

Conference on Disarmament
Plenary Meeting, 30 June 2020

Second Intervention by Pakistan

Mr. President,

I have requested the floor to respond to some of the insinuations made by the delegation of India, today. It is unfortunate but hardly surprising that India has chosen once again to deflect the many serious issues raised by my delegation.

India's deflection strategy has a purpose and context. Let there be no mistake. India is desperate to divert attention and escape international scrutiny from its deliberate defiance of international law in Occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

While India may wish otherwise, the facts brought up by my delegation are relevant to the work of this body, based on ground realities and actual developments. Can the Indian delegation deny or justify any of the statements of its leadership which were recalled by my delegation earlier today? Or any of the following additional set of remarks?

The Prime Minister of India On April 21, 2019, in Barmer (Rajasthan), said in a public rally that India's nuclear weapons are not for celebrating 'Diwali' (a Hindu festival which also involves fireworks and pyrotechnics), while boasting that India had the capability to launch nuclear attacks from land, air and sea.

Yet again, on April 22, 2019, addressing an election rally at Patan in his home state of Gujarat, the Indian Prime Minister said that he was ready to launch 12 missile on Pakistan in a "qatal ki raat" – "a night of bloodshed", in reference to the February 2019 misadventure by India.

Earlier this year, on 29 January 2020, the Indian Prime Minister said in a speech that India's "armed forces will not take more than 7-10 days to make Pakistan bite the dust".

This is the kind of irresponsible rhetoric and statements that have a direct bearing on issues of peace and security as well as nuclear arms that Indian leadership brandishes and threatens to use.

Let me remind the Indian delegation that the CD is not an echo chamber of denial and deflection. It has a duty to take note of these dangerous statements that imperil regional peace and security in South Asia.

Mr. President,

These statements are as a window to the mind of India's belligerent and fascist leaders. This Indian psyche of hegemonic ambitions and obsession with Pakistan was

again on full display when On October 14, 2019, the deputy chief minister of India's most populous state, Mr. Keshav Prasad Maurya of the ruling Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), while campaigning for elections in the state of Maharashtra, said that and I quote: "if people press the lotus symbol (the election symbol of BJP), it will mean a nuclear bomb has been automatically dropped on Pakistan".

Not to be outdone, the Indian Army chief General Manoj Naravane, in January 2020, declared his forces' readiness to invade and annex Azad Jammu and Kashmir, pending a parliamentary approval.

Mr. President,

The Indian delegation did not address these facts and expectedly went about a self-serving tirade. While speeches can attempt to be circuitous, South Asia is all too familiar with the consequences of India's continued hegemonic aggression against all its neighbours and the people of Indian Occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

It is precisely to smokescreen its reign of repression against the people of Indian Occupied Jammu and Kashmir that India resorts to these baseless allegations of so-called "cross-border terrorism". Pakistan strongly rejects these self-serving and groundless assertions. This is an all too familiar an Indian ploy to externalize blame. By repeatedly parroting the canard of "terrorism", India cannot delegitimize the indigenous struggle of the people of Kashmir for their inalienable right to self determination.

Nor can such tactics, unilateral and illegal actions by India un-write the dozen UN Security Council resolutions promising Kashmiris' their right to self-determination. Contrary to what may work for domestic consumption in India, Jammu and Kashmir is neither an integral part of India, nor is it India's internal matter. In accordance with UN Security Council resolutions, it remains an internationally recognised disputed territory whose final status is to be decided through a UN supervised plebiscite. The UN Security Council has met no less than on three occasions during the last ten months to address this matter, recognizing the threat posed by India to international peace and security and regional stability in South Asia. These meetings amply debunk the mantra that Occupied Jammu and Kashmir is internal matter of India.

Also, there simply is no justification for targeting innocent civilians in Azad Jammu and Kashmir through indiscriminate and unprovoked shelling across the line of control. Rather than churning out the deceitful rhetoric of "cross-border terrorism", India must cease its state-terrorism that it has been perpetrating for decades against the Kashmiri people in Occupied Jammu and Kashmir.

India's tactics of obfuscation and deflection by bring up victimhood of terrorism goes against all established facts. India's leaders are on record affirming the use of terrorism against Pakistan.

Mr. President,

This Indian policy pursuit of using proxies and financing terrorist groups to destabilize the region has a face and that face is Indian Navy Commander Kulbushan Jadhav, its face is Davinder Singh, its face is Venumadhav Dongara and many others awaiting designation by UN 1267 Sanctions Committee.

Mr. President,

Let me also unmask the Indian sophistry that its security interests transcend regional or sub-regional contexts. If this assertion were to be taken at its face value, would the Indian delegation inform this body why the overwhelming numbers of its conventional and non-conventional capabilities remain deployed against Pakistan. Contrary to such claims, it has been India's express and long standing policy of destabilizing and fomenting trouble in all countries of its region. This is precisely what India would like the international community to forget with these fictitious claims and is yet another testament to India's disingenuous behaviour.

Mr. President,

India's gratuitous claims about its support for FMCT have been addressed previously by my delegation as well. However, for the record I will recall some facts.

After amassing tons of unsafeguarded fissile material as a so-called "strategic reserve", directly aided and abetted by discriminatory waivers from the NSG and nuclear cooperation agreements with many major supplier countries, India can surely continue grandstanding by maintaining a declaratory position in favour of FMCT negotiations. For Pakistan, these declarations continue to ring hollow.

If India claims to support FMCT, then why does it insist on basing the negotiations on the restrictive Shannon Mandate? Why is it unwilling to include existing stocks in the treaty's scope, in a manner that would genuinely contribute to global and regional stability as well as to nuclear disarmament – which India also claims to support? In fact, India is the strongest opponent of extending the future treaty's scope in a manner that encompasses existing stocks, in order to perpetuate the prevailing asymmetries in South Asia to India's permanent strategic advantage.

Also, unlike the other nuclear armed States that favour the commencement of FMCT negotiations, India has neither declared a unilateral moratorium nor ceased the production of fissile material. This is so because India directly benefits from the current situation that it is disingenuously blaming on Pakistan – it continues to increase its fissile material stocks and building new fast breeder reactors which will exponentially add to its unsafeguarded fissile material production, while maintaining a completely opposite declaratory position. If ceasing national production was a gauge of good-faith towards the start of FMCT negotiations, India fails to fulfil that condition on all accounts.

Pakistan's position on a Fissile Material Treaty is guided by our national security interests. The treaty should provide undiminished security for all States, a principle recognized by SSOD-I. It should contribute both to the objectives of nuclear disarmament as well as non-proliferation in all its aspects. The way the treaty is currently envisaged under the Shannon Mandate, it affects Pakistan disproportionately. We, therefore, have been compelled to oppose such negotiations as they would be detrimental to our vital national security interests. Other countries in similar situations take the exact same position in the CD on issues that prejudice their national security.

We would also counsel India to refrain from self-serving and hollow declarations which may please constituencies back home or perpetuate jaundiced media narratives, but not to this Conference which can see through the pretensions.

The Indian delegation would be well advised to introspect, set its own house in order and eschew diversions, deflection and distractions.

Mr. President, I thank you.