

of the reign of terror by private armies in Hyderabad, and other events which, he said, had obliged the Government of India to take action.

At the 359th meeting of the Security Council on 20 September, it was announced that Hyderabad had surrendered to Indian military forces, and the representative of India read a telegram from the Nizam instructing the head of the Hyderabad delegation to withdraw the complaint from the Security Council. The receipt of any new instructions coming directly from the Nizam was denied by the representative of Hyderabad who suggested that the discussion be postponed in view of the confused situation.

In a cable dated 22 September (S/1011), the Nizam of Hyderabad informed the Secretary-General that, on 18 September, he had forwarded a message to the representative of Hyderabad ordering him to withdraw the case from the Security Council. He now confirmed this decision and added that the Ministry, at whose instance the complaint was made, had resigned as of 17 September, at which time he had personally assumed charge of the State. He also notified the Secretary-General that the Hyderabad delegation to the Security Council now ceased to have any authority to represent either him or the State.

The delegation of Hyderabad, on 24 September, transmitted a note (S/1015) which reviewed the more recent developments in that country and asserted the Nizam had been compelled to surrender complete power to the Indian Military Commander who had assumed full military control of the State. It was further stated that the Indian authorities had issued instructions to the Agents-General of Hyderabad abroad to suspend their activities, and it was claimed that Indian sources substantiated the fact that a regime of victimization and persecution had already begun. The Hyderabad delegation insisted that, in view of these circumstances, it was imperative that a meeting of the Security Council be convened to review the situation and prevent the extension of the scope of the fait accompli. It was also suggested that the Council might find it desirable to appoint its own observers for the purpose of keeping itself informed of the trend of events in Hyderabad.

## **2. Discussion in the General Assembly at its Third Session**

The question of Hyderabad was referred to in the general debate at the opening of the first part of the third session of the General Assembly. At the 143rd meeting on 25 September 1948, the

representative of India quoted admissions by members of the Hyderabad Government that there had been looting, arson, and a complete reign of terror in certain districts of Hyderabad. After a series of warnings and appeals, India had been forced to take action. The fact that all resistance had collapsed within five days had been mainly due to the fact that the people of Hyderabad, irrespective of caste and creed, were behind India's action and heartily welcomed the restoration of order. In the last twelve months, India had realized as few other countries had, the dangers of mass disorders and fratricidal strife and its anxiety to eliminate them from a region situated in the very heart of its territory required no explanation. If they could be routed out with the same speed from Palestine, Burma, Malaya and elsewhere, the world would be a happier and more secure place. The representative of India quoted from a published letter by Lord Mountbatten to the Nizam, stating that the Government of Hyderabad was dominated by a party which commanded the support of only part of the minority community and was not responsible to the legislature. Lord Mountbatten had considered that there could not be friendly relations between India and Hyderabad, so long as this state of affairs existed. The representative of India stated that the Government of India had made it quite clear that, as soon as normal conditions were re-established, steps would be taken for the election of a constituent assembly which would determine the constitutional structure of Hyderabad.

Speaking at the 145th meeting of the Assembly on 27 September, the representative of Pakistan described the Indian action as an act of aggression lacking even the shadow of an excuse, and he wondered how this challenge to the United Nations would be met. He asserted that Hyderabad had been overrun by the military forces of a powerful neighbour at the very time Hyderabad was pleading for a settlement of differences by peaceful means in conformity with the principles of justice and international law. Following a detailed expose of these differences, he urged the United Nations to establish immediately its own system of observers in Hyderabad and then take effective steps to remove every trace of aggression so that the State would be in a position to make its own decisions without any suspicion of pressure, coercion or intimidation from any quarter.

## **3. Discussion in the Security Council**

The credentials of the Hyderabad delegation and the right to further participation in the Secur-