a constitution is framed and that it is a people's constitution, but please remember, I am warning you and you should not forget my words, that a constitution alone cannot solve your problems.

We believe in democracy because it makes possible the establishment of the people's rule. There are two types of political structures, dictatorial and democratic. In dictatorship one man rules over the country and the Government is run according to his wishes. He is not answerable to anyone. In a democracy, the people elect the government and have the right to vote it out of office. We believe in democracy because it means the rule of the people but again, democracy alone cannot solve your problems. We tried democracy in the past, but our troubles multiplied. All the parties want democracy and a constitution for the country. Then where is the difference? We come to you and others also come to you, but why are we fired upon? Why are we being prevented from contacting the people?

The difference is the economic system. On the one hand you have people who want to perpetuate the capitalist system, the system of the 22 families. We say that this is not Islamic. It has pushed the people of Pakistan into a morass. It has exploited them. We want a people's system, a people's constitution. In politics, we want a people's government and in the economic field we want a people's economy.

They admit that a constitution can be a people's constitution, then why can't there be a people's economy? Why should the rule of the 22 families continue? They are afraid that if the people have a say in formulating the economic system of the country, the national wealth will have to be divided among the people. They are the ones who want the capitalist system to continue, who want the oppression to continue, who want to suck your blood. They have been running this system for the last 23 years. They have the backing of the imperialists. They have the money and the mills. You can see that the banks, the insurance companies, the textile mills, the cement factories and the sugar mills, in fact, all the resources are in their hands. These mills are running because of your money which is being used by your exploiters. It is not strange that when we oppose this system, we are dubbed as opponents of Islam.

Pakistan is a Muslim majority country otherwise Pakistan would not have come into being. Wherever the Muslims are in majority, Islam can never be in danger.

My dear friends, Islam is not in danger. The capitalists and their stooges are in danger. They cannot come to you and tell you that they have exploited you for the last 23 years and that they want to continue doing so. They cannot naturally say that they want a system which is against you and which exploits you. Instead, they come to you and tell you that Islam is in danger. May I ask them how Islam is in danger? If Islam had been in danger, the people would have sensed it. Who are the people and which is the party that comes to you and asks you to give up your religion? When we fought against the enemies of Islam before the establishment of Pakistan, against the Hindus and the British, where were these gentlemen who say that Islam is in danger? They opposed the Pakistan movement and the Quaid-i-Azam.

These critics never accepted Pakistan and now they want to weaken it. If they want to serve Islam, they should serve the people. It is no service to Islam that Pakistanis should continue to remain poor. They only have to look at the miserable condition of the poor. The people are living like animals. In Karachi, there is no drinking water available in many areas where the poor live. The poor people, the poor farmers, their women and children are toiling in the fields in this terrible heat. Even in Bannu, it is they who are reaping the kharif harvest. It is only in Pakistan that the women and children have to work so hard. In other countries, the young children are not labourers; they go to schools. In other countries, not only is education free but the children are given books free of cost. Why can't this be done in Pakistan?

My dear brothers and friends, I have explained to you that the people's struggle should not only be for a constitution or for a particular political system. Their struggle must be to change the economic structure. On the one hand there are people who want capitalism. Then there are the people who want equality in this country. Equality is in accordance with the principles of Islam. Islam gave the message of equality to the world.

We would have never upheld equality had it not been in accordance with Islam. I am not the first one to talk about Islamic equality. I did not originate the idea. If you study your history, and if you go through the speeches of the Quaid-i-Azam, you will see that Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah, who founded this country, promised that there would be Islamic socialism. The system of Islamic equality prevails in many other Islamic countries. Islamic equality has been established in Algeria. The Algerians are very good Muslims and fought against the French under the banner of Islam. They have introduced Islamic socialism in their

country. Similarly, in Libya, Egypt, Sudan, Iraq and Syria, Islamic Socialism has been established. The people there are Muslims, but they have socialism.

In Pakistan, we are Pakistanis because we are Muslims. The Muslim countries have different political systems. Some of them have monarchies while others are democracies. Their political systems are different, but they are all Muslims. Their faith in Islam cannot be doubted because of the differences in their political systems. If there is a people's system, equality will have to be established. Justice demands equality. Justice does not demand the present capitalistic system. Justice is against the present system. Justice calls for a fair balance between different sections of society.

If you want to serve the cause of Islam, you have to serve the people. There are no enemies of Islam in Pakistan. If you want to see the enemies of Islam, you should go to India. I have done nothing against India. Why do they oppose my coming into power? It is because I want to serve the people of Pakistan and I want to establish the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam's dreams. I want Muslim children to be educated. I want to bring their miseries to an end. It is said that bribery is rampant in the country. How can they stamp out bribery? Those who rule should keep their hands clean. They should not assist the capitalists who are establishing mills. A police constable gets only ninety rupees per month. If you want to end bribery, his salary should be raised. Lower grade government servants should be provided with housing and free education for their children. Their pensions should be increased. Unfortunately, we are adopting the wrong methods. That is why conditions in the country are deteriorating. If you want to end poverty and deprivation, the answer lies in Islamic Socialism. That is the reason why we are advocating Islamic Socialism.

When the newspapers went on strike and the journalists were struggling for better wages we supported them and they emerged successful. Some newspapers of the capitalists did not co-operate. They did not allow the strike and launched a false propaganda campaign. I was surprised to see the lies published by them. I started my tour on the 18th of this month and there was a complete blackout of my stories in these papers as if we did not exist in this country. They tried to distort my speech in Mianwali and tried to give it a twist in order to extract a meaning of their own. I had said in Mianwali and I repeat – if there was no scope for socialism in Islam, there could be no scope for the parliamentary system either. This was distorted.

When the people struggled against dictatorship, we were with them. We resolutely faced Ayub and defeated him. We had faith in the people, while the other parties did not have any faith in the people. Their oily concern is for their personal welfare. They will never come to you. When we sided with you during

the struggle against dictatorship, they were not with you. Now they come to you to beg for votes. They say that only young people are with us. I say that not only they are with us, but the labourers, the farmers and the students of Pakistan are all with us. Then they say that the young students who are with me do not have the right to vote. I am proud of the support of the students because they are the future leaders of the' country. I do not want their support because of their votes, but because they have to make this country. Please remember that these unsuccessful politicians who have brought the country to ruin during the last 23 years, do not want the support of the students because they do not have the right to vote. These people are forging fronts against us because the masses have awakened and during the elections they will have to face the multitudes of Pakistan. We do not need any fronts.

You have to strengthen the hands of this party because you will be strengthening your own hands if you do that. If any harm comes to this party, your interests will be harmed. This is my appeal to you. I have not come to beg for votes. The country cannot be built by securing votes only. It needs a fundamental change and we will be with you in the struggle for that change. The final decision lies with you. I give you my word as a Muslim that if you stand united, nobody can defeat you.

Beware of Vote Beggars
Public Speech at Peshawar,
April 27, 1970

When I was a Minister, Ayub Khan used to ask me to go to the universities. I am the same person who used to be called upon to address the students and now, suddenly, I have become dangerous. I am the same Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. Why I am not allowed to hold a meeting in the Peshawar University? Heavens will not fall if I address a meeting in the University. I have never spoken there although I have visited the University twice. I do not wish to talk to the students about my party or elections or socialism. I will only speak about foreign policy and national affairs. I think that is reasonable. The Vice-Chancellor, for whom I have great respect, should accept it. These days, leaders of other parties are making speeches over Radio Pakistan on the subject of Pakistan's ideology. Why can't I speak at the University?

You would have noticed that since the newspapers strike, the radio is not covering the activities of our party, as if we did not exist. I have been touring this area and there have been processions and meetings of historic proportions but not a word about them over the radio. This is not fair play, our Government claims impartiality. Is this impartiality? I want to recall the Sanghar incident. I will not talk about it in detail. Armed assassins had been waiting to ambush us since the night before. They were armed with rifles, hatchets and sticks. It could not have been a secret from the local police, the police recorded in the first information report that five to seven thousand people were assembled in the town. One of the injured also stated that six to seven thousand people, armed with rifles, had launched a murderous assault on my party. That evening in the national news broadcast at 8 p.m. it was only at the end that a snippet had been added to say that there had been an attempt to assassinate Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. I have served this country for some time and incidents concerning me have news value but the official radio played down the Sanghar incident. Later, a press note stated falsely that I had been advised to delay my visit to Sanghar. The next day, the Government of West Pakistan issued another press note saying that the firing took place after I had left. That was a lie. They opened up on us, and my companions fell upon me to protect my life. The police confirmed our version. On the third day after the incident I held a press conference in Karachi, but television and radio ignored it.

That is why I say that if this Government claims impartiality it should remain neutral. Their actions should correspond with their claims. The entire Government should be impartial. If its Ministers want to take sides, they should say so. I saw the President twice recently and emphasised that his Ministers

should remain neutral. But even if they concede that they are not neutral we shall continue our campaign. I also discussed with the President the Legal Framework Order and pointed out the disabilities we shall have to face because of this Order.

During the recent press strike, the Pakistan Federal Union of Journalists played an important role. The P.F.U.J. came into being in 1954. Ever since, the journalists have had many problems. They are not in the habit of going on strikes because they are not irresponsible. When the workers go on strike they are dubbed as irresponsible people. This cannot be said about the journalists. It was their first strike and it had sound reasons. What are we to conclude?

Look at the situation in general. The prices are up and it is very difficult for the poor and middle class to survive. If the journalists went on strike for a rise in their salaries, I see nothing wrong with it. They had only demanded the implementation of the decision of the Wage Board established by the Government. It was a perfectly justified demand and there was no controversy about it. They were being opposed by the All Pakistan Newspapers Society whose members are owners of newspapers and whose income is increasing every day. They refused to accept the decision of the Government. Between these two parties, the Minister for Information declared that the Government was neutral. It was a very strange thing to say because the implementation of the decision of the Wage Board was the responsibility of the Government. – which also controlled the National Press Trust – the biggest employer of journalists.

The Government could not remain neutral in this matter. They remain neutral where they are not supposed to be neutral. I call upon the Information Minister to act honourably and resign. It may not be accepted, but he should have the courage as a gentleman to submit his resignation. But you cannot expect this from him. He has always been in service. First he served in the army, then as an ambassador, but he's not worked for the people. He knows only how to work for a salary. If he wants to serve the people, he should resign from his Ministership and come into the political field. He should face bullets like we did in Sanghar.

Let me come to Tashkent now. Ayub Khan wanted to turn the entire nation into a nation of jackals. When I left the Government, I came to you and you welcomed me. I did not want to enjoy any privileges after Tashkent. I chose to stay with the people whatever the cost. I knew that there would be many troubles and pitfalls. I can never forget those days and the support given by the people. They were very hard days. Ayub Khan was the dictator of the country and held absolute power. He had warned me that if I joined politics he would destroy me. He put me through a lot of trouble, but with the support of the poor people, the workers and the students, I came through unscathed. If you had not supported me, some

harm would have come to me. In fact, you protected me. People in large numbers turned out to receive me wherever I went.

It was said during those days that my popularity was temporary. It was only because of the Tashkent question and the memories of war that people came out in large numbers to receive me. It was expected that I would be forgotten within six months, but time passed and my supporters increased. I held historic meetings. A murder attempt was made on my life in Multan. My support continued even after that and your co-operation did not decline. Then it was said that because of my campaign against Ayub Khan I was popular among the people, but I would soon be forgotten. It was expected that within three months of the Martial Law I would go into the background. Well, they had a surprise coming their way. Now they say that it is only the students who are with me and the students do not have the vote. I am very proud of the fact that the students are with me and that they are my strength. It should not be forgotten that the students are the future of this country. It is not the students alone who are with us. The labourers are with us and the farmers are with us, because we are representing their feelings. This is not my speech, this is your speech. This is not my voice, this is your voice. Never mind if the students do not have the right to vote. They are a great force in the country and can influence the situation. We shall lay down our lives for the cause of the students. We are always with them. Now many of them are in jail. We cannot tolerate the situation that while thieves and smugglers are roaming about freely, students and workers are rotting in jails.

My dear brothers and friends, this is your party and you have formed it. I did not have big people with me. No capitalist or feudal lord sided with me. They were all with Ayub Khan. Only you were with me. Ayub Khan had the support of the police, the army, the government servants, the capitalists, the jagirdars and the Basic Democrats. He was in power and used the big stick. How was he defeated? How was this Hitler of Pakistan defeated? You defeated him! I shall never say that this was my achievement. I was only on your side. I had promised that I would be with you throughout the struggle.

This is your party. We shall never betray you because that will be betraying ourselves. I never want to see the day when I have to bow my head in shame before you. I know that there has been a lot of treachery against Pakistan. A great deal could have been done during the last 23 years. Much has been done in other countries but what are the conditions here? We are suffering because of misery, poverty and deprivation. I have just come from an area where many people do not easily get drinking water. The lives of such people in Karachi and Bannu are worse than those of animals. These are harvesting days. I have seen that not only my brothers are working in the fields, but our sisters and small barefooted

children in rags are working in the fields under the scorching sun. What is happening in other countries? Children get free education. I am not interested in power. I have been in power for eight years. But I must do my bit to change this sorry state of affairs whether elections are held or not, whether an assembly is formed or not.

Hypocrisy prevails all round. The people who ruled over Pakistan under the parliamentary system before Ayub Khan are again coming to you. They are not coming with a programme to change the face of Pakistan or to eradicate poverty. They are only coming to beg for votes. They again want to become members and ministers and to fly the Pakistan flag on their cars. But they have no intention of serving you. When the movement against Ayub Khan was launched, they remained in their rooms, locked from inside. They were hiding under their beds. Now they have come out to ask for votes.

A constitution will be framed, but it will be no magic wand. We have tried constitutions. The mere ushering in of a constitution will not bring prosperity and end the troubles of the common man. Other countries have their constitutions. We have tried constitutions in the last 23 years. If a Pakistani child is dying of hunger in a poor man's family and his father does not have the money to feed him, the constitution cannot serve as food for that child. It cannot serve as a school for the education of the children. It cannot be a substitute for employment or for a house. A constitution is the fundamental law. We certainly need it. Those who say that Bhutto does not want a constitution are wrong. I certainly shall strive for a constitution, but a constitution alone will not solve the economic problems of the people.

We also want democracy. We have struggled for it more than anyone else. We launched the campaign against Ayub Khan who was a dictator. It was because we believed in democracy. We faced the dictator and offered many sacrifices. We were with the people and we emerged victorious. We shall fight for democracy again, but please remember that so long as there is no basic economic change in Pakistan, there can be no progress and your troubles will go on increasing. Please remember that there is no difference of opinion on the question of constitution or democracy or religion. The only difference is that some people stand for the capitalist system which is a system of exploitation. The capitalists who are sucking the blood of the people and increasing the number of their mills want to perpetuate this system. They want to continue to exploit us. They do not want a change in your conditions. On the other hand, there are those who want equality and an end to exploitation. They want that poverty should go along with capitalism. This is how the forces are arrayed: the capitalists and their stooges on the one side and the patriots and the poor people of Pakistan on the other.

We are all Muslims and this is a Muslim country. It would not have come into being were we not Muslims. It is my strong faith that Islam can never be in danger in Pakistan. It is an eternal religion and will be there even after the Day of Resurrection. May I ask you a simple question? If there had been a danger, a threat, would you not have felt it. If some one tries to kill you, you sense the danger. Do you feel any danger to Islam? It is not Islam which is in danger. It is the capitalists and their stooges who feel threatened. Such danger calls have been given very many times. These people dubbed the Quaid-i-Azam as a 'kafir.' They did the same to Allama Iqbal and Sir Syed Ahmad. In fact no one with progressive ideas has escaped their 'fatwas'. Why do not they issue these edicts against exploitation and against the capitalists?

Gentlemen, you need not worry about this because this bogey has fizzled out. Islam is not in danger. It cannot be in danger anywhere in the world. When Hindus and the British were opposing Pakistan and Quaid-i-Azam, our opponents were in the enemy ranks. They did not side with the Quaid-i-Azam. They are still against Pakistan. They cannot openly oppose it now. Therefore, they are trying to weaken it. Why do they not serve the Muslims if they want to serve Islam? True service to Islam means Muslims should be served and justice provided to them, and their misery brought to an end? No more prophets will be sent by God because our Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) was the last of them, and with him the revelation of religion was complete. Islam is a complete religion and cannot be in danger. The people who have exploited you and oppressed you cannot come to you and enumerate any services. They can only raise the slogan of "Islam in danger".

If Islam is a complete code of life, why does one of these gentlemen keep talking about the 1956 Constitution? Why do we need a constitution then, especially the 1956 Constitution? Where is the parliamentary system provided for in Islam? It is not mentioned in any verse of the Holy Quran or in the Hadith. This is a system formulated by the British. Have they 'Islamised' it by translating it into Urdu? If they accept a system formulated by the British, why do they oppose 'Musawat'? They say that they do not want any 'ism' because there is no scope for any 'ism' in Islam. Why do they accept capitalism, feudalism and imperialism? Why are they opposed to socialism alone, which is nothing but an English word for "Musawat."

I am not the first one to demand Islamic Socialism. Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah was the first to promise that Islamic Socialism would prevail in Pakistan. I can assure you as a Musalman that we want to introduce Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. We do not want the Chinese or the Russian system in our country; we want Islamic Socialism in keeping with the spirit of our religion. Equality is one of the basic principles of Islam. When the fertile lands of Egypt, Iraq and Syria

were captured by the Muslims, they were not turned into feudal estates. They were nationalized and given to the tillers. The treasure captured in the war was equally divided between the commander and the soldiers. Justice does not mean that a few should enjoy all the luxuries and comforts while the poor die of hunger.

Our party stands for establishing a system of equality. We have come out with this objective. Our opponents are afraid of us. They are worried about the revolution to come, but no one can stop the revolution.

Fighting Internal Imperialism
Speech at Charsadda,
April 29, 1970

I am very grateful to you that you have taken the trouble of coming to this meeting in such hot weather. I have been touring this area since the 18th of this month. I have been very warmly received everywhere. I can never forget the kindness of the people.

The elections are drawing near but I haven't come to you to ask for votes. I believe that votes alone do not solve problems. Elections have been held in the past but no fundamental change has been effected. We came to you when elections were nowhere in sight. We established this party against big odds. Ayub Khan had declared that if Zulfikar Ali Bhutto participated in politics he would destroy him. Important people shunned this party. No capitalists or landlords were on our side, but the poor people of Pakistan, the workers, the peasants and the students were with us. We can never betray you because our present success has been achieved only because of your support. If you had not sided with us, Ayub Khan, who was the Hitler of his time, would never have resigned. You launched a movement against dictatorship. You faced the dictator resolutely. It was an arduous struggle. No one can forget that the dictator had the support of the army, the police, the government servants, the Basic Democrats, and the capitalists. Above all, he had force and he used it. He sent people to jail. The press and the radio were in his control. In spite of this the people faced him resolutely. I have full faith in you. That is why I have come to you. It was your victory and you emerged triumphant. We came to you when there was no question of securing votes. We sided with you and went to jails along with you. We faced the batons of the police. It was not a question of elections or votes. It was a period of trial and tribulation. But where were the people who are now raising such a hue and cry? They had hidden themselves behind closed doors. Now they have come out and are boasting about their achievements. They are making all sorts of false promises to secure votes. They are the same people who misled the masses prior to Ayub Khan; They painted a very rosy picture of the future, but during the ten or eleven years of their parliamentary rule they could achieve nothing. They only occupied high chairs and enjoyed the privileges of power. Government is a temporary thing. The parliamentary system failed because those elected did not remain in direct touch with the people.

On the other hand, we are determined always to side with the people through thick and thin on all the fronts. The People's Party wants to establish the people's rule. It wants to form a people's front. This party is not afraid of struggle. This party is determined to root out poverty, hunger and deprivation. We want to change the invidious system of exploitation. We shall bring about an economic

revolution and change the face of Pakistan. We shall save this country from oppression and exploitation. We shall bring an end to poverty, tyranny, violence and exploitation.

My dear friends, there is a lot of political awakening in the area. I compliment you on this, but please remember that our movement has spread right unto Karachi. This is not the Pakistan of forties or fifties. There has been a revolution of ideas. If the old politicians think that the same old conditions prevail, they are mistaken. The days of closed-door politics are over. If they think that they can win the elections with the help of the landlords and ignoring the tenants, they are again mistaken. Elections will not be held on this basis now. There is a lot of awakening in the country.

When we talk of an economic change and the economic progress of the country they accuse us of talking against our religion. How can we say anything against our religion? We are proud that we are Muslims. Pakistan came into being for Islam. It is a Muslim majority country. If the Muslims had not been in a majority, Pakistan would not have come into being. Who says that Islam is in danger? Islam can never be in danger because it is an eternal religion. There is no question of Islam being in danger in Pakistan. If that was the case, the people would have felt the danger. Any danger can be felt if it exists. If a person is attacked he can feel the danger. If somebody is drowning he is conscious that he may lose his life. Similarly, if there was danger to Islam you would have sensed it. Is anyone asking you to give up your religion or not to have belief in the Holy Quran or to give up offering prayers? I don't see any such people in Pakistan, although I keep moving from place to place in the country.

There was a danger to the Muslims in the subcontinent when the British and the Hindus were opposing the Pakistan movement. The danger was obvious. When the Muslims were being massacred in the Punjab, the danger was tangible. We saw our enemies and recognised them. We achieved Pakistan through a united struggle, under the leadership of the Quaid-i-Azam. Where were the people who are now declaring that Islam is in danger? When Islam was in actual danger these people could not be seen in the ranks with the Quaid-i-Azam. They were, on the other hand, with Gandhi, Nehru and Patel. When the enemies were trying to endanger the very existence of Muslims these gentlemen were talking of united India and opposing Pakistan. They issued an edict of 'Quaid-i-Kufr' against the Quaid-i-Azam. When there was a war going on in Kashmir they issued 'fatwas' against it. Why didn't they then say that Islam was in danger? Why do they say now that Islam is in danger? It is only the capitalists and the feudalists who are in danger.

It is the capitalist system which is in danger. This system is a legacy of the British who exploited us. Now our own people are exploiting us. The capitalist system is the system of a few. The British established external imperialism. Now we are groaning under internal imperialism. A few capitalists hold the entire wealth of the country in their hands. They have everything, the banks, the insurance companies, the textile mills, the sugar mills, the paper mills and the cement factories. This is the system which is being supported by our opponents. They are the stooges of this system. They cannot come and tell you that they have sucked your blood and have committed atrocities on you. Instead, they come to you and tell you that Islam is in danger.

We say that there is equality in Islam. There is more equality than democracy in Islam. You can see the life of the Holy Prophet as also the lives of the Khulafa-e-Rashedeen. You will find that they acted upon the principles of equality. When Egypt, Syria and Iran were conquered what was done to the lands there? No estates were carved out as the British did in India. Hazrat Umar declared these lands to be the property of the people. Similarly, the treasure won during the war was equally divided between the commanders and the ordinary soldiers. This was the equality of Islam. One of the ulema says that there is no equality in Islam. He is misrepresenting Islam. Islam was the religion which gave the message of equality to the world. We respect the ulema but the ulema who indulge in politics and do not understand it have to be told that they are wrong. He says that there is justice in Islam and not equality. We accept this for a moment, but then may we know what justice, demands? If you want to do justice you have to establish equality. Without equality there can be no justice. You live in this country and you have seen the plight of the poor people. Is this justice? There are millions of rupees with some people while others are starving.

There has been no justice during the last 23 years of Pakistan's existence because the wealth of the country is concentrated in the hands of a few. I have seen that our poor farmers and their women are reaping the harvest in this hot weather. It is only in this country that little children, eight or nine years old, clad in rags and bare-footed, work in the fields. In other countries children of this age are provided free education. This is a shameful state of affairs. This is not the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam. He had visualised a Pakistan where there was to be no poverty or hunger. That was the Pakistan for which the Muslims made sacrifices and laid down their lives. But what sort of Pakistan did we get? We have seen that there is no parallel in the world to the poverty and hunger which prevails in Pakistan. We want to build a new Pakistan which will be a great country, where there will be no poverty and hunger and where prosperity will prevail. Our people are working very hard. They work day and night in the mills and in the fields. It is not ordained by God that they should live such a miserable life. We want to change this system and that is going to be our struggle. This is

your struggle and our success will be your success/If any harm comes to us your cause will suffer. These people are afraid of my speeches. That is why they do not allow me to speak to you. What would have happened if I had spoken in Sanghar? They know that I talk about the problems of the poor. I speak the truth. I go to them and call upon them to rise and end the exploitation.

Many assassination attempts have been made on my life, but I am not going to quit the political field. I cannot betray the people of Pakistan. If the people want I shall retire from politics right now. I don't bother about anyone else. If you, the people of Pakistan, ask me to retire from politics I swear by my faith that I shall comply with your wish immediately. On the other hand, if these imperialists and capitalists think that they can frighten me by bullets, I shall never retire from politics and fight till the end.

We want a constitution, but a constitution cannot satisfy your hunger if you are starving. It cannot serve as your house for as a school for your children. It is a basic law and we need it but in addition the economic question is also very important. Our party stands for three principles. Our first principle is that Islam is our religion. We are prepared to offer any sacrifice for the cause of Islam not only in Pakistan but anywhere in the world. When the Masjid-e-Aqsa was set on fire by Israelis, the workers of the PPP were prepared to give their blood. We are not trying to appease you. We have never made false promises to you. Whatever promises we have made we have fulfilled.

My very first promise was to give you an independent foreign policy. With the blessing of God and your support I formulated an independent foreign policy. The world laughed at the previous foreign policy of Pakistan. We were only carrying out the wishes of a super power. Our policy moved in accordance with their directions. Our enemies made fun of our foreign policy. They did not consider Pakistan a free country. It was not the Pakistan for which the Quaid had struggled. Its sovereignty was not located in Karachi or Islamabad but in Washington. The people said that if Pakistan's opinion was needed it should be sought from Washington rather than Karachi because it was Washington's instructions which Pakistan followed. What were our relations with the neighbouring country of Afghanistan? There were severe differences. We had no relations with China or Russia. In 1960 I concluded an agreement with Russia as the Minister for Natural Resources. A new chapter was opened in our relations with Afghanistan, China, Egypt and other countries. We also established relations with countries of Latin America and Africa. During the 1965 war, Shastri said that India had been isolated and the world was with Pakistan. This was my foreign policy and I formulated it. Even my successors were proud of it and it is appreciated even today.

My second promise was that we shall fight against India bravely. During the 1965 war this promise was fulfilled. We fought against India resolutely. Even today the Government of India doesn't want me to come into power in Pakistan. It is because they know that I shall execute a people's foreign policy with prestige and dignity. My third promise was that we shall fight against dictatorship. We fought against the dictatorship and defeated it with your support. Thus I carried out all the three promises I had made. Our fourth promise is that we shall eradicate poverty and hunger from Pakistan. We shall end the system of exploitation and establish Islamic equality whatever the sacrifices and whatever the struggle. This is going to be a long and arduous journey but we are going to achieve our objective.

These are our promises with you but many people tell you that I am a dangerous person and that I am against Islam. I have proved to you that I am not against Islam and that my programme is not against Islam. They accuse us that we want to make some additions to Islam by introducing socialism. They say that Islam is a complete code of life and there is no scope for socialism in Islam. I say that we believe and accept that Islam is a complete code of life. My question is why do they keep repeating the demand for the 1956 Constitution? There is no specific mention in Islam of a constitution because the Quran is our constitution. Why do they demand the parliamentary system? We are for it but it is not mentioned in the Quran.

Why do these self-appointed standard-bearers of Islam demand the parliamentary system? Why do they oppose Islamic Socialism? If parliamentary democracy can be Islamic, equality is certainly Islamic. Why do they oppose something which is in the interest of the poor people? Why are they so worried? It is because there is awakening in the country. Now you can decide who your friends and enemies are. Who talks of your interest and who is against it? My dear friends and brothers, socialism is an English word. Its Urdu translation is 'musawat' or 'barabari'. Just as 'jamhooriyat' is called democracy in English and 'dastoor' is called constitution, musawaat is called socialism. These people don't want socialism because it means their end. They are against the people's rule. When somebody falls sick he has to be given the right type of treatment. Socialism is the remedy for poverty and hunger. All other things may come and go but it will not make any difference. I repeat that we believe in constitutional democracy but we also believe that democracy and a constitution alone will not solve all problems. If you want justice and progress, if you want a bright future for your children, a fundamental economic change has to be brought about. Your children should not lead the lives you have lived, and we are determined that we shall change their lot. We shall see to it that justice is done to them.

We don't believe in Round Table Conferences. Pakistan has been entangled in round table conferences from the very outset. Ghulam Mohammad held meetings with leaders, and then Ayub Khan held a Round Table Conference. Why do they hold round table conferences in closed rooms? Why don't they go to the people? They should allow the people to take the decisions. That is the democratic way. No constitution will be successful unless the people decide. No political system will work unless it has the backing of the people. No economic system will be successful unless it is supported by the people. You got two constitutions in the past and both of them failed. It was because they were not according to the wishes of the people. The third constitution will not be successful if the will of the people is not carried out. We should learn a lesson from the past. The most important lesson is that if you want a decision to be final, ask the people. Don't run away from the people. They are afraid of the people because they have exploited them and oppressed them for 23 years. They come to you only to ask for votes. When the elections are over they win confine themselves to the four walls of their houses. We shall be with the people day and night. We shall have constant contacts with the people.

General Yahya made an important announcement on 28th of November. He has decided about One Unit and declared that a third constitution will be framed. This constitution again will not be successful unless you take the will of the people into consideration. The final decision rests with the people. The Pakistan People's Party is a party of the masses. The people have formed it. Our only demand is that there should be a people's constitution and a people's government which should carry out the people's wishes, bring prosperity to the people, defend the country, raise the salaries of the low paid government servants and not put the labour leaders and students in jails. We are going to co-operate with you and fight for your cause. This is our final decision.

Ending the Tribal Voting Pattern
Speech at Public Meeting, Hathian, Mardan,
April 30, 1970

I am very grateful to you for having taken so much trouble in coming to this meeting in such hot weather outside the city. My colleagues and I are indebted to you and we shall never forget this kindness. I started the tour of this area on the 8th and it will be over today. I shall try to come again. I have always believed that we should have more contact with the people. We should take our programme to the people and present to them our principles. This was my second tour of the area within ten months.

I came here in July last and held successful meetings. This time also we were received with open arms by our poor brothers in Nowshera, Peshawar, Kohat, Bannu and Mardan. Our public meetings have been a great success. I want to thank the people of this area again on the last day of my tour; I also wish to thank the workers of the People's Party who worked hard day and night. Our meetings and processions would not have been successful without their untiring efforts. I thank them from the bottom of my heart.

My dear brothers, I am again speaking to you today after an interval but I have not come to beg for votes. This party has not come into being for securing votes. When this party was established the question of elections or votes did not exist. During Ayub Khan's dictatorship there were no direct elections or adult franchise. The Basic Democracies' system prevailed, a system formulated with the sole purpose of perpetuating the rule of that regime. Only 80,000 members of Basic Democracies had been entitled to vote out of a population of 120 million. It was easier for the administration to influence 80,000 members of B.D. They did not represent public opinion. This system was a big fraud. It was called Basic Democracies, but neither was it basic nor democratic. It only served as a pillar for Ayub's dictatorship. Public opinion did not matter at all to them. We were with you during that period. This party was established under very difficult circumstances. We faced Ayub's dictatorship when other political leaders had run away from the field and were hiding in their houses. Those who considered themselves the foremost politicians of the country had also retired from politics. They could not stand up to dictatorship. They were in opposition only in name. That was not the way to struggle against dictatorship. The struggle against dictatorship demanded sacrifices, imprisonment, and facing lathi charges, tear gas and even bullets. It was no easy thing to do. Making speeches in the Chowk Yadgar or Paltan Maidan or Mochi Gate every couple of months was not the way to topple a dictator. Ayub Khan never bothered about these speeches. He ruled

in spite of them because most of these speakers went to the Deputy Commissioners after making the speeches and apologized abjectly.

The opposition was opposition only in name. Ayub Khan ruled for eleven years ignoring all of them. Our party was formed when Ayub Khan thought that he could not be removed by anyone and that he would rule Pakistan as long as he lived. He was preparing his son to succeed him. The people with big names laughed at us. They never believed that we could face the dictator. These big people did not support us. When we founded the Pakistan People's Party we called a convention at Lahore. An attempt was made to set on fire the house where the convention was being held. Government servants went to our delegates and tried to prevent them from attending this convention. Attempts were made to stop our delegates from the Frontier and Sind. We did not have any newspapers, and the radio never covered our activities. The capitalists were not with us. What to say of supporting us they even avoided meeting us. Who was with us at that time? Only the people of Pakistan were with us. You, the people, made our success possible; the workers, the tillers of the soil and the students supported us. We can never betray you. We shall always side with you because we have full faith in you and I am sure that you too have complete faith in us.

We knew that with your help dictatorship could be toppled but the others did not believe it. They did not believe that the people would face the police and the army. If they had any confidence in you they would have come to you, and called upon you to fight against dictatorship resolutely. We had to burn our boats. That is the way to fight dictatorship, but the old style leaders remained at home. They did not believe in the power of the people and they did not know how to mobilise it. They had their personal ends to serve. They say they have served you for 23 years. What service have they rendered during these long years? A whole life-span has passed and conditions in Pakistan have deteriorated. When Ayub Khan ruled over the country these people could not be seen anywhere. They were hiding in their houses, rather under their beds. Now they have come out because they want to secure votes and are boasting about their achievements. They claim they can bring down the heavens but didn't even bring down Ayub Khan. My dear friends, of course, we want the votes but we want to build Pakistan. At the same time we want to make it clear that Pakistan cannot be built only through elections and votes. A lot of constructive work has to be done, inside and outside the Assembly. The Assemblies have been there in the past, but nothing happened outside the Assemblies. Time demands that political activity should be carried on in all spheres of life. Politics in the open, politics of the people, have not been the technique of these old politicians. They are used to round table conferences. What did Ghulam Mohammad do? He

dissolved a sovereign Constituent Assembly and formed a new Assembly. This was an illegal act. He had no right to form a new Assembly.

The same thing was done by Ayub Khan. When a movement was launched against him, he called a Round Table Conference instead of going to the people. And what did our friends do? They had declared that they would never talk to Ayub Khan. But when they were invited to the Round Table Conference they rushed to Rawalpindi. Ayub Khan only wanted to sabotage our movement. If all of us had gone to the Round Table Conference the movement would have failed because the people would have placed some hopes on the Round Table Conference. The workers would have gone to their mills, the farmers to their fields and the students to their schools and colleges, and when the movement would have been over, Ayub Khan would have refused to make any changes in his system. He had declared that his Basic Democracy system was the best in Asia and he was never going to amend it. It was because of the people's movement that he was prepared to make some changes. He convened the Round Table Conference only to sabotage the movement. That is why I did not join it. It would have been another betrayal of the people.

Once again, the old politicians are depending on the feudal system to win the elections. They are counting on tribal jealousies, but they have forgotten that this is not the Pakistan of 1940 or 1950. A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since. The people of Pakistan are wide awake. They will not cast their votes on the basis of tribal ties. They will cast their votes for their welfare and betterment. Pakistan has undergone a complete change. The people of Pakistan have come to realise that there has been no progress during the last 23 years which is a long period. Other countries have progressed a lot during this period. Even the countries which attained independence after us have progressed much more as compared to Pakistan. China achieved her independence much later but she has made great progress. Apart from China, you can take the example of Iran, Turkey or Egypt. They also have made great progress.

In Pakistan there is oppression and misery. What is the plight of the common man? You work day and night in your fields and your mills. These days you are reaping the harvest in the fields. Even our sisters are working in the fields. Not only that but small children who are clad in tattered clothes and who don't have shoes to wear, are working in the fields. These are the conditions in Pakistan while in other countries the children of this age are provided free education. There is a general complaint that bribery is on the increase. The question is how can we stop it? What is the salary of the lower grade government official? A constable is paid only ninety rupees per month. How can he make both ends meet? The prices are increasing. If you give them proper salaries, if you provide free education to their children, if you give them houses and raise their pensions,

only then you can demand that they should resist temptation; Under the present circumstances bribery is increasing, the misery is increasing, and hunger and poverty are increasing. With what face do these politicians come and ask for votes?

It is not that we don't want your votes. We do want your votes but we want to make it clear that mere votes or a constitution will not serve the purpose. A constitution is needed because it is the fundamental law but it will not solve the problems by itself. It is regrettable that no constitution has been successful in Pakistan. We believe in a constitution and we shall frame one. But a constitution cannot serve as a shelter for the homeless; you cannot eat it if your children are starving and if you need clothes the constitution will not provide you with clothes. We want a constitution and we believe in democracy. We have struggled for democracy and we believe that through democracy the people's rule can be established.

There is no controversy here so far as the need for a democratic constitution is concerned. The difference of opinion is about the economic system. We have an anti-people capitalist system in our country which aims at the oppression and exploitation of the common man. This system has been in vogue for 23 years. It is a legacy of the British. On the other hand there is the system of equality, the system of justice, the system of the poor people, the workers, and the tenants. You have to decide whether you want the system of exploitation or the system which will eradicate poverty and hunger from the country. This is where the difference of opinion arises. There are two types of political systems, dictatorship or one man's rule and democracy or the people's rule. Similarly, in economy there is capitalism which is just like dictatorship in politics and on the other band is the peoples economy which is like democracy in politics. Just as we don't want dictatorship in politics we don't want a monopoly of the few in the national economy. When we raise our voice against capitalism, the agents and stooges of capitalism come to you and alarm you by saying that this is against Islam. This certainly is not against Islam. Islam gave the message of equality to the world. It was because of equality that Islam spread from Algeria to Indonesia. Equality could be seen in the life of the Holy Prophet. It could be seen in the lives of the Khulafa-i-Rashedeen. Equality is a basic principle of our religion. Equality can never be against Islam. You can see that this system has been adopted in Egypt, Algeria, Libya, Sudan and Iraq which are all Islamic countries. Have they become infidels? In fact the biggest 'kafir' is one who dubs a Muslim as 'kafir.' Equality is not against Islam. I have just cited the example of the Muslim countries which have adopted this system.

Moreover, Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah who was the founder of Pakistan, also desired to establish Islamic Socialism in Pakistan. You can look up his

speeches or ask someone to read them to you. He had declared in Chittagong, in Bombay and in Delhi that Islamic equality will be enforced in Pakistan. After the establishment of Pakistan, he declared at Chittagong in 1948 that Islamic equality would prevail in Pakistan. Who can be a greater benefactor of Pakistan than the Quaid-i-Azam? He was one of the greatest Muslims and he founded Pakistan as the largest Muslim state in the world. Islamic socialism was a term used by him, and has not been coined by us. It was used by the Quaid-i-Azam and later the Quaid-i-Millat, Liaquat Ali Khan, had also declared that we shall establish Islamic equality in Pakistan. 'Musawat' is called 'yaksaniyat' in Persian. In English, it is called socialism. Just as 'jamhooriyat' is called democracy in English or 'dastoor' is called constitution. Our friends say that they don't need socialism, because they don't want any addition to Islam. They say that Islam is a complete code of life, and there is no scope for any addition to it. We accept that Islam is a complete code of life but then why do they demand the 1956 Constitution? When the Holy Quran is there as our constitution and it has all our laws, why do they want the 56 Constitution? Why do they want to form a new constitution? If our religion is a complete code of life we do not need any constitution. The parliamentary system is not mentioned anywhere in the Quran. This system was formulated by the British who were our imperialist rulers. They ruled over the country for 200 years. Why should we want their system? If there is scope for democracy in Islam and if the parliamentary system is not against Islam, Islamic Socialism is also not against Islam, if that had been the case, Quaid-i-Azam, the founder of Pakistan, would not have used this term.

My dear friends and brothers, there is no danger to Islam. Islam being an eternal religion can never be in danger. This religion is forever. It cannot be in danger especially in Pakistan because the Muslims are in a majority in this country. If there had been any danger to Islam you would have felt it. Nobody has asked you to give up your religion. Nobody has asked you to stop believing in the Quran or to give up your prayers. When Pakistan came into being our opponents were with the British and the Hindu Congress. They were issuing edicts against the Muslims. When Muslims were being killed in the Punjab and in Patiala the danger was felt by everybody. Where were these people then who say that Islam is in danger? They were not with the Quaid-i-Azam. They were with Gandhi, Nehru and Patel. During the struggle against the Congress and the British these gentlemen sided with the Congress against the Quaid-i-Azam. Now when we are faced with the task of building Pakistan and eradicating poverty and hunger they have come to tell us that Islam is in danger. Islam is not in danger. Our Prophet was the last of the prophets of Allah because our religion has been completely revealed. God Almighty has ordained in the Holy Quran that he will protect this religion. If there had been any danger it would not have been revealed that the last of the prophets had appeared. That is what is meant by 'Khatam-i-Nabuwat.' It is not Islam which is in danger but the capitalists and the

feudalists who are in danger, persons who have exploited this country and its common people.

This party has come into being to serve Islam. Our very first principle is that Islam is our religion and we shall lay down our lives for the sake of Islam. We are prepared to make all sacrifices wherever needed, in Pakistan, in India or in the Arab countries. It is our duty to render any service that is possible for the sake of Islam. Islam is our religion, democracy is our polity and Islamic equality or Islamic Socialism is our economy. This is our message. We are not like other parties. We have one flag and one programme. We shall not change our programme because we are not going to betray you. We shall end the politics of the betrayal of the common man. We have introduced a new system of politics, a revolutionary system which will protect you and bring progress and prosperity to the country. We want to build a Pakistan which should serve as a model for the world.

**Towards People's Raj
Speech at Public Meeting,
Lahore, May 1, 1970**

What is the objective of the progressive parties of Pakistan? Their only objective is the eradication of poverty and exploitation from Pakistan. Pakistan did not come into being to be ruled by a few capitalists. I have just returned from a tour of the NWFP. The wheat harvest is being reaped these days. I have seen with my own eyes that not only our brothers and sisters are working in the fields but also small innocent children of nine and ten years who are clad in rags and are barefooted. In other countries, the children of this age receive free education. We have to bring this injustice to an end. We have to bring to an end this oppression and exploitation. When we declare that we shall eradicate exploitation and tyranny from the country, some people say that we want to endanger Islam. Islam is not at all in danger. We are all Muslims and Pakistan is a Muslim country. Islam can never be in danger in Pakistan. I have a firm belief that Pakistan is a strong country and will live forever. Islam is not in danger. The capitalists and their stooges are in danger. The agents of capitalism are in danger. Those people who have exploited the masses are in danger. They cannot sleep soundly these days even with the help of sleeping pills.

We want a constitution. We shall try our best to give the country a constitution. A constitution is the fundamental law and we need it. But my dear brothers, please remember that if you are hungry you cannot eat the constitution. If your children need education and you don't have any money, the constitution cannot serve as a school. If you are in need of employment, the constitution cannot serve as a factory to provide you employment. If you are in need of a house, the constitution cannot be a substitute for that. In spite of this we shall strive hard to frame a constitution for the country. We want a people's constitution, a people's Raj, a people's government, a government of the workers, farmers and students. We believe in democracy and elections. We do not want frauds in the name of the elections. The first Round Table Conference was convened by Ghulam Mohammad when he dissolved the sovereign Constituent Assembly. Later, Ayub Khan convened another Round Table Conference. We did not go to the Round Table Conference. It has to be an election to the Constituent Assembly, this Assembly must be a sovereign body and must act as a people's Constituent Assembly.

Issues at Stake
Speech at Taxila,
May 24, 1970

Taxila is famous and historic. The museum here is known throughout the world. You have many relics of the past in the museum. They can be seen any time, but the political relics in our country come out of their museums after every four or five years. They come to you only at the time of elections. We are not like them. You will recall that when there was no question of elections, it was at that time that we came to you. We launched a struggle against the Ayub dictatorship when the question of votes did not arise. We were with you during that period. We were with you during the struggle against Ayub Khan. He had threatened that he would not allow the formation of this party, but this party came into being. He was power-drunk and dead set against the formation of this party. It was against great odds that this party was formed. It was no ordinary achievement. Ayub Khan tried his best to thwart our efforts. When we called a meeting at Lahore the house in which the meeting was to be held was set on fire. We were not allowed to hold our meetings at other places. Air passage was refused to our delegates from East Pakistan. These were the difficulties in the face of which this party came into being.

Even after the formation of the party every effort was made to curb its activities. Section 144 became the order of the day. When we held a public meeting in Qasim Bagh in Multan, goondas armed with swords and pistols were sent to disrupt the meeting. We were also interrupted by the goondas on our way to Qadirpur. They tried to prevent us from proceeding any further, our motor car was stoned. In spite of all these difficulties we did not shut ourselves up in our homes. We launched a public campaign at the risk of our lives. At that time, the elections were nowhere in sight.

Now the elections are drawing near and public meetings are being held every day. A variety of political leaders have appeared on the scene. They are making lofty promises but you have tried them in the past. They ruled the country for 10 years before Ayub Khan came into power. Later, during the Ayub regime they hid themselves in their homes. Ayub Khan was not afraid of them. They only opposed him in name. Instead of launching a struggle against him they made occasional speeches, but speeches alone cannot topple a dictatorship. Our party served the country at the time when it was most essential. You will recall that we did not have the support of the big people. Even now we are not being supported by them. The capitalists were all with Ayub Khan. Ayub Khan also had the support of the army, the police, the government servants, the Basic Democrats, the assemblies, and the moneyed people. He was in power. The

press, radio and television were under his control. In spite of all this the people's movement emerged victorious. We were with this movement and underwent many trials and tribulations. In 'Pindi' a student of the Polytechnic was killed in the police firing on 7th November, 1968. You and the workers launched a movement. We were with you in this movement. If you went to jail we also went to jails and suffered with you. We cannot give up the support of the people under any circumstances. This party shall never betray the people. This is a party of the masses. Its popularity and prestige flows from the people. There have been many betrayals of the people of Pakistan. The common man has gained nothing during 23 years. He has only been allowed to make sacrifices. You can see the most deplorable condition in which the workers and the peasants live. The lower grade government servants are paid very meagre salaries. We have only heard about but not seen freedom in this country. Our politics have been wrong and immoral. They have been the politics of palace intrigues. These politicians scorned the people. They never had any faith in the common man. All their schemes failed because they did not represent the will of the people.

Pakistan tried two constitutions during the last 23 years and both failed. India gained her independence along with us but her constitution, whatever its form, is running successfully. Administration is being run and elections are being held under this constitution. The situation in the subcontinent was the same at the time of partition. We got our country and the Indians got theirs. Why is it that in 23 years two constitutions failed in Pakistan? They failed because they were not framed by the true representatives of the people. Governor-General Ghulam Mohammad did not have the right to dissolve the Constituent Assembly and to form another. The second Constituent Assembly was not representative of the people. It was this Assembly which formulated the 56 Constitution and that is why it failed. So far as the 62 Constitution is concerned Ayub Khan had himself said that he was personally giving this constitution. This one-man constitution also failed. Now the people have to frame a constitution and they have to take the basic decisions. This is the stand of the People's Party on the question of constitution-making. Unless the new constitution is a people's constitution it also will fail. It will meet the same fate as the previous two constitutions. It is our promise to you that we shall try our best to ensure that the constitution to be framed should be your constitution.

We need a constitution because it is the basic law of the land. We shall try to give the country a workable constitution and we are not against it, but please remember that it also has to be given substance. The constitution alone cannot solve the questions of poverty and unemployment. It cannot be a substitute for two square meals a day, for employment and shelter. The major problem of the country is the economic system. When we talk of economic change and the eradication of poverty and hunger, our opponents criticise us. You can compare

the situation with other countries which have made progress. I do not understand why Pakistan cannot progress. There is no divine law that there should only be exploitation in Pakistan.

When we say that exploitation should end in Pakistan, when we say that the present capitalist system should be changed because it is anti-people and that the people have been looted under it, it is said that we are against the ideology of Pakistan. We want that Islam should be followed but what is the best way to do that? It does not redound to the glory of Islam if Muslims are dying of hunger and are deprived of the basic necessities of life. Islam cannot be served if the condition of the poor masses deteriorates every day. Service to Islam lies in bringing prosperity to the people of Pakistan.

You can see that Pakistan is becoming weaker every day. In India the Muslims are being mercilessly killed. There was a time when we faced the Indian aggression bravely and effectively. This was done because we were following a correct policy, and Pakistan was being served in the right manner. I can assure you that if there had been a people's government in Pakistan, India would not have dared touch a single Muslim. The Indian leaders say that Zulfikar Ali Bhutto should not come to power in Pakistan. May I ask you why they want that? It is because they know that we shall make Pakistan really strong by eradicating poverty, misery and hunger. This can be done in this country as it has been done in others. In many countries education up to the university level is free. Apart from America, China and Russia, even in Egypt, education in the colleges and the universities is free. Under King Faruk poverty prevailed and the children were deprived of education. Now in the same country education is being provided free. This has happened because the right system has been introduced. Nobody can recover from a disease if the right type of treatment is not given to him. If you want that your country should progress you should know that this cannot be done without Islamic equality. When we talk of Islamic equality which is called 'Islamic Socialism' in English, it is said that this is against the ideology of Pakistan. I declare that it is not against the ideology of Pakistan: The principles of equality were given to the world by Islam. There is great stress on equality in Islam.

The life of our Holy Prophet and the lives of the Khulafa-e-Rashedeen show us equality in practice. That is also the lesson of the Holy Quran. Now our ulema say that there is no equality in Islam but there is justice in Islam. I say even if there is justice what are its requirements? Justice demands that there should be equality. It is no justice if a nation has very poor masses and a few very rich capitalists. Justice demands that the capitalists should have less wealth and what they give up should be used to raise the standard of life of the poor.

Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah had also prescribed Islamic Socialism for Pakistan. You can read this in his published speeches. He was not the kind of person who could say anything against the interest of Pakistan. He was the founder of Pakistan and served the Muslims. He was for Islamic Socialism. I am advocating what he said.

After the Quaid, the Quaid-i-Millat who was the first Prime Minister of Pakistan also promised that Islamic socialism would be introduced in Pakistan. He said in his speeches that Pakistan had not come into being for a few families. Pakistan had not been established so that Muslim capitalists should replace Hindu capitalists. The British left but did not take away their system with them. Pakistanis have taken the place of British officers. There has been no change in the system or in the mentality. The same economic system prevails unchanged. This system suited British colonial ends because they were imperialists and wanted to exploit the resources of this country. We did not struggle against the British for a change of regime. Our struggle was directed against their system. There has been a great fraud played on the people of Pakistan. It is a great tragedy that during the last 23 years nothing was done to change the system. I am sure that if Quaid-i-Azam had lived he would have introduced Islamic equality. Liaquat Ali Khan who also spoke about introducing Islamic Socialism was shot in Rawalpindi. Now we are talking of Islamic equality and attempts were made to kill us in Sanghar. It is because we are the supporters of the poor. They may fire any number of bullets. We are prepared to lay down our lives. We are ready to offer all sacrifices but we shall never give up our struggle. We are determined to bring about equality in the country and to eradicate poverty and misery.

My brave people of Pakistan, I have not made any false promises to you. My first promise was to give the country an independent foreign policy. You have seen that in spite of many difficulties, I fulfilled that promise. Previously, our foreign policy was controlled by a big power. We did everything according to its dictates. We had lost the support and sympathy of the whole world. I entered into an agreement with the Russians for the exploration of oil in Pakistan. I had to fight against Ayub's Finance Minister and the United States but I was successful. I went to China and settled the boundary question with that big power. This opened a new chapter in our relations with China. I also improved relations with Afghanistan and with the Arab countries. A change was also effected in our relations with Indonesia. Before this we were all alone in the world. Now every government which comes to power claims very proudly that our foreign policy is very successful. The basis of this policy was laid when I was Foreign Minister. That is how I fulfilled my promise in respect of foreign policy.

My second promise was that we shall fight against India* resolutely. We fulfilled that promise. I demonstrated it in the Security Council. We were conducting a successful policy and secured plenty of aid from China, Indonesia, Iran and Turkey. Who was the Foreign Minister at that time? I was. People say that the international situation was such that we gained support, but why was it that Soekarno did not support us on Kashmir previously. The same Soekarno later supported us and Shastri had to say that India had been isolated.

There is a retired General who has started interference in politics. He says that I am also responsible for the Tashkent Declaration because I was present in Tashkent. I want to inform him that he should try to understand politics, if he has entered this field. The whole world knows, the Russian and the Indian governments know that I alone opposed the Tashkent Declaration. Ayub Khan was a dictator. I kept on repeating that I shall not be a party to it because the agreement was against our national interest. When we returned, I left 'Pindi and went straight to Larkana. I returned only because Ayub Khan appealed to me to stay on in the Government till the Indian armies had withdrawn from our frontiers. If I had left the Government at that critical juncture it would have been against the national interest.

The General says that I should have resigned. My dear friends, I did resign but my resignation was not accepted. May I ask him why he did not resign? After all he was the commander of the Lahore front. If the Tashkent agreement was wrong why did he not resign? Instead, the General got a cushy job in a semi-government body after his retirement. If he had any feelings for the country why did he accept that job? Ayub Khan had also asked me to take anything that I wanted? I told him that I did not want his money or his ambassadorship or mills. I only wanted to be with the people. If our brave young officers had not laid down their lives nobody can say what would have been the situation. The country was saved only because of the fortitude and bravery of the young officers and their men. This General was the commander of the Lahore front but at the time of the attack he was at his home. He wanted to be the Commander-in-Chief but was by-passed. He is a frustrated person.

My dear friends, my third promise was that we shall defeat the dictatorship in the country. It was no easy thing to do but we fulfilled our promise and toppled the dictator with your support. Now my fourth promise is that we shall establish a people's government and eradicate poverty and hunger in the country. We shall bring about a revolution, and the rule of the workers and peasants shall be established in Pakistan. You will be happy and prosperous. It will be a true Pakistani system, an Islamic system. We are not trying to import a system from China, Russia or America. It will be our own system. Our opponents say that Islam is a complete code of life. We believe in it because we are Muslims. We are

proud of our religion and shall lay down our lives for its sake. But why do our opponents demand the revival of the '56 Constitution? The Holy Quran is our constitution. If they believe that Islam is a complete code of life which instead of outlining broad principles defines minute details also why are they talking of a constitution enshrining the parliamentary system? This system is not specified in the Holy Quran., It is a British system. Why do they forget while saying that our religion is a complete code of life, that it also has something to say about the economic system. When we talk of the poor people and of equality they say that Islam is in danger. I say if there can be Islamic democracy there certainly can be Islamic social justice.

They support democracy because they think that with their money they will be able to control it or contain it if parties with vague programmes with Islamic labels come to power. But they are afraid of a party emerging with a public commitment to social justice. That is why they are worried about us. They are afraid of my speeches because I speak the truth and present the true picture before you. I say that we shall not tolerate this system of exploitation. They have already subjected you to a lot of oppression. Islam is not in danger but they certainly are in danger. I have given to the people my manifesto which is not a mere election manifesto. It is a manifesto for the service of the common man. These people cannot come to you and tell you that they have sucked your blood. Instead, they come to you and" tell you that Islam is in danger. After all this is a Muslim country and if there had been any danger to Islam the people would have perceived it.

Where were these people when the Quaid was fighting against the Congress and the British? You should not forget that at that time these people were not with the Quaid-i-Azam. They were with Nehru, Gandhi and Patel. They opposed the Pakistan movement and issued fatwas against the Kashmir war. I believe that Islam can never be in danger because it is an eternal religion and God Almighty is Himself its protector. Our Prophet was the last of 1,24,000 prophets because this religion has been finally revealed, and there can be no danger to it. If there was any possibility of any danger, more prophets would have followed. We are true Muslims and we are serving the Muslims.

You can see that there is a crisis in Kashmir again. They are fighting against the Indian government. They shall continue to do so till they achieve their right of self-determination. I have great respect for Sheikh Abdullah but times have changed. This is 1970 and not 1930 or 1940. You can see what is happening in Vietnam? I want to advise Sheikh Abdullah that he should launch a struggle against the Indian Government as we did here against Ayub's dictatorship. He should come out and burn his boats because mere speeches are not going to help him. Speeches may also be needed but what is needed most is sacrifice. A

leadership is needed which may liberate them from India. Sheikh Abdullah will have to fight just as we fought against Ayub Khan. I have a very high opinion of Maulana Farooq. He is young but has already undergone many hardships for the cause of his people. He is the future hope of Kashmir.

**The People's Struggle Builds Up
Speech at a Public Meeting, Korangi,
Karachi, June 7, 1970**

This is my third speech in Karachi since political activity started in January. My party is very keen to contact the people. We tried to contact you even when there was no question of elections. When we were struggling against Ayub Khan and when the question of adult franchise had not even arisen, we were with you. Although the country was dominated by "Ayub Shahi" and there was a system of Basic Democracy, we struggled against his dictatorship with your help. I only want to point out that we are not the kind who only come to you during the elections.

I have already outlined my party's aims and objectives. We are not contacting you because there are going to be general elections in the country in October. The Pakistan People's Party is not interested in elections only. This party came into being when the elections were nowhere in sight. It came into being to launch a struggle, a great movement against dictatorship. I want to remind you that Ayub Khan had boasted that he would destroy this party. When we decided to hold our first meeting in Lahore, we were not allowed to hold it in an auditorium or any other public place. Later, the meeting was held in the house of a friend. Attempts were made to set that house on fire. The PIA flights from East Pakistan were cancelled to prevent our delegates from that province from attending our convention. Petty bureaucrats in the Punjab and Sind were directed to dissuade our delegates from attending the meeting, but the party did come into being. It gave you a manifesto at that time. Now everybody is giving you a manifesto and making lofty promises. Why were they hiding in their houses at that critical time? Now when the dictatorship has been toppled all these knight-errants are holding public meetings and promising you a piece of the sky. You must take into account their past. You must consider the achievements of all the parties. The Pakistan People's Party came into being at a very critical period, but because the people of Pakistan were with this party it gained in strength every day. You have supported us and given us the prestige that we enjoy today. There are no big people in this party, no capitalists and feudalists. The big people are afraid of us. It is because this party believes in democracy and the welfare of the poor. When we held our convention at Hyderabad, I made it clear in my speech that we have to burn our boats and at the risk of our lives plunge into the fight against dictatorship. I pointed out that the struggle against Ayub Khan was going to be a tough and arduous one because Ayub Khan had the support of the police, the army and the government servants. He had full control of the country's affairs. He could have people beaten up or bribed. He could throw people into jails. It was no easy job to fight against such a dictator. I told my

friends that they should be prepared for all sacrifices. It was after this that my friends launched a massive struggle which can never be forgotten. But this struggle succeeded only because the people supported it. It was all due to your, efforts and the sacrifices of the students who in laying down their lives became martyrs. The youth came out in this movement. So also did the workers and the peasants. And the dictator was defeated.

My dear friends, this movement is unparalleled in history because dictators are mostly removed by the army and not by the people. This has been happening in the Middle East and in Latin America but here in Pakistan the great people defeated a dictator.

The Pakistan People's Party performed its duty. We cannot forget that struggle. Many of the politicians are now claiming that they opposed Ayub Khan for eleven years. This is incorrect. They were co-operating with Ayub Khan and some of them were prepared to accept ambassador-ships under him. I don't want to name a standard-bearer of democracy who claims time and again that he has always upheld the cause of democracy. This gentleman agreed to become an ambassador in America. Later Ayub Khan told him that his services were not required. Then he started opposing Ayub Khan but only in name. These people made speeches and later went and apologised to district officials. Ayub's dictatorship could not have been defeated by them. It needed a people's movement which you launched.

You should always remember that your voice is our voice, your demands are our demands and your struggle is our struggle. The Pakistan People's Party is a party of the masses. I promise that this party will never betray you. It will side with you on every issue. The people of Pakistan have suffered enough during the last 23 years. They have been betrayed time and again. The people struggled for freedom because they wanted to enjoy the benefits which liberty brings. The countries which became independent have developed. Unfortunately, in Pakistan the people have seen nothing but suffering. What are the economic conditions of the people? We believe in having a constitution because it is the fundamental law of land, but we also want to make it clear that a constitution alone cannot solve your problems. If you are dying of hunger the constitution cannot be eaten. Similarly, it cannot serve as a school or a mill. We have no difference of opinion with others so far as having a constitution is concerned. We believe in democracy and have struggled for it. But democracy alone cannot solve your problems.

The real struggle concerning the people is in the economic field. It is between capitalism and socialism. After 23 years you have to decide whether you want capitalism or Islamic equality. If you want that the country should progress and

that poverty and exploitation should be eradicated you have to take the right decision. We have launched this struggle in the interest of the people. That is why the capitalists are opposing us. The people of Pakistan have to decide whether they support a people's rule or an anti-people system. What is the plight of the poor people in Korangi? Nobody can say that you have got a house here. The houses have been built at a cost of 800 rupees but you have had to pay sixteen hundred rupees for them, because interest was charged on the price. How can we call this an Islamic system? When these houses were built, I was the Industries' Minister. I had advised that nothing should be charged from the people for these houses because they had been built out of their taxes. But later their price was fixed at Rs.1600.

The people's government is sure to come into power whatever the opposition and propaganda of the stooges of imperialism. I assure you that your rule is bound to be established in Pakistan. Atrocities have been committed against mill workers. These capitalists are spending money against us. It is because the Pakistan People's Party is the only party which supports the workers. When the journalists went on strike only this party supported them. The journalists were told that they should misreport our speeches. Even now our news is being blacked out. We have organised huge meetings and processions in all the important cities of Pakistan but these activities have not been covered in the newspapers. When the Shaukat-i-Islam day was celebrated by the rightist parties newspapers were full of its reports for three days.

My dear friends, we are Muslims and we are proud of Islam. We are prepared to lay down our lives for the sake of Islam. We don't need any certificate from anyone in this respect.

When we presented our manifesto there was no question of any elections. We told the people of Pakistan in plain words what our economic and political programme was. We want to eradicate poverty, hunger and misery from Pakistan. We haven't changed our manifesto. There is a party which gave different manifestos in 1941, 1950, 1960 and 1970. In 1940 and 1950 they said that there could be no limit on private property. The Quaid-i-Azam was called the "Quaid-i-Kufr." They said that if Pakistan came into being it would be a great tragedy. When the Quaid was struggling for Pakistan, they were with Gandhi, Nehru and Patel. They said that the movement of Pakistan was against Islam and that there were no fundamental differences with the Hindus and the British. You can see the plight of the Muslims in India. They are being mercilessly massacred. Quaid-i-Azam demanded a separate homeland for the Muslims to give them protection. These gentlemen opposed Pakistan at that time. Why do they say now that Islam is in danger? If they want to serve Islam they should serve the Muslims. If the Muslims are dying of hunger, if they are deprived of clothing and

shelter, if they are being killed in India and Kashmir and the Middle East, Islam is not being served. This situation has arisen because we are weak and we have been weakened because of exploitation and the sucking of our blood under the capitalist system.

True service to Islam lies in serving the Muslims. In many countries children are getting free education. I am not talking of Russia, China, France or England. You can see what is happening in Egypt. During King Faruk's regime there was no free education. After the revolution, when Faruk was ousted, the revolutionary government began to provide free education up to college and university level with the same resources. But in Pakistan poor children of tender age are working in the fields. This cannot be their destiny. They are captives of a system.

We don't have any personal differences with the capitalists. We are against their system. The British have left but we have retained their corrupt system. There has been no change in this system so far. It is only that those ruling over the country today are Pakistanis.

The majority of the people cannot buy cloth even for shrouds, and if shrouds are available the maulvis charge fifty rupees for burying the dead. We want to end this situation. There are no differences on the question of constitution and democracy. The differences are about capitalism and socialism. When we talk of socialism they say that it is against Islam. We have challenged them time and again to prove it. We do not want to import a system from China, Russia or America. We want to establish a new system based on our own principles of 'Musawat', which is called socialism in English just as 'jamhooriyat' is called democracy.

These self-appointed custodians of Islam have never been able to prove that socialism is against Islam. They say that Islam is a complete code of life, implying that socialism as such should find mention in it. But they demand the 1956 Constitution which also is not mentioned in the Holy Quran. We don't need the 1956 Constitution. If they regard Islam as a complete code of life why do they want to form a new constituent assembly? The Holy Quran is our constitution and we don't need the parliamentary system. This parliamentary system in any case has not been mentioned anywhere in the Quran. This is a system given to us by the British. When they talk of it they forget that Islam is a complete code of life, and there is no scope for any parliamentary system in it. It is only when we talk of equality, when we talk of the problems of the worker, the eradication of poverty and exploitation that these people say that it is against Islam. No! It is not against Islam. This certainly is not against Islam otherwise Zulfikar Ali Bhutto would not have raised his voice in its favour.

My dear friends, I am not the first one to talk about Islamic Socialism. The Quaid-i-Azam who was the founder of this country promised to introduce Islamic Socialism. You can consult his books. Nobody can deny that Quaid-i-Azam said it. Later Quaid-i-Millat Liaquat Ali Khan also advocated this in his speeches. I believe that he was assassinated only because he believed in Islamic Socialism. The capitalists and their stooges were responsible for his murder which was not properly investigated. Why was it so? The Quaid-i-Millat had said that Pakistan had not come into being for a few capitalists or feudal lords. He declared that Islamic socialism will be introduced in Pakistan. It is surprising that in spite of the fact that the Quaid-i-Azam and the Quaid-i-Millat both promised to introduce Islamic socialism, the system of exploitation goes on in Pakistan. Now you can see that there is all round awakening in the country. People have come to realize the difference between truth and falsehood. This country is going to have a people's government, whatever the difficulties. If we have to eradicate poverty and hunger, if we have to end the exploitation of the masses, if we want that Pakistan's prestige should be raised, if we want the killing of the Muslims in India to be stopped and if we want to secure the right of self-determination for the people of Kashmir, a people's government will have to be established in Pakistan. That is the reason why India does not want Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to come into power. They know that I can lay down my life for the cause of Pakistan. They cannot forget that I made their Foreign Minister run away from the Security Council. We are so weak now that we cannot demand our rights from the Indians. We are being discouraged but if we have to take revenge from India and if we have to solve the Kashmir problem, we should never forget that after China and India, Pakistan has the largest army in Asia. It is a brave army because the people of Pakistan are brave. It is a surprise that Muslims are being killed in India. We are the largest Muslim country. I have been in the government for eight years and I gave the country a new foreign policy. I can tell you that we can stop the massacre of Muslims in India. We can also help the people of Kashmir.

When I say that we need Chinese support our opponents say that there is communism in China. I want to make it clear that we shall have our own system but we need Chinese friendship. When we entered into an agreement with America, did we accept their system as well? They have no objection to our agreements with America or India. It is only our relations with China that they object to.

Our opponents say that they are supporters of Islam, and they will turn Pakistan into Indonesia. They forget what happened in Indonesia. Nearly a million Muslims were killed and Soekarno who was removed was an enemy of the imperialists. He supported Pakistan during the 1965 war. He also supported the right of self-determination of the Kashmiris. They want to repeat the same thing

in Pakistan. They want to destroy Pakistan. They should never forget that Pakistan cannot become Indonesia. We shall bring about an economic revolution in Pakistan and end the domination of capitalism and imperialism.

My dear friends, we are not interested in elections alone. We want the progress of the people of Pakistan. Why are assassination attempts directed against us? It is because we come to you and tell the truth. We want that the exploitation of the poor Muslims should end. You should remember that if you want to bring prosperity to your country you will have to launch a struggle and offer sacrifices. The capitalists cannot tolerate that we should come and tell you the truth. I assure you that our party will never betray you. This is your own party and whatever the obstacles, it is going to stand by you. President Yahya has been repeating in his speeches that the Government is neutral. He may say so but his Information Minister is not neutral. He has repeatedly made speeches in which he has clearly shown that he represents a particular party. We are not afraid of it. We are going to confront him.

We want a constitution. We want democracy. We are not against the parliamentary system but unless basic economic changes are introduced no problems can be solved. You can see that the big capitalists and their stooges are joining hands against us. We believe in only one front and that is the people's front. We shall face the capitalists and the imperialists from that front. Insha Allah we shall emerge victorious.

**Inauguration of P.P.P. Office, Quetta
June 12, 1970**

I am very happy that God has given me this opportunity of coming to Quetta after a long time. You can see that political activity has started in the country and I am undertaking extensive tours from one end of Pakistan to the other. I have come to the people of Baluchistan because the Pakistan People's Party is a party of the masses. This is your party and it will never betray you. This is my word of honour to you. We have seen that during the last 23 years there has been a continuing conspiracy against the people of Pakistan. With the deaths of Quaid-i-Azam and Quaid-i-Millat the conspiracy began to surface and operate quite blatantly. There has been no political or economic progress in the country. Poverty and misery have been on the increase. We stand for justice and equality. That is what the people in this country want. We want to end the system of exploitation. This also is our party programme. A great deal of baseless propaganda is being carried out against us. The capitalists are vilifying us in their newspapers.

Without your co-operation this party cannot succeed. You have made today's procession a success. You came of your own accord. You came because you wanted to. That is important. This was bur own procession and no capitalists spent any money on it. I am very happy that this procession has been successful. I am inaugurating this office today and want you to remember that this is your own office. It is not possible for us to open offices everywhere. Offices should be opened so that work is done there. You should visit this office and acquaint yourself with the programme of the Pakistan People's Party. This is not the office of the People's Party only but your own whether you are members of our party or not. You are our brothers and the doors of this office will remain open to you

**Forming a Revolutionary Party
Speech at Quetta Reception,
June 13, 1970**

Yesterday you took out a great and successful procession. I thank you and the party workers without whose efforts it could not have been organised. We should continue to give the highest importance to discipline in our party. When the Pakistan People's Party came into being, it gave a manifesto to the people. This manifesto was given at a time when there was no question of elections. We are following the same manifesto and -working for its implementation. We need a strong organisation. It is difficult to organise a party in the beginning. I am happy that this basic work is being done gradually and now our organisation is well grounded.

You will recall that I also came to this city when the party had not been formed. A reception was arranged in this same garden. One of my friends had then come to me and asked me to form a party. I had already decided to do so but I had not announced it. At that time press representatives and other friends asked me about my future plans. I told them that I planned to, form a revolutionary party, a progressive party, a people's party which should work according to the needs of the time. Its main purpose would be to bring about a change in the economic system because this is the need of the hour. I was told that it would not be easy to form such a party in Pakistan.

My friends told me that there were so many parties in Pakistan and a new one was not needed. There were perhaps seven or eight parties. Later, a few more parties were formed. It was also said that there was dictatorship in the country and the dictator would put hurdles in our way and it would be difficult to proceed. I told them that that I knew it was going to be a difficult task but I believed that without struggle and sacrifice nothing could be achieved. For the last two decades there has been no proper political activity in our country. A few politicians along with some army officers ruled the country most of this time. To form a revolutionary party was an uphill task but we were determined to face the difficulties. You have seen that in spite of many hindrances we have formed this party.

I am not going to make a speech because it is not a political reception. People from all parties have joined this reception. I am grateful to them for accepting our invitation and do not want to misuse this opportunity. They may not like me to talk about my party. The People's Party has to do a lot of constructive work. It has a manifesto. It has a philosophy. It is following certain principles. We need not indulge in false propaganda and speeches against other parties. We have to do our work. I haven't come here to make a political speech. I have respect for all

the elderly people from other parties who are sitting here. Democracy demands patience with others. After the establishment of Pakistan people did not tolerate differences of opinion. The Governments put their opponents in jail. This did not serve any political purpose. Political issues should be solved through political methods by going to the people because the people's verdict is final.

You have seen two constitutions in 22 years in Pakistan. India gained her independence at the same time. They framed a constitution which may have its faults but it has been working successfully. On the other hand, both the constitutions in Pakistan failed, because the people had no say in their framing. No fundamental question can be solved permanently without a final decision being taken by the people. We welcome the workers and the leaders of other parties who have come to attend this reception. We are holding a public meeting tomorrow. Our friends from Kalat and local workers will make speeches. We shall explain our party's stand on different issues. That will be a political meeting.

In the end I want to say something political with your permission. It has been said that the Pakistan People's Party does not exist in Baluchistan. Tomorrow you will see that the Pakistan People's Party is very much here. I am grateful to my friends and brothers who are standing outside. I am sorry that the police had to take the trouble of coming on duty again!

Why Was Liaquat All Khan Shot?
Public Speech at Quetta,
June 14, 1970

I have come to Quetta after a long interval. My tours of different areas to explain the party manifesto have taken a lot of my time. All the political parties started their activities on the first of January. Our political struggle, however, has been going on for the last four years. When I left the Government of Ayub Khan he warned me not to join politics otherwise he would destroy me. He said that he would not spare me till death. I told him that I couldn't take any decision in this respect and that if the people of Pakistan needed Zulfikar Ali Bhutto then I would certainly take part in politics. I also told him that I believed that life and death and honour and disgrace were in the hands of God.

I formed a political party after consulting the people. It is no ordinary thing to form a political party in a backward country where there are already so many parties in the field. When our party came into being there was dictatorship in the country. In spite of this the first meeting of the Pakistan People's Party was held in Lahore. Many hurdles were put in our way. Every attempt was made to make our first meeting unsuccessful. An attempt was also made to set on fire the house in which we were holding our meeting. Notwithstanding these difficulties the party came into being. Now this party has been working for three years. Our meetings were banned in the beginning. It was only because of your co-operation that the party took root. Attempts were made to sabotage our meetings through the police and other minions of the government. Goondas armed with swords were sent to our meeting in Multan to disturb it, but we were not cowed by this. When we could not hold a meeting in Multan we would go to Karachi or Hyderabad and if we failed to hold our meetings there we went to Dacca or to Lahore. In short, we never lost contact with the people. We were never in hiding in our houses like other politicians.

My dear friends, please remember that we haven't come to you now because elections are being held and we want your votes. We are not asking you to cast your votes for us. We know that the history of this country will not be made only by votes. Its destiny depends on what happens after that. You have witnessed the movement we launched against Ayub Khan and how we led this movement to success. This was not our success but the success of the brave people of Pakistan. Ayub Khan was a very strong dictator. He used the machinery of the Government, the police, the army, the Basic Democrats and he controlled the press as well. He was a new Hitler. One of my political friends has accused me of trying to become a Hitler. I say he should have some fear of God. How can I

become a Hitler? We have defeated the Hitler of Pakistan with the help of the people.

My dear friends, the way you defeated the Hitler of Pakistan is unparalleled in history. A dictator is generally removed by the army but in Pakistan the dictator was toppled by a people's movement. It was a struggle of the common man. There is no such example in history. This movement clearly proved that the majority of the people of Pakistan is with the Pakistan People's Party, This party has the support of the students, because it is a modern party. It is working in accordance with the needs of the hour. The people of Pakistan need this party. We are proud of the fact that the students are with us. Some people say that only the students are with us while the people are with them. I say that if the students and the youth are with us it is a matter of great pride. It was our party which demanded that the limit on the voting age should be fixed at eighteen because this party wanted to secure the right of vote for the students. We believe that the students are capable of taking correct decisions. If a peasant can be given the right of vote then the students who are educated and well-informed must be given this right.

The other parties have said that we are making this demand only because the majority of the students is with us. We are not interested in votes alone. We know that the country can be built only by hard work, struggle and sacrifice. It is a very arduous process. The problems cannot be solved in an easy manner. The history of a nation includes periods of suffering and tribulations. For the last 23 years the logic behind our politics has been to find a short cut. There are no short cuts in this task. Pakistan's masses have always been doing hard work. The peasants who work in the fields know it well that a crop is ready only after a good deal of hard work and labour. It has to be a long Struggle.

We believe in having a constitution and also in holding elections but we want to emphasise that mere elections cannot solve your problems. The basic problems are poverty and hunger. Elections have been held in the past, but these problems have not been solved. Elections will help you to elect your representatives for the Assembly to frame a constitution. A constitution cannot solve your problems because if you are hungry it will not feed you and if you are unemployed it will not provide you employment.

The present struggle is against those who want to perpetuate the capitalistic system. We want to establish the system of Islamic equality. The capitalists and their stooges want that the system of exploitation which has been in vogue for centuries should continue. They cannot come and tell you that they want to suck your blood. They cannot come and tell you that they want your poverty and misery to last forever. Instead, they come and tell you that Islam is in danger.

Islam can never be in danger. We are all Muslims and we know that Islam cannot be in danger. The capitalists and the feudalists are in danger. Islam is our religion and will last even after the Day of Judgement. God Almighty has taken upon Himself the protection of this religion. How then can Islam be in danger? Our Holy Prophet was the last of the prophets. Only the capitalists believe that Islam can be in danger. You must take into consideration who the people are who come and tell you that Islam is in danger. They are the same people who opposed the Pakistan movement and dubbed the Quaid-i-Azam as the leader of infidels. They opposed Pakistan till the last day. During the Pakistan movement they were with our enemies. Now these very people say that Islam is in danger.

When the struggle for Pakistan was in progress and when efforts were being made to carve out a home for the Muslims they said they did not want a Muslim state. At that time they didn't feel any danger from the Hindus. You can see today how the Muslims are being massacred in India. If Pakistan had not come into being the Muslims would have met the same fate even in the areas which now form a part of Pakistan. When the Hindus and the British were opposing the Pakistan movement, these people opposed Quaid-i-Azam and Islamic Pakistan. Why do they now say that they alone can run Pakistan and ensure its Islamic character. In fact they want Pakistan to remain a weak country. Their conspiracy against the establishment of Pakistan having failed, their efforts are now directed towards weakening it, to bring about its destruction.

After Pakistan's establishment they began to pontificate about what sort of state it should be and issued edicts against all who did not accept their sole and permanent right to interpret Islam. They did not call Hindus infidels but Zulfikar Ali Bhutto who recites the Kalima has been called an infidel. If they are addicted to issuing fatwas why don't they direct them against those who are killing Muslims in India and Kashmir. Even in England the Pakistanis are being beaten up. But our mullahs want to shed Muslim blood in Pakistan. They are openly saying that they will turn Pakistan into Indonesia. What happened in Indonesia? A million Muslims were killed there and that is what they want to do here in Pakistan. We shall not allow them to do so. The people of Pakistan know that the Pakistan People's Party will serve the country and defend Islam. We shall serve the Muslims by working for their progress and prosperity. We shall uphold the prestige of Islam. That is how we want to serve Islam. I served the cause of Islam when I was Foreign Minister.

The Indian Prime Minister has said that she doesn't want Zulfikar Ali Bhutto to come to power in Pakistan. Why doesn't she? It is because she knows that I have served Pakistan and I will not accept India's dominance. She knows that I shall serve your cause and put Pakistan on the path of progress. It is my solemn promise to the brave and valiant people of Pakistan that if the Pakistan People's

Party comes to power we shall never allow the massacre of Muslims in India. The Indians know that Pakistan is weak and they are taking advantage of it.

Our opponents cannot serve Islam. Islam can be served only if the people are served. What is the plight of the common man? It is deteriorating every day. How can Islam be served under these circumstances? You cannot even educate your children. In other countries education up to university level is free, while your children have to work day and night. Leaving aside the developed countries you can take the example of Egypt. Under King Faruk the peasants and the poor people in Egypt were suffering just as they are suffering in Pakistan. In the same Egypt, with the same resources, free education is being given to the people up to university level. In Pakistan you cannot educate your children even up to Matric. How can Islam be served if this situation continues? The country cannot progress when so much ignorance prevails. The lives of the new generation cannot be wasted. They must get the rights which have been given to people in other countries. Prices are increasing every day. This situation cannot be tolerated any more. Government servants are not being paid enough to make both ends meet. The same is the condition of the peasants and the workers. I promise that when the Pakistan People's Party comes to power, education will be free up to Matric. We shall revise land revenue rates in favour of the small land holder. The salaries of the poor Government servants will be increased. We shall work for the eradication of poverty.

I have been the Foreign Minister of Pakistan for several years. I had promised to give the country an independent foreign policy. I fulfilled that promise. Our previous foreign policy was dictated by a big power. Our relations with Russia, China, the Middle Eastern countries and Afghanistan were strained. We had good relations only with America. The whole world laughed at us. Pandit Nehru made fun of the foreign policy of Pakistan, the largest Islamic state of the world. We could not take any decision independently. It was after a good deal of struggle that I gave an independent foreign policy to the country) This boosted our prestige abroad. It was a people's foreign policy against the interest of the imperialists and the capitalists. I also promised to struggle against dictatorship and you have seen that we defeated the dictator with your support. We were with you throughout the struggle.

My third promise was that we shall fight against India resolutely. When the time came we faced the Indian aggression bravely. I fulfilled all the three promises. I won't make false promises. I may die but I shall never betray you. Now my fourth promise is that we shall eradicate poverty, hunger and misery from Pakistan. We shall end exploitation in the country. We shall bring prosperity to Pakistan. We shall give the country a people's constitution. We are Muslims and we are very proud of it. We shall lay down our lives for the cause of Islam not

only in Pakistan but wherever it is needed. Our very first principle is that Islam is our religion. We believe that there should be democracy in the country. So far as the economy of the country is concerned we want to introduce Islamic equality or socialism as against the capitalistic system. There is no third system. If you want that exploitation should continue and your blood should be sucked, then you may support capitalism. We have no personal enmity with the capitalists. It is a question of principles. If you want that your children should get education, that you should be provided with food, clothing and shelter and employment, and that your salaries be increased then you have no choice but to support Islamic equality or Islamic Socialism.

I am not the first one to make such a demand. Quaid-i-Azam Mahomed Ali Jinnah had promised in his speech at Chittagong that Islamic Socialism would be introduced in Pakistan. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto is not the first one to make that demand. The Quaid-i-Azam who was one of the greatest of all Muslims and who founded Pakistan, the largest Islamic state, was the one who supported Islamic socialism. On the other hand, the people who opposed the Pakistan movement are now opposing Islamic socialism. The Quaid-i-Millat, Liaquat Ali Khan, who was the first Prime Minister of Pakistan and a lieutenant of the Quaid-i-Azam also promised to introduce Islamic Socialism in the country. Anyone can look up their speeches. I am only following in their footsteps. I want to eradicate poverty and hunger. I want that there should be progress in Pakistan.

It is surprising that our critics do not want Pakistan to progress. Investigations into the murder of Quaid-i-Millat have turned up nothing. I believe that he was assassinated because he wanted to introduce Islamic Socialism. His murder was the result of a great conspiracy. That is the reason also why Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was fired upon in Sanghar. I am not afraid. I believe that life and death are in the hands of God. I shall side with the people and shed the last drop of my blood for their cause. I shall be with you through every phase of the struggle. Islamic Socialism is nothing new for us. The principles of socialism and equality are in keeping with our religion. Islam was the first religion to give the message of equality to the world. Because we support the principles of social justice we are fired upon.

Our opponents say that Islam is a complete code of life. If that is the case then why do they demand the restoration of the 1956 Constitution? They are always repeating this demand? The Holy Quran is our constitution. Why do they demand the parliamentary system? This system has not been mentioned anywhere in the Quran. They do not find the demand for parliamentary system against Islam. It is only when the question of the salvation of the poor arises that they say that Islam is a complete code of life and there is no scope for socialism in Islam. They reject socialism because the term as such does not exist in the Quran.

But then the Quran does not specifically mention parliamentary democracy either. The People's Party accepts both; the capitalists accept only what suits them.

In the end, I demand that the young students who have been arrested in Baluchistan should be released. Not only in Baluchistan, but students should be set free wherever they are in jails. The elections are meaningless for us if they stay in jails. Labour leaders and the peasant leaders should also be released immediately because there are only three months left for the elections

I also wish to assure the minorities in Baluchistan that we shall protect their rights. It is a principle of our religion that we should protect every body. I believe that the Sindhis, Pathans, Punjabis and the refugees who came from India must unite and struggle hard to build Pakistan according to the dreams of the Quaid-i-Azam.

Go From Door to Door
Speech at the Opening of the Orangi P.P.P. Office,
Karachi, July 7, 1970

The first and foremost principle of the Pakistan People's Party is that Islam is our religion. We would sacrifice our lives for Islam. We are always ready to offer any sacrifice for its cause. Pakistan came into being because we are all Muslims. Had we not been Muslims, Pakistan would never have come into existence and there would have been no need at all to create this country.

It is against this background that our party's foremost principle is that Islam is our religion. We also say at the same time that democracy is our polity. It is because democracy leads to the formation of popular governments. In democracy the people's voice is heard. The people have a say in forming or undoing a government. Hence our profession that democracy is our polity. Our third principle is that socialism is our economy, our economic system.

Do you see how much propaganda is being launched against this word socialism and for what? I may tell you that it is only in Pakistan that such propaganda is being carried on.

The struggle for socialism is progress even in countries like England but there socialism is not described as anti-religion. Those who are against socialism there would never say it was against Christianity. Nowhere in the world is socialism criticised for its alleged conflict with religion.

You have democracy in Islam. Had democracy not been provided for in Islam, you would never have struggled for it. Had it been against Islam... you would have opposed democracy. Since Islam is the basis of democracy, and democracy is in the very roots of Islam, it follows that democracy is not against Islam, but when socialism is mentioned, it is described as anti-religion. Socialism is a Western term, just as "jamhooriyat" is called democracy, but no one is against "jamhooriyat". Socialism in our language means "Musawat." So why should we be against "Musawat"? Why do they not want "Musawat"? Is it against Islam? If democracy is not against Islam, then nor is "Musawat."

My dear brothers and sisters, as I told you yesterday, nobody can stop "Musawat" from being enforced in this country. I can assure you, and it is my promise to you, that the Pakistan People's Party, my colleagues and myself will firmly stand by you. We shall not pause in our struggle until we have completely eliminated misery and poverty from the country. On my part, I am

prepared for any sacrifice. I have already gone to jail once, but I am prepared to go to jail again. This is of no consequence considering the objective before us.

Our struggle is based on principles, a struggle for truth and for right; an epoch-making struggle. Had I wished, I would have continued to cling to power like others, sucking your blood. But I am against all that. I want justice in Pakistan. I want an end to all exploitation in Pakistan. What good will it do to me to persecute my people, to exploit my people? If I have to serve my nation, my country, I should do it with a clear conscience. Otherwise, I have no right to remain in politics. Why should I side with those doing injustices I shall follow the right path. I could have further strengthened the grip of exploitation by supporting them. But I detest that. I don't want that. Because that system is against the people of Pakistan. I cannot support any anti-people system and an anti-people government.

It is a pity we should be accused of weakening our religion when we demand schools for our children, the restoration of the rights of labourers and an economic system under which this country can prosper. We are not weakening our religion nor do we want to do that. We only want to Strengthen Pakistan.

How will Pakistan become strong? It will become strong only when her labourers and students will get strong. If the majority of the people are poor; if the majority of the people are dying of hunger; if they are weak, how can Pakistan become strong? What after all is Pakistan? Pakistan means the people of Pakistan. If the people of Pakistan are weak, Pakistan can in no circumstances be strong. We want to make our country strong. We want to serve our country as well as our religion. It pains us to hear that those wanting to serve the country are called infidels. Are there not enough infidels in the world? If our opponents want to fight infidels, they can find them in Israel and India.

We have been struggling for democracy. But democracy alone will not do. We certainly want democracy. We have been fighting for democracy. And we have faced and fought against dictatorship. But I want to make it absolutely clear that democracy alone is not enough. We cannot progress unless we make fundamental changes in our economic system.

It is time for the Pakistan People's Party to strengthen its roots. You have to strengthen its roots. It is your party. It has been set up for you. The very name of the party means it belongs to the people of Pakistan. It is not my party, nor is it the party of any individual. It belongs to all of you.

We are not a rich party, unlike the Jamat-i-Islami or Ayub Khan's Muslim League which had thirty million rupees. We do not even have three hundred rupees. We

have no wealth but our wealth lies in your strength and force. That is all we need.

It is time for you to strengthen your own party. You have to face and counter the propaganda that your party will take you away from Islam. As Muslims, you should go from door to door, meet the people, train them politically and answer false propaganda. It is the duty of political parties to educate the people and to counter what is said against them.

You have to set up offices. You have to pay attention to organisational matters because no party can be run without organisation. In fact there is need for organising the party. You have to acquaint yourself with the party principles. You have to think them over. Do not think you will get your rights so easily. You will have to fight for them.

The people should not think they will get their rights while sitting idle at home. You will have to undertake a long struggle. You cannot do all this with one stroke. You should be ready to work. We are with you, if you are vigilant no anti-people conspiracy can ever succeed.

You will remember Ayub Khan tried to hatch an anti-people conspiracy through the Round Table Conference. It was aimed at compromising with the right wing parties and to protect the citadel of exploitation. All the parties that had once been against Ayub Khan went to the Round Table Conference. They went to strengthen Ayub Khan's hands. They did so because they had identical economic views. They may have wanted democracy, but they were all one on the fundamental question of the economic system. They participated in the Round Table Conference, although they had once opposed the idea of attending it and reaching any agreement with Ayub Khan. But when they saw that their common ideas, their common points of view were in danger they rushed to Rawalpindi.

Later, they started propaganda against me saying that the conference did not succeed because of my non-participation. How could I go into a conference that was being held against the interests of the people? How could I support a front that was being made against the people? Had I participated in it, the movement going on? In the country would have ended. Ayub Khan only wanted to sabotage the people's struggle one way or the other. However, no anti-people conspiracy can ever succeed here. It may succeed temporarily; it will certainly be defeated in the end. I declare that if any anti-people front is set up here, we will fight against it tooth and nail and will bury it deep.

Consulting the People
Address at Public Meeting in Malir,
August 5, 1970

It is being argued that one should avoid extremist policies; that balanced policies should be evolved and pursued. I wonder how one can solve the problems of extreme corruption, black marketing and poverty by balanced policies. Indeed we need a modern party which can translate the Quaid-i-Azam's dream into a reality. Talking of a balanced policy is a mere deception. You cannot pursue balanced policies in a country where all sorts of vices are rampant in their lowest forms.

I will not pursue a balanced policy. I have a revolutionary policy. It will be directed against our enemies both within and outside the country. We are not afraid of making sacrifices. We are not afraid of going to jails. We will always be ready to offer the last drop of our blood for the preservation of Pakistan. These elections would be the last for us under the present regime.

Nawabzada Sher Ali Khan gave an interview earlier this year in which he said that if these elections could not be held smoothly or if the constitution could not be framed, elections would be held again after three months, and if even these elections did not produce results, yet another round of elections would be conducted within three months. I would say to Nawabzada Sahib that we shall not be a party to this hoax. General elections could not be held in 23 years. How would you be able to hold elections again every three months? In case there is a deadlock a reference to the electorate within three months will not affect the position of parties very much. So, what good will you get out of fresh elections? We shall consider the coming elections as final. We shall form a constitution—a Pakistani, Islamic and popular constitution. If we lose, everyone would lose. We shall simply not fight elections again and again, for we know the elections alone cannot solve problems.

It is the People's Party which has held the largest number of public meetings since the restoration of political activity. It is because the party wants to maintain contacts with you, with the masses. It is your party because you have formed and made it popular. It is not the question of elections alone. We have not come forward to ask for your votes. We have been making speeches even during the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. One would like to ask where the so-called great politicians had gone then? The Pakistan People's Party was not formed for us to come out only at the times of elections.

True, it is for the first time that elections on the basis of adult franchise are being held here on a nation-wide basis. But there have been provincial elections. India has had three elections so far. But, then, has poverty and misery ended there? Rather the situation there is going from bad to worse. That is why we do not consider the elections as the remedy for all ills. Ours is a revolutionary party believing in struggle for and service to the common man. It stands for fighting against the enemy. It is committed to continue fighting till the last to give Kashmir is the choice of joining Pakistan. I sought your opinion on whether or not we should participate in the elections. I continued asking you from January to July. Our opponents then said that the People's Party would not fight the elections as it believed in violence and disruption, and that it was not hopeful of success.

This was one aspect of the propaganda against us. On the other side elections on adult franchise were being held here for the first time. We asked for your opinion by holding public meetings. You decided in favour of our participating in the elections. So at the Hala Conference we decided to participate in the elections. You will recall that I had also sought your opinion about attending the Round Table Conference. I was against attending that conference, for I thought it was a conspiracy against the people. I knew it would lead to strengthening the hands of dictatorship. However, I did not take the decision by myself. I came to you but you did not allow me to attend, so I did not.

At the Hala Conference there were two opinions about our participating in the elections. One view was against our participation on the plea that by doing so we would be betraying the people. The argument was that the people would think that the elections would solve their problems immediately. And when they found that their problems were not solved even after the elections, they would feel they had been cheated.

The other point of view was that the people wanted the elections to be held. So we should make it clear from the very beginning that the elections alone would not solve the people's problems. We should, however, participate in the elections in order to defeat our opponents. It was also argued that the Assembly would provide us with an additional platform. So, in view of your opinion, we decided to participate in the elections.

I am confident that we shall, be returned to the Constituent Assembly and by the Grace of God, emerge as a majority. No one can stop us. Our enemies, imperialist agents and capitalists have been saying that ours is not a party; it is a one-man party. This propaganda is false. They did whatever they could do against us. But the people are with us. It was propagated that people come to see Bhutto; they do not come to attend his public meetings. I am not a movie star that people

should come to see me. They come to hear me. Because I explain their problems, their feelings and put forward solutions. That is why they have faith in our party. Time is coming for you to see how much success we achieve.

Some Government Ministers have been creating difficulties for us through the press and by spending a lot of money. But, despite all this, the People's Party will emerge victorious. Although we have no money, we are accused of spending huge sums on public meetings. We are in fact, spending very little and that too due to the assistance of friends. I do not favour spending money like this. I have never appealed to the people for donations. I do not want to put burdens on the poor people. I feel ashamed of asking them. That is why I had asked you to do whatever minimum you can. Even a rupee two rupees or eight annas would do.

You may rest assured that the People's Party would represent you truly and faithfully. I assure you if ever anyone in the party did anything against your wishes, I would throw him out of the party. The people are dearer to me. I would not tolerate anyone betraying the people. I would not make it a prestige issue as Yahya Khan has been doing. You know whenever we ask Yahya Khan to relieve certain Ministers, he makes it a matter of personal prestige. It is like the imperialists.

We told Yahya Khan that during the election campaign his Ministers would not be neutral. He said he would remain neutral. We know that his Ministers are not. What has he done to stop them? There is no doubt that they have been meddling in politics. One of them has actually been asking the capitalists to help a particular party. The anti-people budget has been made by these Ministers. On the one hand the Six Points are dubbed as anti-Pakistan – we too say that, because they endanger Pakistan's integrity – but on the other a newspaper belonging to one of the Ministers from Karachi has been playing up these Six Points.

Now the budget. We have never seen such a useless budget in the last 23 years. It has put an enormous burden on the people. The prices of virtually everything have increased by 25 per cent. The people have been crushed by this budget. Those with fixed monthly salaries are already burdened so how would they pay taxes? Millions of rupees were charged under the Refugee Tax. Where has all this money gone? Previously a quarter in Malir cost Rs. 700. Now it costs Rs. 1,400. Interest is also charged on this amount. And there is the problem of transport. How would the children go to schools? All these problems can be solved after bringing about economic changes in the country. We want to make education up to Matric free.

The problems and difficulties of labourers are increasing. You know the harsh treatment meted out to the labourers of various mills. The workers have been locked out, persecuted and then thrown into jails. What should the poor people do? Prices have been increasing constantly. Mills are closed. How can the people survive? Death seems better than such a life. But we will bring about a system of Islamic equality which will put an end to violence and exploitation, and set up a popular government. Our demands are the demands of the people. Poverty and misery cannot end unless revolutionary changes are made in the economic system. Poverty, misery and illiteracy cannot end without nationalising big industrial units. Pakistan cannot prosper unless Islamic equality is enforced. It is not I alone who favours Islamic Socialism. The creator of Pakistan the Quaid-i-Azam, stood for Islamic Socialism. Both Liaquat Ali Khan and Hussein Shaheed Suhrawardy advocated it. We are not the first believers in Islamic socialism. We shall not be able to control the situation that is developing unless we radically change the structure of our society. Unless we do this and ensure a more equitable distribution of wealth and income Six Points would continue to be talked about in East Pakistan, and voices for a confederation would continue to be raised in West Pakistan.

such things happen only when a country is plagued with dejection and failures. Why do not the U.S., Russia and China think of a confederation? Why don't these parties involved in the controversy over a confederation talk TO us directly? Did millions of Muslims make sacrifices to transfer their independence and sovereignty to others? All this is the result of depression. Pakistan was not made to land in controversies of Six Points or confederation. Pakistan was not brought into being to impose on us such people who had spoken against the Quaid-i-Azam in Washington. The concept of Pakistan did not envisage the arrests of students and labourers.

In Kashmir, the Muslims and young students are being persecuted. The situation is so grave that Mrs. Indira Gandhi herself had to go to Srinager. She went so far as to say that India would in no case be prepared to hold talks with Pakistan. Despite all this nothing is being said or done from our side. All leaders are quiet. When Britain announced her decision to sell arms to South Africa, a meeting of the Security Council was called. The African Commonwealth countries threatened to leave the Commonwealth. But while the Muslims are being killed and arrested in Kashmir, Pakistan does not say it would raise the problem of Kashmir in the Security Council.

Is it not an irony that we are talking of elections here while the Muslims in Bombay, Ahmedabad and Kashmir are being ruthlessly killed. I salute the young Kashmiri Muslims for defying Indian guns and bayonets. But alas, we have been

paying only lip-service to them. The matter should be raised at the Security Council.

We cannot compromise on the problem of Kashmir. We believe that a compromise on this problem will nullify the existence of Pakistan. Ayub Khan tried to take this issue into the background after the '65 war. But the situation now has taken a serious turn. If the Government cannot do anything else, it should at least take this issue to the Security Council immediately.

Prepare for a People's Government
Speech at a Public Meeting at Gol Bagh, Lahore,
October 14, 1970

I am glad today to have the opportunity of addressing you in Lahore once again since the restoration of political activity in the country. I have made three or four speeches in this historic city since the restoration of political activity. I made the first speech at the historic Mochi Gate on 8 March. You will recall that by the Grace of God that public meeting was very successful on that day I had spoken to my brothers and sisters of this city about the aims and objects of the People's Party and about its manifesto. In that three-hour speech I had assured you that my party and I would stand by the people in all circumstances, on all fronts and in all their troubles and tribulations. I had assured you that in no circumstances would the People's Party desert the people or ignore their demands. It would always continue working for them and projecting their agonies and sufferings. That was my pledge to you. I made two speeches after Mochi Gate: one in Ichhra and the other in the cantonment. Today I am speaking again in this old city and I am particularly glad that I am making this speech in Gol Bagh.

I had also made one speech here in Gol Bagh about three years ago. The difference between then and now is that it was night then and it is midday now. It was Ayub Khan's Government then, and it is Yahya Khan's now. It was a bad time then and it is a bad time now. The people were with me then and the people are with me now. We had the people's co-operation and confidence then; we have the people's co-operation and confidence now. Ayub Khan spared no effort to harass and break us then. In the same Gol Bagh water pipes were broken and the drenched ground strewn with tampered but live electric wires to expose the audience to the danger of electric shocks. Attempts were made to disturb our public meeting. What, after all, was the objective behind it? The only object was to stop us from holding public meetings, from making speeches and from speaking the truth before the Pakistani people. They only wanted the people to hear things which suited the Government. They did not want us to speak the truth about the internal and external security of the country.

As you well know, some politicians are saying that they have come forward to stop Bhutto. Ayub Khan had the same purpose – of stopping me and the People's Party. These attempts are still being made. All politicians were against the People's Party during Ayub Khan's rule. And even now all of them are against the People's Party. The People's Party leaders and workers were arrested then as they are being arrested now. What can we infer from -this? Is there really no difference between then and now?

In those days Ayub Khan signed the Tashkent Agreement, but we came out against it. We have again come out. Capitalists and feudalists were against us then; they remain our opponents today. In fact there is no difference between now and then. We put up a tremendous struggle and made sacrifices to end the Ayub dictatorship. Many of our young workers were killed. Peasants and labourers left farms and factories and joined the great movement, defeating the dictatorship.

When the people defeated the Hitler of that time, a military government took office. That Government held out a promise that a provisional government would be formed which would eventually be replaced by a popular government. This military government had stated that it would transfer power to a popular government. It kept on repeating its promise of transfer of power. It was reaffirmed on 28 March, 29 June and then on 28 November, that this government only wanted itself to be replaced by a popular one. This policy was reiterated by the President while he was in Nepal, in Dacca and then in Lahore. It was asserted that the military government was temporary and its sole aim was to transfer power from the military to civilians. Another promise made by the Government was that it would remain neutral in internal politics, that it would not side with any political party and hold free elections on the basis of adult franchise. It promised non-interference in elections. In effect, it held out three basic promises. And these promises were made by no less a person than Yahya Khan—General Agha Mohammad Yahya Khan—who calls himself the President of this country, and is the Commander-in-Chief and Chief Martial Law Administrator. He himself claims to be wearing four caps—those of the President, the C-in-C, the Chief Martial Law Administrator and the cap of neutrality. It was a promise by the President of the provisional Government of this country to the people of Pakistan. And the Pakistan People's Party welcomed this promise.

My dear friends, do remember that when the Pakistan People's Party had welcomed this promise, the other parties like P.D.P. and P.D.M. and I suppose there must be one called D.D.T. were opposing it. In the beginning, the Government held the view that a referendum should be held on the constitutional principles. We agreed to this proposal also because we considered this a democratic method. Referendums have also been held in Turkey which is an Islamic and democratic country and is a member of the R.C.D. We, therefore, agreed to the proposal for a referendum.

But the question was not of politics and democracy alone. It was also a question of economy. The struggle in Pakistan cannot be for democracy alone. The real struggle is about the economic conditions. Despite this we not only accepted the referendum offer but welcomed it.

In July my colleagues and I toured the NWFP. Wherever we went— Dera Ismail Khan, Peshawar, Kohat and Bannu—we welcomed the referendum and the elections in our speeches, because both were democratic practices. From Bannu I went to Chakwal, Shikarpur and then to Larkana.

But the question of all questions was of economic reforms. Those who were opposing the referendum and the elections were in fact opposed to economic reforms. Although we welcomed the proposals, the Government arrested our workers and colleagues. On 13 August, 1969, Mumtaz Ali Bhutto was arrested. Then Ghulam Mustafa Jatoi and Abdul Qadir Sheikh were arrested. All of my colleagues and relatives in Sind were arrested. Why after all, were they arrested? We made no criticism then. We were rather supporting the Government. We were asking for a referendum. But in spite of that the Government arrested my brother without allowing him even an hour to get ready. He was immediately taken to prison. I ask the Government: You could not say then that we were opposing you. Why then were our people arrested? Was your proposal hailed a year ago, certainly not. You knew that the struggle was for economic reforms and on foreign policy. Even then you tried to stop us. On 12 August you sent to me five military officers, including a Brigadier, who asked me to accompany them to the Martial Law Headquarters. I refused to go. But I told them that I would go if it was in the interest of the people. I told them to come to my house. These officers said that I had been called to Rawalpindi. I said if I was being called I would not go. But it was another matter if I had been invited. They then said that it was an invitation.

Ayub Khan tried to harass us. The present Government dug up all those cases which Ayub Khan had made against us. It permanently posted in Larkana a Deputy Superintendent of Police who had concocted the Tractor Case against me at the instance of Ayub Khan.

I ask Yahya where was your Government on 28 November when attempts were made to kill us in Sadiqbad. Our motor cars were stoned. And a friend of mine was injured. He is now in jail. Thirty people had been arrested then, but 25 of them were released on bail. It was done under Martial Law Regulations. I could not believe the news when I read it. I phoned General Osman Mitha to ask him what was happening. The hooligans who had come in broad daylight to kill us were sentenced to only two months imprisonment.

And what offence did we commit on 31 March? We were on a political tour of Sind on that day. It was a very successful tour. We were going to Sanghar. It was midday. The people were resting in their homes. But our opponents armed with rifles and machine-guns were preparing to ambush us. Nothing can compare with the goondaism experienced by us that day. Five thousand armed men were

in their positions, and the administration did not know what was happening! At that time the Deputy Commissioner and Superintendent of police asked me to go to the Circuit House. Had we then gone to the Circuit House, we would have been killed, because the armed Hurs had circled the Circuit House. The Hurs were hiding even in the kitchen of the Circuit House. And we were being asked to go there. God, however, saved us. I came out of my motor car, and asked those people why they wanted to kill us. About 20 shots were fired. The people shielded me. And in this way I was saved. Two officers of the police gave evidence that I was attacked and that shots had been fired. But the news was not broadcast the radio, however, gave a news item quoting Sobur Khan as saying that mosquitoes had increased in East Pakistan. Foreign radio stations gave importance to the news about the attack. It was the first lead, but when it was broadcast from Karachi it was the sixth item in the bulletin in order of news value!

When I called a press conference in Karachi, the Government asked TV not to cover it. Apart from that you know what is happening here everyday. Our people are being arrested everywhere. In Sind, 300 People's Party members have been arrested. In the Punjab, Lyallpur, Sargodha and other places PPP workers and students have been detained. Maulana Kausar Niazi has been arrested. Is the weekly Shahab alone writing objectionable material? How do you rate the contents of Zindagi, Chattan and Jasaral? Have you ever heard speeches against us? Ever since their appointment as Ministers, the imperialist stooges like Sher Ali Khan, Mahmood Haroon and others have been trying to crush the Pakistan Peoples Party. How can the Government claim to be neutral? Would you call the Sanghar incident an act of neutrality? Are the arrests a sign of neutrality? Was it for neutrality that military officers were sent to me.

The brave people of Lahore are my brothers. I have served them. I do not claim to be your hero. Today, however, I am going to make a speech that will be remembered. I may be in jail tomorrow.

My friends, we have seen neutrality in action. Why has the People's Party been victimised from the beginning? Why should it be so despite the fact that we have welcomed the elections as well as the referendum?

There are two reasons for this. First, the economic problem. We are against the economic system of the capitalists, bankers, feudal lords and exploiters. Secondly, we do not want a compromise with India.

There is no substance in the allegation that the Pakistan People's Party does not want elections. Why should we oppose the elections. The people are with us. You are with us. The poor labourers and peasants throughout the country are our

supporters. Why should we be frightened? Only they should feel frightened who have no support of the people. We had decided at Hala in favour of participating in the elections. October 15 is only ten days away. You will see how many candidates we sponsor. Why should there be no candidates with us while the people are with us? You will see what we do on 15 October when nomination papers are filed. We are fully prepared for the elections. We want elections. We want a civilian Government. I swear by God that we want elections. But if our workers, colleagues and friends are arrested everyday, how will we be able to fight elections? Leaders from the Punjab, Sind and NWFP have been and are being arrested. No army can fight without its generals. No commander can fight while his generals are in prison. Now it is for you to give a verdict on whether we want elections or not. The Government would like only those forces to win the elections which do not stand for changes in the economic system. It believes that the old parties like the Muslim Leagues – which seek votes on the basis of a caste system – the P.D.P. Jamat-i-Islami, the three Muslim Leagues should come into power. But this does not seem to be very likely. A popular revolution is in the making. They can foresee a revolutionary party of labourers and peasants being elected to the Assemblies. They know what this party will do. Soon after the coming into power of this party, all insurance companies and major industries will be nationalised. Their owners fear we will change the whole system; we will turn the tables. Well, we shall turn the tables. We will serve the people.

This country has seen in the last five thousand years the reign of Hindus, Christians, Sikhs, Afghans, Rajputs, the British and the Generals. But you have not seen a popular people's government. We shall form such a government. That is why we are being opposed.

My brothers and colleagues, I assure you that we are prepared for any sacrifice. Imprisonment means nothing to me. I am quite prepared to die. I assure you as Allah is my witness. I am prepared for martyrdom.

My dear friends, brothers and colleagues, our opponents are now scared of the popular, Islamic upsurge. They tried to dub us as kafirs. They should be ashamed of calling their co-religionists kafirs. What bigger crime can there be than this?

Our opponents managed to call themselves "Islam Pasand" by celebrating the Shaukat-i-Islam Day in Lahore. They are the people who opposed the basic ideology of Pakistan. They thought they would bait the people by calling upon them to come out in the name of Islam. But it did not work. Our opponents did not realise that this was 1970 and the people were those who fought India in 1965. It was their voice which declared in the Security Council that they would

fight against India for a thousand years. Our people have faith in Islam many of them may be illiterate but they know what the vital issues are today.

My dear friends, Jamat-i-Islami called Egypt's Gamal Abdel Nasser as kafir. They used to call this man a kafir who was a leader of the Muslims and who was a great enemy of the enemies of the Muslims, a man who was dreaded by the Jews, and of whom America was afraid. These people labeled Nasser's socialism as the faith of an infidel. But was Nasser's body burnt like kafirs or was it buried in a mosque? You know that the whole world mourned his death. His death was a great tragedy for us too. These leaders could not even issue a statement to condole Nasser's death. But today I make an announcement that from today onwards this Gol Bagh will be named as Bagh-i-Gamal Abdel Nasser.

Nasser served the Muslims throughout his life. He served the poor people. He nationalised all the big industries in his country. He called it Islamic Socialism. He improved the lot of his people. So who shed tears on his death except the poor? The poor mourned his death because he belonged to them. He was against the capitalists and feudal landlords. He brought about a revolution by struggling against the moneyed exploiters. We too announce that we will break our shackles. We will eliminate the capitalists and feudal lords. We will make Pakistan a great country. Those who oppose us do not know what democracy means; while I am the representative of the large majority of the people, they represent only a very small minority. You represent the capitalists and stooges.

Allama Iqbal has said:

"Stand up and wake the poor of my world."

Allama Iqbal, I have woken up the poor of your world.

Hardships never lessen with time. Ask the poor. who have nothing to eat, nothing to wear and no houses to live in. They have no money to educate their children. Their grief cannot vanish. They will never get used to grief.

My friends, efforts are being made to stop us. All the three Muslim Leagues are being merged, Daultana, Qayyum Khan and Fazlul Qadir Chaudhry are cooking some sort of curry.

Bhashani came to Rawalpindi and had a three-hour talk with Yahya Khan. Now he denies that he had a secret agreement with Ayub Khan. The whole world knows how and under what conditions this agreement took place.

Masih-ur-Rahman came to me with a letter from Bhashani Sahib. It bore Bhashani's signature. I gave this letter to former President Ayub Khan. Bhashani

then asked that this letter should be given back to him. But the former President put this letter into his pocket. Another meeting took place.

Bhashani should recall the Dacca meeting. Another meeting was also held at Barrister Shaukat's residence in March 1966. We had meals together. I still have in my possession all the letters written by Masih-ur-Rahman. Bhashani should not disgrace himself in his old age. I have kept silent for three years. And now he comes to tell Yahya Khan that there has been no change in foreign policy. I know all these things as if I were present during his talks.

My dear Maulana, I have never attacked your person. But you have started attacking me. You had said in 1968 that Bhutto was a nobody and his participation in politics was of little significance. But when you came to Lahore, the people raised slogans of Bhutto-Bashani Bhai Bhai. You then told them that you were no brother to Bhutto. When you staged a rally in Toba Tek Singh, our workers went there. But you neither allowed them to fly their flags nor raise slogans.

My dear friends, I am being attacked from many sides. But I am the least worried, because the labourers, peasants, and the students are with me. All these leaders today stand disunited and disintegrated. They want to stop me. But to stop me means stopping the labourers, peasants, students, all the working people from coming to power. And you cannot stop them. To stop Bhutto means promoting imperialism, and denying the Kashmiris their right of self-determination. In fact, our opponents want to change the foreign policy. They think I am the greatest obstacle in their way. They want to remove this obstacle.

The leader of our present delegation at the United Nations, Sardar Abdul Rashid, has made a statement that I had deliberately softened the tone of my statements at the U.N. in order to let the India-Pakistan conflict settle. But as you know my statements were strongly criticised by Swaran Singh.

My dear compatriots, friends, labourers and peasants, this may perhaps be my last speech. I may not be in Lahore and may be arrested. But I assure you I will not avoid any sacrifice for Pakistan, her people and for the ideology of the Quaid-i-Azam. I will never leave you. I will die for you. I am being attacked from all sides but given your co-operation I will defeat all of them. This is my promise to you.

We will make this country, Insha Allah. We will eliminate corruption and illiteracy and spread education. We will make this country prosperous by nationalising all big industries. We will establish the sovereignty of the people. And I will stand by you forever and always. This is my final pledge to you.

**Candidate for Lahore
Speech at Public Meeting, Lahore
November 2, 1970**

I am very grateful to you that you have always sided with us. The time for speeches is over and the elections are being held on the 7th of December. You have to decide which party you are going to support. My only appeal to you is that you should cast your votes according to the dictates of your conscience. I don't ask you to cast your vote for me. I only want you to be judicious. If you take into account the fact that our party has served Pakistan in the past, it has awakened the poor masses and made sacrifices for their cause and that I have given the country an independent foreign policy and faced India resolutely, you will decide to support us. I differed with Ayub Khan at Tashkent in the interest of Pakistan's integrity and left the Government. After that I formed a party of the masses. This popular party made sacrifices facing a dictatorship. It is my faith that if you take into consideration these past services, you will support the Pakistan People's Party.

This is your own party. It has come into being because of you. It is determined to face the capitalists and the external enemies of Pakistan. Internally, the capitalists and their stooges are joining hands against this party. Those who are opposed to Pakistan are opposing the Pakistan People's Party. From this very constituency there are three candidates besides this humble servant of yours. Maulana Maudoodi who is himself not a candidate, is issuing appeals to my two opponents that one of them should withdraw from the contest. He wants that our opponents should face Bhutto unitedly. Maulana Sahib is not keen to defeat Bhutto. He is anxious to defeat the people of Pakistan. I can assure him that even if they put up a united front against me the valiant people of Lahore will give them a crushing defeat and none of their efforts will succeed. General Sarfraz, who is opposing me had taken to his heels from the Lahore front during the 1965 war. Why is he running away from the political front now? He should face me on this front at least. Everyone can see that there is a rising flood of the people's awakening. It is very difficult for our opponents to stand against this tide. They have fallen so low that in spite of the fact that they call themselves "Islam Pasands," they are raising objections why a Sindhi should contest from the Punjab. These so-called "Islam Pasands" should at least follow the basic principles of Islam. Islam has taught us that all Muslims are brothers and there should be unity among them. If we regard the Turks, the Arabs and the Afghans as our brothers why should a person who has served Pakistan and who was the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, not of Sind, be discriminated against? They should be happy if such a person contests from the Punjab. On the one hand, they

proclaim that they are against territorial prejudices and, on the other, they are using the same prejudices against me. I welcome them to contest from Sindh.

I am contesting from the Punjab, Sindh and NWFP because I want to give a befitting reply to the enemies of Pakistan who are propagating against the integrity of Pakistan. The Indians and the imperialists have been propagating that Pakistan will soon disintegrate because there is no unity among its people. If I succeed from the Punjab, NWFP and Sindh it will be symbolic of the unity and integrity of the people of Pakistan. I have served you in the past and I promise that I shall continue to do so in the future by bringing about an economic change. Our struggle is for establishing the rule of the peasants/the workers, the students and the intellectuals. We are ready for all sacrifices for the cause of the common man.

**Campaigning in Lahore
A Public Speech,
November 3, 1970**

I shall say that Islam is not in danger in Pakistan because God Almighty has Himself proclaimed that He is the Defender of Islam. The religion which has been completely revealed and about which God Almighty has said that no more prophets will be sent can never be in danger. If any danger was at all possible, more prophets would have appeared. "Khatam-e-Nabuwat" stands for the fact that no more prophets will come because the religion of Islam is complete and there is no likelihood of any danger threatening it at all.

We are trying to serve the cause of the Muslims. We are trying to bring to an end the exploitation in the country. The capitalists have joined hands against us and they are propagating that Islam is in danger. Islam is not in danger but the capitalists are in danger.

They can never defeat the people. The people of Pakistan are conscious of their rights. These so called "Islam Pasands" should follow the fundamental principles of Islam. On the one hand they call themselves "Islam Pasands" and on the other they object on my contesting from Punjab. Am I not a Muslim or a Pakistan? Islam does not teach us to discriminate among Muslims, especially when we all belong to one nation. Bhutto was not the Foreign Minister of Sind. He was the Foreign Minister of Pakistan.

We are determined to serve the cause of Pakistan and Islam. We believe in one Pakistan. Others can go and contest from Sind or Sarhad. We shall be happy about it. The whole of Pakistan belongs to Pakistanis. They are talking in terms of our enemies. I want to tell you that I am contesting from Punjab, Sind and Sarhad only to prove to our enemies, the imperialists and the capitalists, that we are all one nation, and that we believe in the integrity of Pakistan. Our enemies want that Pakistan should be divided between the Punjabis and the Bengalis and then the Sindhis and Pathans and the Baluchis should fall out among themselves. They want to weaken the integrity and unity of Pakistan. I am contesting from all the areas to give a befitting reply to the enemies of Pakistan. I want to prove to them that the integrity of Pakistan is intact, and we can win from Punjab and Sind and Sarhad because we are Pakistanis first and Punjabis, Sindhis and Pathans later. It is a pity that the people who call themselves "Islam Pasands" talk in terms of territorial prejudices.

I have never made a promise which I did not fulfill. I had promised to give the country an independent foreign policy and I fulfilled this promise against heavy

odds. Later, I promised that if India attacks Pakistan we shall fight against her resolutely. You saw the way we fought against India. But for Ayub Khan's weakness we would have defeated the Indians in Kashmir. My third promise was that we shall struggle against the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. We fulfilled that promise also. My fourth promise is a very important promise, and it is about breaking the shackles of exploitation. We shall establish our people's rule in Pakistan and exploitation will end. If the Government is handed over to the people who know how to run it, the cause of the common man will be served. You should not vote for the novices who are contesting from this constituency. They shall not be able to run the Government. You should cast your votes for the person who has the necessary experience, you should exercise your judgement on the services rendered by him to Pakistan.

Campaigning Continues
Public Speech at Lahore,
November 3, 1970

Elections are being held on the 7th of December. The time for speeches is almost over. Now you have to take an important decision as to which party to support. I only want to request you to please take into account and give serious consideration as to who has served Pakistan well in the past. We have served Pakistan even at the risk of our lives. We are capable of serving you in the future as well. You have to take into account the political conduct and contribution of all the candidates. You must try to understand the political background of each of them, and also what capabilities they possess to serve the nation.

The Pakistan People's Party is the party of the masses. It has come into being only for the poor people, workers and the peasants. This is your party while other parties are the stooges of the capitalists who want that the system of exploitation should be perpetuated in Pakistan. They have sucked the blood of the people and have mercilessly looted them. They are fighting against this party. You have seen that Maulana Maudoodi has issued an appeal to General Sarfraz and Dr. Javed Iqbal that only one of them should contest against Bhutto to try to defeat me. It is not the person of Bhutto that they want to defeat because there is no personal enmity between us; they want to defeat the people of Pakistan. They want that the shackles binding the people of Pakistan should not be broken. They want that the exploitation of the common man should continue. That is why Maulana Maudoodi is issuing appeals that only one candidate should contest against Bhutto. He wants me to be defeated. Why is he so keen that Bhutto should be defeated? Is Bhutto not a patriot? Has not Bhutto been the Foreign Minister of Pakistan? Has not Bhutto served this country?

It is because our enemies are the enemies of the people. They claim that they are "Islam Pasands" but they do not follow even the basic principles of Islam. Islam does not teach any discrimination between Muslims whom it enjoins to live as brothers. There is no question of any territorial consideration in Islam but these "Islam Pasands" are propagating that Bhutto, being a Sindhi, should not contest from the Punjab. If they were true Muslims and true Pakistanis they would not have raised such questions. Our enemies are raising objections on my contesting from the Punjab, Sindh and Sarhad. I want to make it clear that I am doing so because I want to prove to the enemies of Pakistan that our nationalism is based on very sound foundations. It will be proved by my election from the Punjab, Sindh and NWFP. It will prove that there is unity of thought and action between the people of different areas.

When India attacked Lahore I did not say that because the Punjab had been attacked I was going to Sindh, my home province. I am determined to serve my motherland. I have to serve every poor man in Pakistan whether he comes from the Punjab or Sindh or Sarhad or Baluchistan or Bengal. The poor people of Pakistan are the pillars of this nation. We have to strengthen them. I am sure that you will take the right decision and do justice. On my part, I can assure you that we shall eradicate poverty, misery and hunger from Pakistan. Why can't Pakistan progress and prosper while all other countries have done so? Only the right type of leadership is needed, the leadership of the people who have experience of political administration and who are full-time politicians. General Sarfraz has been a failure in his own profession. How can he be successful in my profession? He had run away from the Lahore front. How can he contest on the political front of Lahore?

My dear friends, I am sure that you will make the Pakistan People's Party succeed because this is your own party. This party is making every effort to establish a people's rule in the country. It will uproot capitalism and establish the system of Islamic equality. This is our ambition and we are devoted to it. We have served you in the past and we shall serve you in the future. We shall accept your decision as final because it is one of our principles that the people's verdict is always right.

**A Collective Change
Speech at Lahore,
November 3, 1970**

The Pakistan People's Party is a party of the masses and it has promised that we shall end the system of exploitation in Pakistan and eradicate poverty, hunger and misery from the country. All our efforts have been directed towards that end before the elections and will continue in the same direction even after the elections. I can assure you that our manifesto is not a mere election stunt. It is a solemn pledge that whatever the sacrifices, we shall adhere to our promises even at the cost of our lives. It is a party of the masses, the peasants, the workers, the students and the intellectuals. The anti-people parties are joining hands to fight against us. They want that the system of capitalist exploitation should be perpetuated.

My opponents say that if I am elected from this constituency I shall not be able to look after your individual problems. I can assure you that my party will look after everything. I shall serve the people of Pakistan and bring about a collective change so that individual problems do not arise. We have to work for collective objectives. This is the only party which can serve Pakistan by breaking the shackles of exploitation. I only want you to do justice to everyone. I only want you to consider our contributions to the nation in the past. Who gave an independent foreign policy to Pakistan? Who faced India bravely? Who faced dictatorship? You have only to compare our services with their misdeeds and do justice. There is no question of your supporting them in that case. You should support the Pakistan People's Party which is determined to serve you and will never betray you.

The recent incident at Karachi Airport in which the Polish Deputy Foreign Minister was killed will not be repeated if a people's rule is established in Pakistan. I haven't commented on this incident so far because the matter is being investigated but I can't help expressing my doubts that this incident is the result of a conspiracy by the enemies of Pakistan. It is a very sad incident and could not have taken place without an international conspiracy. It appears to be an attempt to jeopardise our good relations with Russia and Eastern European countries. This may also result in the stoppage of arms supplies to Pakistan. It is a great conspiracy against the integrity of Pakistan and we have to face these conspiracies. This can be done only with your help and support. Even the most complicated problems can be solved if the people support us. Take for example the case of foreign debts. We have borrowed so much that it is hardly possible for us to pay them back. If there is a people's rule and we have the support of the people we can tell the other countries that we are poor and cannot afford to pay

in the stipulated manner we can renegotiate. This can be done only if the people who know how to handle political affair come to power. If you support such people a solution to all these problems can be found.

**Fourth Speech of the Day
Public Speech at Lahore,
November 3, 1970**

I am very grateful to you that you have taken the trouble of coming to this meeting. I am very happy to speak to you. The Pakistan People's Party represents the poor masses of the country. We are determined to serve the poor people of Pakistan, the workers and the peasants. It is because of your support that this party has achieved so much success. It is my strong faith that you will take the right decision in the elections. You must take into consideration the political history of the country. You should try to assess the services rendered by each party in the past. Our party has made sacrifices for the common man. It has given an independent foreign policy to Pakistan. It faced Indian aggression bravely and it toppled the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. This party is supporting the poor people of Pakistan. It is fighting against capitalism and exploitation.

Because we want to eradicate poverty and hunger and because we want to stamp out capitalism and establish a system based on Islamic equality, the enemies of people are joining hands to defeat us. I am sure that you will frustrate their designs and support the Pakistan People's Party.

Towards a New Pakistan
Address to the Nation over Radio and TV,
November 18, 1970

Tonight I am addressing you as a citizen of the poorest nation in the world. The economic conditions of Pakistan are miserable in the extreme. Such abject poverty exists nowhere except perhaps in India, a country from which we separated in 1947 because we rejected its iniquitous system, its exploitation and domination. Our people braved the hazards of partition to carve out Pakistan, the pure land of promise and fulfillment. In millions Indian Muslims made the great pilgrimage to integrate with the Baluch and the Bengali, the Sindhi, the Pathan and the Punjabi to build the largest Muslim state on the foundations of Islamic justice and brotherhood.

But now today after 23 years of tumultuous existence the country is being ripped apart by controversies based on regional prejudices and still in search of its moorings. In this span of time Pakistan has had two constitutions and is in the process of moving towards the third. There have been riots and tensions, a continuing economic crisis marked by general instability. East-West relations remain unsettled, the population has grown from 80 to 130 million and in the wake of chaotic conditions two Martial Laws have been imposed in the country.

We have gone up and down, side wards and backwards but neither parliamentary democracy nor military dictatorship have been able to find a lasting solution to the problems that afflict Pakistan. Frustration and despair is writ large on the face of the people. We stand on the edge of catastrophe. A new class, small in number, of capitalist barons is unabashedly plundering national wealth while the overwhelming majority of the people is without food, shelter and clothing.

Unemployment and underemployment, both in the countryside and among the educated classes mounts menacingly. Our people have been cheated and humiliated, their feelings have been ignored. They have suffered from a massive deception. Shall we call this the lost generation or the generation that was betrayed? I leave it to you to choose the epitaph. But what about the future? Are the children of this tormented generation also destined to remain in the same squalour and shame?

The youth of today is losing faith in the future. The dream of Pakistan was not to end in the agony of its people. It was an invigorating dream. This dream was to mature in a great new society for the benefit of the common weal.

For you, my dear listeners, and for all those who have been the victim of the most inhuman exploitation known to contemporary times, this intolerable state of affairs has to be brought to an end. It is our moral duty to lift the people of Pakistan from the quagmire of poverty.

There was a time in the history of Islam when the great Omar declared that if along the banks of the Euphrates should a dog die of starvation the Khalifa of Islam would be answerable to the Almighty Allah. Here in Pakistan—in the largest Islamic state—men and women die of starvation by the thousands. Our children sleep on the streets without shelter.

Our toiling masses live an appalling life. This has to be changed.

So, ladies and gentlemen, and my young friends, the foremost duty of the Pakistani people is to wipe out poverty from the face of Pakistan. The problems we face are gigantic but I am not overwhelmed. I have an unshakable faith in the people of my country. Pakistan possesses the potential of being one of the most important countries of Asia. It has inherited the strategic frontiers of the subcontinent.

In two wars against India, a much larger neighbour, the people showed their mettle magnificently. Our people, both men and women, are hardworking. They have made tremendous sacrifices in the past and shall not found wanting in the future. Our soil is rich and we have sufficient resources to meet the test. Our ideology is inspiring and Islam our religion is the final message of Allah to man. In other words, we certainly possess the wherewithal to overcome the lingering crisis.

Let me make it quite clear that in truth there is no dispute over religion. Islam is not in danger. Islam can never be in danger. In the history of Muslim countries the decisive attacks against Islam have come from outside. In Spain the Muslims were conquered step by step by their Christian opponents. In Palestine, a foreign colony has been implanted and holy city of Jerusalem wrested from Muslim possession. Here again the attack against Islam has been external; men alien to the faith, that is Jews, have fought against Muslims. In India, there has been a long history of confrontation between the Hindus and the Muslims. In recent years, however, there has been a new and alarming development. Islam is being attacked from within. Muslims are being pitted against Muslims, in the name of religion.

There are Muslims who are proclaiming that other Muslims who do not accept their political views are kafirs and should be killed. One million Muslims in Indonesia were killed by Muslims because foreign powers wanted it so. The

campaign that is being carried out in Pakistan is also quite systematic. Along with the propaganda in the false guise of religious zeal there is a phenomenon which is clearly linked with it. People who have been notorious for their hostility to Pakistan, some of whom vilified Pakistan and its Quaid-i-Azam when it was formed, are today posing as the upholders of the Pakistan ideology. There are persons in Pakistan who are loudly proclaiming themselves as the sole interpreters of the Muslim faith. Dear friends, if you are Muslims, please reflect what this implies because the claim that there are self-appointed and final living interpreters of Islam concerns you closely. The Islamic world is divided into a large number of sects; classically there are seventy two. Each sect bases its authority upon its own interpretation of passages in the Holy Quran.

In the course of Muslim history there have been many tragic periods of sectarian persecutions but since many years, fortunately, most sects have learnt to keep the peace due mainly to the doctrine of tolerance established by the major orthodox sects to which the majority of the Muslims of Pakistan belong. This peace is now being broken deliberately by persons who are proclaiming that the touchstone of belief lies not in faith but in politics. This is a most dangerous development and it can lead to fratricidal carnage: but I can assure you, my countrymen, that we are determined never to allow another Karbala to take place, on the soil of Pakistan. This country was not made to become the Granada of Asia. The struggle in Pakistan is not between Muslim and Muslim but between the exploiters and the exploited, between the oppressors and the oppressed. If the citizens of Pakistan are provided with employment, with food and shelter, with schools and hospitals, indeed with normal facilities, we would be acting in conformity with the injunctions of the Holy Quran and the Sunnah. I repeat with all the emphasis at my command that Islam is not in danger in Pakistan.

The awakening of the people and their increasing determination to resist exploitation has endangered vested interests. That is why the vested interests are exploiting religion to divert the people's attention from the main point in dispute. And that is why, in contrast, we are making it plain that there can be no progress, no end to our miseries unless exploitation is wiped out. We require fundamental changes in our economic structure to be able to stem the tide. None of the problems are as serious as this one. For this reason my party has placed its central emphasis on the economic and social problems of Pakistan. This question must end the monstrous economic and social inequalities. The discontent we see around us will lead us to reform if we are wise, or to chaos if we ignore the lessons of history. Which shall it be? This is the burning question, and it must have an answer soon for we are now in a dangerous state of mental and physical agony. We stand face to face with the necessity of making a quick decision which may in all probability involve the fate of our nation. One thing is clear enough.

The preservation of the status quo will not be tolerated for long. Whether the answer to be made shall be for reform or for annihilation, that answer will be given by those who are dissatisfied with existing conditions. We are passing through a phase similar to the one that Europe witnessed during the Great Depression. Like the institutions of Europe the institutions of Asia are crumbling under the strain of an economic crisis. The same kind of polarisation is taking place here that took place in Europe about forty years ago. That is why it is so necessary that we grapple courageously with the existing realities.

The country is divided into two parts and there is much loose talk about separation, but basically the logic of common existence remains the same. This logic is rooted in self-interest and it transcends the weaknesses of geographical division. Perhaps, with the exception of this limitation the problems of neighbouring India are more serious than those of Pakistan. So, despite the depressing disparities around us and the mighty task ahead of Pakistan's leadership, I look to the future with confidence. I believe that we can effect a grand reconciliation of different interests. We are convinced that with the massive participation of the people we are in a position to find a comprehensive answer to the problems that have haunted us for more than two decades. This epoch, exciting and full of challenge, requires a fresh approach for building society anew on the finest aspirations of the entire population.

We have a long trail to cover. The unresolved problems are legion. The cancerous growth of corruption has to be arrested. We promise that we shall tackle the problem of corruption vigorously and with determination. We promise to the people of Pakistan that we will give them a clean administration. We pledge to you that our Government will consist of men of integrity. We solemnly promise you that we will strain every nerve to put an end to the host of social evils that have degenerated our society. We will do everything in our power to lift the curtain of ignorance. We will respect the cultures and languages of all our people. The autonomy of the provinces will be safeguarded, regional rights will come in great measure in the blossoming of our pluralistic society. We will come down with a heavy hand on crime and violence.

We will make every endeavour to control rising prices. We will provide fair wages; we will bring bureaucracy under the command of the people. We will remove the ghettos and clear the spectre of slums. We will restore the freedom of the press; we will make the conditions of the peasants and labouring classes the criterion of our success or failure. We will ensure that the judiciary remains independent. We will electrify villages and we will recognise student power, the fountainhead of our future.

We will fight inflation. We will fortify our defences and increase the wages of Government servants at the lower echelons. We will enhance pensions. We will protect the rights of the minorities. We will abolish black laws like FCR and carry the jurisdiction of the High Court to the people of Gilgit and Hunza, we will give equal rights to the people of the states that have not yet been integrated. We will mobilize our manpower; we will remove disparities and ensure employment. We will seek to give free medical aid to the poor. We will take flood control measures. Heavy industries will be owned by the people.

There are various methods of running nationalised industries. They can be run directly by the state agencies, they can be run by autonomous state organs, they can be run by local organs, and they can be run entirely autonomously. How each industry and enterprise is managed will depend on the actual circumstances. We shall bring into the public sector all basic and key industries. We shall take positive steps for creating essential industries that are needed to produce industries. Oil and gas and other natural resources will be nationalised. I need not emphasize the necessity of bringing the infrastructure under the control of the state. The transport will come into the hands of the people. At the same time we do not propose to nationalise industries that are functioning competitively and whose control in private hands is not detrimental to the security of the state. Thus we propose to bring about a harmonious equation between the public and the private sectors to ensure that the people of the country stand to gain.

The rural problem is a complicated one and it requires energetic attention. Positive ways of dealing with the rural problem will be in the forefront of our programme. We cannot leave the fate of our peasantry entirely to the anarchy of private possession. There must be a bold and an imaginative agrarian programme aimed at reformation. The remaining vestiges of feudalism require to be removed. State lands will be given to landless peasants co-operative farms will be introduced on a voluntary basis. The small landowners will be exempted from the payment of land revenue and self-cultivation will be laid down as a principle of land policy.

It is necessary for the growth of agricultural productivity that surplus labour should be taken away from the land. Under-employment works as a deadweight on the growth of an efficient agriculture. We propose the founding of new cities, say about 200, which will be closely linked to the agricultural countryside as centers for processing agricultural products, as market places. as well as localities for establishment of small industries needed for agricultural economy.

These small towns are called "agrovilles." Their establishment is also a necessity in order to prevent the influx of surplus rural population into large cities which

are growing out of hand into huge slums. Pakistan's "agrovilles" will be planned to offer their inhabitants the amenities of urban life and full participation in civic affairs. Each such township will have its public square, its civic center, and its recreation grounds its mosque and schools and hospitals.

In the field of external affairs, we will put an end to foreign interference. We will reactivate foreign policy to give effective support to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. We will seek to resolve the Farakka dispute. We will not be dictated by any foreign power. We will not succumb to external pressures. We will not barter away our sovereignty.

These and so many other Gargantuan activities have to be undertaken with vision and vitality. We will bring our entire population into the service of Pakistan. We will change the pace of our economy, we will bring freshness and sunshine in place of darkness and dispossession. These are not empty boasts. I am not making tall promises to capture votes. Such radical changes have taken place in other countries and, Insha Allah, they can take place in Pakistan as well.

I am convinced that most of these profound changes can be made but I am equally convinced that none of them can come about under the present economic and social structure. That is why it is imperative to reject the present system of capitalism and to replace it by Islamic socialism. Only by this indigenous system of our own will we be able to banish poverty.

I am not the innovator of the concept of Islamic Socialism. I am merely following the doctrines of the Quaid-i-Azam, and of my conscience, by preaching Islamic Socialism with all the strength and power that I am capable of mustering, on the 26th of March, 1948 the Quaid-i-Azam said:

"You are only voicing my sentiments and the sentiments of millions of Musalmans when you say that Pakistan should be based on sure foundations of social justice and Islamic socialism which emphasises equality and brotherhood of man. Similarly, you are voicing my thoughts in asking and in aspiring for equal opportunity for all."

The principal lieutenant of the Quaid and the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, said on 25th August 1949:

"There are a number of 'isms' being talked about now-a-days, but we are convinced that for us there is only one 'ism', 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. Countries which cannot ensure these for their people can never progress. The economic

programme drawn up some 1,350 years back is still the best economic programme for us. In fact, whatever systems people may try out they all ultimately return to 'Islamic Socialism' by whatever name they may choose to call it."

These are not the only utterances of our two great leaders on this question. For want of time I am unable to quote their other speeches on the subject. Nor do I have the lime to quote Mr. Hussein Shaheed Suhrawardy, our popularly elected Prime Minister, who is also on record as endorsing Islamic Socialism.

Islamic Socialism is not alien to Islam. It is not in conflict with our beliefs. If British parliamentary democracy is not in conflict with Islam, I fail to understand how the values of equality and brotherhood which Islam gave to the world can be opposed to Islam.

Islamic Socialism means that we will have a socialist economy according to our conditions, covered by our own heritage, flowering from our own traditions and in conformity with our values and ideology. Only this kind of economic structure can provide equal opportunities for all protect the citizens from exploitation and remove the barriers between the privileged classes and the exploited classes. Socialism is of direct interest to Pakistan, an underdeveloped country marred by internal and external exploitation.

The roots of socialism lie deep in a profoundly ethical view of life. We of the Pakistan People's Party earnestly maintain that the high ideals of Islam in relation to society can be attained only through a socialist system abolishing the exploitation of man by man. We believe that the nature of justice in the world demanded by our religion is inherent in the conception of a classless society. In this Islam differs fundamentally from other religions. Islam recognises no castes. Capitalist society has a class structure which is opposed to the equality and brotherhood enjoined upon Muslims by Islam. When we call our economic programme Islamic Socialism we are perfectly within our rights and also within the moral traditions of Islam. In the name of justice the Pakistan People's Party spells out Islam in concrete terms of fraternity and friendship but our opponents, the self-appointed monopolists' of Islam, condemn it in the name of socialism. Their manifestos, however, use the same language and the same words without calling it socialism. This only shows how they are desperately seeking to double-cross the people. Such people stand condemned by their own contradictions.

The real reason for the spiritual trepidation of big business and its hirelings is the prospect of nationalisation of industries and banks. Although at present we envisage only the nationalisation of heavy industries and other connected industries and not those that can work efficiently under competitive conditions,

nevertheless because we start from the premises that the possession of the means of production in private hands is the cause of exploitation of the workers and the masses, a powerful conspiracy of vested interests has been hatched against the Pakistan People's Party. We are not afraid of this conspiracy. We are confident that with the support of the people we will destroy it.

Once far-reaching internal changes are brought into being and the economy of Pakistan harnessed on an egalitarian pattern, we will be able to establish internal tranquility. The acquisition of this new strength will enable us to complete our mission.

Pakistan without Kashmir is like a body without a head. The ideology of Pakistan that is being now insidiously exploited by all and sundry, including those who opposed Pakistan, will find its logical articulation from our party in its drive for the liberation of Jammu and Kashmir. The people of Kashmir cannot be held in bondage forever.

It is my firm belief that a strong and vigorous Pakistan will be able to gather sufficient internal and external strength to redeem its pledge to the people of Jammu and Kashmir. The foreign policy of Pakistan will find new dimensions by the change in internal conditions.

Once this nation of a hundred and thirty million people is freed from the burden of exploitation, it will be able to defend a genuinely independent foreign policy. We often talk of an independent foreign policy as if that were possible to implement isolated from its requisite condition, an internal policy free from foreign interference. You must remember that I have been for years the uncompromising champion of an independent foreign policy, its exponent and practitioner when I was in Government and its persistent advocate after leaving office. There is no political party so committed as the Pakistan People's Party to pursuing a foreign policy fashioned to serve our vital national interest.

I have said repeatedly in public, giving all the cogent reasons, that we should break away from the entanglements of greater power politics. Knowing my own altitude, and that I speak on behalf of my party in this matter, you should accept my assurance that when my party comes to power, it will fulfill without delay the foreign policy objectives of our nation: never letting Pakistan to get inveigled into imperialist clutches, never permitting Pakistan to forsake its commitments to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, never allowing Pakistan to deviate from the path of Asia, never making it possible for the voice of our people to get silenced on questions of colonialism and external domination.

Such fundamental internal and external changes will release Pakistan from the strain of a perpetual crisis. It will enable the two parts of the country to remain united. I warn you fellow citizens, that if we do not turn quickly in this direction, which means that if we do not undertake revolutionary economic changes, we will soon reach a point when it will not be possible to combat foreign intrigues aimed at Pakistan's disintegration:

Ladies and gentlemen and my young friends, in my youth I spent the better part of my life in the service of my people. This has been so in the making of our foreign policy, in the great confrontation against India and in the people's struggle against dictatorship. Now after passing through many vicissitudes I see ahead of me another colossal challenge. We stand at the crossroads. We have to rekindle a sense of purpose. We have to embark on the task of reconstruction and reconciliation. I believe that I have a part to play in the fulfillment of Pakistan's purpose. In playing this part, please believe me that I shall always remain with the people, and never for a moment will I compromise their cause.

Countrymen, my friends, my brothers and sisters, I make this pledge to you solemnly as a Muslim and as a Pakistani.

Pakistan Zindabad.

Thanking the Voters
Public address outside the Assembly Chambers, Lahore,
December 12, 1970

First I wish to thank you all once again— I find no words to express my feelings—for the kindness you have once again shown to me. I distinctly remember that it was in 1965 when India had committed aggression against Pakistan that you first supported me. And you have been supporting me ever since. You have been supporting me and my principles since the day I vowed that we would continue fighting for a thousand years. Five years have passed since I said that. Much has happened since then. When we came back from Tashkent and the integrity and sovereignty of this country was at stake, all Ministers and advisers were quiet. They could not challenge Ayub Khan. The responsibility fell on my shoulders. I know how much you have seen and experienced since then. I remember my historic journey from Rawalpindi to my home after leaving the Government as a result of differences with Ayub Khan. Your decision was clear from the manner in which you received me at the Lahore railway station on 15 June. I took note of it. I could not, however, make a speech for certain reasons. I said nothing but only thanked you.

Many events followed. Tension grew. Opposition mounted. The Pakistan People's Party came into being at a critical time. We had to make sacrifices. Public meetings were banned then. You remember the Bagh-i-Nasser. The public meeting was allowed but goondas were sent to disrupt it. It was not only in Lahore but everywhere. First, they would not allow us to hold a public meeting, and if they did, goondas would come to create disturbances. We were stoned and attacked by persons armed with swords, guns and sticks. However, we kept up our courage. We organised a party and set up its branches throughout West Pakistan. We launched a campaign against dictatorship. We went through trials and tribulations. Now the question is why did you support me and my party at each and every step? You remained steadfast. You supported us in every difficult moment. I have not won. The people of Pakistan have won.

We had organised the People's Party at a very critical-time. You won when we launched a campaign against a dictator. The Round Table Conference followed. I remind you and repeat that the Conference was a big conspiracy against the people. It was aimed at keeping Ayub Khan in power. Its basic object was to maintain Ayub Khan's presidency after making a compromise on principles. An unprincipled man is always ready to abandon everything for power. Ayub was a supporter of the presidential system, but later became willing for the introduction of the parliamentary system. The people's campaign was against Ayub Khan, his dictatorship and corruption. It was against the betrayal of the

nation at Tashkent. They wanted to overthrow him. Any manoeuvre to maintain his rule was a betrayal of the people. That was why I did not participate in the Round Table Conference and preferred to stand by you.

The elections are over now. The Government has released all political prisoners. We welcome this decision. The Government should have taken this decision much earlier. We did suffer. But then, I believe in forgetting and forgiving.

The rightist parties observed the "Glory of Islam Day." It was a conspiracy to sabotage the people's festival of 1970. It was done deliberately to protect capitalism and exploitation. It was done in view of the fact that our people were illiterate. It was done to deceive them. But hats off to the people, they deserve rich tributes. The reactionary parties, in collusion with the imperialists decided to put Islam in "danger." They spread prejudices. Before Round Table Conference started, these people said they would fight against dictatorship, but when our movement began they went to the Conference. They started praising Ayub. They conspired to burn copies of the Quran in Lahore and Multan. They themselves desecrated the Quran. They thought that by doing so they would be able to stop economic reforms.

Our opponents lavishly entertained voters for three days before the elections. I am happy that you ate their meals, rode in their trucks, sat in their camps, but voted for us. They contended that my public meetings were well attended because the people came to see me acting and dancing. The people come to our meetings because we talk of them and about their problems. The people are awake now. All are not educated, but why were they not educated? It was due to the system which did not provide for solutions to basic economic problems. Unless the present system is replaced your troubles will go on increasing every day, every year. You know food and clothing have become expensive. How can a poor man survive? The present system spells disaster, a complete disaster for the country and the people. As long as capitalism is in force, prices will go on increasing, so will your difficulties. You have seen that in the past 23 years prices have been steadily going up. What does that mean? How can the poor live? I know how to run this system. Unless basic changes are introduced, the country's lot will not improve. We say this in the interest of the people and the country. We have already urged the Government to find an immediate solution to the price-hike after the elections. The solution does not lie in capitalistic laws. The proper implementation of the principles of Islamic socialism can solve this problem. As you have emerged victorious and have gained a majority in the Punjab and Sindh, and now that a constitution is to be framed, I want to assure you that the People's Party will try its best to have a popular constitution framed. Unless a new constitution is made and a new government installed, prices will go on increasing. But it is yet to be seen what type of constitution will be framed

and whose government there will be in the country. It is time for a revolution. The country is faced with an economic crisis. A solution will have to be found for the sake of the masses who are poor. I know who have voted for the People's Party. Those in rags, without shoes and uncertain about their next meal. Those who are penniless. I must make it clear that this will not be allowed to continue. A new era is bound to come. No power on earth can stop it.

I congratulate Sheikh Mujibur-Rahman. We respect the majority. East-West parity no longer exists. We recognise the principle of majority under accepted democratic traditions. But we must also take into account many other factors. Both Punjab and Sindh are centres of power. We may or may not form a government at the Centre but the keys of the Punjab Assembly Chambers are in my pocket. In one of my pockets lay the keys of the Sindh Assembly and in the other those of the Punjab Assembly. No central government can run without our co-operation. Any constitution will have to provide maximum autonomy for the provinces. One Unit is finished. All the provinces will get autonomy. If the People's Party does not support it, no government will be able to work, nor will the constitution be framed. The Centre needs our co-operation. We cannot keep the people waiting. The People's Party shall do its job. Bhutto's party will take steps, one after another. We have to rebuild and strengthen this country. Our marvelous people can even move mountains. Let nobody stop our party. We will Insha Allah build up this country. Some people said the People's Party would get only 15 seats in the elections. You have seen the party has virtually brought about a revolution. We have gained the confidence of the people. Any attempt to create obstacles in our way will lead to dangerous consequences.

You know me well. You have been trying me for the past four years. When I say that we must get our due, I mean that. It is no joke. I have devoted myself to the uplift of the people. I am ready to die for my people. We are determined to make Pakistan stronger and prosperous. You shall see everything settling down, everybody working hard. No one will be persecuted. There will be no exploitation. We are capable of resolving both internal and external problems. We would, however, first solve our internal problems particularly the economic problems. We do not believe in compromising on principles. We have never done that. Our opponents first dubbed us as anti-Islam. Now they maintain we will not be able to follow Islamic principles. They doubt our integrity. As a matter of fact they prepared their manifestos by copying from ours but with no intention of carrying them out. Now, after the elections, they accuse us of not intending to implement our manifesto. Well, now, at least it has been proved that the implementation of our manifesto is not contrary to Islam. We shall implement our manifesto, we will nationalise all insurance companies and basic industries

Some people argue that nationalisation means that Government will take away wealth from the people. This is wrong. Your money will remain with you. The Government will, however, run more financial organisations. In effect, you will be running them. Therefore, you need not be afraid of it.

These industrialists lock workers out of their mills and tell them to go to Bhutto. From now on, if anyone says that, workers should note down his name, address and the time and send it to me. I shall then take suitable steps to stop such action. You have suffered a lot. Have just a little more patience and you will find everything will be all right.

A maulana of Karachi says why don't I surrender my own lands first. I must tell him, the surrender of a single individual's land would not help. I on my part am prepared even to give away all I have. But that would serve no purpose. We shall take lands from landlords after fixing limits on land holdings. It would not be Bhutto's lands alone, every big landlord would have to surrender his excess land.

My dear friends and colleagues, I whole-heartedly felicitate you on refusing to vote according to the old tribal or feudal systems. I am very happy indeed. I am nothing by myself. You have been very kind to me. You have blessed me with your support. I assure you I will remain always at your service. I want neither ministership nor presidentship. I only want to end the exploitation of the poor. It would be the happiest day of my life to see the poor man's home bright with smiles and prosperity. The poor man now cannot wait. My party has authorised me to do whatever I can to end the present capitalistic system in the country and to adopt an independent foreign policy.

My dear friends, perhaps you remember my earlier statements in which I had said that India would continue to play ping-pong with us as long as we pursued a weak policy. She will keep on attacking us from here and there sometimes in East Pakistan and sometimes in West Pakistan. We know the Indians. We have been together for a thousand years. They are experts in exploitation and intrigue. They have to be slopped. Then they would not even raise a finger. You know what happened in the Rann of Kutch. The Indians think they have a bigger army. Well, we too have a big army.

If victories depended on numbers alone, nations would have won wars only by doubling their armies. Nations do not fight on numbers alone. The Indians call for talks. Well, we have been talking for 23 years and nothing has come out of it,

Deadlock on the Constitution
The Punjab University New Campus, Lahore,
February 22, 1971

It is after a long time that I am addressing you. When I was a Minister I used to make speeches in various universities. In 1960 I addressed the students in the Senate Hall of this university. I have been trying to speak to you ever since I was removed from Ministership for having refused to put my thumb impression on the Tashkent Declaration, but I was not allowed to set my foot in the University premises.

It is, therefore, a very happy day for me that I find myself here. I want to remind you that I am to address a public meeting in this city of Lahore tomorrow. I hope you will also come there. Since I will speak in Urdu at tomorrow's meeting, let today's address be in English.

The students are our pillars. Progress and knowledge are impossible to have in the country without imparting correct education to them and without looking after their interests. A country cannot develop without education.

The People's Party has never interfered in students' politics. In fact, there is no student organisation in our party. We have not even set up a student wing in our party. We are opposed to mixing the Country's politics with that of the students. And we will never do that. We are, however, certainly interested in student politics. It is our duty. But we would not mix it with national politics.

The country is passing through a grave crisis. Every government in the past has been saying that. This was said even before the country's first constitution was framed. But please do believe me that the present time -is really the most critical time for the -country. If we take a wrong decision the consequent crisis may prove fatal for the country. What is involved is the integrity and solidarity of the country as well as the sovereignty of the people.

At the moment, I shall not touch on the current constitutional crisis because I plan to make a detailed speech on this subject tomorrow. I would, however, not like you to raise slogans of Six Points Zindabad or Six Points Murdabad. I have often said in my speeches, ever since the Six Points were presented at the Lahore national conference of opposition parties in 196-5 that these Points should be debated: but even at the National Conference itself leaders from West Pakistan did not debate them. They rejected any political dialogue on the Six Points. On my part I had even advised Ayub Khan's Government to consider all points; twenty-two, eleven or six, and to hold political talks.' I had told them that any

delay in considering these questions will further complicate the problem. I threw a challenge to Mujib for a public debate. After I left the Government, I addressed the students of the Dacca Engineering Institute. I analyzed and criticized the Six Points. I said that we were ready to talk on these Points, But since the press was controlled by the Government—and it still is—it twisted and blew up my statement saying that I was taking a contradictory stand. When I came back from East Pakistan and addressed a public meeting in Sialkot, the people asked me what I had said in Dacca. I told them and I reaffirm that a time is coming when we will have to hold talks on the Six Points. The Six Points are the result of the exploitation of the people of East Pakistan. It would have been better if these Points had been debated when they were first raised.

In politics, time and circumstances must always be kept in view. Politics should be viewed in the context of external influences rather than internal considerations. The People's Party believes in evaluating. Politics in the light of external factors. The country is passing through a critical and dangerous crisis. There are people here who hold a monopoly on politics. It is they who have been opposing the Six Points. Some time ago the Six Points were confined only to an individual, and it would have been better to have talks with him in those days. Now the Awami League says that. The Six Points have become the property of the people. It argues that its members-have been elected on the basis of these Points.

When I went to East Pakistan, I told Sheikh Mujib that it was his Awami League that had been elected on Six Points, not the People's Party. I told him that we had been elected on the basis of our stand on revolutionary changes in the economic system and on evolving an independent foreign policy, that we would try our utmost to co-operate with him and come as close to the Awami League as possible. However, there was a limit. If we went too far it would lead the country to disaster. It was no time for slogans. The need of the hour was to find a solution which should satisfy both our Bengali brothers and the people of West Pakistan. If all of us join hands there is no reason why we should not be able to find this solution.

Pakistan was not created for us to remain perpetually involved in a constitutional crisis. It is a pity that we have not been able to frame a constitution in 23 years. We cannot claim to have resolved our basic problems during this period. We have neither framed a constitution nor ended exploitation. Those who want to end exploitation are dubbed as infidels. Economy is a fundamental problem. You will remember that at the time of elections, I did emphasise the need for a constitution because without a constitution a country's stability is always in danger. A constitution shall be framed, but will it by itself solve the basic problems? The most important and immediate problem of the country is to

end poverty. We wish to-serve this country. We will end poverty and will never ignore Islam. Islam does not oppose the betterment of the lot of village folk, urban people, peasants and workers.

How can you make your country strong with corruption, nepotism, and lawlessness? The country will prosper only when the poor prosper.

The People's Party, therefore, presented a manifesto. Although it was presented during the elections, we had, at the time of the founding of the People's Party in this great city of Lahore, mentioned in our fundamental documents that poverty was Asia's biggest problem and that Pakistan was the poorest country of Asia. We had stressed that serious attention be given, to the eradication of poverty. I was, however, pained to see certain elements trying to create disruption by issuing fatwas. They wanted to create doubts among the Muslims. They were trying to create the impression that we had no interest in Islam. So edicts were issued against us. But we made it absolutely clear that we would shirk no sacrifice for our religion.

I assure you—and this is no political gimmick—that I have instructed my colleagues not to interfere in student politics. You will recall that on my return from Tashkent I had said that we will welcome any elected President of your Union, regardless of his political views. We have always upheld fairplay in politics. The People's Party owes its victory in the recent elections to this principle. It is said that the People's Party's victory will endanger Islam. Two months have passed since the success of the People's Party. Can you tell me whether any danger to Islam has developed? Has any mosque been closed down? It was all false propaganda. You will see all sorts of obstacles put in the way of a popular government. But if we stick to our principles, then God willing, a popular government shall be formed. You need not be disappointed. I assure you that the People's Party does not want to pollute the political atmosphere of the country. We have never done that. We want to prove our case through argument and logic. I will tell you tomorrow why we decided not to go to Dacca.

I know some people are demanding that we should explain our stand in the National Assembly in accordance with established democratic principles. True, a constitution is framed after debate and discussion in the Assembly, but we are faced with a peculiar situation. It would have been a different matter were a Constituent Assembly already in existence. Since the Awami League calls the Six Points the basis of the constitution, no room is left for any compromise whatsoever on that stand. On top of it, a time limit of 120 days has been fixed for constitution-making. It would not be helpful if a deadlock was created in the Assembly on account of these two factors. Is it not better not to hold the National Assembly session until these problems are resolved outside the Assembly?

Sheikh Mujib quotes me as saying that if need be I would again go to Dacca for talks. Well, I am prepared for two, three or even ten rounds of talks. I am prepared to go to Dacca, to Chittagong. Or anywhere Sheikh Sahib wants me to go. There is still time for a rapprochement. Had there been a clean slate, a clean paper, an unwritten document before us, we would certainly have participated in the Assembly. But now, as things stand today, if we attend the Assembly and there is a deadlock, what explanation will we have for the people of West Pakistan? You yourselves will criticize us for attending the Assembly in the absence of an understanding on Six Points. If the majority party frames a constitution, to the exclusion of our views, you will accuse us of betrayal.

The People's Party is on record as having recognized the fact that the people of East Pakistan have been exploited. It is enshrined in our manifesto. The poor are incapable of exploiting others. Both East and West Pakistan have been the victims of exploitation. If we have the same destiny, then why this rigidity in our stands? The interests of East Pakistan are ours also, because East Pakistan is the majority province of our country. A great majority of Pakistanis live there. If they say "Joi Bangla" we also say "Joi Bangla," for that is a part of Pakistan. We have great respect for the people of East Pakistan just as we have for the people of the Punjab, NWFP, Baluchistan' and Sind. Their interests are our interests. But it is painful that slogans based on provincial prejudices are raised. Why do they not raise slogans for the whole of Pakistan?

We want a constitution, not a deadlock. We would have participated in the framing of the constitution had it not been already written on the basis of Six Points and had there been no limit of 120 days. It would have been another matter if this one were the first Constituent Assembly. But the mutual mistrust of the past 23 years coupled with the atmosphere in which the yearlong electioneering was conducted has generated extremism. It has led to the Playing up of the Six Points. We won the elections on the basis of a new economic system and an independent foreign policy. They had the Six Points as their prime problem while economic deterioration and independent foreign Policy were the issues we raised. If we are to serve our country, our nation and our religion, we will have to strike off the shackles of exploitation. The success of the People's Party here and the Awami League there has been made possible by the people. Had we opposed the Six Points at the time of elections, there would have been a confrontation and the country would have gone to pieces.

In both parts of the country only the people have emerged victorious. That is why we avoided a confrontation. In fact, we kept retreating. It is necessary for one of the two sides to do so in order to avoid a confrontation. We did not play

up our differences. We went to East Pakistan to explain our stand. I met all political leaders in Lahore, Peshawar and Utmanzai.

I held conferences with my colleagues in Lahore, Multan and Karachi. We retreated so much that people began to ask what had happened to Bhutto. But it is regrettable that Sheikh Mujib remained rigid. Those politicians who had lost even their securities in the elections made a beeline for Dacca. The Sheikh then thought that he had succeeded in his mission. The President of Pakistan went to Dacca and announced that Mujib would be the Prime Minister of the country. Both said they had had satisfactory talks, so it was presumed that the constitution had virtually been framed. But we have a duty to those millions who elected us. Their views on the constitution have to be heard and taken into account before it is finalised. We shall try our best to live up to the expectations of the people. We have regard and respect for all. Let the newspapermen take note of it. If any of them misreports, please remember others have heard me and can bear witness.

The Crisis: Two Alternatives
Public Meeting, Lahore,
February 28, 1971

I propose two alternatives to resolve the present crisis—postponement of the National Assembly session or removal of the 120 day time limit for the Assembly to frame a constitution.

If either of these alternatives is accepted, I shall go to Dacca tomorrow to meet Sheikh Mujibur Rahman to resolve the pre-session deadlock.

If the session of the Assembly is held on March 3, as scheduled without PPP's participation, I shall launch a popular agitation from one end of West Pakistan to the other. If the elections to women's seats take place on March 2 there will be a general strike from Peshawar to Karachi. I have never opposed the Six Points, although the programme was not acceptable to me personally. However, we narrowed down our disagreement to foreign trade and foreign aid which cannot be entrusted to the provincial governments.

Both the subjects are concomitants of foreign affairs and should be in the charge of the Federal Government if the Centre is to be effective. Agreement can be arrived at on inter-wing currency arrangements and on taxation power but we cannot give in on foreign trade and aid.

I refute the allegation leveled by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman that I have been conspiring to create impediments in the transfer of power. This allegation is a lie. It is unimaginable that I could be in league with bureaucrats or the capitalists or the regime, or any foreign power, because all of them have shown consistent hostility to the People's Party.

I have always established liaison with the people in every emergency that has arisen. I have done it in the past and have always taken decisions after consulting the people. This public meeting is of the same nature.

Since the country is facing a grave crisis I have chosen the same venue where the Quaid-i-Azam had made the demand for Pakistan 30 years ago. It is for the preservation of that Pakistan that I have been struggling. I would offer any sacrifice for it.

Since January last year when political activity was revived my party and I never criticised or condemned Six Points. I did not make it a personal issue and have

attributed no motives to the leader of the Awami League as other politicians from West Pakistan have done.

The Six Points were made known by Sheikh Mujib at the then opposition parties' national convention in Lahore in 1966 for the first time. The leaders who participated in that convention had rejected them outright.

As Foreign Minister I had advised President Ayub Khan to tackle Six Points on the political level as they contained the seeds for serious differences between the two wings of the country. I had urged him to find a solution acceptable to East Pakistan. But, he ignored my advice and, instead of using political language, threatened to use the "language of weapons."

I tried to enter into a political dialogue with the Awami League while agreeing with it that elimination of exploitation was a common objective.

The People's Party is the only party which accepted that East Pakistan had been exploited. But the exploitation has not been confined to East Pakistan alone. The people of West Pakistan have suffered equally on that account. They are equally poor and down-trodden, and the workers, peasants and intellectuals of West Pakistan have suffered at the hands of exploiters who are common to both wings.

I have toured East Pakistan and the poverty I saw in Chittagong, Khulna and Noakhali was the same acute poverty I had seen in D.I. Khan, D.G. Khan and in Lahore. It is unfair to say that the people of West Pakistan have exploited the people of East Pakistan. The exploitation has been the result of the capitalist system and unless that is demolished, the people of both wings will continue to be exploited. This is the reason the PPP has struggled to change the economic system of the country and replace it by Islamic socialism. No constitution by itself can end exploitation.

The solidarity and the sovereignty of the country should be preserved to end exploitation. If the country disintegrates there will be nothing left to save from exploitation. The country was created by Quaid-i-Azam and three million Muslims of the subcontinent had made tremendous sacrifices. It is not easy to break up the country and I would not let anyone do it.

People today are talking of the interests of Bengal, Punjab, Sindh, Frontier and Baluchistan. But nobody talks of Pakistan which has to be made an Islamic Socialist Republic. In case the country is divided into five separate states, how viable would they be, and would they constitute the Pakistan for which the people of all these areas fought under Quaid-i-Azam? A clear cut answer is called for.

East Pakistani leaders wanted a federal constitution for the country and the PPP agreed to it. But in that case the federal constitution must be endorsed by each federating unit.

It is being suggested that the PPP should accept the normal democratic procedure and debate the constitution on the floor of the House. But it should not be forgotten that an extraordinary situation has arisen because the Awami League has already drafted a Six Point constitution and wants the Assembly to rubber-stamp it. And at the same time a 120 day limit has been imposed for the framing of the constitution. I have never rejected Six Points because I wanted to discuss them with the Awami League. I have refrained from indulging in personal attacks as other leaders in West Pakistan have not done. It is unfortunate that the leaders of East Pakistan have leveled allegations against me. I had suggested a political dialogue on the Six Points as I wanted to avoid a deadlock in the National Assembly because if it occurred the country would face an extremely grave crisis.

I have never talked of a “strong Centre” as I believe that it was because of a strong Centre that East Pakistan suffered exploitation. We want an effective Centre although with the minimum number of subjects. This is in the interest of the country. It is being suggested that the Centre should only be responsible for defence and foreign affairs, and that foreign trade and foreign aid should be under the provinces. I wonder how the defence of the country can be managed and an independent foreign policy pursued without the Centre having control over foreign trade and aid. Without trade and aid being federal subjects Pakistan would not be able to survive as one country.

I am sure that some arrangement is possible in respect of currency and federal taxation, but I cannot reconcile myself to a position in which the provinces would independently control foreign trade and foreign aid. If that is allowed and all five provinces are to have their own policies in respect of foreign trade and aid, the country would be a hot-bed of intrigues by foreign powers.

The Awami League is in favour of having a federal system in Pakistan but there is no country in the world where a federal system can operate without a bicameral legislature.

I am prepared to accept a federation in which all the federating units can enjoy equal autonomy. What is not acceptable to me is that one province should have more autonomy than others. If East Pakistan is to have autonomy a similar quantum of autonomy should be provided for the Punjab, Sindh, Frontier and Baluchistan.

It has been pleaded that the two wings of the country have two separate economies. It has been subsequently maintained that their politics is different too. And, finally, it has been suggested that they should have two separate constitutions. If Pakistan is one country it must have one integrated constitution. One document containing two different constitutions for East and West Wings would be an oddity, which would not be acceptable to the people.

It is unfortunate that an assurance was given in Dacca to members from Bahawalpur that they would have a separate province. Bahawalpur is an integral part of the Punjab and would continue to be so.

Similarly, I have heard that members from tribal areas are toying with the idea of having a separate tribal province. The new settlers in Sindh might demand a Muhajir province in Nawabshah. If the intention is to disintegrate Pakistan, all these moves should be encouraged. But I shall oppose all efforts at the dismemberment of the country.

These are the matters on which I wanted to have a dialogue with the East Pakistan leaders and I was sure I would convince them that an effective Centre with control on foreign trade and foreign aid is in the best interest of the country.

It is unfortunate that the leaders of East Pakistan have leveled serious allegations against me. One of the allegations is that I am conspiring with vested interests to obstruct the transfer of power. It is unimaginable that a political party which has the support of the working classes would ever be in league with vested interests. One vested interest could be bureaucrats and it is a known fact that bureaucrats have been extremely hostile to the PPP from the very beginning. They are the enemies of the people. How can the People's Party be in league with them? The bureaucrats supported the political party in East Pakistan but the situation in West Pakistan so far as the PPP was concerned was different.

It is equally-unimaginable that the PPP could have conspired with the capitalists to obstruct the transfer of power. Since the PPP won the elections the capitalists have been passing sleepless nights. In fact, they are all rushing to Dacca for protection.

It is also being alleged that the People's Party is conspiring with foreign powers. Nothing can be more ridiculous than that as it is the PPP which launched a campaign against imperialism and neo-colonialism. The eyes of the foreign powers are set elsewhere.

Yet another allegation is that I have been conspiring to impede the transfer of power with the help of the regime, the same regime which has shown hostility to my party during the elections. It was this regime which jailed some of my prominent party leaders. I had declared at a public meeting at Nasser Bagh that Nawabzada Sher Ali Khan, Nawab Muzaffar Ali Qizilbash and Mr. Mahmood Haroon were openly working against my party. Had the regime not been hostile I would have won at least 120 seats.

I have also been accused of hurling insults at East Pakistan. Exception has been taken to my statement that the PPP members would be “double hostages” in East Pakistan and that the National Assembly would be a “slaughter house” for them. I cannot afford to be away from West Pakistan for 120 days when Indian troops are massed on the West Pakistan borders. My duty is to be with my people when their security is being threatened. I had described the Assembly as a “slaughter house” in the context of amendments and what the brute majority by the Awami League would do to them.

I cannot even dream of insulting East Pakistan where the majority of the population of the country lives. In fact, the people of West Pakistan felt insulted when the Prime Minister-to-be of the country refused to visit their half of the land.

My insistence on an understanding between the major parties on the basic constitutional issues was and is well-intentioned. I have kept the door open for negotiations and am prepared to go to Dacca if the necessary assurance is given to me that my point of view along with reasonable suggestions would be considered dispassionately. This assurance, if given by the Awami League, would be considered by the Central Committee of my party and if it agrees we shall participate in the session. But in the present circumstances how can PPP members attend the National Assembly session? If they go there and abstain what good will that do? If they rubber stamp the Awami League’s draft constitution they will have no leg to stand upon on their return to their respective constituencies here. Voting for the Awami League draft constitution will be like breaking the backbone of our national integrity. It will not be allowed. If the National Assembly meets on 3rd March my party will launch a campaign of protest.

First, the President can dissolve the National Assembly. This would not be acceptable to me at any cost as it would mean the continuance of Martial Law indefinitely which is not desirable. That situation would create a very dangerous crisis for the nation.

The other alternative is the postponement of the Assembly session scheduled to be held on 3rd March. If that is accepted it would give me time to discuss the constitutional issues with the Awami League. In that case, I would not lose a minute to go to East Pakistan to have a dialogue with my elder brother.

Yet another alternative is that the time limit of 120 days imposed on the National Assembly for the framing of the constitution should be removed. That would give ample opportunity to my party to debate fully the constitutional issues which have caused the present deadlock. If the time-limit is removed I would rush to Dacca tomorrow.

Former Constituent Assemblies took years to frame constitutions. The 1956 Constitution was prepared after the Assembly had debated it for seven years. The 1962 Constitution was the result of a three-year debate. It is surprising that in the case of the present Assembly a 120 day time limit has been imposed.

If the two alternatives – postponement of the session and the removal of the time limit – are not accepted, the present deadlock would continue. That would mean the end of democracy in the country.

**Ready for Negotiations
Press Conference, Karachi,
March 2, 1971**

The Pakistan People's Party has all along championed the cause of the oppressed people in both wings of Pakistan, and it has been the only party in West Pakistan, to expose forcefully and unambiguously; the nature of the exploitation under which the people have been suffering these many years, particularly in East Pakistan.

The new capitalist class that has come into being in Pakistan has ruthlessly robbed the common people, misusing foreign aid and internal and external resources of Pakistan. Wealth is monopolised within their limited groups, who happen to be mainly in West Pakistan.

The claims of great economic progress are based on dubious figures. It is established that the average Pakistani whether in West or East Pakistan, has grown poorer since the "wonderful" planning under capitalist auspices began. Acutely conscious of the fundamental problems of Pakistan, the People's Party has been demanding a revolutionary change in the whole economic and social structure of the country East Wing or West Wing, to remove the root cause of the misery of the oppressed masses.

Pakistan was established in both wings by the common consent of the people and established as one nation, a homeland for the Muslims of this subcontinent and a protection for the Muslims who remained behind in the other country.

The fundamental basis upon which the state exists is unalterable. The Muslim people of Bengal suffered greatly for the ideal of Pakistan and contributed to its creation with their very blood. Many of them were slaughtered in Calcutta and other places in Bengal.

In the sort of partition that the British, with the connivance of the Indian Hindus, imposed upon Pakistan several historic areas of Muslim Bengal were lost to this country. Lost were the contiguous areas of East Pakistan, where Muslims were in a majority. Abandoned also were the Muslim people of Assam.

And since partition, we were the first in West Pakistan to have candidly admitted in our foundation papers that the people of East Pakistan were unjustly treated and did not get their due share in the national economy.

God is our witness that all our efforts since the election have been directed to finding a solution to the constitutional problem which would not only right the injustices done to the people of East Pakistan in the past but also enable all the people of the nation to live in harmony.

We took the initiative of going to East Pakistan in search of an understanding with the Awami League so that a viable constitution could be framed. It has not been our attitude to reject the Six Points.

On the other hand, we have consistently endeavored to move as close to the Six Points as was logically and reasonably possible on the assumption that Pakistan would still remain a single nation.

There we did not demand a strong Centre, but only a federal Centre that would have the character of keeping the country a united federal state. We further manifested our bona fides by mass mobilisation of public opinion in West Pakistan in favour of a constitution as close to the Six Points formula as possible.

In the press conference of 15th February at Peshawar, we had only asked for an assurance that there was room for negotiation and settlement. This stand we have reiterated time and again.

It is absurd that we have been charged with attempting to sabotage the transfer of power to the people by entering into a conspiracy with the supposed dark forces. The Pakistan People's Party represents the aspirations of the toiling masses of West Pakistan who were not a party to the exploitation of East Pakistan.

Indeed, we are the people of West Pakistan who cannot imaginably conspire to frustrate the transfer of power in which they will have their share. Let it not be forgotten that only recently the people of West Pakistan reposed this confidence in us by a democratic verdict.

It is most unfortunate that a necessary postponement of the National Assembly session should have incited a disproportionate reaction in East Pakistan Awami League. Surely, nothing is lost if the premise of a united Pakistan is accepted, by the delay of a few days to enable the major parties of the whole of Pakistan to come to an agreement on the nature of the constitution that ought to last for years and years to come.

The constitution should not be made an excuse to break up Pakistan. The very idea of a constitution is to preserve the state of Pakistan and to keep intact the machinery, namely the Assembly that is to undertake this momentous task. We

demanded postponement of the National Assembly session only to provide the two major parties with an opportunity to have another dialogue. We are willing to have this dialogue anywhere at any time that the Awami League would like. If the Awami League fails to reciprocate the onus for the consequences will not be on us.

Cable to Mujib
March 9, 1971

I am deeply distressed and profoundly concerned over the recent turn of events in our country I grieve for our countrymen who have lost their lives in this crisis. My heart goes out to the bereaved families. We seek a new order for Pakistan—an order where exploitation of man by man or of region by region—comes to an end. Let us strive to enshrine such a new order not only in the constitution but in the hearts of all Pakistanis.

We are faced with a crisis of the gravest magnitude. The future of our country hangs in the balance. Both of us carry an extremely heavy responsibility and everything humanly possible must be done to avert the disaster that threatens us. It must be our common objective that Pakistan be saved and set on the road to peace and progress in which both wings of the country can play their full part.

The unfortunate crisis that has since developed leads me to believe that we have come to a stage when the two wings of Pakistan must immediately reach a common understanding if the country is to be saved and the country must be saved whatever the cost.

To overcome the present crisis, every effort must be made to bring the people of the two wings together. Every effort must be made to erase the bitterness and misgivings engendered during the past 23 years. Every effort must be directed to preserve the unity and solidarity of the people of Pakistan so that they may march forward hand in hand as brothers.

I am prepared to visit Dacca again immediately to meet you and to devise a common solution to end the crisis that faces the country so that the Assembly can proceed with the framing of the constitution.

Let not the people say nor history afterwards record that we have failed them.

A Compromise is Possible
Public Meeting at Nishtar Park, Karachi,
March 14, 1971

Pakistan is passing through an extremely dangerous and critical crisis. We have been witnessing crisis after crisis ever since the creation of Pakistan. You may think it is traditional for all political leaders and parties to say that the country is faced with a serious crisis. But I assure you, my brothers and sisters, that it is very much true today to say that Pakistan has never faced a more dangerous crisis in her 23 years than she faces today. It is in view of this crisis that we will have to take decisions. Pakistan is the largest Islamic State of the world. Millions of Muslims have made sacrifices for its creation.

Hundreds of thousands of Muslims died to bring Pakistan into being. Will such a Pakistan remain one or be divided into pieces? Indeed the present is the most complicated and dangerous of crises. All of us recognise this fact. There is no doubt about it.

But there is also no doubt that if we make sincere efforts in the right direction and with the support of the people, we shall successfully overcome this crisis, and be able to preserve the integrity and solidarity of Pakistan.

My dear friends, my poor brothers and sisters: you will recall that on 4 January 1971 from this Nishtar Park I had started my election campaign. And after I had made my speech our enemies, no not our enemies but your enemies for there is no difference in your enemies and our enemies, had tried to create misunderstandings between us. Because we are with the people, the enemies of the people are our enemies and our enemies therefore are the enemies of the people. They had then tried to create misunderstandings among the people. They had formed a powerful front against the Pakistan People's Party. That front is still in existence. But you have emerged successful. You have already given your verdict through the elections/The elections have been held under democratic principles. You have made the Pakistan People's Party succeed with a great majority in West Pakistan. You made great sacrifices in doing this. You wished to see us returned in a majority. You worked for this day.

But now you see this front working against the Pakistan People's Party – no, against you. It was set up to conspire against you. For a time it went underground, but now it has emerged again to oppose you, to betray you. The front is not opposing the Pakistan People's Party. In fact it is opposing the poor people of Pakistan.

Take it from me that it is not the person of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto that is being opposed. When the reactionary press accuses me of being responsible for this crisis, the attack is not meant against my person. It is directed, and is a part of the conspiracy against the labourers, peasants and poor people. These elements which consider themselves as powerful forces are in fact nonentities. They opposed the People's Party during the elections and dubbed the Muslims as infidels. They issued edicts against people like us who are prepared to sacrifice their lives for Islam. They said we were a danger to Islam. Now it is for you to see whether Islam is faced with any danger now that the elections are over. We remain the same Muslims. Our hearts still glow with the light of Islam. Mosques are filled with the believers as before. Muslims still recite the same Kalima. The same prayers are still being offered.

There is no incompatibility between Pakistan and Islam. We will sacrifice our lives and everything for both. We will fight on all fronts. But who is behind this conspiracy? The people have no hand in it. On the other hand, as I have said, it has been hatched against the people. It is the same hand working behind all the conspiracies—past and present. And it will be the same hand which will stage future conspiracies.

I shall now tell you what this force is. I say this openly that it is the conspiracy of the capitalists. It is the conspiracy of the reactionaries and the imperialists. Once they saw the election results, they knew they had been doomed; they had been defeated. They feared that their mills would now be nationalised, lands would be lost and the poor would have all their rights. They conspired to stop all this at all costs. Therefore, they tried to create another crisis.

I had made certain promises to you during the elections. These were the promises of a Muslim, a true Pakistani. I had told you that when your government came into power, it would bring about economic changes. It would nationalise the big factories. It would distribute agricultural lands among the poor. It was because of this that conspiracies are being hatched on all sides. And it was because of this that after 23 years of the creation of Pakistan a confrontation was created between Urdu and Sindhi in Hyderabad. You know what happened. The Board of Secondary Education passed a resolution. Its 10 members included five Muhajirs and five Sindhis. This was turned into a controversial language issue between Sindhi and Urdu. The vested interests tried to distract the people's attention from the need for a change in the economic system. The poor Sindhi people have been dying of hunger; they have been economically exploited. So are the poor Muhajirs being persecuted and oppressed. The interested circles wanted to divert the attention of these poor people from the changing pattern of events, because they feel that if these poor people's attention was directed to the need for change, it would result in a

revolution. These circles fear that in that case their interests would be adversely affected. Therefore, they first resorted to the slogan of "Islam in danger." But you have proved this wrong through your verdict. I salute you on this. So, after failing in their conspiracies, these circles tried to create all sort of difficulties for the Pakistan People's Party. They discovered a new move. This time they raised the cry of "Urdu in danger; Sindhi in danger." You know, both these languages have not been in "danger" at all during the last 23 years. Sindhi has not been in danger for the past 5,000 years. They only saw "danger" when the People's Party emerged victorious.

As a matter of fact these were devices to weaken the People's Party, to weaken you. With this conspiracy having failed, the vested interests raised the question of canal waters in the Punjab and Sindh. They thought that since the People's Party had a majority in both the provinces, it would find itself in extreme difficulty in pleasing one province at the cost of the other. Did the River Indus not flow before? If its water could be distributed before why can it not be fairly distributed now? Well, it will be equitably distributed!

All these were conspiracies against the people. You were told to ask Bhutto to solve your problems, because you voted for Bhutto. They raised the prices and asked you to seek Bhutto's help.

The Press Trust is in their possession. The whole reactionary press belongs to them. They have been persecuting and doing injustice. They have done injustice not to my person but to the people of Pakistan.

Now all such people who were defeated in the elections and who lost their securities have been posing themselves as leaders. They go to East Pakistan; they come from East Pakistan with big messages in their pockets.

My friends, brothers and sisters, I wonder what type of democracy this is. They have been crying hoarse for democracy. But do they know the alphabet of democracy? Well, democracy means the wishes of the people. You have to carry out the decisions of the people. And what decision have the people taken? The people's decision resulted in the emergence of the Pakistan People's Party as the majority party in West Pakistan. It was a great majority. At the centre we have at least 90 seats. In Sind and the Punjab we are in a big majority. So the people made their decision in our favour. Democracy for which we had been struggling for the last eleven years, has taken the first step towards its rightful place in our country. The people's verdict has been in our favour. You have reposed confidence in the People's Party. So how do these people who have been defeated in the elections, claim to be great leaders? They can neither understand politics nor the people. They cannot understand the situation in Pakistan. They

do not even believe in democracy. Why have they then jumped in? Who allowed them to do that? You have already given a clear, democratic verdict. It is not a hundred years' old verdict. It was given in the very recent past. You gave this verdict just a few months ago on 17 December and 17 January.

Despite all this these "leaders" claim to have brought messages. They have been suggesting that this or that be done. Your voice is the voice of the electorate. Your representatives' voice is your voice.

Let me tell you how confusion is being created about us. The reactionary press has been trying to establish that we are responsible for this crisis. I will prove it to you today that the Pakistan People's Party is in no way involved and that the responsibility does not lie with it. We have all along been working for the integrity and solidarity of Pakistan. We have been trying to restore the sovereignty of the people of Pakistan. I swear by God I stand for what I have just said.

My dear brothers and friends, what are these defeated politicians doing now? One of them has been saying that the People's Party did not fight the elections on constitutional issues; that the Pakistan People's Party fought the elections on its economic programme and foreign policy. That is why it has no right to represent the people on constitutional questions. I would say that only an intellectually bankrupt person can say these things.

You have elected us as your representatives—that is, to represent you in both internal and external matters. You have not stopped us from representing you on any particular subject. But our opponents argue that we said nothing on the constitution during our election campaign. Perhaps, they do not know that we had written a book on the constitution. It was written by our Party's Secretary-General much before the elections. So, it is not true that we had taken no stand on the constitution. However, we did not want to disturb the atmosphere for nothing. We did not attack the Six Points unlike those who opposed them before but are supporting them now.

We did present our views on the constitution to the people saying that we favored a federal constitution. We have been demanding this in our speeches. You may recall many of my speeches in which I had said that we would frame a people's constitution. I had pledged to make a poor man's constitution. One of the parties opposing us published a booklet against a federal constitution. I have all along been pleading for a constitution of the labourers and the poor in which fundamental rights will be ensured and protected. These fundamental rights would not be tailored for the rich and the capitalists alone. These rights should

be extended to provide proper cover for the poor, the labourers, the working class and the peasants. I had promised such a constitution.

You may as well recall the attitude of the capitalists during the year of electioneering. They rallied against us. They opposed us tooth and nail. Why did they oppose me? Why did the big Pirs oppose me? Because I was against exploitation, that is why everybody, the 22 families, the bureaucrats, the reactionary parties, all of them opposed the People's Party. They have been accusing me of collusion. May I ask them, collusion with whom? Was it with the Government? If so, which Government? Tell me, which Government has Bhutto colluded with?

As you know, ever since its existence the present Government has been trying to destroy the Pakistan People's Party.

My dear brothers and sisters, do you have such a weak memory that you cannot now recall one of my speeches at this very place, Nishtar Park? I had then addressed myself to Sher Ali Khan saying: "Sher Ali you better give up your conspiracies." Sher Ali was a Minister in this Government. And then you know my speech which I made in Lyari. You know what I had then said against the Government.

My dear brothers, have you forgotten all that so quickly? The same Government banned my book, "Myth of Independence." Have you then, my friends, forgotten that on 13 August 1969, this Government arrested 20 members of my Party? Have you forgotten that this Government arrested my beloved students in Hyderabad the next day? The Government did not even allow me to plead their case as a lawyer in Karachi. Have you, my dear friends, also forgotten, that this very Government arrested Mir Ali Ahmad Talpur ten days before the elections? Have you forgotten that this Government arrested Maulana Kausar Niazi? Have you also forgotten that 22 of my election agents were arrested in Tando Bagar? In Dera Ismail Khan ballot boxes were tampered with to ensure that Bhutto should lose at least from one constituency.

So, who can I collude with? Who is Bhutto colluding with? Some East Pakistanis and those who lost elections here, have been saying that a big conspiracy is being hatched. What conspiracy and with whom? Is it being hatched with the capitalists? Out of question! It is impossible I They have been openly opposing us. They have been asking for our heads. So, can we conspire with those who have been trying to destroy our Party? Then, are we conspiring with Government officials? They too are against us. They tried to persecute me after I left the Ayub Government. We simply cannot collude with the capitalists, government officials and reactionaries. The whole struggle of Bhutto has been

against the reactionaries. We cannot conspire with the Government for you know what the Government attitude towards us has been during the elections. Had the Government been with us, bullets would not have been fired at us in Sanghar. I ask where was the Government when Bhutto was attacked in Sadiqabad? What was this Government doing when a high police officer collected 3.6 million rupees from capitalists out of which 2 million rupees were used against the People's Party? Can this Government have any collusion with us?

To my brothers in East Pakistan, I would say: at least do keep the facts in mind; at least tell us which forces have been colluding with us? We represent the people. They are the source of our strength. We cannot go against the people.

It is said that Bhutto's secret meetings with President Yahya last for as long as five hours. Now, let me tell you about these 'secret' meetings. The fact is that the People's Party is a majority party in West Pakistan. It is the voice of West Pakistan. We represent West Pakistan for you have elected us as your representatives. Therefore, the President is forced to meet us in our capacity as the representatives of West Pakistan. After all, he will have to meet the party which has succeeded, not the "leaders" who have lost the election. Moreover, has not President Yahya been meeting the majority party leader in East Pakistan? On 3 November, Yahya Khan had a very long meeting with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. Was it or was it not a secret meeting?

So if I meet the President along with my party colleagues to discuss the crisis—because we are passing through a very dangerous crisis—what offence do we thereby commit?

And now, what can we do if Sheikh Mujibur Rahman refuses to come to West Pakistan? He has said on many occasions that he would come. In Dacca he told me he would even come to Larkana to see me. He told President Yahya he would come. But he has not come here. The President lives in West Pakistan. We too live in West Pakistan. And we want to discuss the crisis in the interest of the people. So where is the conspiracy?

The situation now is that Sheikh Mujib has not come here. The President cannot go there every now and then. But the East Pakistan Governor has to see Sheikh Mujib thrice a day. Should we then say that a conspiracy is going on there? The Governor went to Sheikh Sahib's residence and even on three days without being accompanied by his ADC or the Military Secretary,

It is a meeting like that one may call secret. But what crime is it to discuss the national crisis with the President, at his invitation? In fact it is one of our duties to discuss the affairs of the country with the President. Had the Sheikh been here,

he would have had many more meetings with the President than we have had. But he has been refusing to come here. He has not come. But if the Governor is having meetings with the Sheikh, our opponents are reluctant to call them secret meetings.

As for the five hour talks between the President and myself, the fact of the matter is that our talks began at 10 a.m. and ended at 12.30 p.m. After that the President said that it was lunch time and asked me where I was having my lunch. I told him, where else except at my hotel. He then invited me to have lunch with him. He, however, sought our leave for half an hour to see an ambassador. The President came back at 1.30 p.m. I had lunch and then came back. So much for our five hour meeting. Well, then, in future I will take sandwiches with me so that I may be able to tell the President that I will not have lunch with him.

The Sheikh has said that 3rd March Was fixed for the Assembly session in consultation with the People's Party. But I assure you we were not consulted in this connection. It is utterly incorrect. I swear that we were not consulted on this. In fact, it was in Peshawar that a PPI correspondent told us that 3rd March had been fixed as the date for the Assembly session. He told this to Sherpao not me It is incorrect to say that we were consulted on the date. I recite the Kalima and swear that we were not asked to give our opinion on whether the Assembly session should be called on 3rd March.

Later, the Legal Framework Order was amended. It provided that a member could resign his Assembly seat by writing to the Chief Election Commissioner. Who was this amendment directed against? It was against us, because our party had refused to attend the Assembly session. Under the existing rules a member has to tender his resignation to the Speaker. But there is no Speaker at the moment. So the amendment has exclusively been made against us. But Sheikh Mujib has said in his Race Course Ground speech that the Legal Framework Order has been amended to benefit the People's Party. How can he say that? Since we have refused to attend the session, the amendment was made against us. How can, therefore, anyone say that the People's Party had conspired to have the Legal Framework Order amended?

I am telling you these things because I want to maintain direct contact with you. I will always have my contacts with the people. I will tell you as much as I can. As! have already said my party is the party of the people. We do not sit and talk in drawing-rooms trying to reach compromises with Sheikh Mujib or President Yahya or anyone else. We will talk and compromise only with you. I am telling you these things because you are the source of our strength. So please listen to what I say. We have to represent you. And you will see how successfully we do that, Insha Allah. So please listen to me attentively. I have to say so many things

today. Tell me what newspaper do we possess to have our statements published? What medium do we have at our disposal to explain our views? Since others keep on telling lies, this is an opportunity for you to hear the truth from me.

Our opponents are still saying that the responsibility for the crisis lies with the People's Party. Who are they? They are those people who had opposed us in the elections. They are capitalists, reactionary parties and government officials. They include those who have lost the elections. They will never forgive us. They can never forgive you, for it is you who have defeated them.

Even today, they have distributed large pamphlets saying large-scale violence is imminent. Such conspiracies are being carried out by those political parties who have failed in the elections.

My dears sisters and brothers, after all differences in politics mean something. They mean adherence to some political morality, political ethics. I have made no mention of my talks with Sheikh Mujib in East Pakistan. Because if one leaks out details of confidential political talks it is a breach of confidence. Reporting to the people on such talks is one thing; giving running commentaries on them is something else.

My dear friends, I had asked for some time; you may now wish to know why? You may recall I had said that public opinion in West Pakistan was against the Six Points. A number of parties had launched propaganda movements against these Points. As a matter of fact it is very difficult to accept some of the things in the Six Points programme. It was because of this that I had requested Sheikh Mujib to give us some time. I told Sheikh Sahib if he had the majority there I had the majority here. I told him in plain words that I would do nothing without consulting public opinion. I would take account of that opinion. I told him, "You have been insisting on a session on February 15. How would I explain it to the people of West Pakistan." I told him I would have to go to West Pakistan to hold talks with my MNAs and MPAs. I would also have rounds of talks with other political parties and then have to go to the masses. This would mean holding public meetings in Peshawar, Lahore, Quetta and Karachi. After all there are four provinces in West Pakistan and I have to explain to the people, to my friends, all facts about the Six Points. I would have to tell them what the Six Points meant and what their implications were. I would have to explain the merits and demerits of the Six Points. If Sheikh Mujib insists that opinion has already been given on the Six Points, that the opinion of the people of Bangladesh is in favour of these Points, then I would plead with Sheikh Mujib, my brother, at least to try to understand what other people want I would request him to come to West Pakistan. If he tells us what Bangla Desh wants I would tell him what Pakistan Desh and West Pakistan wants. I requested him to look at this aspect too. I

begged for some time, some breathing space, so that I could go to the people, because it was my responsibility. It was not the responsibility of the defeated politicians. It was the responsibility of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Because in West Pakistan, people could have accused me of having signed their death warrant. They would have held me responsible for supporting the Six Points without taking their opinion. Under the Six Points, Sind, Punjab and the NWFP will have to contribute more than 80 per cent of the federal levy. The people of these areas would naturally have objected to it. They would have argued that since East Pakistan was a majority province they should not pay 80 per cent of the federal levy. The Awami League alleges that West Pakistan owes Rs. 31 billion to East Pakistan but I cannot accept the position that West Pakistan should agree to repay this amount. And there is a total of Rs. 40 billion loan in foreign exchange. The Awami League contends that West Pakistan will have to pay Rs. 38 billion. Now if I had compromised with them, you would have held me responsible for burdening you with loans. You would have questioned my integrity. You would have reminded me of my promises to bring about economic changes.

You would have asked about Kashmir. You would have said, "Bhutto has compromised with India." My opponents would have ridiculed my so-called constitutional solution of the crisis.

Already, I have been accused of having rejected the idea of a zonal federation. In Sind, the capitalists have been labeling me as an agent of the Punjabis, whereas in Punjab I am described as opposed to a zonal federation. It is because East Pakistan Students' 11 Points provide for the dissolution of One Unit and the setting up of a zonal federation. So, then, will the people of Sindh accept a zonal federation?

To think over all these matters I needed only two weeks because I wanted a clarification on some points. Because if the Assembly decisions are taken by simple majority, and since the East Pakistanis are in a majority, I would have been unable to do anything.

Please remember this crisis had to come. It was inevitable. Some facts warranted it. On the one hand, East Pakistan wanted virtual independence, and on the other West Pakistan did not want to be exploited. But the crisis was destined to come. However, the question is of its timing. Was it to come before the Assembly session? Or was it to come inside or outside the Assembly?

Now if it were to come inside the Assembly, the Assembly itself would have been dissolved, rendering the elections void. The whole episode would have

ended. And if this crisis were to come after the-elections, the constitutional obligation would have been yours. It was, therefore, advisable for this crisis to erupt before the Assembly, before the framing of the constitution. It was desirable that what lay behind the scenes should come to the forefront.

So, my brothers and sisters, I only wanted a breathing space of 10 to 15 days in order to go to the people. You know, I immediately came to Lahore from Dacca. I called a meeting on 2nd March and went to Karachi on the 4th for a similar meeting and then to Multan on the 10th where I did the same. Then I went to Peshawar on the 12th, rushing to Utmanzai, then came back to Peshawar. Why all this at all? Had I not wanted a compromise, we would not have come so close to the Six Points despite the dangers inherent in them. How much close we came to the Six Points is clear from our acceptance of the 10 out of the 11 points of the students. We rejected only one Point about a zonal federation. I also said in Dacca we accepted two of the Six Points. When I came back here I said at a public meeting we could not accept three of the Six Points. But after that I even said that some compromise could be reached on the remaining three Points as well.

So, if you look at these developments, only one Point was left to be discussed. And for that I wanted only two weeks. It was not a year I wanted; only two weeks. And for this alone such a big crisis was created. Collusions were made with the forces of darkness. A big upheaval took place. But then had it not been so you would have accused us for doing something against your interests. You would have said we had failed to represent you properly.

Since I have dedicated myself to serve this country and its people, I had, in all earnestness, made it clear that a constitution was not everything. But I did say that we should have a constitution which would guarantee the integrity and solidarity of Pakistan.

But when we saw our brothers in East Pakistan unwilling to talk to us, we found ourselves helpless. However, we made every effort on our part. After all ours is a political party which has to continue its sincere efforts but in the right direction. So what can we do if they are not prepared to talk. They have left no room whatsoever for give and take.

And, tell me who took up constitutional matters at the public level, at public meetings. I did not. It was Sheikh Mujibur Rahman who raised constitutional matters at Paltan Maidan on 3rd January. Oaths were taken there to stand firm by the Six Points in letter and spirit. They vowed they would rather prefer to be buried alive than to support any change in the Six Points. How could then one talk in the Assembly in this atmosphere? It is suggested we should have gone to debate all the issues on the Assembly floor. Well, how can you debate when

there is no room left for it. Who should we talk to? What would we do in the Assembly when they had already framed a constitution and ruled out the possibility of a change at all on the plea that it was framed by the majority?

So if at all there was to be a debate, it should have been outside the Assembly. And it was for this reason that I wanted some time.

The East Pakistanis themselves raised constitutional issues at public meetings. If, as they say, they had the majority, they should have used it in the Assembly. But they kept on harping on the one and only tune of Six Points. How then could we hold discussions on any issue?

We wanted some time to sort things out. We wanted some assurances. An assurance whether a compromise was possible or not. And if some son of compromise was possible what type of constitution was it going to be? We were then asked not to put conditions, for everything would be settled in the Assembly. They said no conditions were acceptable to them outside the Assembly. Well, if they did not like conditions to be put outside the Assembly, why had they themselves put four conditions outside the Assembly? Why could they not present these conditions within the Assembly?

We were accused of putting conditions although we did not put any. It is a simple principle. If you do not like conditions to be put outside the Assembly why are you doing it yourself? Why can't you put your own conditions in the Assembly?

And you know, why are we now willing to go to the Assembly when we had refused to do so before? First, because they are willing to talk to us, secondly, things would have been different had they held their press conference a few days before 3rd March.

On 28th February I had demanded the postponement of the Assembly session. In case it was not acceptable to them I had suggested the waiving of the time limit of 120 days. So I did not confine my demand only to the postponement of the Assembly session. I had also presented an alternative in that the limit of 120 days should be waived.

My dear friends, we believe there is only one way to end exploitation. And that is the elimination of the capitalist system and the introduction of socialism. That alone is the way to help the poor and to eliminate exploitation from both East and West Pakistan. Exploitation must be ended in all of our provinces. On this question there should be no difference of opinion. Party strengths in the central and provincial assemblies should not stand in the way of achieving this

objective. On this there should be no question of majority or minority. If they are in a majority there, we are in a majority here. Pakistan consists of two parts. Both parts have to prosper equally. We want power to be transferred. There is no other way out.

My dear friends and colleagues, As politicians go I have not had a very long political life. But in the past 15 years of my political life I have all along been fighting for the prestige, integrity and solidarity of Pakistan, especially since I became a Minister at the age of 30. I even stood up against a great power. Russia too is a great power. I fought against her Prime Minister in Tashkent. India is no ordinary country. It was said that we could not fight against her. But I fought against all of them, India, Russia and America. Why? I fought, and am prepared to fight even now against any big power for the sake of one Pakistan, for the honour of the largest Islamic state, for a socialist republic and for a Pakistan of its own people. I would consider it a great honour if I went to Dacca tomorrow and was killed there. I can sacrifice my life for Pakistan.

I have been weeping for my Bengali brothers. I am dying to be able to help them, because they are being killed. I cannot sleep these days. I have always served Bengal. Bengal is a part of this country. The Bengalis are our brothers. No one can say that I ever opposed the rights of the Bengalis during the eight years of my Ministership. I still remember the day when I went to Dacca after leaving the Ayub Government and my Bengali brothers stood up in the Dacca Stadium to give me an ovation. They clapped and raised slogans to welcome me. I have devoted myself to Bengal. I will sacrifice my life for the whole of Pakistan.

I have recently sent a telegram to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. After all I am not an untouchable. I am your representative. I sent this telegram in that capacity. It was not my personal telegram. I would say it took the heartbeat of the whole of West Pakistan with it. It was a reasonable proposal from West Pakistan. I have told Sheikh Mujibur Rahman I am ready to come to Dacca with a true heart and a sincerity of purpose. I have requested him to try to keep the country intact. I have no other objective. I want nothing else. I am prepared to give up politics for the sake of the country's integrity. I requested the Sheikh to meet me. I told him a compromise was possible. And now I appeal to you, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, please agree to compromise. It is possible.

Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, I say to you; you have made a mistake. I am prepared to work for Pakistan's integrity. Let us sit together. Let us go to the Assembly and frame a constitution there, so that Martial Law is buried and power transferred to the people. Let us form a Government. I once again appeal to you, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, and want to tell you that by ignoring my telegram you have ignored the whole of West Pakistan. But you cannot overlook the whole of

West Pakistan. You are a brother to me. I have regard for my Bengali brothers. I had warned the people of West Pakistan not to harm a single Bengali living here. I have ordered my party here to protect each and every Bengali, not because he is a Bengali, but because he is a Pakistani.

To us they are Pakistanis first. We therefore want to protect them all. So, once again I would say to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, with utmost sincerity, "Please don't act upon incorrect advice. Don't listen to wrong counsel. There can be a compromise. A constitution can be framed. Let those who have the support of the majority of people sit together and work out a compromise to their mutual satisfaction for the sake of Pakistan. But if you are to go on talking about a 'Bangla Desh', we too, in view of our majority, can talk about 'Sindh Desh' or 'Punjab Desh'.

But in that case it would be asked where has the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam gone? It would be asked why did a country like Pakistan for which 3 million Muslims sacrificed their lives, want to scuttle itself? On our part, we want a government, a strong government, a progressive government for the largest Islamic state in the world.

So my dear friend, Sheikh Mujib, if you are angry, be so only with me and not with the people of West Pakistan, although you have already hurt them by not replying to my telegram. But I still appeal to you to forget everything. We are ever prepared for talks. I am prepared to go to Dacca tomorrow. A compromise is possible. Let us get together at once as patriots, in order to work out a programme for the restoration of democracy, for the framing of a constitution and making the country prosperous.

How can I ignore the poor of my country. And how can I forget the support I have been given by the poor. How can I forget the people? I have to serve these people. I have to serve the poor in rags. I have to serve the rickshawalas. I have to serve those dying of hunger. I have to form governments. It is the people's verdict, not mine. They want us to come into power.

Now, why should the people want us to come into power? It is because they want their problems to be solved. And it is the People's Party alone which can serve them better and solve their problems.

The people have been persecuted for the last 23 years. This Party alone will serve them truly, and will make Pakistan stronger.

Pakistan Zindabad.

**Exploiters Rejected by Voters
Press Conference at Karachi,
March 15, 1971**

At Nishtar Park yesterday, the whole substance and tenor of my speech was a plea and a demand for maintaining of the unity of Pakistan. In the course of it I brought out the efforts made by me to reach an understanding with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman so that a united Pakistan could be maintained.

The Pakistan People's Party's position has remained consistent. It is not we who have demanded a constitution based on two economies and virtually two countries. We have said that in framing a constitution for Pakistan the West Wing must be heard and protection for its legitimate interests incorporated in the constitution. The East Wing has rightly complained of dictation by the West Wing in the past. This wrong must be undone but this cannot be done by reversing roles. In the conditions of Pakistan, divided as we are geographically into two parts, a constitution that is to endure can only be one that brings about a just partnership between the two wings.

The Pakistan People's Party has from its very inception fought for the transfer of power to the people. We say that power should be handed over to the representatives of the people in both the wings. We say that at the Centre power should be transferred to the majority parties of both the wings, and in the provinces to the majority parties in the provinces. Only such an arrangement will ensure the unity of Pakistan. We want a united Pakistan and that is why we want the united power of the majority parties of the two wings at the Centre. Those who are against such a transfer are against the unity of Pakistan.

In my speech yesterday I recounted what measures I had taken to make a compromise acceptable to the people of West Pakistan and to bring about an understanding between the two parts of the country. No one could have done more or gone further in this direction. My party has throughout made every effort to bring to public attention in the West Wing the capitalistic exploitation of the East Wing. I can only repeat my request to the leaders of the Awami League that they should not slander the fair name of the West Pakistani people – the sins of a handful of capitalist exploiters cannot be attributed to the people of West Pakistan. The same vested interests which in the past exploited the East Wing continue in their evil efforts to bring disunity between the people of the two Wings. They have been rejected by the people of the West Wing in the elections. Their views only appear in their own newspapers and are not heeded by the people here. Let not the people of the East Wing now pay heed to the voices from

the past. Let us, instead, join hands to eliminate exploitation and establish a new order for a united Pakistan.

**Attitude of Other Countries
Press Conference at Karachi,
April 14, 1971**

Because of the new Martial Law regulations promulgated on the 26th of the last month and in view of serious limitations, it is difficult to hold a press conference on the vital issues that confront the nation. Nevertheless, at the same time, when the crisis is as total as it is today, when the country is facing the gravest situation in its history of 23 years, it is necessary to take the people into confidence and to mobilise the people in order to overcome a situation as critical as the present one. I do not think that any serious national crisis can be successfully overcome without the full participation of the people. You will recall that during the 1965 war the people were fully utilised and they rendered an invaluable contribution to tide over the difficulties that our country faced at that time. With the blanket of Martial Law and its regulations, our inability to address public meetings and holding productive press conferences, activities get restricted and rumors spread around, whispering campaigns take place. All sorts of vile and unfounded stories get fabricated. This not only confuses public opinion but also demoralises the people and the problem is made more difficult because the world does not remain silent.

In the present age of communications the people listen to broadcasts of foreign countries. They manage to get newspapers from abroad and this kind of distorted information blurs the true picture. In the present crisis, the Indian press and All India Radio are indulging in wild attacks on Pakistan, fabricating stories and trying to confuse and confound public opinion in our country. Naturally, there is need for vigilance and need for sensible control. There is a dilemma both for political leaders and for the people, particularly for the political party that has a direct democratic responsibility to the people, particularly for "those leaders who have received a mandate, an overwhelming mandate from the people to represent and serve them.

Every citizen of Pakistan is concerned with the present crisis, but the responsibility of the elected representatives of the majority party here is indeed a special responsibility. We have taken important decisions and these decisions have had a bearing on the situation. The PPP feels that it does have a special responsibility in serving the people and in making its effective contribution to overcome the crisis. In the discussion that I had with President Yahya Khan on the first and second of this month we covered a wide range of subjects, we discussed the present crisis in depth and in these discussions I pointed out to the President the need for active association of the people in overcoming the political problems facing the country at present. I carried the impression after the meeting

that the President was alive to these problems and that progressively, depending on the situation in East Pakistan, he intends to associate the people and their representatives more comprehensively so that a total effort is made to have this terrible agony behind us as soon as possible.

During this crisis we have seen the attitude of many people inside the country and we have also noted the position taken by other countries. The present situation is complicated enough. I don't think it would be useful to further complicate it by going into details on the attitude adopted by certain countries. In any case, we believe that a national crisis of this magnitude can only be resolved by the people themselves. If we are determined to put our house in order, to restore normal conditions, to bury the legacy of the past and begin anew, we will come out of this crisis in spite of interference by foreign powers. As a matter of fact interference by foreign powers should make the people more determined to confront the challenge and to restore normal conditions.

This, notwithstanding, we cannot be unmindful of the role played by India in her efforts to bring about the disintegration of our country. India has violated all the normal, accepted and recognised rules of international conduct. India has violated the UN Charter. Her interference has been an affront to the principles of Bandung. India has played for a double standard: while she ruthlessly suppresses and holds in bondage the people of Jammu and Kashmir, she is trying to undermine the integrity of Pakistan. It is certain that the people of Pakistan will not allow India to succeed in her machinations. In the past also we have resisted and repelled Indian interference and Indian aggression and I know my people. I know they are capable once again of responding to the challenge of Indian interference. Actually, by interfering in this way India is adopting an extremely myopic attitude. As you sow, so shall you reap. India has all the conditions in her own country to reap the bitter harvest of interference. In this connection, in this matter of foreign interference, I speak with some diffidence but at the same time I consider it my duty to the people of Pakistan to register the strongest protest on behalf of the people of Pakistan and I have every right to speak for the people.

What is the attitude taken by the Soviet Union? The Soviet Union is a great neighbour of Pakistan. It is a great power. We seek good relations with all the states and naturally, we would like to have good relations with the great powers. We have made strenuous efforts to improve our relations with the Soviet Union. You'll recall that the first start in these relations came when I went to the Soviet Union in 1960 to conclude the Oil Agreement. An element of reciprocity is essential in the improvement of strained relations. The President of the Soviet Union deems it necessary to address a letter to our President on our internal crisis—on a matter which was and remains and will remain strictly within the

domestic jurisdiction of Pakistan. I am out of touch with foreign affairs. So I don't know whether it was a letter or a note. You'll have to read it to find out what it is. But whether it was a letter or a note it was blatant interference in the internal affairs of our country.

Naturally, we would like to see a political solution to the problems facing Pakistan. We made every effort to find a political solution. Once the situation comes under control, I am certain that a solution will be found. Once the situation comes under control, I am certain that the pieces will be picked up and renewed efforts will be made to arrive at a political settlement. For, only a political settlement can be a lasting settlement- But how we arrive at a political settlement, it is a matter which exclusively concerns the people of Pakistan. It is for them to determine in their better judgment what should be the nature of the settlement. We do not need advice from foreign countries on how we should proceed to settle our internal matters. We are neither a colony of another country susceptible to viceregal advice, nor do we fall within the hegemony of another country for this kind of advice to be given to us. I repeat, we shall find a political settlement but that is our concern. We do not have to be instructed or directed by a foreign country on the modus operandi for a settlement, nor did we have to be advised on whether to restore democracy or have any other system of governing our country.

On our part, we have admired the manner in which the Soviet Union has faced foreign aggression and foreign interference in the last 50 years of its history under socialism. We remember well how soon after the Leninist Revolution in the Soviet Union, the Soviet leaders and the Soviet people repelled foreign aggression and foreign interference. We have also noted how in these long years the Soviet Union consolidated her country by taking many measures, not all of them of a political nature, to safeguard the sovereignty of the Soviet Union.

We have known of countries going across their borders to safeguard what they term as their basic interests and we have seen how they have gone across their borders and what methods they have applied to safeguard what they term as their basic interests. We have not left the frontiers of Pakistan. We are within our frontiers and have every right to protect and safeguard our sovereignty. The Government of Pakistan has replied to the Soviet Union and reminded the Soviet Government of the United Nations Charter and the Bandung Principles. It is doubtful that the Soviet Union has forgotten the UN Charter and the Bandung Principles. What is regrettable is that the Soviet Union has forgotten Lenin and its socialist principles. The Soviet note was against the famous doctrine of the founder of the Soviet state on the question of state conduct in so far as interference in other people's affairs is concerned. It is one of the cardinal

principles of Leninism, Marxism and Socialism to refrain from interfering in the affairs of other countries.

What the Soviet Union is to be reminded of is not the UN Charter or the Bandung Principles but the teachings of Marxism and Leninism on the subject of foreign interference. In accordance with the teachings of Lenin and Marx, the People's Republic of China has taken a correct and just stand on our side and on the attitude of India and other countries about interference in our affairs. The assurance given by the People's Republic of China to Pakistan came only when it was crystal clear that there was foreign interference. After having satisfied itself that India was interfering in the internal affairs of Pakistan, China thought it her duty as a great Asian state, as a great power and as a neighbour of Pakistan and India to protest against the flagrant interference by another country in the internal affairs of Pakistan and to assure the people of Pakistan that China would support the just cause of the people of this country to resist foreign interference.

It would be much better for foreign countries to leave us alone to resolve our internal difficulties. We have a very serious problem on our hands and we would like to give our undivided and total attention to this problem. I do not want to make any comment at the attitude of some of the other countries. I say this because so far their attitude has been ambivalent. There is evidence of interference but the evidence has not been so conclusive as to draw the people's attention to it. However, we are watching the situation. If their interference does increase and we are satisfied that it is taking place we will certainly take our people into confidence. We will also take other necessary measures to deal with the situation. Since 1947 Pakistan has witnessed many emergencies but this is the gravest one that we have come across so far. I hope and pray that we draw the right conclusions from this crisis.

The present crisis is a legacy of past blunders. It would have been much easier, had we been able to find a constitutional and a political equation in the fifties. With the passage of time our problems have become more complicated. In those days the leaders who were responsible to the people failed to frame a constitution not because a constitution could not have been framed in those days but because they wanted to perpetuate themselves. This was a great blunder and we are suffering for it today. Another blunder, another mistake callous and crude in the extreme, was the appalling exploitation of the people. The Pakistan People's Party was the first West Wing based party to admit that the whole nation had been exploited and that the main exploitation had been of East Pakistan. We were the first to admit in our election manifesto that East Pakistan was treated like a colony.

We must face the ugly realities. In our search for a political settlement we must willingly give the people of East Pakistan their legitimate political rights and we must ensure that the exploitation of the majority of the people comes to a permanent end. We must evolve a system to live in a harmonious affinity under an equitable economic system, under the cover of democracy and under one flag. It may take a long time. It is not going to be an easy task. There is hatred and passion in the hearts of the people. But I am equally confident that with the right approach and a clear outlook we can surmount the present difficulties for all times.

In this connection, I would appeal to some individuals to learn from past mistakes and not make proposals on the future constitution. That would be misinterpreted by the people of East Pakistan. I do not know whether they are doing this in their innocence or there is some sinister objective behind it but this is hardly the time to talk about the restoration of parity or to talk about separate electorates or to talk about the division of Bengal into various provinces. What would be the reaction of the people of East Pakistan when they hear these fancy proposals? I do not want to elucidate on the subject. You can draw your own conclusions. They will naturally take it as yet another attempt by West Pakistan to extend its domination and hegemony over, them. They will think that we do not even want to let them have their natural political rights; that we want to deny them rights of the majority in the legislature. What legs will the patriotic elements have to stand on with such proposals coming from these individuals?

That is why I do not think these proposals are emanating from some genuine and innocent motives. The people who are making these proposals were always against Pakistan. Their hostility to the creation of Pakistan is a matter of record. Are they trying to seek by these means to further complicate the crisis? Do they want to achieve the dismemberment of Pakistan? One party that suffered an ignominious defeat in the elections and was against the creation of Pakistan, immediately after the elections, enthusiastically supported Sheikh Mujibur Rahman and his Six Points, is now very much active. A party that did not believe in Pakistan and does not believe in Pakistan cannot come to the rescue of Pakistan. If the Awami League is to be banned for wanting the dismemberment of Pakistan—and it has rightly been banned for that purpose—it would logically follow that those parties which opposed Pakistan should also be banned. They should not set about like a mighty colossus trying to overcome the crisis because they will only aggravate the crisis.

And why are these gentlemen busy condemning Indian aggression on a safe wicket? They should go on record properly and unambiguously to tell the nation how they stand on the Awami League's Six Points. Not only that, they should reconcile their earlier statements after the elections and up to the 25th of March

on the support they gave to the Awami League. We have in our possession the teleprinter messages exchanged between some people in East Pakistan and a notorious news agency of this country that came into being for anti-people activities..

Another forlorn and forsaken individual held a press conference in Karachi the other day. In the press conference he said that the attacks on him were PPP-inspired. He denied what is now called the London Plan. The poor man said that he had nothing to do with it. He went on to explain the talks he had had with certain other people and when he had them and why he went to London? If there was nothing in the 'London Plan,' if there was no such thing as the 'London Plan,' why did this gentlemen not deny it when it was first mentioned? If I am not wrong, I think, the first mention about this plan was made about two years ago. At that time there was no denial by any of them. Even now during this crisis there are frequent references to the 'London Plan' not only by political parties but also by the newspapers in their despatches and articles.

During their stay in East Pakistan, after the 21st of March, these leaders went about in vehicles carrying the Bangla Desh flag. They called Sheikh Mujibur Rahman their leader and their future Prime Minister. This particular gentleman said that he had a long association of over 13 years with Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. So really there has to be a book on the tragedy of the last 23 years and particularly on this crisis. This time there should be an authentic voice on the subject so that mistakes are not repeated in the future.

**Power Must Be Transferred
Public Meeting at Hyderabad,
September 8, 1971**

I have no hesitation in making it clear today that our main interest is not in power being transferred to PPP. Our purpose, with the support of the people, is to continue to struggle against the oppressive rule of capitalists and industrialists. We are being asked to fulfill our election pledges. Maybe there is no pressure on the Government but we are under tremendous pressure from students, peasants and workers. They want to see prosperity come to the people of Pakistan. Those who offered sacrifices for Pakistan wish to see their dreams come true. It is unfortunate that vested interests are engaged in conspiracies against the People's Party.

We are not hankering after power. Who would want power at this stage when rulers have reduced the country to a state where the exchequer is empty? But we owe a duty to the electorate. We therefore, feel that the President should take an immediate decision. No problem can be solved by ignoring the people, nor can the present crisis be resolved.

I am 43 and I have the strength and courage to organise a movement. When the time comes I will prove it. Those who oppose the transfer of power are toadies and conspirators. We know who they are and who is at their back. A demand for fresh elections is being made. It is an evil conspiracy hatched by defeated politicians. The President has already ruled it out but the demand continues. It is strange that no action is being taken against them. My party has decided that if fresh elections are held, we will not participate in them although we would win a more derisive victory than in the last elections.

We did not frame the Legal Framework Order. We did not hold the elections. It is not we who have repeatedly declared that power will be transferred to a representative government. Why is there no civilian government in Pakistan? During the Second War, there was a civilian government in Britain, a representative government. The press and courts remained free. What is happening in Pakistan today? On the one hand, there is a committee which is said to be considering Pakistan's withdrawal from the Commonwealth; on the other, an economic delegation is preparing to leave for Britain. The Indo-Soviet Treaty is criticised and at the same time the Foreign Secretary is sent on a visit to Moscow. There is utter confusion.

I warn the conspirators that they should cease their conspiracies. We will defeat all enemies of the people. When I was a student in Bombay, the Quaid-i-Azam

directed me to lead a demonstration of the students. Our commitment is total. Let me make it clear that if the conspiracies against us do not stop, we will see how mills and banks continue to function, how the educational institutions remain open. There have been changes among the Government's Advisers. These changes are futile. Advisers cannot be impartial, nor do we accept unrepresentative Governors. We want a complete transfer of power because only the people's representatives can solve the people's problems.

Let Democracy Return
Speech at the Quaid's Mausoleum Karachi,
September 11, 1971

If you listen to me in silence, I shall be obliged for we have no loudspeakers. We have come here to pay homage to Quaid-i-Azam and rekindle his memory. I had no plan to speak but on September 6 some gentlemen came here and made speeches. I, therefore, hope that the Government will have no objection if I speak to you. It is strange, however, that speeches are not allowed at the Mausoleum of the Father of the Nation. Isn't it ironic that even here, the most honoured of places, we are not allowed to speak from our heart. But I will speak to you with complete sincerity, from the depths of my soul. I will speak in the interest of the country. I will speak for the restoration of the rights of the people of Pakistan. This is necessary today because for long I have been demanding that political freedom be restored. If there are restrictions placed on the people and their leaders so that they cannot get together, then the gulf between the government and the governed widens even further. It is a basic principle of democracy that no such restriction should prevail. Without freedom, no problem can be solved, not to speak of the grave crisis through which Pakistan is passing today.

Brothers, as Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, an individual, I am nothing. You are my power and my strength. No government in the world can solve its problems without the co-operation and support of its people. Ever since this tragic crisis enveloped the country, I have called for its solution through the help, support and power of the people. No problem can be solved through oppression, through bullets, through force. A few months ago when I said this first, a number of sycophants and defeated politicians said that this amounted to treachery. Had democracy been restored then, we would not be in this sorry state today. These people claim to be the lieutenants of the Quaid-i-Azam. They claim to have taken part in the Pakistan movement. They are the same people who used to say that they would not accept Ayub Khan's one-man constitution. Why are they silent now? Why are they tongue-tied today?

These people are not your friends. First, they wanted elections for the return of democracy. Elections were held. The people gave their verdict. Today, these people are not prepared to accept this verdict. This was not my verdict. It was not their verdict. It was the verdict of the people. Why are they conspiring now? I repeat that if power is not transferred to the people, this crisis will not find a solution. What happened in East Pakistan can happen in West Pakistan as well. I said so many times in the past that bloodshed was imminent, that a civil war was in the offing that a great crisis was brewing. Four years ago, I wrote in my book that a war appears likely. My campaign speeches are on record. They can be

read. I warned of this crisis. I repeated it everywhere. See what happened. East Pakistan is as much a part of Pakistan as West Pakistan. It is the majority province. How tragic it is that today, Muslim is slaying Muslim in this Islamic country.

This can happen in West Pakistan also. But, I warn the powers that be that we will not permit bloodshed here. We will not permit another Jallianwala Bagh. The Quaid-i-Azam made Pakistan with the sacrifices of the people, the common people. Why did thousands perish in this struggle? What was the dream that was Pakistan? It was to be a country where justice would prevail, where democracy and social and economic justice would reign supreme, where the poor would prosper, where there would be joy and happiness for the worker and the peasant. Pakistan was to be a country for the Muslims, without social and economic distinctions or the superiority of race and birth. That is why the Muslims of the subcontinent struggled for this goal. That is why they made sacrifices.

Oh! my Quaid, did you dream of the Pakistan that we are living in today? Was it your concept, your dream? Did you have this Pakistan in mind when, speaking to the first Constituent Assembly, you said that you were indebted to the Members for having chosen you as their President. Why did the Quaid say that? He was a democrat and he respected the democratic process. He felt honoured by it. And do you recall what he said once? He said he was confident that Pakistan's first Assembly would set an example for the whole world to follow. He said it would have two responsibilities: to frame a constitution and to ensure its complete independence and sovereignty. He said that the constitution will be made by the elected representatives of the people. He had given the guidelines by saying that it would be a constitution based on the principles of Islam, on social justice, on egalitarianism. He wanted a just Islamic order. These are his words. I am reading them out to you. No constitution that has not been framed by the representatives of the people can last. There have been many constitutions but they did not last. The 1956 Constitution did not last because it was not framed by the people's representatives. The 1962 Constitution also failed because of this reason. Elections have been held. There is an Assembly in existence. These are popular decisions, reflecting the people's will. Nobody can supersede them.

The Quaid-i-Azam had said, "You are free people today. You have everything. You have the resources and the will. You have to make this a prosperous country. You can bring to an end poverty and privation." Oh! my Quaid, you created this country for the people, not for the few who are today holding absolute power. Oh! my Quaid, I have come to you today to protest. I have come to protest on behalf of students, workers, peasants and intellectuals. I have come to protest because workers are being laid off, because peasants are being ejected.

Was this your concept of Pakistan? Was this the Pakistan you had struggled for? Today, students are being lashed. For the last 23 years, my Quaid, your people have groaned under repression. We cannot even speak at your resting place. What sin have we committed? What is our crime? We divided the subcontinent so that we should be free, so as to be able to live our own lives. Be our witness Oh! Quaid, that today we are forbidden to open our mouths. Silence has been imposed on us. Speak, speak my Quaid, when will this night of oppression end? When will the sun of oppression finally set? We have forgotten what happened to the rule of law. We have forgotten its meaning. We do not understand what justice means. We have forgotten what an egalitarian order is like. For years now we have been completely unaware of the existence of these things that you used to speak about. My Quaid, do you recall the promises that you made to us? Do you remember the dreams that you made us see? Oh! my Quaid, in India where the Brahmins rule, the Prime Minister can speak to multitudes, but in your country we are forbidden to even address ten people. Oh! my Quaid, speaking in Chittagong you had said that public servants should carry out their duties like public servants. You had said that they were the servants of the people not their masters. You had said that they were paid from the public coffers and should remain faithful to their oath that they should serve the people. You had said that they should not meddle in politics or align themselves with one political party or other. You had also said that they should be faithful to the political party in office.

Oh! my Quaid, is this justice that the bureaucracy has cast its black shadow over the entire country? Where is democracy and the rights of the majority? What is happening in villages? There are two uncrowned kings in every district, the Deputy Commissioner and the Superintendent of Police. They are beyond accountability. They do what they will. My friends. I am holding in my hand a book containing the Quaid's sayings his thoughts. He made Pakistan and he told us that there will be a people's rule in Pakistan. Why are we being denied? Why are we not getting our democratic rights? Let me tell you our crime. We wrote a manifesto which enshrined the rights of the poor. the toiling masses, the outer humanity. We raised aloft the banner of the peasants and the workers. That is our crime.

Conditions are deteriorating every day. The crisis is deepening. We are told one thing one day and another thing the next day. There is a limit to hypocrisy. The people have given us political responsibility. We will fight every political change. Why should we not ask who is or is not in your jails? Why should we not ask why the Government has declared a general amnesty? If the entire responsibility is that of the Government, then I declare that we shall not be responsible for the consequences. Shall we not ask how one day you dub a man a traitor and the next day you declare him a patriot? We have a right and we will struggle. We

will resist. We will fight. We have resisted before. We will resist again. I know that the occupied and sycophant press tells lies. It distorts facts. It is said that we are power hungry. I make a promise at the Quaid's mausoleum that we are not power hungry. We don't care about power. The People's Party won the majority of seats from West Pakistan. This is a reality. This is the verdict of the people. I am saying it aloud that the country's economy has been destroyed. We are standing on the edge of the precipice. There is nothing left in the national exchequer. The people are in despair. They come to me and say that they are being oppressed. They come to me with their demands. We, therefore, demand the transfer of power. This is a sign of our patriotism. If the Government is afraid of our party let it transfer power to a minority party. At least they will be representing a few lakh people, if not seventy million as we do. You think that we are hankering after power, all right, do not transfer power to us. Transfer power to a minority. At least it will be a representative government of sorts. There will be an Assembly. There will be democracy. Can we make a greater sacrifice?

For God's sake, restore democracy. Bring this game of hide and seek to an end; stop playing cat and mouse. Or else, have the decency to say in so many words that you do not wish to transfer power. Say that we are not fit for democracy, that you are not prepared to step down from the high chair you are occupying, say that no one has the power to force you down from it. Every four months you make a new speech over the radio. Have you ever heard of a government anywhere in the world which should claim to be interim and which should remain in power for three years? Oh my God, is there nothing in our fate except an interim government? No interim government should last more than a few weeks or months.

Oh! my Quaid, we have come to complain to you. We made sacrifices for Pakistan and this is how we are being treated. We can make more sacrifices. Tell us, our leader, what we should do.

Oh! my Quaid, bear witness to it. We are making this pledge at your mausoleum. We took the revolutionary way. We brought about a revolution against Ayub's dictatorship. We won the elections. We have struggled and sacrificed but power remains denied to the people.

Oh! my Quaid, the last 43 years of my life I have lived like a man. I will live like a man. I do not wish to die like a rat. We will serve the people. We will remain with the people, no matter what happens. Life and death are, after all, in the hands of God.

Oh! my Quaid, if we decide to live, how should we live? All around us is darkness. Shall we continue to live in the clutches of the bureaucracy? Shall we live under the night of oppression? How shall we live?

Oh! my poor people, my starving people, sons of my workers and peasants, how long shall we live like this? How long shall we bear this repression? Come my workers, my peasants, let us all get together and break ourselves free of these chains of oppression and injustice. Let us all raise our hands and pray at this place, "God Almighty, let there be justice in Pakistan. Let there be prosperity. Let there be light. Let democracy return to this troubled country. Let us pray for strength so that we should be able to follow the Quaid-i-Azam's teachings and defend his Pakistan."

End This Long Night of Terror
Press Statement at Karachi,
September 29, 1971

Nearly ten months ago the first ever general elections were held in Pakistan. In the West Wing the people gave their overwhelming verdict in favour of the Pakistan People's party. This victory at the polls was the culmination of my party's struggle against the dictatorship of Ayub Khan. The people gave their verdict in our favour because, in overthrowing Ayub Khan, we had fought for the people's rights and for the restoration of the sovereignty of the people, for a new order. In less than two years, the People's Party mobilised a despondent people, charged them with confidence to defy and defeat both on the streets and at the polls the combined efforts of all the forces of reaction. The People's Party thus demonstrated its strength both in the revolutionary and democratic methods. This achievement is without parallel.

In the months of February and March, following the general elections, Pakistan went through a traumatic experience. The agony of this tragedy has not yet ended. A part of this story is narrated in my book, "The Great Tragedy," which appears today. It will show why the Pakistan People's Party wanted a grand coalition of the majority parties of the two Wings, how before the postponement of the National Assembly session announced by President Yahya Khan on the 1st of March we made every effort to meet the essential demands of East Pakistan, and how after that date we maintained that any proposal to resolve the deadlock should be put to the newly elected representatives in the National Assembly, empowered to frame a constitution.

With the divergent and conflicting needs of the two Wings accentuated by an iniquitous economic system and the cumulative mistakes of the past, it was virtually impossible to arrive at a constitutional settlement with the Awami League within the short span of two months. In the national interest I pressed President Yahya Khan, on the 11th of February in Rawalpindi, to permit us about six weeks' time to make an earnest endeavour to arrive at such a settlement, but instead the Assembly was summoned to meet on the 3rd of March. The validity of our position has now been belatedly confirmed by President Yahya Khan in his broadcast to the nation on the 28th of June 1971 when he disclosed that Sheikh Mujibur Rahman had "clearly indicated" to him that "all the major provisions of the Constitution would be settled by the political parties in parleys outside the Assembly."

Many calculatedly false and insidious accusations have been levelled against my party for its role after the elections. But we are confident that when the storm of

the great tragedy of 1971 passes – when in the West Wing the politicians get over the humiliation of their defeat by us, and in the East Wing the hatred which the Awami League directed against us after the elections gradually disappears – the role of the Pakistan People’s Party, in attempting to avert this crisis, will stand vindicated. It will be seen how consistently we tried to arrive at a just settlement of the grave problems facing Pakistan, but how the sinister conspiracy of vested interests thwarted us at every turn.

One great tragedy has very nearly brought about the end of Pakistan. We must now do all in our power to stop the final tragedy which will bring doom in its wake. But, instead of appreciating the gravity of the situation instead of extending co-operation to the victorious party, the schemers and intriguers continue to impede our attempts to find a solution to save Pakistan. Let it be known that we cannot, and will not, allow the forces of reaction to destroy Pakistan.

On the 28th of June, 1971, President Yahya Khan, departing from his Legal Framework Order, put forward a new plan for the restoration of democracy. All the other political leaders immediately acclaimed the announcement. On account of its serious implications, the scheme required reflection in depth. I, therefore, informed our people that I would make my party’s position known not in a hurry but after a period of about two months. After our negotiations with the regime had reached a certain point, on the 27th of August, I was able to promise the people of Pakistan that I would put forward my party’s position on the negotiations, whatever the outcome, before the end of September. Today, I am fulfilling that promise. I propose to place before the people of Pakistan what has transpired since the 28th of June and the efforts made by my party to assert the sovereignty of the people. Events have shown that, although some doubts and misgivings may have arisen over our long silence, national interest has been served by remaining silent during the negotiations with the regime on the grave constitutional issues.

On the 6th of July, I left for Teheran for a few days on the invitation of the Government of Iran. Taking advantage of my brief absence from the “country, the enemies of the people indulged in a fresh wave of petty intrigues. On my return to Pakistan, we held a meeting of the Central Committee at Islamabad on the 15th of July. After careful scrutiny of the 28th June plan, we came to the conclusion that it was contrary to the people’s expectations and not in conformity with the requirements of the situation. When I met the President on the 16th and 17th of July in Rawalpindi, I informed him that the solution to the country’s problems fundamentally lay in honouring the rights of the people, and that the crisis the nation was witnessing could not be overcome without the participation of the people, without the people controlling their national destiny, without the

people's government. I reminded the President of his categorical assurances that he would not allow a handful of trouble-makers to destroy the country and that the misdeeds of a few could not nullify the general elections. I pointed out that the elected representatives had a mandate to frame the constitution within the concept of one Pakistan. The history of Pakistan had shown that without the sanction of the people no constitution could be durable. Only the will of the people could give permanence to the constitution. I informed President Yahya Khan that as I had refused to put my thumb impression on Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's dictated constitution in the Assembly, I could not betray the people by rubber-stamping a constitution dictated by the President outside the Assembly. To be fair to President Yahya Khan I must state that he appreciated this position and agreed to continue the talks at the end of July in Karachi.

On the 29th of July, President Yahya Khan, along with his aides, met me and my advisers in Karachi, and we discussed in greater detail the character of the Assembly. I emphasised that the People's Party did not seek a confrontation with the regime as this would lead the country to disaster. If there was trouble in the West Wing also, the world would think that there must indeed be something basically wrong with Pakistan, and this would be most unfair and damaging to our people. However, I made it clear that if the people were to be deceived by putting our opponents into power through machinations, we would be duty bound to resist such a trumped up government to the bitter end. We could not countenance such a fraud being practiced on the people. I also pointed out that it was a calumny to propagate the charge that the People's Party was hungry for power. 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 knew 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.

In the Karachi meeting at the end of July, we proposed a formula which we believed would reconcile the President's announcement of 28th June, and our commitment to the people. As a result, the President assured us that he had no desire to impose a constitution and therefore agreed to our formula in principle. It was settled that our advisers would meet to evolve the details. The next round of meetings took place in Rawalpindi. I met the President on the 25th of August and our respective advisers met separately on the 25th, 26th and 27th of August. At the meeting between our respective advisers, the attitude adopted by Mr. Cornelius, the President's Legal Adviser, was, to say the least, baffling. However, on my instructions our advisers pressed that the character of the National

Assembly as a constituent body should be recognised. At these meetings we also gave our position on the necessity for a bicameral legislature essential for a federal structure, on the directive principles of state policy, on the principle of electorate, on the permanent amendment procedure for the constitution and, most important, on our understanding of fundamental rights. We reiterated that the People's Party was resolved to struggle for people's sovereignty, so that poverty, illiteracy, and all forms of exploitation of man by man, and of region by region, be banished, and that the right of man to employment, and fair payment for labour, the right to education, and the right to maintenance in old age, sickness and disability be established and guaranteed in our country as a constitutional obligation.

Since the regime had agreed in principle to the fundamental issue which we raised as early as July, we failed to understand why the regime protracted the negotiations. The urgency of the issue required early if not immediate decision. It appeared to us as if the talks were being spun out to accommodate the reactionary forces opposed to the transfer of power. In this way, precious time was being lost to the peril of the country. In the circumstances I was constrained to speak on behalf of the people and their aspirations at Hyderabad on the 7th of September, and at the Mazar of the Quaid-i-Azam on the 11th of September while observing the Quaid's death anniversary. In the shadow of this tension I met President Yahya Khan on the 13th of September at Karachi before his departure for Teheran. We discussed the critical situation facing the country. In this connection my last meeting with President Yahya Khan was in Karachi on the 18th of September. In both these meetings the President pointed out that all the other political parties and leaders had agreed to his plan as announced on the 28th of June. However, noting the wishes of my party, which represented the wishes of the majority of the people at this time, he had evolved a method which he believed would reconcile the exigencies and urgencies of the crisis, with the expression of the peoples will. He informed me that in the circumstances, with the country nearly at war with India he could not go further to meet that demand. On the night of the 18th September, the President's statement to this effect was broadcast to the nation.

Taking everything into account, the announcement of the 18th of September is a step forward in the right direction. Whereas under the previous announcement of June 28th, the National Assembly was to act only as a legislative body under a constitution to be given by the President, the new plan announced on the 18th of September clearly recognised the constituent character of the Assembly. Firstly, what is now being prepared by the President's Committee of Officials, is a provisional constitution, to be given final shape after full consideration by the National Assembly; and secondly, the very fact that amendments to the provisional constitution are to be passed by a simple majority upholds the

sovereignty of the Assembly as a constituent body. It is also a step forward in that whereas under the Legal Framework Order the President could reject the entire constitution passed by the Assembly without assigning any reason, under the plan announced on the 18th of September, the President has pledged that he would accept any change provided it did not adversely affect the territorial integrity and solidarity of our nation or the ideology on which Pakistan is based. In pursuance of this statement, the Chief Election Commissioner announced on the 19th of September a time-schedule for the by-elections in East Pakistan to be completed by the 19th of December. A few days later, revising the time-table, the Chief Election Commissioner provided for the by-elections to be completed by the-23rd of December.

I must make it clear that if the President's pledge is to take tangible form, four essential matters are required to be fulfilled:

In the first place, the amended Legal Framework Order must be promulgated incorporating the announcement of the 18th of September and clarifying certain points arising there from. For example, it should stipulate the form of consensus that would not vitiate the principle of simple majority. It should also provide for further by-elections in East Pakistan if some of the 88 members who have retained their seats do not attend the Assembly. In addition, it must state whether the 90-day period includes the time it would take for the President to consider the amendments and the Assembly to reconsider them, should the President return the amendments. If the Legal Framework Order can be amended with alacrity to allow the nominated Ministers in East Pakistan to contest the by-elections, it is imperative that amendments of national purport should not be delayed.

In the second place, the terms of the draft constitution should not act as a dyke to prevent the programme of reform. As I have stated, we have given our position to the President on certain matters pertaining to the constitution. We also have firm views on the question of autonomy and have said that we cannot countenance the imposition again of One Unit in any form. However, as we have not participated in the drafting of the constitution, nor have we seen the terms of the draft, we can but await its early publication to solicit public opinion.

Thirdly, constitutional governments should be formed both at the centre and in the provinces immediately after the National Assembly meets to consider the constitution. My party's position is that the announcement of 18th September should not be made an excuse to delay the process of democratisation by three months. It must not be forgotten that the main justification for the President's presenting a provisional constitution has been that the people's government should start functioning without loss of time.

We believe the main task before us today is to save the country. Even constitution-making must of necessity take a secondary role. No further time can be lost. Already too much time has elapsed before the transfer of power. The lack of urgency that one feels pervading Islamabad is indeed striking. In a situation where hours and days should matter, months have been allowed to pass. We know what the people want and have faithfully reflected their aspirations. We have been consistent in our attitude. As the majority party of this Wing, we believe that we have the right to be, at the very least, informed of the Government's major decisions, but unfortunately we are kept in the dark. In most countries the people are taken into the Government's confidence before major decisions are made, but here, although my party speaks for the people, we are considered interlopers and trespassers when we merely ask to be informed of important decisions. The latest and most conspicuous example of this has been the sudden announcement of the general amnesty for those struggling for Bangla Desh. I must make it clear that we do not want to be associated with the decisions of the government, we merely seek information so as to understand the decisions and to prepare for the future. Even this much liaison is resented. We fail to comprehend why such an attitude is adopted by a regime seeking to transfer power to the elected representatives of the people.

The internal situation is in a state of disarray. Under these chaotic conditions I do not have the temerity to speak with authority on our external relations but it seems that in this field the chaos is complete. We would urge the regime not to take any fundamental decisions in the field of foreign affairs in these two months. We are deeply concerned over the rumours about a Four-Power intervention in Indo-Pakistan affairs to the exclusion of the People's Republic of China. We would not like to see any intervention by outside powers; and in any case, whatever the efforts on the diplomatic level these should await the emergence of a responsible government. Only a responsible government will be able to speak on behalf of the people of Pakistan to the external world. We are opposed to an interim government taking decisions of a permanent nature in domestic affairs, and we are all the more averse to such decisions being taken on foreign affairs. An internal mistake can be rectified more easily than an external blunder. Whether we are capable or not to cope with it, one is within our control, the other is outside our control and as such more damaging in its repercussions.

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. This is clear from the pathetic situation prevailing in the country and from the prognosis of the world outside. Why should God repeatedly and continuously come to Pakistan's rescue? For God helps those who help themselves. Let me now put everyone on notice that the present regime cannot cope with the mess. Any new Government

which assumes responsibility in Pakistan in the near future will require the next six months before it can even hope to turn the tide. It is essential that the next year's budget be prepared by a progressive government enjoying popular support. Retrenchment of labour and eviction of peasants have to be stopped, relief must be given to the peasantry and many more urgent and immediate steps have to be undertaken. As it is this is a Herculean undertaking. It is made more complicated with the passage of time.

Let me tell you, my countrymen that as each day passes I get more convinced that the only way out of the dreadful political and economic crisis facing Pakistan is to give power to the people. President Yahya Khan has repeatedly pledged that he will restore power to the people of Pakistan, to whom it rightly belongs. But the vested interests and the bureaucracy are engaged in a conspiracy to oppose the President's wish to restore democracy. They will devise means to advise President Yahya Khan not to yield to the will and the verdict of the people. Such men will never tolerate the common and united rule of the people. Their concept of the solidarity of Pakistan is to be found in totally exploiting the country, humiliating the people, and keeping the people half-naked and half-starved. We want to assure President Yahya Khan that he will have our support to crush this evil conspiracy against democracy, so that the will of the people prevails.

The enemies of the people are advising the regime to take refuge in the threat of war with India. No doubt there is a threat of war, but this threat will always be there unless the outstanding issues are settled between the two countries. The threat cannot be met, nor the issues settled, without the firm resolve of a united people. It cannot be met by a suffering country whose wounds are unsuccessfully bandaged by Martial Law. Nobody wants war, but if there is war it will be total war, which must mean the total participation of the people. How can the people respond when even public meetings are not permitted? How can the masses be galvanised into action without a popular government, without the strength of democracy, without their chosen leaders taking charge of the situation?

At this critical juncture when the existence of the state is in danger, we naturally would not like to come into conflict with the Generals' regime. But I ask you, my friends, how long can we go on testing the intentions of the regime? Elections took place ten months ago. On one pretext or another, with one contradiction after another, the abominable status quo is being maintained. It is our solemn duty to expose the mischief and machinations of the bureaucrats and vested interests, the lackeys and the agent provocateurs. The people should not be caught unprepared and unguarded – they should be ready to react, to hit back at those who, by force or fraud, seek to strike them. Such subterfuges as the

appointment of civilian Governors and additional Advisers for an interim period are unacceptable and cannot hope to work. This exercise in futility is ostensibly being carried out for only a transitory period. But let us not forget that for the past two-and-a-half years the Martial Law regime has chosen to describe itself as an interim Government. In the process, the people feel that Pakistan is itself becoming interim. Let us put an end to this uncertain state of affairs. The answer lies not in appointing more Advisers but in summoning the Assembly to perform its sovereign functions and in restoring constitutional government. This the regime should do before the year 1971 is out or declare unambiguously that it will not relinquish power to the people. Any sham arrangement to perpetuate the existing order will be read by the people as a denial of democracy.

East Pakistan is in flames; the whole country is in near ruin. How will Pakistan be rescued if new fires are to erupt in other parts of the country? And erupt they will if the people's rights are not recognised. These rights cannot be denied by force for they are legitimate, inherent and indestructible. It must be noted that our demands on behalf of the people are for the solidarity of the country and the well-being of the people as a whole, and totally different from those of the Awami League whose leadership sought to wreck Pakistan. We simply cannot be tarred with the same brush. It would be a monstrous injustice to the people of Pakistan to equate the two. Patriots and traitors cannot be equated. To reduce a complex problem to its essentials without getting involved in the debate over autonomy and secession, the PPP is not in league with India, Pakistan's mortal enemy, to destroy our nationhood.

The Government has granted a general amnesty in East Pakistan in the midst of the crisis. The terms of the general amnesty are riddled with contradictions, appearing to cater for a dual purpose. As a political party we are fully equipped to deal with every situation as it arises. We have not shirked any responsibility in the past and we will not recoil from it in the future. But I think we have a right to say that if goondas, arsonists, murderers and rapists are to be suddenly released in East Pakistan along with political dissidents, we fail to understand why the progressive forces in East Pakistan are still being singled out for victimisation. If fascists, secessionists and those who have been described by President Yahya Khan as enemies of Pakistan are to be pardoned, we see no reason why peasants and labourers here are detained for seeking their rights or why students, poets and professors should be arbitrarily arrested and lashed. And, above all, it is important to point out that a general amnesty is always granted after a civil war is over. By this single action, the Government has admitted the crisis has ended, and therefore nothing now remains in the way of the forces of democracy being put into full motion without further delay.

We simply cannot be shaken in the belief that it is our moral duty, indeed a point of honour, to fulfill the people's mandate. There is no other way out of the crisis. Let me make it clear that no gimmick or subterfuge can succeed any longer. "Surfeiting, the appetite may sicken, and so die" to quote Shakespeare. Hated and rejected politicians are unfit to grapple with the grave issues of war and peace. Surely, the time has come for a change, and this even the regime cannot deny. This change cannot be brought by desperate and last minute efforts of the regime's bureaucrats to achieve the barren union of the three Leagues and other moribund parties. What is needed is a wind of change, a breath of fresh air, a new style invigorating in its actions and inspiring in its leadership. The change must be brought about by the newly elected forces, by a reconciliation through the introduction of Islamic Socialism and democracy as enunciated by the Founder of Pakistan and resurrected as our credo by the Pakistan Peoples Party.

There is no justification left for continuing the ban on political activities. The dialogue between the people and their leaders must be restored forthwith. Without this communication we cannot steer the country in the right direction. By-elections should be held not later than the revised schedule announced by the Chief Election Commissioner on the 21st of September, so that the National Assembly can meet without further delay. Immediately after that, the Assembly should be called into session to have the final say on the constitution, and simultaneously popular governments should be installed at the centre and in the provinces to contribute collectively to save Pakistan from being wrecked.

O' my people! Let this long night of terror and uncertainty come to an end. I want your voice to prevail. Flood or rain, drought or famine, the whole process of democratisation should be completed before the twilight of this year. If the democratic process is not thus put into motion, God is my witness, that all constitutional means will have been exhausted. Then there will only be two alternatives: either to pack up and sit at home, leave politics to the caprices of the Generals, and bid fare farewell to Pakistan; or to continue the struggle of Jinnah and Iqbal to seek democracy and social justice come what may. Time and again I have declared that my struggle on behalf of the people is both inside and outside the Assembly. Let not things come to such a pass that if the Assembly is not called into session in either the capital in the East or West Wing, then the people call their own assemblies to session in the barren hills of Baluchistan, in the paddy fields of Bengal, in the mountains of Sarhad, in the plains of the Punjab and in the deserts of Sind. I apologise to the people if they are fatigued by our lugubrious documentation but our experience of the past and dealings in the present leave us with no alternative. I owe this record to the people of my ravaged country and I owe it to history.

I am not giving any ultimatum or threat. I am too small a person to extend threats. I am only putting forth the reality and melody of politics. To conclude with Lenin's words:

"Man's dearest possession is life, and since it is given to him to live but once, he must so live as not to be seared with the shame of a cowardly and trivial past, so live as not to be tortured for years without purpose, so live that dying he can say: "All my life and my strength were given to the first cause in the world—the liberation of mankind."

**A Change of Rules
Press Conference at Karachi,
September 29, 1971**

I think you must have read in the papers that after the PPP Central Committee meeting we pressed the Government to convene the National Assembly session by the end of this year and to induct popular governments both at the centre and the provinces by the beginning of next year. We gave a number of reasons for the need to keep to this time-table. Enough time has been wasted. We find that time is really slipping away. We are convinced that the sooner the people are given their responsibilities the better it would be for Pakistan. We believe that the next six months are extremely important. I said in Quetta recently that we need at least six months. In these six months, especially in winter, a lot of travelling can be done, a lot of public meetings can be held and you can really get to the people. We can go out to the people in these six to eight months. Communication and dialogue with the people, winning their confidence and letting them know what is happening what the consequences would be, is most important. If any catastrophe comes, the people must be ready and mobilised. This I consider essential. For a long time now political activity has been banned and, therefore, it is all the more necessary to restore communication with the people.

Apart from that we believe that many other matters have to be taken up at the executive level and in the legislature. We have to pass many laws. We have to take many reformative measures. We have to try and put the economy on the rails. That also means that the Government must have sufficient time and be well-acquainted with the administrative problems on an executive level to be able to give the people a budget which, we hope for the first time, will really be a people's budget. If, for one reason or the other, it is considered that there should be a further delay, then I am afraid it would be difficult to retrieve the position.

Under the present circumstances, there is Martial Law in the country and there is a grave emergency in East Pakistan and, therefore, we believe that it is necessary for the general atmosphere to be right and congenial for the holding of elections.

As for the announcement yesterday that the Governor and the provincial ministers would be allowed to contest elections in East Pakistan while the Presidential Council of Ministers would not be allowed to do so, I would not like to make a comment. The answer rests with the authorities. They shall be asked to reconcile the two different positions. However, there are also nominated gentlemen who are in the provincial cabinet. What is more interesting in my opinion is that when it comes to matters of this nature amendments are brought about in the Legal Framework Order, with great proficiency. When it comes to

more urgent matters, I think, far too much time is given for reflection and stagnation.

As to the question whether elections will be free and fair in the presence of these provincial ministers, we will have to see. Only time will tell. If the elections are fair, we shall be very glad to contest them or we will abandon them under protest. Essentially, we are confining our attention to the basic problem, the problem of problems, which is the transfer of power to the people as soon as possible. We are not interested in side issues.

We have to be prepared for all eventualities. It is our duty to the people to make them vigilant and to prepare them for these eventualities. If the people are not aware, partly it will be the fault of the leadership. The people must be informed of all possibilities. For that reason we are discharging our duty to warn the people against the conspiracies directed against them. The people are aware of these conspiracies. They have been going on for a long time. Ever since the death of Quaid-i-Azam and Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan, the people of Pakistan have been the victims of one conspiracy after another.

Now they are aware of the realities of the situation. They know how they have been cheated and robbed of their rights. The last general elections have shown that the people of Pakistan are awake and aware of the situation, especially when the situation is getting more difficult for the country. These conspiracies are continuing. As a matter of fact, not only are they continuing, but intensifying. It becomes essential for us to pinpoint the factors that are involved, the factors that are trying to prevent the people from attaining their democratic and economic rights. We cannot fail in doing our duty to the people of Pakistan. We cannot let them down.

I have been asked about the applicability of the general amnesty declared in East Pakistan. As far as the general amnesty is concerned, I have only pointed out some of the anomalies. General amnesty, as we understand the term, is granted at the end of a crisis. When the civil war was over in the United States, in Spain, in Nigeria and various other countries, it was given. It is only at the end of a civil war, when the emergency ends, when the conflict is over and when genuinely normal conditions are restored that general amnesty is granted. I don't think there is a parallel or a precedence of general amnesty being granted in the middle of a crisis. The crisis is not over. The situation has not returned to normal. In this situation, it is an anomaly to use the words 'general amnesty.' We should have used some other words or some other terminology. This is not general amnesty as properly understood and known. We have pointed out the anomaly.

We also wonder how is it that in East Pakistan general amnesty has been given in the middle of the crisis and yet the progressive forces there as well as here – socialists, student leaders, poets, philosophers, professors – are being arrested. If there is a general amnesty, then it should apply to the whole country and not only to one province. Whatever the Government does, must be done simultaneously for the whole country. Otherwise, the impression will grow that one part of the country is a colony. If such fundamental decisions are taken, they should apply to the whole country.

I have also said in my address in Karachi as well as in Quetta that the Awami League leaders are in the custody of the Government. The Government has the data and the information; it has full knowledge of their activities and of their role as a party and as leaders. It also has on a number of occasions made some statements on the subject. As such, it is for the Government to decide the fate of the Awami League and its leaders.

As to whether we favour an open trial for Sheikh Mujib, I would say we would have preferred an open trial. But the Government is in a better position to come to a decision, because, as I said, it alone is in possession of all the facts. For instance, we do not know the extent of the involvement of the Awami League with any foreign country and particularly with India. We know that they were involved. This much we know. But we do not know the extent of the involvement. So, this decision can only be taken by the Government, but in principle, we would have preferred an open trial.

A word about Mr. Kosygin's statement in Moscow yesterday I have read the statement. The statement follows other statements which he has made on the subject. His previous statements are partisan and this present statement is also partisan in character. All I can say is that it is regrettable and unfortunate that a neighbouring country of Pakistan, a great power for whom the people of Pakistan have always shown admiration, respect and concern, should indulge in this kind of partisan appreciation of the situation in the subcontinent. You know when I was in Government how assiduously I tried to improve Pakistan's relations with the Soviet Union. You know the position we had taken on the CENTO and other military pacts. But nevertheless the Soviet Union continues to have receptive ears only for the Indian point of view. This does not become a great power. And the Soviet Union is a great power. We would expect a better understanding of our point of view by the Soviet.

I have been asked if in law the present regime is sovereign. The point is that sovereignty in the Austenian sense, and sovereignty in the absolute sense, is an academic proposition in the world today. However, sovereignty in essence and in fundamentals is a different matter. We have fought for the sovereignty of the

people and we will continue to fight for the sovereignty of the people in the sense of its essence. Let's confine ourselves to the situation as it is in the country. Since the inception of the Martial Law Government, you would recall that the LFO under which political parties contested elections, does not give to the Assembly that kind of sovereign character, not sovereign in the sense in which you put the question to me.

The LFO, as a matter of fact, laid down everything right from the preamble to policy directives. All the issues and provisions of the constitution were provided in the LFO. In the first instance, it was said that it was the provisional LFO but when it came out, it didn't come out as a provisional LFO. It came out as a permanent LFO. So that the LFO under which all parties including the Awami League contested the elections did not give the Assembly a sovereign character, because, as I have said, the constitution was virtually given in the Legal Framework Order.

What was omitted or the lacuna that had to be filled was whether there should be a bicameral legislature or a unicameral legislature. If the constitution is to be federal, then it has to be a bicameral legislature. All federations in the world without any exception have bicameral legislatures. Besides, what was really left out was the voting procedure. At that time the voting procedure was left out because it was, I think, anticipated and assumed by the Government that a number of political parties will emerge. When the election was over, only two major parties emerged. In the LFO the President took powers without qualifications. He did not qualify the powers he took in the LFO. Thirdly, 120 days were given for the framing of the constitution.

Now, on the 20th of June, the President took away the powers of the Assembly to frame the constitution and said that the Assembly would be a legislative body and the constitution would be presented to it. A big difference! A great departure! However, you know, the other parties immediately hailed the announcement. They fell over each other. The same so-called stalwarts of democracy who had been saying that they were opposed to the dictatorship of Ayub Khan without exception hailed the announcement immediately. Secondly, they fabricated reports of conflicts within my party to weaken my negotiating capacity. It is not that my negotiating capacity can be weakened by such attempts but I must tell you how deep the conspiracies are against the people. There is Martial Law and a ban on public meetings. There is mobilisation of Indian forces. There is censorship, so you know they have limited my power of negotiation but, nevertheless in spite of all these factors we undertook negotiations from the 15th of July up to the 18th of September.

I do not want to take credit. There is no credit to take. There is no credit involved in it. We talked to each other. But you should see what other changes have taken place since June through our efforts. When our great leaders came to know that the Government was inclined to change its position that there were negotiations going on, and when the President told me, "I agree in principle that the Assembly be given more authority," they started saying that the Assembly should have a say in constitution-making. We do not aim at perfection, but we have to be satisfied that the basic ingredients have been attained. We shall, of course, keep fighting for the attainment of the people's rights.

Let it be known that we can still look the people in the eye, because we have not betrayed them. But some adjustment is essential. You know of the tremendous developments that have taken place in East Pakistan, so some adjustments are necessary because we are responsible to the people and their welfare. But now there is a change. Ninety days have been given for the constitution. Instead of 120 days, 90 days only. The original 120 days were supposed to be for the framing of the whole constitution, but 90 days have been given for amendment by simple majority.

If we are to have a federal constitution, if there is to be a federation, it is necessary for each of the federating units to be a party to that constitution. Their consensus is necessary. This is the type of consensus which we want; not a consensus which gives powers to the Assembly to pass the amendment by a simple majority. The point is that a simple majority also shapes the character of the Assembly. No constitution can be made or amended by a simple majority. Simple majority as a base for amending the constitution also reflects on the character of the Assembly. Considering all these factors, I believe basically, not ideally, that single-handed we have tried to maintain the position of the people in consistency with our pledges and involvement.

We told Sheikh Mujibur Rehman, "Sorry, we cannot rubber-stamp your constitution which you want to dictate outside the Assembly. We asked him to be reasonable and also consider our point of view." We are saying the same thing here. That we must be heard, if you are reasonable, our point of view must be considered. When I said in Peshawar on the 15th of February that there should be no imposition of a ready-made constitution on us, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman said, "Yes, we are reasonable." So we have taken the position that we must be heard in the interest of Pakistan. We are reasonable and we would like you to be reasonable. We would like to see that amendments are brought into the constitution. In the present circumstances, I can still look at the people in the eye and tell them that I have maintained a consistent position. We want to serve the people more than anything else, more than a constitution. We want to bring about a change in the social structure of the country. People today want an end

to poverty misery and exploitation. They want bread and butter; they want food: they want their leaders to take charge of their destiny so that welfare should come to them. The people must get the opportunity to take the destiny of Pakistan in their hands.

**Designs Against the People
Address at Public Meeting,
Multan, October 8, 1971**

I have come to Multan after a long time. You will recall my having told you that the basic problems of the people, of the struggling masses would not be solved through elections alone. We participated in the elections because they had been held for the first time in Pakistan's 23 years of history. The people wanted us to take part. Our opponents were saying at that time that PPP was against democracy and did not believe in the electoral process. We proved them wrong. We were not opposed to democracy then: we are not opposed to democracy now.

These very people who had paraded before the people as great believers in democracy are now opposing transfer of power to elected representatives. I do not wish to name them because you know these defilers of democracy too well. One of these persons told me after the elections that since we had won at the polls, I was his leader. He said the country was passing through a crisis and he will extend his full co-operation to us. I say this so that you should know what hypocrites these people are. We do not believe in their politics. They have been rejected by the people. The people have given their decision in unmistakable terms. You should not, therefore, be misled by their statements. They do not matter. Their conspiracies are not directed against any person but against the toiling masses. I am merely a symbol of the people's struggle. I have merely carried the people's banner. You will once again defeat their conspiracies. History has passed them by. This they must realise. It is ordained that there will be a change. The Pakistan of today is not the Pakistan for which the Muslims had struggled, made sacrifices, left their homes and hearths to come to the land of promise. This is not the Quaid-i-Azam's Pakistan. The Quaid had said to his people, "It will be your Pakistan. You will be the rulers. There will be truth and justice. There will be a constitutional government run by the people. The shackles which chain the poor and disinherited will disappear. Your problems will be solved. The Government will be accountable to you. It will be an Islamic Pakistan". This is what the Quaid-i-Azam had said.

My friends, it is nearly 25 years now. Where are the Assemblies? Where is the constitutional government? Where are the results of the elections held after a quarter of a century? A strong Pakistan can only be a people's Pakistan. What do you see today? Despair and despondency, no one is prepared to listen to the wails of the poor. Could anyone have imagined that Pakistan would be run like a bureaucrat's principality? The Quaid had said to the civil servants, "It is not your function to interfere in politics." What is happening today? We do not seek

power for its own sake. Had I loved power, I would not have left Ayub's Government after Tashkent.

Why did all these politicians go scampering to Rawalpindi when Ayub summoned the Round Table Conference? We had led the movement against Ayub and we stayed away from that conspiracy against the people. They went because they thought they would get a share in the pie. They went to sell you out. This is their character. While they went to Rawalpindi, we stayed with the people. We refused to be traitors to your cause.

It is not a question of power. We only want to build the Pakistan of the Quaid-i-Azam's dreams. We want nothing more, nothing else. We are only concerned with the people and their happiness, their future, their place in the sun. If power means the mere occupation of the chair of office, then we reject power. We do not want it. After all, Ayub too had power for 10 lone years. What did that bring to the people? The entire system was wrong and anti-people. There could have been no progress. Finally, he betrayed the people at Tashkent. Where is he today? Therefore, we do not wish power for its own sake. We want power to go into the hands of people because that is permanent. That lasts. Individuals come and go. Only the verdict of history is final. I do not want this verdict to go against me. I do not want that after I am gone my son should live to face the shame of my betrayal of the people. I will stay and fight even if I have to lose my life.

Public meetings are not allowed. Isn't this strange? Are we Indian soldiers that our getting together should worry the Government? We belong to this country. After all, if the leaders are forbidden to meet the people, what will happen to the country? We are not allowed to speak. Our party newspaper, the only one, has been banned. What is our crime? Are we not the peoples elected representatives? I do not want to say unpleasant things but I have no option now. If some people do not like what I say, I leave the decision to you. You are my only judge. I said in Karachi, "Oh God! When will the long night of oppression end!" My brothers, let us get together to bring this night of terror to an end. I had said we do not want a government of Generals in this country. They got very annoyed at this. I ask you, what wrong did I do? If it is not a Generals' government whose Government is it? Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's?

Our President is a General. The Information Minister is a General. The Governors of Sind, Punjab, NWFP and Baluchistan are Generals. So, I ask you, what crime did I commit when I said this was a Generals' Government? I am not against the army. But is it the rank and file of the army which is ruling? All I say is that the Generals' Government should go. I respect the army as such and I pay them a

tribute here for their professional services. As Minister I worked for the strengthening of our defence forces. But we want to change this system.

I told Yahya Khan in July that the Government was trying to do us down, to work against us. I told him we would not stand idly by, that we will do our duty to the people. I told him to do justice, to be fair, to decide if we were in the wrong, to decide if we had committed a crime. Everyone wants democracy. We want democracy. The Government wants democracy. Then what is the dispute? If we call for the implementation of the electoral verdict, what is wrong with that? I am a servant of the people and I will not commit political suicide.

What is happening today? The prospects of a people's Government are fast receding. First it was said that there was a crisis in East Pakistan, therefore, power cannot be transferred. If the crisis was so bad why did they make a vague effort to associate public representatives of all sorts with the running of the Government there? What is the logic?

When I returned from East Pakistan on March 26, I went to call on an important member of the Government in Karachi. I said to him, "It is a national crisis. The nation comes first; all else is secondary". I asked him what the Government's intentions were. I asked him if they wanted to prolong the crisis or shorten it. I said if they wanted the latter, they should listen to us. I warned him that if the crisis continued, Pakistan would come to an end". I asked him to state honestly if they were even interested in the revival of democracy. He assured me that they were interested in the revival of democracy.

The President called a Secretaries' meeting in Rawalpindi in April and said that he would transfer power in June, no matter what. One of the Secretaries said to me, "You will make the new budget; the people's Government will make the new budget". I also sent one of my lieutenants to Yahya Khan and he told him the same thing. He said he would set the date soon. The situation remains unchanged. The crisis continued, but the Government seems to have changed its mind. Now they have a non-military government in East Pakistan. It may not be representative, but it is a non-military government nevertheless. If they can have it there what prevents them from having it here? When we say that we will launch a movement, they speak of national solidarity. They wanted time. We gave them time. And then the President said he would frame the constitution himself and all the sycophants said it was most welcome. Well, we went to see the President on July 15 and said, "How can we accept it?" He replied, "Why not"? I said, "Because we are pledged to the people that they will frame the constitution. How will we face them? I had told Mujib that I was not prepared to sign on the dotted line. How can I sign on your constitution?"

Discussions were spread over a period of three months. All parties except ours have accepted what Yahya said. Then came the announcement that amendments could only be brought about within a period of 90 days. I reacted on September 29. My last meeting with the President took place on September 18, I told him that he had gone back on his word. His advisers tell him that Bhutto is making trouble. I told the President that his advisers were misleading him. I told him they were like cobras. And you must have read in the papers that they found cobras in the President's House, Karachi! I told the President that his advisers were working against the national interest. I, therefore, implore the people to decide who is in the wrong.

Let me give you another example. On 18th September, we had satisfactory discussions with the President. But what happened then? Did I do any wrong or is it the Government which is to blame? I was with him when the Chief Election Commissioner telephoned him on and the President told him, "No, no! Elections will be held according to schedule. You announce the date. A lot of time has been wasted". I was happy to hear this but the next day; Mr. Nurul Amin issued a statement saying that by-elections should not be held. Did the Chief Election Commissioner not know that Mr. Nurul Amin would object? Is this official unaware of what is happening in his country? Did he not know that the month of Ramzan was due or that floods were expected in East Pakistan? Do our people suspend all our activity during Ramzan? Could they not vote during this holy month? I ask the President to decide who is playing foul. Nobody listens to us. Well, we want a people's government in January next year, no matter what happens.

They have appointed Ministers in East Pakistan. What parties do they belong to? Are they elected? All parties have been represented but the majority party has been ignored. We do not want to be associated with an unrepresentative government but democratic practice demanded that we should have been at least asked. My party is committed to the solidarity of Pakistan. Could we not join the Government? It is said that we are not popular in East Pakistan. If our popularity is less there, this Government's popularity is much lesser than ours.

The Government had said that Ministers would not be allowed to fight elections. Why was this policy changed in East Pakistan? What has happened since 18th September? Why have elections been put off? The "razakars" are working against us in East Pakistan. What are the options open to us? We are true to our commitments. We will not betray the people. I am told the President is going to make another announcement on 12th October. Well, we are waiting. But, also, he is leaving for Iran on 13th. Perhaps, he will announce the convening of the Assembly before he leaves and, on return, announce that it cannot be held. He may tell us that since the Indian troops are concentrated on our borders,

democracy cannot return. Well, if there is a threat of war, our forces can face it. If there is going to be a war, it is still the people's right to demand that power be transferred.

Every war is fought on a political level. You know what the condition of the people in East Pakistan is today. If the people of Pakistan are not with the Government how will it face the enemy successfully? The people are the greatest power. They are talking of a total war. If it is going to be a total war, then the people cannot be ignored. Who are the people going to follow? We are their representatives. We need time to consolidate the country, at least six months. We can do nothing now. Our Foreign Secretary goes to Moscow, meets Mr. Gromyko but is not even allowed to enter the Kremlin. When the President returned from his visit to Moscow, our party weekly wrote about it and he was very annoyed. Were we wrong? It is the same Soviet Union, the same Pakistan. I was once the Foreign Minister. What has gone wrong now? I tell you this Government does not understand any of these things, not to speak of foreign affairs. If the people's government is not inducted into office immediately, there will be a deluge. Nobody will be then able to stop it.

We have had our say on the constitution but one of the defeated politicians who called upon Yahya Khan the other day came out and said that he had been assured by the President that he will make a truly Islamic constitution. "We are completely satisfied and we will fully co-operate with the President", he declared. Then he told his three and a half workers to move out into the country and fight disruptionists. Well, we have never claimed to be experts on Islam. We are Muslims. We are not theologians. They know religion as we know politics. When they declare that Yahya's constitution will be Islamic, I tell them to keep out of things they know nothing about. Their testimonials will help no one. Let the constitution come and let everyone see how Islamic it is. The man who is drafting it is not a Muslim. The politician who says it will be an Islamic constitution has not even seen it. He just spent 40 minutes with the President.

So, they are going to confront us. Who are they? We defeated them at the polls. What have they got to confront us with? Why are they trying to mislead the President? Why do they tell him that they will confront and fight Bhutto? I say to the President, "Don't be taken for a ride. These people are hollow."

The Generals' Government will try to weaken our party in two ways. One, they will set up a joint political front of rightist parties against us. Two, they will try to spread dissension in our ranks. Money is being passed around. I have evidence. I showed it to Yahya. The intelligence agencies, the I.B. and the National Security people are involved in it. Do you know what Yahya told me? He said, "They are spending secret funds. How can I ask them where they spend them? This was a

strange reply. Supposing, they start using these secret funds against Yahya tomorrow. What will he do? He won't even know. These funds belong to the Government. Investigations can be made if they are being misused. Let them try to buy over Members of the Assembly. The people are with me. We know what is going on. We too have money. It ran our intelligence service. We know which of the Muslim Leagues received into Rs. 1.2 million. If we have to perish, we will go down fighting. We will not permit these leeches to suck the people's blood. This is my promise.

The Invasion and the Veto
Speech at the Security Council, New York,
December 12, 1971

The Pakistan delegation has come to the Security Council at a time and moment of crucial and dire importance not only to Pakistan but to the world community and the United Nations.

I am aware of the urgency of the situation, and I would not like unnecessarily to waste either your time, Mr. President, or that of this august body, which is primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. Time is running out. I too could go into the genesis of the Indo-Pakistan dispute. I could start from the time of the Emperor Ashoka and go down the lanes of history to the conquest of the Indian subcontinent by Mohammed Bin Qasim and the thousand years we have had of a most unfortunate and tragic conflict in our subcontinent between its two predominant, profound cultures. We have sought to resolve them in the spirit of contemporary times.

At the present moment I cannot make an elaborate comment on all the issues that have been raised by the Foreign Minister of India, Sardar Swaran Singh, whom I know very well and with whom I have worked in the past on these very disputes. In 1962 we had six months of negotiations for the settlement of India-Pakistan disputes. Sardar Swaran Singh was, I think, then Minister of Railways and I was the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. We had six months of painstaking and sincere discussions for bringing about a settlement of Indo-Pakistan disputes based on equity and justice. We made an effort; we tried and endeavoured hard. As far as we are concerned, I can assure you that it was a sincere effort, and I assume it was an equally sincere effort on the part of India. But unfortunately, we always seemed to reach an impasse. And so I shall not now go back to the past. The past is known to India; the past is known to Pakistan.

We are part of the same subcontinent. The past is in part known to the members of the Security Council because it is their problem also. It is their responsibility to know of these grave issues. So from that point of view we expect them to know of the basic causes of the differences that divide India and Pakistan.

I am not going to indulge in glib rhetoric or semantic contrivances because the situation is far too serious. The fat is in the fire, and the time has come for us to act either individually as separate states defending their sovereign integrity and national unity or collectively for restraint as members of the United Nations acting in and through the Security Council which is charged with the primary

responsibility of maintaining peace and security in the world. Either we act individually or we act collectively. Those are the two basic options open to us.

Secondly, I do not attempt—and I never will—to speak in a spirit of recrimination or to put the blame on one party or the other. My effort will be to invoke the basic objective principles and point to the basic objective realities involved in the situation rather than to inject a subjective character into the dispute that today is burning the subcontinent and that has led to fratricidal warfare.

I am not going to assume a sanctimonious attitude. From the outset I am quite prepared to accept that we have made mistakes. Man is not infallible. Mistakes have been made everywhere—not only in the subcontinent. Mistakes have been made by the Roman Empire, by the British Empire, by every state of the world. But states are not penalised for their mistakes. I admit that certain mistakes have been made by us, as they have been made by others. We are prepared to rectify those mistakes in a civilised spirit, in a spirit of understanding and co-operation, in conformity with the highest principles of international law and international norms. I am not going to deny that tremendous and tragic blunders have been made.

We all make blunders—all of us in Africa, Asia, Europe; the East and West. It is not that we have been oblivious of or blind to these factors. Everywhere there have been blind spots and tragic developments. But the effort must be always to try to repair the damage. We are quite prepared to try to repair the damage.

So I do not say that we did not make mistakes; I do not say that mistakes have not been made in the subcontinent in the past. It is not a new phenomenon; it goes back to ancient times. It is rooted in history, and I am not going back into the historical factors involved in the situation. I am trying to confine myself to the relevant propositions involved in the present crisis.

And what are the issues involved in the present crisis? There are certain basic and important issues involved in the present crisis that has brought about a catastrophic situation in our subcontinent. In my opinion the primary and fundamental issue is that the world community, the United Nations and people at large, will not accept the fact that the unity of a state brought into being through its own efforts, brought into being by its own struggle, brought into being by its own personality, is to be subjected to dismemberment by the use of force. That is the important basic issue.

Pakistan was not created by force. Please remember that the establishment of Pakistan was a great historic phenomenon. Pakistan came into being in the face

of the opposition of the Indian Congress and of the British who were the masters not only of the subcontinent but of an empire on which the sun did not set. Since such powerful forces were opposed to it, the creation of Pakistan could not have occurred without the pressure of historical forces and the force of a people's will. Pakistan crystallised as a sovereign, independent state in 1947, but the germs and seeds of Pakistan were there much earlier. They were there from the time when Mohammad Bin Qasim set foot in the subcontinent. The theme and the message of Islam came into the subcontinent: the message of equality of fraternity, of brotherhood. The seeds of Pakistan were sown much earlier than the creation of Pakistan.

If Pakistan might seem to be destroyed physically today by a predatory neighbour, by a military juggernaut, it will still last, because Pakistan is an ideal. Pakistan is not a mere physical reality: Pakistan is an ideal. It will last even if it is physically destroyed. We are prepared to face that physical destruction. We are prepared for the decimation of 120 million people. We will then begin anew and build a new Pakistan. But we will never accept subjugation by brute force. This is the reality. This is the situation: the ideal, the dream, the concept, the vision of Pakistan can never be destroyed by a military juggernaut. It can never be destroyed by force and by the preponderance of military power.

This is what I would like my Indian friends to recognise—I refer to them as friends while fighting is going on. They recognised it in 1947 when they conceded the inevitability of the establishment of Pakistan. Their great leaders are still respected in Pakistan. They had stood for an ideal, they stood for a united India. But they recognised that that could not be maintained in the face of historical factors and the diversity of cultures. Finally, in 1947, the Indian Congress accepted the creation of Pakistan as an independent, sovereign state after years and years and years of opposition.

There was a great Prime Minister, the first Prime Minister, the father of the present Prime Minister of India, who said, "We were too old, we were too tired to oppose Pakistan, and Pakistan had to come into being. But we hope that one day we will get together again." I too hope so, not that Pakistan will emerge as subservient to India but in the sense that we will get together again as equal friends, in a common fraternity, living in a common subcontinent and sharing the common effort of seeing that poverty, ignorance and misery are wiped out. If there are any two countries in the world that are the poorest in the world, they are Pakistan and India. Our resources might be tremendous, but the fact is that we two are the poorest in the world. Yet, in the last 24 years, we have gone to war three times. Three times there has been conflict in the subcontinent. I remember the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union once telling me that even rich

nations try to avoid war; poorer nations should make a greater attempt to avoid war.

We are too poor. There is too much misery. There is too much squalor. You should know, Mr. President, as the representative of an African country that our basic problem is to fight poverty, to bring about social justice, to bring about equality, to bring about a sense of fraternity, to progress, to try and keep pace with the progress of other countries, of other continents. It is unfortunate that today we should be pitted against each other and one of us should dream semi-barbarically of the liquidation and annihilation of another. There can be no liquidation. It is not possible today. Even the great powers cannot do it. Even they have found that hegemony and domination do not last. Does India think that today it is going to become a great power in Asia? It is simply not possible, because then India will be pitted against 120 million people, valiant people with a great past fighting for their independence, fighting for their dignity, fighting for their self-respect.

So I offer a hand of friendship to India. I would have offered a hand of greater friendship to India if we were not at war. India knew that we were prepared to offer that hand of friendship to India as soon as a civilian government returned to Pakistan. Perhaps they pre-empted that development, unfortunately for the subcontinent. But I shall come to that later.

So the issue, the basic issue involved today is that a state, a sovereign state, brought into being by the will of its own people, freely, without let and hindrance, without interference, should not be dismembered by force. This will be a tragic precedent for the world at large. It will be a terrible precedent. Today, I speak not only for Pakistan but for a principle. I speak for a basic principle which affects Asia, Africa and Latin America. That is why the Third World overwhelmingly supported the cause of Pakistan in the historic resolution adopted by the General Assembly on December 7.

If I had spoken only for Pakistan, I would have been isolated, because India is a bigger country than Pakistan. Power politics would have come into play. Pakistan's cause succeeded on December 7, because it was based not on the interests of Pakistan conceived selfishly and subjectively but on a world principle – universally accepted, universally recognised – that a sovereign state, brought into being by its own blood and toil and sweat, cannot be dismembered by a predatory neighbour wanting to tear it apart limb by limb. Today it is Pakistan; tomorrow it will be other parts of the world. Please accept that position. Please remember, we are not fighting the war for Pakistan alone; we are fighting the war for a cause, for a just cause; the cause that involves a state which came

into being by its people's volition and whose establishment was recognised by India.

The British were the departing power in 1947. What interests did they have? If the subcontinent wanted to be fragmented into six states, the British would not have bothered. They would have said: all right, let there be six states; if there are to be four states, let there be four states. They were leaving the subcontinent. Why did the British create the two states of India and Pakistan? The British left the subcontinent with two states because the people of the subcontinent at that time, 400 million, wanted two states, and not three, or four or five states. One was India that was called Bharat, and the other was Pakistan. And it was the people of East Bengal who played a valiant role, a predominant role in the creation of Pakistan. If the Bengalis, the East Bengalis—over whom my friend Sardar Swaran Singh waxes eloquent and sheds crocodile tears now—had wanted a separate state, the British would have granted a separate state and there would have been a separate state of Bengal—not only for Pakistani Bengal, but of Indian Bengal as well, and of Assam. There would have been a third state—and perhaps a fourth state as well.

So there is a basic issue involved. Stripped of all the frenzy and eloquence of Sardar Swaran Singh, it is that states which have been created by their people through a struggle and in the teeth of formidable opposition, cannot be dismembered by physical force by a neighbouring state which is physically more powerful in military might. So please remember what we are fighting for. We are not fighting just for Pakistan. We are fighting for a cause that affects all of us, everyone of us: either states are to remain independent, sovereign, free, or else they will be dismembered at will whenever a great power or a semi-great power, or a seemingly semi-great power wants to do it.

Today it is in the subcontinent, tomorrow it will be in other parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America; it can be anywhere. So it is a basic issue which is involved in the present situation.

And I ask you, Sir, as President of the Security Council: Is it not a challenge to the United Nations, to the United Nations Charter? I am out of touch with the United Nations Charter because for the last five and a half years I have been struggling internally for the restoration of democracy and social justice in my country. After five and a half years I have come to the Security Council, after a very big struggle for democracy and social justice in my land. Is the present situation not a challenge to the United Nations itself? There is another basic issue involved. Is the United Nations going to permit this kind of mutation by physical force?

There are many Articles in the Charter. The Indian Foreign Minister referred to Articles 55 and 56. I shall not refer to the Articles. But representatives know the responsibility of the United Nations, and especially that of the Security Council, which is entrusted with the primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security in the world. So I repeat: This is a challenge to the United Nations itself.

Today it is Pakistan, tomorrow it will be Bhutan—indeed Bhutan is already in the bag; Sikkim is already in the bag; Nepal is not yet in the bag, but it is going to be in the bag very soon if Pakistan is dismembered. Bhutan, Sikkim, Nepal, Ceylon, Afghanistan and Iran: Pandora's Box has not opened for Pakistan alone. It has opened for many countries, and in a very decisive way. So, it is a challenge to all members who have to see whether this kind of mutation can be permitted to take place in the world through physical force, physical blackmail and physical intimidation.

The Indian Foreign Minister has given a long list of events to try to show that we are the aggressors. Now, I appeal to your common sense and logic. India is five or six times larger than Pakistan. We are about 120 million, they are about 500 million; our foreign exchange earnings and resources are so much more limited. One of the reasons why we wanted to create Pakistan was so that we could get into our own little corner and live in peace with a bigger neighbour. But the bigger neighbour did not accept that position. And so we have been accused of aggression. Can Denmark be accused of aggression against Germany? Can Mexico be accused of aggression against the United States of America? Can Holland be accused of aggression against France?

So, basically, I am dealing with the wider issue involved. The first principle is that a sovereign, independent state brought into being by its own free will and volition cannot be dismembered by force. The second principle involved is that there is a responsibility for the United Nations, embodied in the Charter, undertaken because of the consequences of the Second World War, and through all failures and successes, maintained for the last 25 years.

In this connection I shall have to tell the Council that the United Nations has failed Pakistan in the past as well, because we are smaller than India. We came here in 1947 and 1948. We came here pleading for the exercise of the right of self-determination which both India and Pakistan had accepted. And the then Prime Minister of India, the father of the present Prime Minister of India, had himself said that Kashmir was a disputed territory and that the future of Kashmir would be determined by the free will of the people of Kashmir. That was in 1948, but until today the Kashmir dispute has not been resolved and a territory that would have formed a legitimate part of Pakistan has been denied to Pakistan.

Then we came here in 1965—the Foreign Minister of India referred to that—and at that time I was representing my country and I remember that we were told in the resolution which was adopted that the underlying cause of the conflict would be resolved. If we had really gone into the causes of the conflict about which the Foreign Minister of India spoke so much this evening, if we had really gone into the basic causes of the conflict in 1965, today we would not be facing a greater tragedy. At that time the President of the Security Council was Mr. Arthur Goldberg, Permanent Representative of the United States of America. He told me that that resolution was a Bible—I wish I had asked him whether it was the Old Testament or the New Testament—and we believed in that Bible, because people believe in a sacred document. He said, “We will see to it that it is implemented”. That was in 1965. It has not been implemented. So a further deterioration has taken place and today we find ourselves facing an even greater catastrophe. And if the world does not seize the problem, if the world does not have the courage and the moral fibre to say that these issues must be resolved and the full force of the international community, its might and power must be brought to bear on them, then Indo-Pakistan problems will become even more complicated. And who will suffer? The poor people of India and Pakistan will suffer—and I am not a friend of only the poor people of Pakistan; I am a friend of the poor people of India also. We have more poverty than any other people in the world.

We want to put an end to armed conflict. We want to put arms a side. We want a period of security and goodwill in the subcontinent, because we have had so much conflict and so much turmoil. And the elite has not suffered, the elite never suffers. The people who suffer are the poor. the refugees, of whom the Indian Foreign Minister spoke, the people who merely eke out a subsistence living. We want to give our people food, shelter, clothing and education. We cannot do those things if we are daggers drawn fighting all the time, chauvinistically quarrelling in the same geographical area, in the same place.

And when I say this I am not speaking from a position of weakness— because Pakistan can never be weak and the Indians know that. We have a thousand years of history.

If this conflict had not taken place and if the Indian Government had given us a chance to transform the military regime in Pakistan into a civilian regime, it would have seen how far we would have gone to bring about basic changes in our outlook. I speak on these matters as an elected representative of the people of Pakistan. Sardar Swaran Singh spoke about Mr. Mujibur Rahman being an elected representative. I am as much an elected representative of the people of West Pakistan as Mr. Mujibur Rahman is an elected representative from East Pakistan. I have as much *locus standi* in West Pakistan as Mr. Mujibur Rahman has in East Pakistan. I also speak not as a puppet; I speak as the authentic voice

of the people of Pakistan. I spearheaded a struggle against a mighty dictator, and my roots are with the people and I want to serve the people of my country. The people of my country cannot be served if we are going to be locked in this suicidal fratricidal warfare in this fashion.

I am not speaking from a position of weakness. I said these things even during the election campaign. I said that we must begin a new chapter because our basic objective was to bring about social and economic justice. What the subcontinent faces is not a political crisis or an economic Crisis. The subcontinent faces a social crisis, a crisis of the social structure born of the struggle against an unmaintainable and disgusting status quo which has lasted for years. Therefore we should bend all our energies for the end of an iniquitous status quo. Europe has progressed; other countries have progressed. We also are civilised peoples. We have 5,090 years of civilisation behind us. We, too, have the means, the resources and the ability to progress, and we, too, can progress and bring about a better life for our peoples provided we lay aside our arms not on the basis of capitulation, not on the basis of the violation of international principles, not on the basis of lacerating states, not on the basis of trying to dismember countries.

We should coexist, as the Soviet Union and the United States, two great powers, can coexist. Now, today, if China and the United States can open a new dialogue, why cannot this happen in the subcontinent? We wanted it to happen. But we were not given a chance. The Indian Government pre-empted those possibilities by striking a month before a civilian government, after 13 years, was going to come into power in Pakistan. They should have given us an opportunity, and we wanted that opportunity. But they struck two months before a civilian democratic government was to be installed as a result of the struggle of both East and West Pakistan. The struggle in one region was not unconnected with that in the other. It was a common struggle, it was one united struggle. But we were not given that chance.

We have been unfortunately let down in the past by history, but in contemporary terms we have been betrayed by the United Nations. We have been let down by the Security Council's inability to secure the implementation of its resolutions, on Kashmir in 1947 and 1965. And today we are again before this great world body. We have not come here to beg for peace. Please do not misunderstand. We are a nation of 120 million people. So what if a city falls? If Dacca or Jessore fall about which people talk so much? A battle lost is not a country lost. Governments can go, monarchies can go, dictatorships can go, but nation's last States are rooted in the people. I wish the Indian Government would realise this. It should not be intoxicated by these reports of the fall of Jessore, the fall of one city or another. What is the fall of a city? The country is still there. The country was there before 1947 in idea, in spirit, and it crystallised into a sovereign nation state, and it will

continue to be there even if today or tomorrow Dacca falls. Do not be misled by press reports. Because we are a smaller country we do not have the resources to pump in that kind of propaganda. I see the effort here is to filibuster until Dacca falls. And even if Dacca falls, so what? In some sections of the Western press, Dacca has been described as Dunkirk. Do not be uncharitable. There is no comparison between Dunkirk and Dacca. Dunkirk was 20 miles away from Calais. For us the distance is 2,600 miles. Dunkirk was not so completely isolated. East Pakistan is covered from three sides. If the people of East Pakistan were not with Pakistan, East Pakistan would have fallen within minutes. Seven to one is the Indian superiority over the forces of East Pakistan. They are completely blockaded. No ammunition can get through, which I can understand they do not want to allow through. But even medicines and food cannot be airlifted. The blockade cannot be broken. We are completely blockaded.

And here we have East Pakistan representatives still sitting with us. It is an oversimplification to say that the people of East Pakistan are against Pakistan. If the people of East Pakistan were against us, we would have capitulated and fallen long ago. And do not think that by filibustering, that if the Security Council debate is postponed by a day or two, we are going to be down and out and that we are going to be on our knees. Like Alice, we have come to the Wonderland to tell you that our country and our subcontinent is turning into a wasteland.

We were told that the General Assembly and the Security Council are responsible for peace in the world. But we do not want peace without justice. We want peace with justice and our only demand is that our country should be spared from invasion, that foreign interference should stop, that an internal struggle should not be interpreted as giving rise to an external obligation. This is a basic requirement. Today we ask for it, tomorrow others will ask for it. So I am not pleading only for Pakistan. I am pleading really for the rule of international law and morality.

A basic unalterable principle of international law is non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries. Article 2, paragraph 7 of the Charter speaks of non-interference in the internal affairs of states. It says:

“Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorise the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter....”

Now this is a Charter obligation. But the Indian Foreign Minister spoke for an hour and fifteen minutes and all he spoke about was the internal affairs of Pakistan. His whole speech was devoted to the internal affairs of Pakistan. I did not have such a bad conscience so I did not ask one of my friends here – and we still have a few friends left – to raise a point of order to say that he was raising a matter within the internal jurisdiction of Pakistan. I welcomed it. I am glad that the Indian Foreign Minister saw fit to talk about the internal matters of my country. For one thing, I hope that I will have an opportunity now to reply to it, but if I do not cover all the points I hope that Members will forgive me because he only spoke just now. However, I shall try to cover some of his major points and, if I am unable to cover all his points now, I shall do so later, not to filibuster, but to try subsequently to clear the points that he raised. I shall make that effort.

But what I am trying to say is that I am glad he raised those questions even though it constituted an interference in Pakistan's essentially domestic matters. It was as if I were to talk about the DMK movement in Madras, about the Nagas' or the Mizos' struggle for independence, about the plight of poor Bhutan and Sikkim, or about the many other matters that plague India. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. The consequences will come to the surface soon. It is up to India. If India thinks that Pakistan is going to be dismembered, the process is not going to stop there. The germ is going to spread, and it is going to spread very fast.

However, I will not choose to talk about the internal problems of India. Interference in the internal affairs of another country offends not only the Charter principle, it also violates the Bandung principles. Mr. President, you are from a state in Africa. There are other member states here from Asia and from Latin America. We all come from the same fraternity, we are all brothers-in-arms. We have been exploited, we have all been subjugated, we are all the victims of ruthless exploitation. Are not the Bandung principles sacrosanct to you? Are they sacrosanct to me only today, because my country is exposed to the mighty juggernaut of a great military power that outnumbers my country in East Pakistan by a force of seven to one and that has blockaded us by sea?

No, this concerns all of us. The Bandung principles, the Panch Sila, are being violated. I was not the author of the Panch Sila; I was only a student then. Who was the author? Who was the man who articulated the Panch Sila? At the Bandung Conference, the Panch Sila were articulated, among other people, by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He talked about the "five principles of peaceful coexistence." The father of the Prime Minister of India said that non-interference was a sacrosanct principle and one of the five principles of the Panch Sila. India today has wrecked the Panch Sila. India has abused and violated the United

Nations Charter and the basic principles of- international law and morality. India, today, has violated the Bandung principles of which it was a co-author.

These, therefore, are the basic principles involved in the matter, and they are very important principles. And furthermore, we never expected the countries of the Third World to indulge in blackmail and big power chauvinism. We thought the great powers were the culprits of big power chauvinism and of blackmail, of seeking hegemony. If the world can rise against the greatest power in the world and against hegemony, and if the greatest power in the world wants to reduce its sphere of responsibility, wants no longer to be the praetor, the policeman of the world, then India cannot do that either. If the United States of America finds itself today incapable of extending its influence over a world-wide range to become the policeman of the world, how can India become the policeman of the subcontinent of Asia? India does not have the capability. India is built on a hollow foundation, nurtured by fraud and deceit. India must abandon these illusions. If the United States of America, the greatest power in the world, after 20 years of experience following the Second World War, finds that it does not have the resources to dispense foreign aid, and to continue the Vietnam war, that it must honourably leave Asia, India must also realise that it cannot hold on to Pakistan, to a part of the subcontinent. India must give up its pretence of trying to become the policeman of the subcontinent; of telling us what we should do in Pakistan: which leader we should recognise, which leader we should arrest, which leader we should release, which party we should negotiate with or what is the interpretation of the manifesto of a certain party.

This is a precedent for all of you to consider before the morning comes. It is all very well to talk sweetly and softly and in clipped tones. But let us talk about the realities. India's Foreign Minister said, "Consider the realities." I say I welcome that: consider the realities. I welcome that more than he would. The realities are that dictation, domination, hegemony, exploitation are being practised against my country through physical force and physical might. The largest Muslim state in the world, brought into being by its own volition, is being destroyed and decimated by a military machine and against the will of the people of the country. If we were not a united people, if we did not have a united resolve, we would not have lasted for 24 years. Egypt and Syria united briefly. They were Arabs. They were of the same race, they had the same religion. How long did the Egyptian-Syrian unity last? Three years, or two years. It broke up. Why are East Pakistan and West Pakistan together? Because we have a common denominator. We have a common interest, and that common interest is opposition to Indian domination, Indian hegemony, Indian exploitation. That is our common interest. So we are brothers-in-arms. We will always remain together. What has happened? The Indian Foreign Minister talks about all the mistakes made by Pakistan. Well, India never has made any mistakes. I congratulate India for never

having made any mistakes in 24 years. We are the only ones who make mistakes. We are the only sinners in the world. Nobody else makes mistakes. We are the great sinners. But the same great sinners have remained together for 24 years, and today also, it took India nine months in order to prepare to intervene for destroying us.

The Foreign Minister of India talks about the patience shown by India in waiting for nine months. It was not patience. India found it necessary; now that they have not succeeded they must physically intervene to destroy Pakistan. If all those brutalities, those terrible atrocities that have taken place in Pakistan were really as bad as the Foreign Minister said, and if there was such a great movement in East Pakistan, then it would not have been necessary for India to intervene militarily to bring about a military, physical victory by force of arms.

So there is a basic contradiction involved in that. And please remember, the issue is not an issue of self-determination. As an Asian—and I am as much an Asian as I am a Pakistani—I have always had an Asian outlook. For, we cannot think in terms of our own country alone. One country in Africa cannot think in terms of that one country alone; it must think in African terms. We in Asia must think in Asian terms. As President de Gaulle said, “a European Europe.” I, therefore, say we must have an Asian Asia. The question here is not a matter of self-determination. As Asians and as members of the Third World, we must never renounce self-determination. Self-determination, after President Woodrow Wilson preached it and articulated it, brought about the independence of many countries. We subscribe to self-determination. There can be no compromise on self-determination— but it must be genuine self-determination. What is self-determination? That a country must be allowed to determine its future that a people must be allowed to determine its future. We are not against self-determination. My distinguished friends are against self-determination, because if they had allowed self-determination to be practised today, there would have been the right of self-determination in Kashmir and the people of Kashmir, after 24 years, would have decided whether they were going to be a part of India or a part of Pakistan. But they were never allowed that right to self-determination.

In Kashmir, where Pandit Nehru himself said, “Yes, there must be self-determination because it is a disputed territory;” India has always blocked, stopped, prevented any action towards the self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. Self-determination is a principle that was not only articulated by President Woodrow Wilson, but the great founder of the Soviet Union, Lenin, one of the greatest men of all times, also articulated it. So, self-determination was accepted by India and Pakistan. But today, when 24 years have passed, self-determination has not taken place in Kashmir. Today, India talks about self-determination of a country which determined its future in 1947,

and became a part of Pakistan How is self-determination involved in Bengal, in East Pakistan? East Pakistan is a part of Pakistan, an inextricable part of Pakistan, united with Pakistan for 24 years. It chose to be a part of Pakistan and was in the vanguard of the movement for Pakistan. Let me tell you quite clearly that there could have been no Pakistan without the struggle of the people of East Pakistan for the creation of Pakistan.

The Foreign Minister of India has talked about the mother state. I also am a student of international law; I have not come across any acknowledged theory of the mother state. I have studied under Kelsen and Oppenheim and other people, but I have not come across this theory. It might be somewhere in some archives found somewhere or other this theory of the mother state. But let us accept the fact that there is such a theory of the mother state, that if a part of the mother state wants to release itself from the mother, it must find its own conditions for freedom. I accept that position, although I do not find authentic or reliable evidence for the mother state concept or theory that has been propounded by the Indian Foreign Minister. As I told you and as the British know because they were in the subcontinent, there could have been no Pakistan without the contribution of the people of East Pakistan to the creation of Pakistan. They were a part of us in the 1965 war;

How heroically they stood by us. I remember in 1967 when I went there how devoted and concerned they were for the welfare and integrity of Pakistan.

After the general elections about which Swaran Singh has spoken, I went there in January. I went there and I went to many parts of East Pakistan and I asked them, "What do you want, because the people's will is supreme. What do you want? Do you want one Pakistan or two Pakistans?" Believe me, Mr. President, I am not lying to you; I would never lie to the President of the Security Council; they all said, "We want one Pakistan. We believe in one Pakistan." This one Pakistan would have remained one Pakistan if the Indians had not stepped in with their powerful military action.

Finally, in deciding these issues, the Security Council is sometimes prevented from taking necessary action because of power politics, because the great powers have great interests and their great interests are determined by their own calculations. But these factors do not prevail in the General Assembly. The General Assembly is the voice of the world. The General Assembly symbolizes the march of humanity towards greater and greater progress. The General Assembly is where you, Sir, and I and others can speak for truth and justice, unimpaired by the calculations of power politics; The General Assembly is where the poorer nations speak. The General Assembly, by an overwhelming and massive vote of 104, decided in favour of the unity and integrity of Pakistan. The

whole world said taking everything into account, taking the truth into account, that Pakistan is one and that Pakistan must remain one. We have no diplomatic relations with some of the countries that voted for us. We have no contact but on a principle they voted that Pakistan is one; it came into being as one, it came into being after greater sacrifices and it must remain one. Out of the great powers, the Peoples Republic of China and the United States of America also supported this basic truth. So this is an overwhelming verdict. I do not have to speak: the Indian Foreign Minister does not have to speak: I only ask you to recognise this truth, to heed the voice of the world. Do not stifle it do not bury it do not ignore it, because it is going to have far-reaching ramifications. Please take cognizance of it, please realise its value and importance. Please do not become isolated from the voice of the world. It is very important that you do not do that because the whole world has spoken for the unity and integrity of Pakistan. How can you ignore it here in this chamber? Can you ride roughshod over the voice of the world community? Can you arbitrarily; whimsically and capriciously deny what the world wants? The world wants one Pakistan, the world wants the unity of Pakistan the world does not want the dismemberment of Pakistan by violence or by force. All I have come here for is to tell you that this is the voice of the world, this is what the world wants, this is its verdict. Implement it, recognise it, accept it, otherwise there is going to be trouble and not only for Pakistan. Pakistan is in enough trouble; we are facing serious problems, but I am not only speaking of Pakistan, I am speaking for all of the Third World and for all those who believe in justice, equality and equity among nations.

Having made these general remarks, I should like to get down a little more to specific matters. We have been told by the Indian Foreign Minister tonight and before that it was implied in the position that India has taken on an internal dispute of Pakistan, that the people of East Pakistan want to be free, and to sever relations with West Pakistan and that this was the result of the last elections. In the last elections which were held in December 1970, the Awami League and Sheikh Mujib received an overwhelming mandate in East Pakistan. We recognise that. In West Pakistan my party and I received an overwhelming mandate. But what was the demand of the Awami League? The Awami League said in their election campaign that they wanted autonomy. They did not want secession. We, in West Pakistan, also were fighting for autonomy; they wanted democracy and we wanted democracy; they wanted to end military rule and we wanted to end military rule. We had these common factors between us. But what happened was that, suddenly, after the elections, this demand for autonomy was converted into a demand for secession/There were many forces in the background. You know, Sir, that the line between maximum autonomy and secession can be a thin one, a very thin one. Through international manipulation and other factors, a struggle for autonomy was converted into a struggle for secession.

But who is to interpret whether it is autonomy or secession? The issue being internal it is for the people to determine; what is the point of that autonomy, whether it is genuine autonomy or ultra vires autonomy. It is not for a third country to interpret, it is not for an outside party to decide whether the people want secession or autonomy.

We were quite prepared to negotiate and to determine the quantum of autonomy within the concept of one Pakistan, but we were not prepared to accept that an outside neighbouring country should judge whether the demand was for autonomy or for secession. If the people of East Pakistan had wanted secession, they would have said so and India would not have had to intervene. I accept that blunders have been made—terrible blunders. But, in spite of those terrible blunders, India would not have had physically to intervene with eight or twelve divisions in East Pakistan in order to get by force what it interpreted to be the aspiration of the people of East Pakistan as a consequence of the elections of 1970.

This is the basic problem again. Now if we are going to determine autonomy and secession on that basis, then may I ask my distinguished friend, Mr. Swaran Singh, the following: When the Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, came to the United Nations in September 1960 and was asked, “When are you going to settle the Kashmir dispute, with regard to which you have agreed that there must be a plebiscite?”, he replied, “I know that I have agreed to that; but if there is a plebiscite in Kashmir, which is a disputed territory”—it is not merely a disputed territory but would have been inevitably a part of Pakistan—“it will be like opening a Pandora’s Box.” So, I ask, have you not opened a Pandora’s Box, indeed a treasure house? Please look beyond today; please do not be so myopic. We have to live in the same subcontinent; we do not want the subcontinent to be in flames. You will find fragmentation following in the wake of this situation. Today you might rejoice over what is happening to us. But if you think that today you are going to dismember Pakistan and the germs of dismemberment are not going to spread to your country, you are sadly mistaken. And where is this Pandora’s Box going to be closed? Is it going to be closed in Yugoslavia? Why not Yugoslavia? Why not Czechoslovakia? Why not Wales and Scotland? I shall not mention Northern Ireland because there is the Queen’s peace there. There has been no trouble in Northern Ireland, so I shall not mention Northern Ireland but only Wales and Scotland. And Brittany, the Basque country, Morocco, Algeria, all the countries in Africa? Can it not happen in any single country in Africa and in Asia? If there is Bangladesh in Pakistan, there must be Bangladesh everywhere. Why should Bangladesh emerge only in Pakistan by force? The fragmentation that it symbolises can occur in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America and it cannot leave untouched the great Powers themselves—in Uzbekistan and in other parts of the world.

There will not be a Bangladesh only in Pakistan. There will be a Bangladesh everywhere.

Bangladesh exists on the lips of the Government of India. Bangladesh exists in their mind; Bangladesh does not exist in reality. And when I say that, I do not say that I do not have love for my Bengali brothers. I say: Joi Bangla as much as I say Jia Sind. They are pans of the same federaration. These slogans cannot be turned against us. So, physician, heal thysself; do not heal the wounds of Pakistan. Pakistan has always had the wrong end of the stick. Pakistan has been called the sinner for a long time; Pakistan's territories have been taken in Kashmir, in East Punjab, in West Bengal, in Assam. Pakistan has been lacerated enough, much more than Mexico was lacerated in this hemisphere.

But the ills and the curses that you would impose on Pakistan by military force will not end by creating a so-called state of Bangladesh in my country only. Then there would be Bangladesh everywhere in the world. Why not? Let us open up the floodgates, because if sovereign states are going to be mutated in this fashion let the deluge comes. Why should it affect only my country?

We are prepared to die. We are not afraid to die. Our people are brave. We and India have shared 5,000 years of history together. They know us. There will never be permitted the liquidation of Pakistan. Believe me, Mexico might occupy the United States, Denmark might occupy Germany, Finland might occupy the Soviet Union—but Pakistan will not be occupied by India in any circumstances. Remember that. We will not be occupied. We shall fight and we shall fight for 1,000 years as we have fought for 1,000 years in the past. Our history is not a new history. We have. a 1,000 year history of confrontation. We can continue.

The Indian Government and the Indian people have a choice: the choice is very clear. It is do you want to live with us as friends in the same subcontinent, believing and respecting the principles of international law and morality, or do you want to be our implacable enemies? The choice is yours. We are prepared to extend the hand of friendship. We want to open a new chapter in our relations. Why can we not open a new chapter in our relations? Why should we always be the exception if the Germans and the French can forget their problems and get into the Common Market after so many wars and if the Turks and the Greeks do not go berserk and mad over Cyprus and start a conflict?

There are so many international disputes, but there is always the restraining hand of civilisation, of morality. If the Soviet Union and the United States after 15 years of confrontation can reach a detente and if China and the United States can open a dialogue, why cannot India and Pakistan also open a dialogue? And we are prepared for that dialogue; we wanted that dialogue. We wanted a new page,

a new dimension. We wanted to move according to the mood and the requirements of modern times, and we were anxious for it. I think the Indian Government is very good at research because they have quoted many facts and figures. I made many important statements saying that we are prepared to open a new page in our history, but they have now prevented it. If India had not today tried to occupy parts of Pakistan, I could have spoken more on the subject. But if I speak today on the subject, they might think that I am speaking from a position of weakness.

If only they had given us an opportunity. The Prime Minister of India said that she could not talk to a military regime. But the military regime said that after 13 years it was dissolving itself within a month. After the Prime Minister of India had spent nine months wailing could she not agree on one more month for a civilian government to come to power and open a dialogue, a communication between our two countries? Of course, the Indian Government did not wait for nine months out of tolerance and good behaviour. It utilised those nine months for infiltration into Pakistan. They wanted nine months to train people—the so-called guerrillas. The Foreign Minister of India has made a virtue of India's waiting for nine months. Well, he needed at least this time. We saw that. As a political leader of my country I said. "By the end of the year, there will be a new situation in Pakistan." We were anticipating their plans. After all intelligence matters. We saw what their plan was. We could see it. They wanted to train guerrillas; they wanted to create an international climate. The Indian Prime Minister wanted to go all over the world to create an international climate of goodwill and then to strike. She needed time. It was not out of good behaviour, wailing for the world to act.

We said, give us another month. Much has been made of the refugees that went from East Pakistan into the Bangladesh of India. And in the Bangladesh of India there are supposed to be nine or ten million refugees. We have not contended that these figures are wrong; we have not disputed the figures. As far as we are concerned, we have said that we are ashamed of the fact that our citizens have left our country. No country likes to have refugees: no country likes to have people leaving it. But if our people have left our country, we want them back, because if they have lived in that place for thousands of years, and have lived there for 24 years after Pakistan was created, then why can they not also in the future live in our country?' This no problem. If we said, "No. there are no refugees." We took a position on principle. We said that whatever refugees, we are prepared to take them back—whether there are six million three million, two million "or eight million genuine Pakistanis who, out of fear and propaganda, have left Pakistan, we are prepared to take them back because if they have lived with us before they can live with us again. The Indian Prime Minister said that they could not go back while there was a military regime in Pakistan. We said,

wait for a month, all we ask of you is to convert nine months into ten months; give us four more weeks. And I was prepared—and I said this in Karachi on the 12th—to go and visit those refugee camps as a political leader. I said that we were not closing any option we were not imposing any conditions for a political settlement but give us time. let us finish with the present phase and let us enter the new phase and usher in peace.

The Foreign Minister of India must know that I said on 18 October-in Lahore that I did not anticipate a war. He has quoted various slogans like “Crush India.” I said that I did not anticipate a war. Why did I say that? Because we want peace in order to serve our people to concentrate on their misery, on their problems. We do not want to be locked in international conflicts. We want time to achieve progress for our people. We have a socialist and Islamic programme for our people for bread, butler and progress. We wanted time to implement that. We wanted time for a civilian government to be established in Pakistan after 13 years, based on a massive mandate from the people, so that we could progress, move ahead, and serve our people. Instead, after nine months, they could not wait for one more month. They struck. And they struck heavily, reversing those forces of democracy about which the Foreign Minister of India waxes so eloquent. If the Foreign Minister is so interested in democracy, he should have waited for some time and democracy would have come. Democracy generates its own laws. It has a parliament. There is freedom of the press, and the demands of the public are more important than the demands of foreign powers. One thing might have led to another. We would first have tackled the principles involved, the causes of the dissatisfaction, which, I can tell you frankly was not confined to East Pakistan; there was dissatisfaction also in West Pakistan over questions of autonomy and democracy. So we were prepared to tackle all these problems. And we were prepared to tackle not only the problems of West Pakistan, but also the problems of East Pakistan on autonomy, on democracy, on secularism—all these matters. But we were not given a chance. It was used as a pretext. The idea was to see that Pakistan would not nourish and resolve its problems; the idea was to take advantage of the internal difficulties of Pakistan. Otherwise, we would have made good use of this opportunity.

India’s interest in the crisis did not arise suddenly after the tragic and fateful night of 25 March. Before 25 March India had manipulated a hijacking incident at Lahore which it used as a pretext to sever communications between East and West Pakistan through the air, through the Indian corridor. That was on January 30th after I had returned from East Pakistan, having completed my preliminary negotiations with Mujibur Rahman. The Indian Government was not happy about the negotiations that we were having with Sheikh Mujib, because the moment that I had completed the preliminary negotiations with him and had come back to West Pakistan, the first thing that was manipulated was the

hijacking incident which was arranged by Indian spies from occupied Kashmir in order to disrupt communications so that Mujibur Rahman and I could not easily remain in contact.

Now the Indian Government talks about a political settlement, a political agreement with the leaders of East Pakistan. But when the accredited leaders of East and West Pakistan met, the Indian Government disrupted their communications because it did not want an agreement on the basis of one Pakistan, which we were trying to achieve. So the first thing it did was to break the means of contact between the leaders of East and West Pakistan. We could not go by sea in those difficult circumstances in order to hold political dialogue and negotiations.

After that, on the pretext of holding elections in the Bangladesh of India they sent 150 thousand troops to conduct the polls. The idea was to put an army into position against East Pakistan and against Pakistan as a whole.

India has talked about how Pakistan a smaller country, one-fifth of the size of India and less in manpower and resources— and bear in mind India's armed forces, its army, navy, air force, its indigenous manufacturing capacity—has always been the aggressor against India. We come to this question of aggression, as to how much we have committed aggression against India in the last 24 years, since 1947 when the two states of India and Pakistan came into being.

In 1948 there was a conflict in Kashmir. You all know the history of the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir. It was a princely state. It had to determine its own future, according to the standpoint of both India and Pakistan, by its free will. If India had permitted a plebiscite in Kashmir there would have been no trouble there today; the Kashmir problem would not still be on the agenda of the United Nations. But it was India which prevented the plebiscite from being held in Kashmir. And yet it accuses Pakistan of the trouble there. If there is trouble in Kashmir it is of India's making because India is the country that admitted that there should be a plebiscite, a referendum in Kashmir and then prevented that plebiscite. No less a person than the then Prime Minister of India himself, and you can see this in the records of the Security Council made the commitment on the question of the plebiscite. And yet, today, the Indian Foreign Minister has the temerity to say that we were responsible for the conflict in 1947-1948 in Kashmir. The Indian Foreign Minister referred to the Rann of Kutch conflict. In the Rann of Kutch conflict it was the Indian forces which were the occupiers. Mr. Parthasarathy, who is now here on the Indian delegation was the High Commissioner. He was a good friend of mine—I was Foreign Minister at the time—and he came to me. I said, we are prepared to solve this problem peacefully; and we did solve it peacefully. I remember that he came to me very

agitated. I said, there must be some trouble: we will solve it peacefully. And if we had not wanted to solve it peacefully it would not have been solved in that manner. We left it in the able and experienced hands of the British who arranged arbitration between the two of us. The British know the subcontinent better than the rest of us. They arbitrated on the question. The trouble is too many people from the outside have arbitrated in the disputes of the subcontinent: right from Clive to the Tashkent Declaration outside intervention has decided the fate of the subcontinent. Why cannot India and Pakistan decide the fate of the subcontinent for a change? Either we have left it to outsiders—the French the British, the Russians and others— to decide our fate or we have gone to war. I tell the Government of India, let us not leave it to outsiders, and let us not let war to be the arbiter. Let us open a new page provided hostilities are ended and we return to normal conditions. But the Rann of Kutch dispute was left to arbitration and we accepted the award. In my opinion it was not a fair award because we were denied our territorial rights. Still, we accepted what was short of our rights. We accepted it in the interests of peace security and good relations between our two countries.

We were not then responsible for the 1947 holocaust, and we were not responsible for the trouble in the summer of 1965 in the Rann of Kutch. After that came the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965. Again we went to Tashkent and we settled it. We had arbitration. I think that arbitration also was not in the interests of Pakistan. That is an objective assessment. Nevertheless, signatures were attached by both the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan. Although the agreement more or less accepted the Indian position yet again in the interests of peace, there was a settlement at Tashkent. The fact is that that settlement was not in our interests; it was more in their interests—so much so that their Prime Minister died of jubilation at Tashkent. It was favourable to them and their press and everyone else was in agreement that it was.

So again we, as the smaller state, witnessed the power and might of the bigger state causing an erosion of our rights. But where are we to stop? How much are our rights to be eroded? Already the Indian Prime Minister is saying that the people of West Pakistan and Baluchistan must have their rights—already making a distinction between them. We know what is in their minds. We know why they are stalling, how they are taking something and consolidating it. And they want to take more and more and more. And Indians have never really reconciled themselves to what they call the vivisection of Bharat Mata. That is the truth of the matter. It has been established now by India's action by its predatory aggression in East Pakistan that it had never really reconciled itself to the creation of Pakistan. Today more than ever before India has barbarically and ruthlessly demonstrated to the world that it is not reconciled to the vivisection of what it calls Bharat Mata. But Sardar Swaran Singh, neither Bharat nor Mata will

be left – because these are the methods which leave behind neither a country nor principles.

Now I come to a problem which I would have avoided dealing with but it is essential being a connected relevant and cardinal aspect of the present situation. Since it is pivotal to the issue I must refer to it because my people know that this is the position and the world must know it is.

India and Pakistan, as we call the two major communities, have existed in the subcontinent for thousands of years. We have had conflicts, we have had wars. We have known how to deal with each other. We have dealt with each other and we have established some kind of equilibrium between ourselves. But today we are not pined against India as such. Today we are pitted against India and a great power. India is a big country. I have already said it is. But today it is standing on the shoulders of a big power to look bigger. If it did not stand on those big shoulders and look bigger it would not have been arrogant enough to defy the will of the General Assembly and the whole world expressed in a resolution calling for a cease-fire, the end of hostilities and the withdrawal of forces. Today we are pitted not against India but against a great power – and a neighbouring great power – to which we have done no harm. We have done it no wrong. We have made every effort to have the best of relations with that great power. We have the greatest respect for it. It is a neighbouring power very close to Pakistan.

In 1960, as Minister for Fuel, Power and Natural Resources, I was the first Minister to go to the Soviet Union to conclude an oil agreement in order to foster good relations between Pakistan and the Soviet Union. We annoyed our allies; we annoyed and had some basic misunderstandings with a country that is a greater power, militarily speaking. We were involved with that country in two treaties – SEATO and CENTO – and in bilateral agreements. But we wanted to improve our relations with a neighbouring country – and at that time it promised that if we got out of those pacts or became passive in those which were directed against it, that would bring about a new turn in relationships. Perhaps, we were not as shrewd in power politics as others are, but believing we should do so we made great efforts to improve our relations with the Soviet Union.

We have never wronged the Soviet Union. We have had the greatest respect and admiration for the Soviet people and for the great founder of the Soviet state, Lenin, one of the greatest men of contemporary times of all time. And our people still admire the Soviet Union. We cannot understand why the Soviet Union is being a party to our dismemberment. What wrong have we committed against the Soviet Union? If the Soviet Union was not a party to this exercise we would not be in the present situation.

I do not want to go into details. I do not want to quote facts and figures, I do not want to tell the Council on what date a destroyer was torpedoed how it was torpedoed or what has been done. I am not a person who goes into detail: I stress principles. My principles make me ask the Soviet Union what wrong the 120 million people of Pakistan have done that the Soviet Union should adopt such a partisan attitude, support a predatory aggressor and take such an extreme position—not in a just cause but to see my country dismembered? That is a legitimate question I ask in good faith, and still as a friend. Why does the Soviet Union want to defy world opinion on the question of the unity of Pakistan? Have we done the Soviet Union some basic wrong?

What makes it more puzzling is that on 2 April, 1971 President Podgorny in a message wished the Pakistani people well-being and prosperity and said he had rejoiced over their success in the democratic solution of the complicated problems facing the country. Mr. Kosygin told the special envoy of President Yahya Khan, Mr. Arshad Hussain, that relations between the Soviet Union and Pakistan were based on principled positions of strengthening co-operation for mutual benefit. He said the Soviet Union was willing to continue developing those relations and efforts for the cause of strengthening peace and international security. Again, Mr. Kosygin told our Ambassador in Moscow repeatedly that the Soviet Union did not wish to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan and that it was for Pakistan to decide what political system to adopt. He went on to emphasise that the political system within Pakistan was for Pakistan to decide, not for India or the Soviet Union. He said, "Please, Mr. Ambassador, tell the President that every aspect of our co-operation is based upon peace and not upon war. It is our constant policy that all disputes between India and Pakistan should be settled by negotiations and not by armed conflict. We are friends of Pakistan, and we want all questions between Pakistan and India to be settled peacefully. They are not rich enough to have conflicts; even richer states try to avoid conflicts. We can sincerely say that Pakistan and India should resolve their differences without resorting to a conflict. We should like to see them as friends. We have no other consideration. We do not want to interfere in your internal affairs."

Now, those are the messages from the President and Prime Minister of the Soviet Union. And in 1965, when there was a conflict between Pakistan and India, the Soviet Union had very good relations with India and with Pakistan—though those with India were better, yet it did not take such a significant and conspicuous position in India's favour as it has today. Today, the Soviet Union has openly and brazenly come out in support of India. The problem is that we are facing not India alone—we have faced India for thousands of years—but the Soviet Union. Otherwise the blockade of the Bay of Bengal would not have taken place. How could it have taken place, when the great fleets of the great powers

are on patrol there during peace time? What is the object of that? They do not patrol in peace time so that they can have a good cruise, because then Portugal and Denmark and others could do the same. It is to ensure that during conflict and troubles they can still keep the sea lanes open. How have the sea lanes been closed to us in East Pakistan? India could not have done it especially with the Seventh Fleet and other forces operating in those seas.

It is because of the massive support that the Soviet Union has given to India. If the Soviet Union detaches itself from the Indo-Pakistan conflict we are prepared to be pitied against India. India has become intoxicated with precisely the military gains which are a result of the Soviet support that it has received.

In this connexion, we must remember that the Indo-Soviet Treaty of 9th August was concluded during this crisis. Now, please consider that India has always pursued a policy of non-alignment. India pursued a policy of non-alignment from 1947 until 1962 when it unnecessarily came into conflict with China. Just as they attacked us today, they attacked China in 1962. But from 1947 to 1962 India was non-aligned. And the architect of that policy was Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. And his name has gone down in history as the architect of such a positive policy. But even from 1962. India on the whole remained non-aligned, albeit with its own methods of duplicity and double-dealing.

Then, why did India abandon its principles of non-alignment openly, legally, juristically on 9 August 1971, and aligned itself with a great power, the Soviet Union? As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, General-Secretary Brehznev's Asian security proposal to isolate China had been made two years earlier. Like the European security proposal, it had its own connotation. But the Asian security proposal of General-Secretary Brehznev had been made two years earlier. Why did not India then endorse the Asian security proposal? Or why did not India conclude a bilateral agreement in the spirit of the Brehznev proposals in 1967 and 1968? Why was it on 9 August 1971 that the Indian Government abandoned its policy of non-alignment, violated its established principles, and concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union which was called the Indo-Soviet Treaty? What is the quid pro quo? What is the reciprocity? As far as the Soviet Union is concerned it is obvious; a great power wants an Asian security pact for certain reasons, matching the power of another great country. But what was the benefit, what was the advantage to India? Why did a country that was wedded fundamentally, irrevocably to the classic policy of non-alignment, abandon it and go and conclude a pact with the Soviet Union on 9th August? Could you tell me what that quid pro quo was? That quid pro quo was the dismemberment of Pakistan. Nothing else. "We will join it, we will abandon non-alignment we will eat our own philosophy: but this is an implacable enemy and you must be on our side to destroy it" – that was the quid pro quo.

The real trouble started not with what happened in Dacca on 24th or 26th March. The real, fundamental trouble started when this Treaty was concluded and we had to face a new India, supported by the power, the prestige the spirit, the resources, the technology and the arms of the Soviet Union. If we had received half the quantity of arms that the Soviet Union has given to India, today we would be sitting in Delhi.

Now, there is an interesting article in that Treaty. It is Article 9:

“Each contracting party undertakes to abstain from giving any assistance to any third party that engages in an armed conflict with the other party. In the event of either party being subjected to attack or threat thereof, the high contracting party shall immediately enter into mutual consultations with a view to eliminating this threat and taking appropriate effective measures to ensure the peace and security of the country.”

These are diplomatic words, couched in defensive jargon, for offensive purposes. We should know this, because for 12 years we were members of two defence treaties, and we still are. So we are familiar with the language of these treaties. This is not a defensive Treaty; this is a Treaty which has an offensive purpose. Today, also consultations are going on. The Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union has gone to Delhi. Some officials of India, such as Mr. Dhar, have gone to the Soviet Union.

I would really like to know what crime or what wrong Pakistan has committed against the Soviet Union that my country should be dismembered. Because the Soviet Union has bad relations with China? China's relations with the Soviet Union do not mean that my country should be dismembered by the Soviet Union. China's relations with the Soviet Union are their relations. We have always taken the position that we want good relations with China and we want good relations with the Soviet Union. We do not want to have good relations with China at the cost of the Soviet Union, nor do we want to have good relations with the Soviet Union at the cost of China. But as a result of our good relations with China, we are being not only penalised, but treated in a fashion in which limb by limb we are being taken apart. This is unprecedented.

But even if we are being torn apart limb by limb, we will not abandon our good relations with China. China is a reliable friend of Pakistan; China is a reliable friend of Asia; China is a reliable friend of the Third World. Earlier on we strained our relations with a power greater than the Soviet Union because we developed our relations with China. But today, we are happy to see that there is

some change in that situation. We would be happy to see some change in the situation between the Soviet Union and China also.

But why should we be the victims? Why should we get into this nutcracker? The trouble is that we belong to Asia. We cannot transplant ourselves from Asia into the North American continent or Europe. China's borders with Pakistan are very long, very rugged: the Himalayas unite and link China and Pakistan—the mountains, the rivers.

Why should we have bad relations with a country which wants to have good relations with us and is a great power in our continent? What is the crime that we have committed by having good relations with a friendly country which has supported us and has stood by us? China's crime is that it has stood by the Third World. Its crime is that it has stood by principles. Its crime is that it will never abandon its friends. Now, if China was a chauvinist power, if China was an expansionist power, if China was an arrogant country, if China wanted to exterminate us, we would not have good relations with China. Of course, at one time our relations were not good.

But China is not an expansionist power. China has not shown any sign ever of interference in the affairs of another country. So why should we unnecessarily spoil our relations with China? But the choice offered us is: either spoil your relations with China or get dismembered. This is a very poignant choice, a very tragic choice.

But I say that even if a part of our territory or country is occupied that is not so important as having good relations with China. For whatever is occupied can be regained—and we will regain it, because it is our territory, they are our people they belong to us. Even this threat, the threat that you must be punished for having good relations with China—the world must see what happens to China's friends and what happens to the Soviet Union's friends—we consider temporary. We are convinced that the friends of the Soviet Union are not going to be beneficiaries in the long run, when they are aggressors. The friends of China are not aggressors. The friends of China are defending their self-respect, their sovereignty and their integrity; and if they are going to suffer some consequences, well a brave nation, an honourable and self-respecting nation is prepared to accept that confrontation.

Take East Pakistan for five or ten years, we will have it back: we will fight to take it back; and we will get our country back. Your occupation is not going to make any difference. East Pakistan is part of Pakistan and all the forces in the world can get together, but our country will remain unimpaired in the long run. You can have any illusions; you can stand on the shoulders of any great power and

use all its resources. But believe me. Mr. Foreign Minister, finally – this is the lesson of history from the beginning of time – what belongs to a people will go to that people. “Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar’s; render unto God that which is God’s.” East Pakistan is part of Pakistan – you know this. Remember this well.

The fact is that we are being made a Poland in Asia. Although Poland voted against us, we are being made a Poland. In 1939, there was a pact between Germany and the Soviet Union and Poland suffered. In 1971 there is a pact between India and the Soviet Union and Pakistan is suffering as a result of that pact. But we will not suffer for ever. The truth must prevail. Even if the Security Council takes no action, even if we have to face more trouble, even if this blackmail is to culminate in further aggression, we are quite confident that, finally, victory will be ours because we stand by justice. And all we are doing is to preserve our national unity and our national integrity.

The United States of America has been accused of supporting Pakistan. The United States of America is not supporting Pakistan but a principle. Please keep the distinction in mind. The United States of America has come out as a great power for a principle, and that principle is not that it is supporting Pakistan: the principle is that it is supporting the unity of a country. It supports the integrity of a country. It cannot permit a country to be dismembered by force. It cannot permit a country to be treated like a despised neighbour. And we are thankful to the United States for the position it has taken, not only for Pakistan but for an important international principle. We are beholden to the United States for promoting not our cause, but the cause of peace, justice and international morality. And the United States knows that its own prestige in the world will rise as a result. The United States has no cause to feel embarrassed. Indeed, if the United States had taken the opposite position, we would have understood it because, unfortunately, sometimes we have had strained relations. I am sorry we have had those strained relations. I am prepared to do everything in my power to repair those relations in Asia for the United States and in my country I do not speak as a puppet or as a representative of any regime; I speak in my right as an authentic voice of the people of West Pakistan. The time will come. We cannot forget it.

We are thankful to all countries which are supporting the cause of justice – we are thankful to China, we are thankful to the United States for supporting the voice of the world.

And now I come to France. The relations between France and Pakistan have been very good. Right from the creation of Pakistan, slowly, we have stepped up our relations in commerce, in trade and economics. We have also obtained a deeper

understanding. We have great respect and regard for French civilisation and culture. We admire the currents of French thought in Asian political thinking. The relations between Pakistan and France have been so good that we are really pained by France's present attitude in claiming that they are working behind the scenes. When there is no scene left, where will behind the scenes be?

France must take a positive moral position for national unity and integrity. We are not enemies of France; we are good friends of France. As far as we are concerned, Mr. Permanent Representative, the die has been cast. You must cast your die. Sometimes there will be the east wind; sometimes there will be the west wind. Do not go by the east wind; do not go by the west wind. Go by a principle. The principle is that Pakistan is a united, sovereign state, and an attempt is now being made to dismember Pakistan by physical force. We have the greatest admiration and respect for your great country. When your great former President went to Canada, all he said was "Vive la Quebec libre!" and such a storm was created. It was not said in the context of secession, but the whole world was in an uproar over how President de Gaulle was interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. That was nothing compared to what the Indians are doing in my country. They are not shouting slogans of "Vive la Joi Bangla." They are going in there with their arms, with their might, with their tanks, to take over my country.

So I appeal to you in the name of justice, I appeal to you in the name of humanity, I appeal to you in the name of the people of Asia—now you have a good name in Asia; you are a respected nation—please do not take the short-term factors into account. You must know that these bad days will pass and the truth will prevail.

I appeal to you in the name of the people of Pakistan. Franco-Pakistan relations have been so good, so cordial and so warm. Today, when we are fighting for our lives with our backs to the wall, when we are facing a much worse Dunkirk—speaking of Dunkirk, that is nothing compared to what our forces are facing—we would expect that France, conscious of the right, conscious of its contribution to civilisation and to world peace would play an effective and positive role.

As for Britain, we are members of the Commonwealth, we have remained members of the Commonwealth and I do not want to say too much. This crisis was, to some extent, aggravated by the attitude the British took, for whenever we go outside Asia we are told that the British know the subcontinent very well so we must consult them. If the British knew the subcontinent so well they would not have left us in this state, because for twenty-four years we have had conflict after conflict due to the way in which the departing power left us.

Now the question is this: why did the departing power leave us in that situation? Of course, the departing power took cognizance of the reality of the situation created by the will of the people. The British would not have permitted the partition of the subcontinent into two states—India and Pakistan, one divided by 1,000 miles—if that was not what the people of the subcontinent had wanted. But, the British did not give any benefit of doubt to Pakistan. The first Governor-General of India, Lord Louis Mountbatten was British; he was not the first Governor-General of Pakistan. Certain areas which the British originally said would be part of Pakistan were denied to us at the last minute. The fact is this: after denying our legitimate rights, the British said of whatever was left, “This, finally, is Pakistan.” Now, since the British decided what was finally Pakistan, why must they now not play a role to at least preserve what they finally conceded as Pakistan?

As far as the Third World is concerned, we are most grateful to it. We are part of the Third World. When it has come to us in our humble way we have always tried to make a contribution to the cause of the Third World. Anywhere in the Arab countries, Morocco, Algeria, the questions of independence, on Vietnam, Cambodia, wherever issues of the Third World have arisen, Pakistan has been in the forefront in supporting principles. Pakistan is grateful to the Third World which has spoken the truth. I salute the Third World. If the Third World had not spoken the truth on this present situation in the subcontinent, then the Third World would have become the Fourth World and the Fourth World would have been the graveyard of the Third World. By upholding truth and unity and justice with respect to Pakistan, the Third World has really preserved itself. We are not fighting only Pakistan’s battle, as I stated. If Pakistan is to be subjugated by force in this fashion, then as far as the subcontinent is concerned; Ceylon can forget its independence, as also Burma, Nepal, Bhutan, Afghanistan and Iran. The steam-roller will continue and go on and on. Any larger country will dictate to its smaller neighbour that so and so should be the President, that so and so should be the Prime Minister, that this is its will, that it should be autonomy here and secession there. And it will send its forces to enforce the diktat. All we ask of the Third World is not to forget us, because we never forgot the Third World. We are part of it. We are the small ones. We are the ones that they try to bully. We are the ones that they have tried to dominate. We must all unite collectively to put an end to great power hegemony and to great power domination. And we will succeed. There will be reverses, like the reverses we are facing. There will be troubles. There will be problems. But, finally, the Third World is bound to succeed because the Third World is really the most inspiring force in contemporary politics. That is why today, even if this draft resolution is vetoed, even if there is a deadlock, even if another draft resolution is vetoed, even if there are more difficulties for my country and more problems. I am sure that finally we shall succeed because the Third World is with us. And, today, we have come to

the Security Council to ask for the implementation of the verdict of the Third World. That is all we ask to be done.

Again I should like to return, before I conclude, to Indo-Pakistan relations. I have some notes here of the main points made by the Indian Foreign Minister. He raised quite a few points and I cannot refer to all of them now. However, there are some of them that I should like to touch upon. I have already touched upon some. I am sure that later the President will be kind enough to grant me the right of reply.

India's Foreign Minister said that West Pakistan had exploited East Pakistan—the resources and the riches of East Pakistan—and that that is basically the reason why we have come to the present situation. This is a very fundamental question. Exploitation is not a phenomenon of individuals or regions. Exploitation takes place as the result of a social system. It is the social system that exploits. And the same social system basically prevails in India and Pakistan. As much as they are making efforts in India to change their social system, we are also doing in our country because we believe that our present social systems are basically exploitative. The political party which I lead contends that there was exploitation, that East Pakistan had been exploited, as well as regions in the West, but by the social system. The struggle was really related to the social system. We are not denying that there were problems. But we do not say that this means that our country should be destroyed and dismembered by another country.

If tomorrow there are certain parts of another country that are being exploited because of the social system or for some other reason, does that mean that that country should be destroyed or dismembered? Certainly not. Therefore, that is a wrong premise on which they have proceeded.

In addition, the question is why has India occupied East Pakistan? It is rich alluvial, fertile and it has jute: it is a very rich region of the sub-continent. But the disaster of East Pakistan and of the other part of Pakistan is that a rich region has remained poor. We do not want to have exploitation in any part of our country and we do not want exploitation in any part of the world. But we should be given the chance to decide how we remake our own country, how we transform our own social system and how the nation is to evolve. It is not the right of another country to dictate to us how that should be done or what should be done or who should come here to represent a point of view.

Today, the Indian Foreign Minister said that the problem could only be resolved if a representative of the so-called Bangladesh government, which was created by India, was represented in the Security Council. But Bengal is Bengal and East

Pakistan is part of Pakistan. Are you going to permit this kind of precedent, when provincial parties and those who are clients of larger countries should have representation before the Security Council? Are we going back to the days of the Greek city states? Are we going to end up with the principalities of India all over again? Sometimes the Marathas will come to the Security Council; sometimes the Sikhs will come to the Security Council; sometimes the Punjabis will come to the Security Council; and other provinces will come to the Security Council to present their case. We can also bring some people from India. We have not indulged in that kind of mischief. But give us some time; we can also give you some representatives from India who will come here and ask that they should be represented.

Shonan, Sardar sahib, eta amar Sonar Bangla Bharater nai, which in English means: Listen, Sardar Singh, Golden Bengal belongs to us not to India. Golden Bengal is part of Pakistan. You cannot take away Golden Bengal like that from Pakistan. We will fight to the bitter end. We will fight to the last man.

Premeditated Invasion by India
Speech in Security Council, New York,
December 13, 1971

There is street fighting going on, from house to house, in Pakistan. On account of the urgency of the matter, I shall confine myself to the main points raised yesterday by the Foreign Minister of India, and also briefly touch upon some of the main points he raised today. Most of what he has said needed detailed rebuttal. When I consulted the text this morning I found that it was mostly a restatement of the characteristically self-righteous position which India has adopted during this crisis and also in the past. However, one thing was quite obvious. After committing a brazen aggression against Pakistan, after assaulting our territorial integrity and political independence, after defying the United Nations openly and blatantly, after ignoring the fervent appeal of 104 Member States, India is attempting to assume a posture of reasonableness. The gist of the Indian Foreign Minister's statement was that: A situation arose in Pakistan which was not of our creation. We were inundated with refugees. We sought nothing more than that these refugees be repatriated. Pakistan refused to allow this repatriation. We had therefore no choice but to invade Pakistan.

Shorn of all verbiage, stripped of its sanctimoniousness, the whole Indian argument amounts to saying that India had the right to invade Pakistan in order to bring about a settlement of the refugee problem. I leave it to any fair-minded person to judge how hollow the pretence is. Even if the principle be disregarded that nothing can justify invasion, the reality remains that the armed attack has multiplied rather than eased the poignant humanitarian problem of East Pakistan; that it has resulted in vastly greater destruction and devastation than had been brought about during the civil strife; that it has done a damage to the infrastructure of East Pakistan that will take decades to repair; and that a calamity has been turned into a catastrophe. Forget the legal rights and wrongs of the conflict for a moment: consider only the human problems in their concreteness, and you cannot but be appalled. Nobody can be more grieved at the desolation caused in East Pakistan by Indian aggression than the people of West Pakistan. I must stress that the problem cannot be rightly appraised if the picture is not correctly visualised or if it is put in a wrong focus. The picture that India presents is that of an invading army coming to the rescue of those, who are fighting for their freedom. This picture has no resemblance to reality. Let me mention some basic facts. Among the Pakistani soldiers today, who are fighting with their backs to the wall in East Pakistan, there are a considerable number of East Pakistanis. A good part of the personnel of the East Bengal Regiment and the East Pakistan Rifles are fighting side by side with their comrades from West

Pakistan for the unity of their country. A hundred thousand volunteers representing the flower of East Pakistan youth are laying down their lives at this very moment for the honour and freedom and integrity of Pakistan, from which the honour and freedom and integrity of Bangladesh are totally inseparable.

Much has been said about the Mukti Bahini as if it were an army of freedom fighters. India itself admits that it is an army raised in India, trained in India, armed by India, directed by India, and that through all these nine months it operated from bases in India. What else is it therefore except an irregular Indian army? People will say that there is no use in dubbing them as Indian agents and dismissing them at that. But I do not call them-Indian agents. I consider them nothing more than Indian auxiliaries, and no one who bears in mind their origin and organisation and command can consider them as anything else. It is true that some among them have been recruited from those persons who were uprooted from East Pakistan. Whatever their proportion might be, whether it is high or low, it cannot change the character of this army; because a fighting group, armed and equipped and trained, financed and directed by India, is nothing but an Indian force. There is ample evidence that many among the refugees joined that force because they had no choice; you either starve or you join the Mukti Bahini. What wonder that many joined.

So the first important requirement for an objective assessment of the situation is to dismiss the myth that has been artfully propagated by India, the myth that India has been moved by sympathy and solicitude for the welfare of Muslim Bengal or East Pakistan. If India had so much feeling for the Bengalis, what explains its indiscriminate raids on purely Civilian targets? Even an orphanage situated in a residential area of Dacca, with 300 innocent children inside, was not spared. What explains a blockade which prevents even the supplies of food and medicines from reaching the people of East Pakistan? What explains India's approval of the slaughter of thousands of innocent people, men, women and children, and even newborn babies, which was rampant in East Pakistan from 2 March to 25 March 1971? And finally, what explains India's direct encouragement of terror and sabotage and destruction in an area where the margin of survival is lower perhaps than anywhere else in the world?

In my statement yesterday and on previous occasions, the Pakistan, delegation has dwelt extensively on the legal issues involved in the conflict with which the Security Council is confronted. Those real issues are of paramount importance because they directly involve the fundamental principles of the territorial integrity of states, non-intervention in domestic affairs of other states, and the non-use of force in international relations, which constitute the very basis of a peaceful world order. If you compromise them, if you qualify them, if you

impose conditions on their validity, you usher in total anarchy in the world. But today I would rather stress the human peculiarity of the Indo-Pakistan situation.

A colossal human wrong is being perpetrated in East Pakistan today by Indian invasion, and it cries to be righted. It can be righted by the collective will of the world community. If that fails, then other forces or a combination of forces will inevitably set in.

The first process would be corrective and of immediate effect. The second would take long and would inevitably involve larger conflicts entailing much hardship for all the peoples of the subcontinent. What course the events will take will depend in great part on the wisdom and the courage of the Security Council today.

It has been said during this debate that the problem is to be viewed in context and that its root cause should not be forgotten. Let me make it clear that such an approach, if sincere and genuine, is entirely consistent with Pakistan's point of view. In fact, it is the approach which Pakistan urges;

in fact, it is the approach that my party, which is the single largest party of West Pakistan, has been approaching since 27 March. We have made many statements on these matters and on the mistakes that have been committed; and from 27 March right up to the present we have been talking about them. On 29 September I issued a policy statement of my party spelling out these problems and also suggesting how they could be resolved. So, I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that these matters are urgent and that they require to be tackled realistically.

If India and Pakistan had been two friendly states, two neighbours with a co-operative relationship, is it imaginable that an internal conflict in Pakistan would have assumed such dimensions? After all, the discontent of the people of East Pakistan was not a new problem which arose suddenly. It has been there and though I acknowledge that it was not approached with the courage and resolution which were required and which only a democratic government in Pakistan could have surmounted, it had received considerable attention, and many adjustments and readjustments were made or contemplated for its solution.

The immediate issue before and after the elections was of a constitutional nature. No heads need be broken over constitutional issues. The crisis may have been severe for Pakistan, but there is not the slightest ground to suppose that the people of Pakistan were incapable of the dynamic adjustments that were necessary.

It was Indian intervention and Indian manipulation that so aggravated the crisis as to cause a most tragic strife. Therefore, when you talk of the root cause of the problem, you have to consider India's persistent hostility against Pakistan. When you talk of the context, you have to bear in mind the multitude of aggressions that have been committed by India.

In October 1947, just two months after the establishment of India and Pakistan as independent states, India invaded Kashmir which, as a Muslim majority state, should have acceded to Pakistan. In early November 1947, India marched into Junagadh, an area whose future should have been settled amicably. In September 1948, India sent its armies into Hyderabad, again an area whose problem should have been solved peacefully and not by invasion. In October 1962, India launched a forward policy of incursions across the Chinese frontier. It was Chinese magnanimity that halted the conflict, but India persisted in rejecting negotiations towards concluding a boundary agreement with China. In September 1965, India invaded Pakistan, an act which it repeated six years later. Even in the very early years of India's independence a most distinguished and far-sighted British statesman, the late Mr. Ernest Bevin, said about India that "this young state has pronounced warlike proclivities." His apprehension has been proved entirely justified. What other state in the contemporary world has committed as many as six major invasions during the last 24 years?

I have not mentioned India's invasion of Goa because India often pretends that it has placed all African states under some kind of obligation by expelling Portugal by force from that tiny enclave. Be that as it may, the fact remains that after ousting Portugal, India has not treated the inhabitants of Goa with justice, but has sought to obliterate their identity.

Much more infamous is India's campaign in Nagaland, which was begun in the middle of the 1950s and whose aim is the subjugation of a people who are culturally and racially distinct from India and whose homeland was never juridically a part of India.

So this is the context of the problem: India's record of one aggression after another, its fatal tendency to have recourse to arms and its aims of establishing a hegemony over South Asia. Had it not been for this, no internal problem of Pakistan, however acute, could possibly have led to a violent explosion.

India alleges that Pakistan has been planning a war in order to draw attention from its democratic crisis. If this were true, why would Pakistan have initiated or accepted every proposal by which hostilities would have been averted? Let me

mention briefly the moves that were made or supported by Pakistan during the last five months.

First, Pakistan sought the good offices of the Security Council in August. What was wrong with that proposal? But India blocked the move. Second, Pakistan accepted the proposal for a pull-back of Indian and Pakistani armed forces from the borders to peacetime stations. India rejected it. Who was seeking peace, and who was plotting a war? Third, Pakistan proposed that the two sides withdraw their armed forces at least to agreed safe distances, to meet India's contention that its lines of communication were longer. This was the proposal made by Pakistan in October. Could it be the proposal of a Government that was planning a war? India's Prime Minister dismissed it summarily. Did she intend to prevent a war by doing that? Fourth, when the Secretary-General offered his good offices in October, Pakistan promptly welcomed the offer. How did India respond? The Indian Prime Minister gave a lecture to the Secretary-General. The message was: If you, Mr. Secretary-General, are prepared to exceed your competence, see the problem as we view it and execute our designs, you are welcome; otherwise, not. Fifth, Pakistan also asked for United Nations observers to be stationed on both sides of the border to prevent any encroachment from either side. Does a Government planning a war ask for observers? And does a Government which seeks to prevent a war reject such a proposal? But India spurned that suggestion also. Sixth, on 29 November, eight days after India's massive invasion of East Pakistan, Pakistan went so far as to signify its willingness to accept United Nations observers on its own side of the East Pakistan borders. Did we want the observers to witness our preparations for war?

All these moves for peace made by Pakistan are apparent from the Secretary-General's report of 4 December. Let any representative seated around this table disregard any partisan sympathies and considerations of expediency and come to an impartial judgement on this question. Does not this whole sequence bear out the premeditated nature of India's aggression?

I know that members of the Security Council are not always free to state their positions candidly, but I shall be content if they make an impartial judgement about the origin and causes of this war. Let them face the issue in the privacy of their own minds. If they do, they cannot but realise what the imperatives of the situation are.

These imperatives are, first, a cease-fire; second, withdrawal from Pakistani territory of Indian forces and other armed personnel which entered Pakistan from India; third, the stationing of United Nations observers to supervise the cease-fire and withdrawal; fourth, the devising of means to ensure that the Geneva Conventions on armed conflict are scrupulously adhered to and that no

reprisals take place in East Pakistan. The withdrawal of forces is, of course, a reciprocal obligation; therefore, Pakistani forces also have to withdraw from Indian territory simultaneously.

Let me make it clear that if these imperatives are fulfilled, Pakistan will heed the appeal of its friends for a cessation of all military activity in East Pakistan, provided that no sabotage, massacre or large-scale violence continues.

As regards the political settlement, it need hardly be said that Pakistan will spare no effort in achieving a solution of its internal problem consistent with the will of the people and its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The sine qua non of the success of the efforts towards a political solution is that they should be free from any outside pressure and foreign participation. It is also an inescapable essential that the negotiations must be without preconditions from either side. Given such an atmosphere, there is not the slightest warrant to suppose that a political solution will not emerge which will end the nightmare of the last nine months and induce the speedy repatriation of the people who have been uprooted from East Pakistan.

This is Pakistan's attitude even in this hour of destructive conflict. If the Security Council responds to it positively, the conflict will be ended. In doing so, the Council will uphold the principles of the United Nations. It will show that it is not swayed by power politics but moved by compassion and courage. It will demonstrate that it has the resources to bring about a reconciliation. If it bears in mind the principles involved, the Security Council can feel assured of Pakistan's co-operation. I have come here to seek peace, a peace with honour and justice. I do not want to go back a disappointed man. Should my mission fail, it will be the defeat of not only our hopes but those of the entire people of Pakistan, both in the East and in the West. The disruptive impact of such disappointment on the fabric of peace can hardly be exaggerated.

So, I reiterate Pakistan's earnest desire to seek a peaceful solution, a peaceful settlement of the internal problems of Pakistan. Within the concept of one united Pakistan, we are prepared to spare no measures to find a peaceful solution of the problems that have aggravated the present tension. This is our hope and we believe that given the determination, vision and confidence, the democratic, elected elements of Pakistan who have the support of the people of Pakistan can come to a correct and just solution in the interests of the whole nation of Pakistan.

I repeat, this has been our point of view right from the day the crisis arose. From 25 March we have been pressing for this, that there must be a political solution. Again and again we have been pressing on the present military regime that there

must be a political solution to the problems of Pakistan. I repeat, on 29 September we issued a policy statement on this matter. Today I represent my nation. I have come in this hour of trial. I have been summoned at the last moment to be at the call of Pakistan. I have responded to this because my nation needs my services, and that is why, at the eleventh hour, I have been summoned by my country to come and represent it in its gravest crisis.

We want a political settlement. The Foreign Minister of India talks about a political solution but has applied a military solution to the problem. He wants the repatriation of refugees but riding on Indian tanks and flanked by Indian bayonets. It is India that is seeking a military solution to the problem. Pakistan wants a political solution and Pakistan will have a political solution once Indian intervention is removed from the soil of Pakistan.

My Country Beckons Me
Speech at the Security Council, New York,
December 15, 1971

We have met here today at a grave moment in the history of my country and I would request the Council kindly to bear with me and to hear the truth, the bitter truth. I know the United Nations; I know the Security Council I have attended their sessions before. The time has come when, as far as Pakistan is concerned, we shall have to speak the truth whether members of the Council like it or not. We were hoping that the Security Council, mindful of its responsibilities for the maintenance of world peace and justice, would act according to principles and bring an end to a naked, brutal aggression against my people. I came here for this reason. I was needed by the people of Pakistan, and when I was leaving Pakistan I was in two minds whether: to go to the Security Council to represent the cause of my country, to represent the cause of a people that had been subjected to aggression, or to remain with my people, by their side, while they were being subjected to attack and violence. However, I felt that it was imperative for me to come here and seek justice from the Security Council. But I must say, whether the members like it or not, that the Security Council has denied my country that justice. From the moment I arrived we have been subjected to dilatory tactics.

It will be recalled that when the Indian Foreign Minister spoke and I spoke after him, I said that filibustering was taking place. That was my immediate observation. The Security Council, I am afraid, has excelled; in the art of filibustering, not only on substance but also on procedural matters. With some cynicism, I watched yesterday a full hour of the Security Council's time wasted on whether the members of the Council would be ready to meet at 9.30 a.m. or that bed and breakfast required that they should meet at 11 a.m.

The representative of Somalia referred to the population of East Pakistan as 56 million, but later on he corrected himself to say that the population of Bengal – of Muslim Bengal – was 76 million. If he had waited for a few more days he need not have corrected himself because millions are dying, and it would have come to 56 million if the Council had kept on filibustering and discussing whether it should meet today or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow – whether the lines of communication between New York and Moscow and Peking and other capitals would permit the members to obtain new instructions. Thus, we could have gone on and on. That is why I requested you, Mr. President, to convene a meeting of the Security Council immediately and I am thankful to you for having convened this meeting, because precious time is being lost. My countrymen, my people, are dying. So I think I can facilitate your efforts if I speak now. Perhaps this will be my last speech in the Security Council. So please bear with me because -I have

some home truths to tell the Security Council. The world must know. My people must know. I have not come here to accept abject surrender. If the Security Council wants me to be a party to the legalisation of abject surrender, then I say that under no circumstances shall it be so. Yesterday my eleven year old son telephoned me from Karachi and said "Do not come back with a document of surrender. We do not want to see you back in Pakistan if you do that." I will not take back a document of surrender from the Security Council. I will not be a party to the legalisation of aggression.

The Security Council has failed miserably, shamefully. "The Charter of the United Nations," "the San Francisco Conference," "international peace and justice" – these are the words we heard in our youth, and we were inspired by the concept of the United Nations maintaining international peace and justice and security. President Woodrow Wilson said that he fought the First World War to end wars for all time. The League of Nations came into being, and then the United Nations after it. What has the United Nations done? I know of the farce and the fraud of the United Nations. They come here and say, "Excellence, Excellence, comment allez-vous?" and all that. "A very good speech – you have spoken very well, tres bien." We have heard all these things. The United Nations resembles those fashion houses which hide ugly realities by draping ungainly figures in alluring apparel. The concealment of realities is common to both but the ugly realities cannot remain hidden. You do not need a Secretary-General. You need a chief executioner.

Let us face the stark truth. I have got no stakes left for the moment. That is why I am speaking the truth from my heart. For four days we have been deliberating here. For four days the Security Council has procrastinated. Why? Because the object was for Dacca to fall. That was the object. It was quite clear to me from the beginning. All right, so what if Dacca falls? Cities and countries have fallen before. They have come under foreign occupation. China was under foreign occupation for years. Other countries have been under foreign occupation. France was under foreign occupation. Western Europe was under foreign occupation. So what if Dacca falls? So what if the whole of East Pakistan falls? So what if the whole of West Pakistan falls? So what if our state is obliterated? We will build a new Pakistan. We will build a better Pakistan. We will build a greater Pakistan.

The Security Council has acted short-sightedly by acquiescing in these dilatory tactics. You have reached a point when we shall say, "Do what you like." If this point had not been reached we could have made a commitment. We could have said, "All right, we are prepared to do some things." Now why should we? You want us to be silenced by guns. Why should we say that we shall agree to anything? Now you decide what you like. Your decision will not be binding on

us. You can decide what you like. If you had left us a margin of hope, we might have been a party to some settlement.

But the Indians are so short-sighted. Mr. President, you referred to the “distinguished” Foreign Minister of India. What may I ask is so “distinguished” about a policy of aggression he is trying to justify. How is he distinguished when his hands are full of blood, when his heart is full of venom? But you know they do not have vision.

The partition of India in 1947 took place because they did not have vision. Now also they are lacking in vision. They talk about their ancient civilisation and the mystique of India and all that. But they do not have vision at all. If I had been in his place, I would have acted differently. I extended a hand of friendship to him the other day. He should have seen what I meant. I am not talking as a puppet. I am talking as the authentic leader of the people of West Pakistan who elected me at the polls in a more impressive victory than the victory that Mujibur Rahman received in East Pakistan, and he should have taken cognizance of that. But he did not take cognizance of it. We could have opened a new page, a new chapter in our relations.

As I said, if the French and the Germans can come to terms, why cannot India and Pakistan come to terms? If the Turks and the Greeks can still talk sensibly as civilised people over Cyprus, why cannot India and Pakistan do likewise? If the Soviet Union and the United States can open a new page in their history, if China and the United States can open a new page in their history, why can we not usher a new era in our relations? We could have done so. But as it was said about the 1967 Arab-Israel war, the military victory of Israel made it more difficult for Israel and the Arabs to reach a settlement. If you want to subjugate Pakistan militarily, you will find it more difficult to bring peace. I say that the choice for us is either to accept living in the same subcontinent and co-operating for peace and progress, or to be implacable enemies of each other forever.

The Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union does not like my reference to the Roman Empire. I do not know what objection he has to it, unless he sees some similarity between his empire and the Roman Empire. I do not really see why he had any objection to that. But I shall again refer to the Roman Empire, and I hope that the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union will have no objection to it because we want to have good relations with the Soviet Union and we want to open a new chapter with the Soviet Union because we are neighbours. I go back to the Roman Empire and I say what Cato said to the Romans, “Carthage must be destroyed.” If India thinks that it is going to subjugate Pakistan, Eastern Pakistan as well as Western Pakistan—because we are one people, we are one state—then we shall say, “Carthage must be

destroyed." We shall tell our children and they will tell their children that Carthage must be destroyed.

So please, Mr. President and members of the Security Council, realise the implications. The Pakistani nation is a brave nation. One of the greatest British generals said that the best infantry fighters in the world are the Pakistanis. We will fight. We will fight for a thousand years, if it comes to that. So do not go by momentary military victories. Stalingrad was overwhelmed. Leningrad was besieged for a thousand days. People who want to be free and who want to maintain their personality will fight and will continue to fight for principles.

We were told about the realities; to accept the realities. What are the realities? Realities keep changing, the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union knows that once the reality was that the Nazis were outside the gates of Moscow, but you fought valiantly, bravely, and the world saluted the Soviet Union for having resisted the realities that were sought to be imposed on it. The reality was that China was under the occupation of Japan, that Manchuria was taken—half of China. That was the reality. Since the Opium War, China has seen reality. The reality for France was that it was under occupation. But there were great men like President de Gaulle who left France and fought from across the seas. Ethiopia was under Fascist domination. But the Ethiopians fought. The Emperor of Ethiopia left his country and sought asylum in Britain. Ethiopia is free today. The realities that matter are those which are not temporary phenomena which are rooted in historic principles. The principle is that Pakistan is an independent, sovereign state which came into being because of the volition of its people. That is the basic reality which has existed for 24 years. Pakistan would not have faced dismemberment like this if it had not been attacked by another country. This is not an internal movement. We have been subjected to attack by a militarily powerful neighbour. Who says that the new reality arose out of free will? Had there been the exercise of free will, India would not have attacked Pakistan. If India talks about the will of the people of East Pakistan and claims that it had to attack Pakistan in order to impose the will of the people of East Pakistan, then what has it done about Kashmir? East Pakistan is an integral part of Pakistan. Kashmir is a disputed territory. Why does India then not permit it to exercise its will?

But yesterday I saw how the Security Council was pandering to India. Even the great powers are pandering to India, saying to us, "Do not misunderstand," "Would you please let us know" and "Would you please answer the following questions; I am not insisting on those questions, but if you do not mind." India is intoxicated today with its military successes.

I told the Indian Permanent Representative in 1967 that we wanted good relations between the two countries—but based on principles, based on justice, based on equity, not based on exploitation and domination, because such relations cannot be lasting. What we want is a lasting, a permanent solution. I do not say this just today; I said that in 1967 to their Permanent Representative who was then the High Commissioner of India to Pakistan I said that to the Foreign Minister of India when we were negotiating on Kashmir, “Let us settle this problem on the basis of equity and justice, so that we can live as good neighbours.” And I add today: we can still live as good neighbours, as friends. Do not wipe out that possibility by military conquest and military power.

This has been the worst form of aggression, of naked aggression. Even Poland was not invaded by Germany in this fashion. Even in that case there were some pretences, some excuses that were made. Here the excuse was, “We have refugees, so we must invade another country.” We said, “We are prepared to take those refugees back.” If we had said, “We are not prepared to take them back,” then you could have said, “Well, you will be sunk.” India’s population rises by 13 million a year. The number of refugees was alleged to be 9 million, 10 million. According to our estimate they were 5 million. But that is not important; figures are not important. The point is that we were prepared to take them back. If India’s population can grow by 13 million a year, then with all the aid and assistance that India was getting for the refugees, it could have held on for a short period till Pakistan had a civilian government to negotiate the return of the refugees. I told the United States Ambassador in Pakistan that once a civilian government came into power in Pakistan, was prepared to go to the refugee camps myself to talk to them. But India pre-empted it all because the refugee problem was used as a pretext to dismember my country. The refugee problem was used as a pretext, an ugly, crude pretext, a shameful pretext to invade my country, to invade East Pakistan.

The great powers will forgive me. I have addressed them in this moment of anguish, and they should understand. The great powers or the superpowers—the super-duper-powers, the razzling-dazzling powers—the superpowers have imposed their super will for the moment. But I am thankful to the people and the Government of the United States among the superpowers, for the position it has taken. The people of the United States, to some extent have been misled by massive Indian propaganda. Because we had no paraphernalia of popular administration and government in Pakistan, there was a political vacuum. The Indians took advantage of that political vacuum and they spread out fast to project their point of view. As a result, American public opinion and public opinion in Great Britain and France and other countries was influenced. Unfortunately, nothing was said of the massacres that took place between 1 March and 25 March. No doubt there were mistakes on our side. I said yesterday

that mistakes were made, and the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union said that I had admitted mistakes. Well, that is not a sign of weakness, is it? Do we not all make mistakes? Are India and the Soviet Union the only two countries that have never made mistakes? I have made mistakes personally. But mistakes do not mean that my country must be destroyed, that my country must be dismembered. That is not the consequence of mistakes of government. Which government does not make mistakes? But if some government has made a mistake, does it follow that the country itself must be dismembered, obliterated? Is that going to be the conclusion of the Security Council if it legalises Indian aggression on the soil of Pakistan?

So you will see now: this is not the end of the road, this is the beginning of the road; this is not the end of the chapter, a new chapter has begun a new page has been written in international relations. This is gunboat diplomacy in its worst form. In a sense, it makes the Hitlerite aggression pale into insignificance because Hitlerite aggression was not accepted by the world. If the world is going to endorse this aggression, it will mean a new and most unfortunate chapter in international relations. A new chapter may have begun in India and Pakistan, but please do not start a new dreadful chapter in international relations. For us, it is a hand-to-hand, day-to-day, minute-to-minute fight. But do not do that to the rest of the world. Please do not permit this kind of naked, shameful barbaric aggression to hold sway. In the old days great warriors swept over the world – Changiz Khan, Subutai Khan, Alexander, Caesar, coming down to the great Napoleon. But this is worse, this is much worse than all that was done by the great conquerors of the world in the past. If the United Nations becomes a party to this kind of conquest, it will be much worse than all that has been done in the past. You will be turning the medium-sized and the small countries into the harlots of the world. You cannot do that. It is against civilised concepts: it is against all the rules of civilisation and of international morality and justice.

The United States Government was criticised for supporting the position of Pakistan. What crime has the United States Government committed? It has taken a position identical to that of the whole world on the India-Pakistan conflict. That position was supported by 105 countries – it was 104 officially, but it was really 105 because one representative did not press the right button. That was the voice of the world. It was an international referendum. You talk about the election of 1970. Well, I am proud of the election of 1970 because my party emerged as the strongest party in West Pakistan. But here was an international poll and India flouted it. With such an attitude towards international opinion, how can India pretend to be sensitive to a national election in another country? The same India that refuses to hold a referendum in Kashmir?

The Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union talked about realities. Mr. Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union looks at this reality. I know that you are the representative of a great country. You behave like one. The way you throw out your chest, the way you thump the table you do not talk like Comrade Malik; you talk like Czar Malik. I see you are smiling. Well, I am not because my heart is bleeding. We want to be friends, but this is not the way to be friends when my country is decimated, sought to be destroyed, wiped out.

Why should China and the United States be criticised when the whole world is for Pakistan? You know that we have won a great political victory. We might have suffered a military defeat, but a political victory is more important than a military defeat because political victory is permanent while military defeat is temporary. The United States Government has acted according to its great traditions by supporting Pakistan, and I will go to the people of the United States before I return home and tell them the truth. The United States has stood by the traditions of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, right down to Roosevelt and Wilson by supporting Pakistan as an independent state, its national integrity and its national unity. What wrong and crime has the United States committed? Why is the Indian delegation so annoyed with the United States? The Indian delegation is annoyed with U.S. – can you imagine that? If it had not been for the massive food assistance that the United States gave to India, India would have had starvation; its millions would have died. What hope will India give to the people of East Pakistan? What picture of hope is it going to give when its own people in Western Bengal sleep in the streets, where there is terrible poverty, where there is terrible injustice and exploitation, when the parliamentary rule in West Bengal has been superseded by presidential rule? Is India going to do better for East Pakistan, for Muslim Bengal, than it has done for West Bengal? Thousands of West Bengali people sleep in the streets of Calcutta. The people of West Bengal are the poorest. India goes hat in hand to the United States for six million tons of food. If they are going to impose presidential-rule in West Bengal, in their Bengal, how can they do any better in our Bengal? They will not. And time will show that they will not.

So the United States has taken a correct and moral position. Thomas Jefferson once said, “I have sworn eternal hostility against any form of tyranny practised over the mind of man”. This is a vast form of tyranny practised over the mind of man and over the body of man. So the United States has adhered to its tradition. And if some misguided Senators were here, some young, misguided Senators who have been overtaken by Indian propaganda—and if the Permanent Representative of the United States were not from Texas—I would have told those young Senators that I was setting up the headquarters for a republic of Texas and making the former President-of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, the chief of that republic, in order to spread the cult of Bangladesh everywhere.

Why can Texas not be free? Let there be a republic of Texas. We did not buy Bengal as Alaska was bought by the United States. We did not pay money to get our territory. We did not pay dollars to acquire territory. The people of the United States should appreciate the position taken by their Government.

Muslim Bengal was a part of Pakistan of its free will, not through money. We did not buy it as Alaska was purchased. Why do the people of the United States not see that? And we are beholden and thankful to the great People's Republic of China. We shall always remain thankful for the position it has taken. It has taken a position based on principles of justice. And I thank the Third World for having supported a just cause, a right cause.

And now in the Security Council we have been frustrated by a veto. Let us build a monument to the veto, a big monument to the veto. Let us build a monument to the impotence and incapacity of the Security Council and the General Assembly. As you sow, so shall you reap. Remember that Biblical saying. Today, it is Pakistan. We are your guinea pigs today. But there will be other guinea pigs and you will see what happens. You will see how the chain of events unfolds itself. You want us to lick the dust. We are not going to lick the dust.

Britain and France have abstained from voting in order to play a role. I said the other day, with all due respect to those two great powers, that they have really exhausted their position in trying to play a role because now the only role they can play is to accept a shameless *fait accompli*. Britain and France abstained, and that abstention has cost us dearly. Gallic logic and Anglo-Saxon experience, whatever it is, have cost us dearly. If Britain and France had put their powerful weight behind the international community rather than sitting on the fence, the issue might have been different. There is no such animal as a neutral animal. You take positions. In that respect we admire the Soviet Union; it took a position, a wrong position, but it took a position. You have to take a position on these matters. You have to be either on the side of justice or on the side of injustice; you are either on the side of justice or on the side of injustice; you have to be either on the side of the aggressor or of the victim. There is no third road. It is a black and white situation in these matters; there is no grey involved. You are either for right or you are for wrong; you are either for justice or for injustice; you are either for aggression or for the victim. If the United Kingdom and France had earlier put their full weight behind the verdict of the international community, I think that we would not have reached this position. But Great Britain and France want to come back into the subcontinent as Clive and Dupleix, in a different role, the role of peacemakers. They want a foot here and they want a foot there. I know that British interests in East Pakistan required this kind of opportunistic role because in East Pakistan they have their tea estates. They want the jute of East Pakistan. So that is why they sat on the fence. And I am sorry at France's

position because with France we had developed very good relations, extremely good relations. But they took this position. And now, today, neither Britain nor France can play a role because their resolution has been overtaken by events. There is a lot of goodwill for France in Pakistan, and they will not get the same goodwill in East Pakistan because in East Pakistan already the clock is now moving in another direction. Everyday that the Indian Army of occupation stays there, it will be a grim reminder for Muslim Bengal that they are under Hindu occupation, and you will see the result of it. You will see how it will turn out. Let them stay – why not? Let them stay. Let them swagger around. If they want to take East Pakistan, let them stay as an army of occupation. They are an army of occupation; how can they be called liberators? They will stay, and they will see how the clock is going to move in a different direction.

Finally, I am not a rat. I have never ratted in my life. I have faced assassination attempts, I have faced imprisonments. I have always confronted crises. Today I am not ratting, but I am leaving your Security Council. I find it disgraceful to my person and to my country to remain here a moment longer than is necessary. I am not boycotting. Impose any decision, have a treaty worse than the Treaty of Versailles, legalise aggression, legalise occupation, legalise everything that has been illegal up to 15 December 1971. I will not be a party to it. We will fight; we will go back and fight. My country beckons me. Why should I waste my time here in the Security Council? I will not be a party to the ignominious surrender of a part of my country. You can take your Security Council. Here you are. I am going.