



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 34 (continued): Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General	1

Chairman: Mr. Milko TARABANOV (Bulgaria).

AGENDA ITEM 34 (continued)

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of
International Security: report of the Secretary-General
(A/8431 and Add.1-3, A/C.1/1015, A/C.1/L.566)**

1. Mr. FRAZAO (Brazil) (*interpretation from French*):
Mr. Chairman, may I first of all convey to you the sincere congratulations of my delegation on your unanimous election as Chairman of the First Committee. I am also very happy to congratulate the other officers of the Committee. It is very pleasant for us, Sir, to see that the work of this Committee will be led by your skilful hands and with your well-known spirit of conciliation. We have not forgotten the very important contributions made by you last year as representative of Bulgaria to the success of the negotiations which we achieved at that time. No one can doubt that your experience and your leadership this year with the assistance of the Committee's other officers, will enable the Committee successfully to discharge the very delicate tasks entrusted to it. On my own behalf and on behalf of the delegation of Brazil, I can guarantee you the most constructive co-operation on the personal and official levels.

[*The speaker continued in English.*]

2. For the third consecutive year this Committee is engaged in a debate on the question of the strengthening of international security. In this way the General Assembly meets the timeless concern of mankind: the organization of life in common, a preoccupation that responds to man's gregarious nature and is the guideline of his constant quest for survival.

3. At the present stage of history that preoccupation and that quest are translated into efforts to make the relationship among States more perfect and harmonious, to define their rights and obligations and to lay down the fundamental norms that must preside over the international community.

4. I shall dispense with stating anew the general position of the Brazilian Government on the item under consideration. In the course of the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth sessions of the General Assembly, the Brazilian delegation,

together with other Latin American delegations, expounded in detail its views on this comprehensive issue, the strengthening of international security. Last year, following protracted negotiations among all groups of Member States, the General Assembly finally adopted resolution 2734 (XXV), the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which stresses the political philosophy that has inspired our Organization since its inception, despite the threatening revival of power concepts and practices. Many Member States represented around this table have experienced in the course of their ancient or recent history the crush resulting from those practices. At the same time, the Declaration reaffirms the constitutional nature of the United Nations Charter and the binding contractual force of the obligations undertaken thereunder by all Member States, which are thus legally liable for actions running counter to the Charter. These are not, I submit, empty gestures. After more than 25 years of tension, disputes and conflicts, the international community, acting under the unremitting prompting of the medium and small Powers, saw fit to renew with all due emphasis the commitments enshrined in the institutional document signed in San Francisco.

5. The Declaration seeks to further the progressive development of the principles of the Charter, particularly those relating to the equal sovereignty of States and the non-use of force to settle international disputes. Doubtless this was one of the outstanding achievements of the Organization in the normative field. The compromise solution arrived at in the Declaration must at all times be observed in its entirety, inasmuch as it does not in any conceivable way supersede the obligations assumed under the Charter, the purposes and principles of which continue to be the very kernel of present-day international law.

6. The Declaration carefully avoids prejudging the outcome of issues under consideration by the different United Nations bodies, since this would be possible only at the unacceptable cost of an invasion of their competence and the infringement of their prerogatives. Neither does it attempt to innovate in the conceptual sphere, something that would prove illusory when it came to the application of such new concepts to specific political issues. The implementation of the Declaration in itself does not dispense with efforts to revise the Charter of the United Nations. As a first move towards that end, the General Assembly decided at its last session, under resolution 2697 (XXV), to include in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session an item on the review of the 25-year-old San Francisco document.

7. The Declaration also sketches a programme for the political strengthening and the diplomatic reactivation of the Organization in the coming years. Thus it provides

guidelines for concerted action by Member States at all levels in the United Nations, including the Security Council. It also charts a new course for the international community—a course free from unilateral coercion and from a number of practices that do not foreclose the possibility of total war.

8. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has come into being at a moment when international relations are undergoing rapid and pervasive change. The unabated accumulation of power, which has hitherto marked our times, appears to be on the verge of reaching its own limits. The arms race has definitely entered upon its late baroque phase, as typified by the weight and confusion of its architecture, by the flamboyant extravagance of its arabesques, by its lack of significance and by the resulting squandering of resources. The concept of power as the single organizing principle of international relations has outlived its usefulness—if it ever had any. Aware of the emergence of a new sense of purpose, a new and challenging consciousness, the beneficiaries of the present system appear to be more and more anxious to freeze power, that is, to translate prevailing power differentials into permanent political arrangements; a pointless effort, because, as was stressed by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Brazil at the opening of the general debate in the Assembly, “historical experience disavows any permanent differentiation of States into a small group endowed with, on the one hand, unparalleled power and, on the other, a second category of countries condemned to the rôle of spectators or protégés of power”. [See 1940th plenary meeting, para. 16.]

9. We are already witnessing new developments. The Declaration itself offers indisputable evidence that the medium and small Powers have a diplomatic role to play in the consideration and settlement of outstanding international issues. Increasing diversity and interdependence are new trends in present-day international life. Political differentiation as a healthy correlative to mitigated bipolarism is increasing daily, encompassing all continents and affecting with varying intensity all political systems. In the course of the current year, this trend towards political heterogeneity has produced a noticeable acceleration in the tempo of diplomacy. Indeed, there are grounds for a certain amount of optimism as to the possibility of solving crises and settling disputes through negotiation and diplomacy: to wit, the peaceful means prescribed by international law.

10. The growing complexity of political problems, the speeding up of their dissemination through mass communication media, added to the intensification of contacts and negotiations, are increasing the interdependence of States; the scientific and technological explosion of our times, however uneven and lop-sided, deepens this process. A large measure of confusion inevitably surrounds the different meanings that may be attached to the idea of interdependence. I do not propose to indulge in semantics. Allow me, however, to stress that if interdependence is one of the salient features of our changing world, it can hardly be manipulated to serve as a cloak to disguise the resurgence of obsolete patterns of international politics. Nor can it be used merely as a prop for the present system of mutual deterrence through nuclear terror. Interdependence cannot be reduced to a slogan for the imposi-

tion of political or economic hegemonies, under a bipolar world structure or under any similar successive arrangement. In short, to be fully productive the concept of interdependence will have to be brought under the sway of international law and of the United Nations Charter. The vices and distortions inherited from the past will have to be remedied: the road to interdependence passes through the attainment of effective national independence and the balanced expansion and development of the international economy.

11. For all these reasons, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is relevant to the present era of transition. The document as a whole aims, on the one hand, at eliminating cold and fatalistic considerations of power and, on the other, it requires the strict observances of the purposes and principles of the Charter and general principles of international law. It also spells out a number of possibilities for the strengthening of international security and effectively furthers the interests of the membership of the United Nations by creating conditions that are bound to minimize the absolute options thus far enjoyed by a few powerful States.

12. In the intervening months between the adoption of the Declaration and the opening of the current session of the General Assembly, the foreign policy of Brazil increasingly took into account the spirit of the Declaration. My Government’s understanding of the Declaration and the prominence we attach to it were stated by President Emílio G. Médici, in his annual message to the Brazilian Congress on 31 March 1971:

“... Brazil is convinced that the political character of the United Nations must be revitalized. Acting on this conviction, she has taken a very active part in the negotiations on the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security... This document is of unique importance as it provides for the strengthening of the United Nations as a political institution and a centre for diplomatic action and negotiation... [It] is today part and parcel of the new philosophy governing the world Organization as an element of peace, justice and progress and not merely as an instrument for the maintenance of the international *status quo*.”

13. In its relentless endeavour to contribute to the enforcement and improvement of an international normative system, Brazil signed, on 3 September 1971, the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Sub-Soil Thereof [resolution 2660 (XXV), annex]. Although the Treaty itself is only a collateral measure dealing with non-armament rather than disarmament, the Brazilian Government nourishes the hope that it will help create a political climate conducive to the adoption of more concrete agreements in the latter field.

14. One of these agreements will be considered by the First Committee in a few weeks’ time. I refer of course to the draft convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and on their destruction.¹ As a

¹ Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1971, document DC/234, annex A.

member of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, Brazil took part in the negotiation of this draft convention, which, when finalized, will become the first concrete disarmament measure to be taken in the post-war period.

15. At the appropriate time and place, my delegation will offer its detailed comments on the merits of the draft convention. Nevertheless, on this occasion I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to two points which touch upon the subject matter under examination.

16. My first remark concerns the control provisions of the draft convention, which in our opinion are not entirely satisfactory. It was for this reason that at Geneva the Brazilian delegation suggested that the Security Council might have recourse to the possibilities opened up by Article 29 of the Charter, and, whenever necessary, set up informal *ad hoc* committees designed to help clarify situations or to settle disputes arising from the operation of the convention on bacteriological weapons. The Committee can easily trace back the origin of this suggestion by recalling the general ideas expounded for the first time in our memorandum to the Secretary-General of 3 April 1970 and incorporated in the report of the Secretary-General on the consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security;² the same proposals were further elaborated in statements made by my delegation in the plenary meetings and in this Committee during the last session; finally, they were included in the Declaration as paragraph 10.

17. My delegation is aware that the draft convention as it now stands does not preclude the Security Council's following in case of need the procedure we have suggested. Nevertheless, we hold that this is a clear illustration of the need for a reform of the methods of work of the Council so as to render it more dynamic, and to make full use of its potential as a forum for negotiation in matters pertaining to international peace and security. Perhaps the Council is trying to decide too much, or avoiding deciding too frequently, but it is certainly negotiating too little.

18. My second point relates to the gist of operative paragraph 19 of the Declaration, which affirms that there is a close connexion between disarmament and the economic development of developing countries within the framework of the strengthening of international security and that any progress made towards one of these objectives should constitute progress towards all of them. In the present context, the application of such a principle would definitely entail the channelling of savings deriving from this disarmament convention towards the promotion of the economic development of developing countries. So far, this principle is conspicuous by its absence from the draft convention. Thus we are confronted with an inexplicable refusal of the super-Powers even to recognize this principle, a situation that must be corrected in time if we are to take seriously their declared willingness to implement last year's Declaration.

19. At this very late stage, the fundamental questions of disarmament and development cannot be the object of

attempts aimed at avoiding their concurrent consideration. The direct connexion between disarmament and development cannot, in good faith, be questioned or worse still relegated to a second priority. I believe that the affirmation of this close relationship is the core of the Latin American contribution to the delicate, subtle and hard-bargained compromise embodied in the text of the Declaration.

20. The foregoing observations must be evaluated in the broader context of the concept of collective economic security, the central and foremost features of which are, on the one hand, the fundamental right of every nation to development and, on the other, the solemn duty of the developed countries to assist in giving substance to this right. In the language of the Declaration, urgent and concerted international actions aimed at reducing and eliminating as soon as possible the economic gap between developed and developing countries are closely and essentially related to the strengthening of the security of all nations and to the establishment of lasting international peace. My delegation could not agree more. We have no higher aim at the present session than that of searching out all possible avenues for putting these ideas into practice.

21. On 25 January 1971 the Secretary-General addressed a letter to all Member States requesting information on steps taken for the purpose of strengthening international security. The Brazilian Government's reply, along with that of others, appears in document A/8431. However, it might be worth noting that the terms of the request were so general that they gave rise to difficulties in the preparation of a specific answer. This, I believe, was one of the reasons why many Member States chose not to respond to the request of the Secretary-General; others merely indicated that their position remained unchanged from the one they held last year, that is, prior to the adoption of the Declaration.

22. In our reply, we advanced the preliminary views of the Brazilian Government on the question of implementation, in the hope that by so doing we should stimulate debate. In any event we were motivated by the conviction that no effort should be spared to implement the Declaration.

23. For our future debates, we hope to have available documents of a more analytical nature, reports that, apart from incorporating communications from Governments and an over-all assessment of political and security developments by the Secretary-General, might also include relevant information on compliance with the provisions of the Declaration by United Nations bodies and other international organs.

24. I should be somewhat less than candid were I to conceal my delegation's apprehensions in regard to the problem of implementation. Our fears have not been allayed, even if allowance is made for the circumstances I have mentioned and for the opinion already expressed by the Brazilian Government that steps taken by individual States, important as they may prove to be, will not in themselves fulfil the aims and objectives of the Declaration, since its implementation also calls for a number of collective measures to be agreed upon in the United Nations. To put it bluntly, my delegation has the disquieting impression that so far the Declaration has failed to produce the political impact we were entitled to expect

² Document A/7922.

after the show of interest displayed in the proceedings of the Committee during the last session.

25. This situation is being allowed to develop at a time when the great Powers are further intensifying their diplomatic activities. Spectacular announcement follows surprising announcement, and visit follows visit. The concert of super-Powers and big Powers is on the move: let us hope that similar developments will take place in the United Nations. Yet, where the Declaration is concerned, we seem to detect in certain cases an unwarranted aloofness and an apparent lack of confidence in the United Nations as a global political agency specializing in peace and security matters. In other instances, I should note, we witness what appear to be opportunistic attempts to divide the Declaration into meaningless component parts and to ascribe to it intentions it never had.

26. My delegation firmly opposes all these attempts, which are tantamount to a disengagement from or a piecemeal approach to the Declaration. The preservation of the General Assembly as a political and diplomatic forum is still in jeopardy. Let me quote an example. In paragraph 5 of his report on the question before us [A/8431] the Secretary-General singled out a number of signs he welcomed as testifying to the “potential of the Declaration”, among which he listed the concluded four-Power negotiations on Berlin, the prospects for *détente* in Europe and the secret Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. It cannot be ignored that none of the events mentioned by the Secretary-General resulted from diplomatic endeavours within the United Nations. Their connexion with the Declaration is extremely tenuous. I should make it clear that my delegation neither expects nor proposes that all international disputes be settled through the machinery provided for in the United Nations. This is not—and never was—the intent of the Charter, as Article 33 clearly demonstrates. But we continue to hope—indeed, we refuse to abandon the hope—that the United Nations, and in particular the General Assembly, as an organ in which participation is open to all Member States, will play the final role in matters relating to international peace and security. I say “final” to allow for the practical possibilities and advantages of having the machinery of the subsidiary organs and the Secretary-General initiate negotiation on certain specific matters.

27. However, I do not want to sound unduly pessimistic. There are also some hopeful prospects that, in time, may open the way for the strengthening of the institutional role of the United Nations, thus helping the implementation of the Declaration itself. The suggestion to convene a world disarmament conference, is, for instance, a promising development. I should like to interpret the very fact that the Soviet proposal³ has been put forward in the General Assembly, rather than through exclusively bilateral channels, as a sign of the importance attributed to our Organization. The normal development of this initiative would be, according to our views, to prepare such a conference and hold it within the framework of the United Nations. My delegation is convinced that the Soviet proposal should be carefully studied in all its implications, since it deals with a problem that is central to our

³ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes, agenda item 97, document A/8491.

preoccupations and since it implies our collective responsibility for disarmament and security. It is in the light of these observations, and looking forward to any additional information which may be made available to us in the near future, that my delegation will make known its views on the Soviet proposal when it comes up for debate in plenary meeting.

28. The institutional problems threatening the United Nations were very ably summarized by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his latest report on the work of the Organization.⁴ Among the Member States there is a growing appreciation of the fact that the structure and functioning of the United Nations need to be updated so as to respond better to the world challenges of the 1970s.

29. I have already commented on the methods of work of the Security Council. However, I shall not refrain from stating that in my opinion many reasons, perhaps the fundamental reasons, for the inefficiency of the Security Council stem from the fact that its present institutional composition reflects the theories of strategic equilibrium, balance of power, ideological confrontation and political paternalism still conditioning the international conduct and the individual aims of super-Powers and big Powers. The dominant issue of this session of the General Assembly is the entry into the Security Council of a Government possessing sufficient military power to qualify for the dignity of permanent membership and thus for the “veto club”. We are asked to comply with the realities of current international life; but does compliance with reality—indeed, international reality itself—end at the point where the strengthening of the *status quo* is served to the world as an ersatz for the strengthening of international security? The erosion of the institutional representative character of the Security Council has been brought about by the dramatic changes of international reality during the 25 years that have elapsed since San Francisco. Permanent membership of the Security Council, equal to veto power, has been one of the taboos of the post-war era because it also was the condition *sine qua non* for the principal victorious Powers to agree to the foundation of the Organization. Let us assume that that is still a sacrosanct principle in international dogmatics. Is it, however, sufficiently comprehensive to embrace and to interpret the new distinctive character of the 1970s? Are we not witnessing the birth of a feeling according to which, for the sake of the dignity, authority, efficiency, operational capacity and enforcement power of the Security Council, its constitutional composition should be adjusted, even through the increase of its permanent membership, in keeping with criteria that correspond directly to the present international scenario? My delegation is prepared to expatiate on this subject on the first appropriate occasion, for this question is in our view closely connected with our concept of the major problems inherent in the strengthening of international security.

30. I should like now to turn my attention to the General Assembly. My delegation does not subscribe to the theory that the so-called irresponsible behaviour of powerless majorities is the major cause of the inability of the United Nations to discuss and settle outstanding international issues. One should not assume that it is possible to

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1 A.

distinguish radically or arbitrarily between what goes on within the walls of this building and events in the world outside. The United Nations is an inseparable part of our political environment. Frustrations and setbacks suffered here no doubt reflect the hard facts, tensions and perplexities of international life at large.

31. In this era when the insanity of the nuclear-weapons race continues to be the central problem of mankind, we should resist attempts to equate power with wisdom, or power with dedication to the strengthening of the United Nations. Indeed, many of the most momentous political and economic issues are today practically excluded from the United Nations owing to unwarranted unilateral decisions by a few powerful States. Some of the crucial aspects of disarmament are a case in point. Another similar instance is the continuing paralysis of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations. As is often the case, inaction and failure to make any progress stem directly from intransigence and lack of political will to enter into negotiations free from the prejudice and self-sufficiency engendered by power. The net result of this disappointing behaviour is uncertainty and the feeling that the competence of our Organization in a vital field is being undermined. Notwithstanding all these circumstances, my delegation persists in the belief that we should not hesitate to resort to all the practical means available in the United Nations in order to serve notice of our profound interest in the matter, to put the States directly responsible for the current deadlock under effective political constraints and finally to seek solutions thereto on the basis of the unassailable principle of collective responsibility for peace and security.

32. The same centrifugal forces are at work even in the economic field. A few months ago, for instance, a futile attempt was made to restrict the competence of the Second Committee to strictly economic matters, thus effectively removing financial problems from consideration by the United Nations, on the insufficient grounds of rationalizing the organization of the work of the General Assembly. To cite another example, only last week we were apprised through the international press that eight, and perhaps 10, industrialized countries of both East and West were banding together to create a new international institute that would study the application of science and technology to the most important problems of the contemporary world. There appear to be no plans to link this new institute to the United Nations. No mention was made in the press of any intention of allowing representatives of the developing countries into such select company. Ironically all this is happening at a time when the developing countries continue to face all kinds of difficulties in their attempt to set up within the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development a permanent machinery for the transfer of operative technology to the less privileged areas of the world.

33. If the strengthening of the United Nations is truly the common interest of its membership, if indeed the United Nations is to be fully utilized as an effective instrument at the service of the world community for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the promotion of the economic and social progress of all peoples, if these general goals are to be attained, we should not lose sight of the financial plight of the Organization. The solvency crisis threatens its very survival.

34. It would be utterly unrealistic and devoid of any practical sense to ignore the necessity of ensuring the physical basis which will enable the United Nations to perform the role devolving on it under the Charter and reaffirmed in the Declaration by the Governments represented around this table.

35. It is with these considerations in mind that my delegation approaches the question of the implementation of the Declaration, a task which we believe to be extremely complex by reason of its manifold implications for the political viability of the Organization itself.

36. Brazil favours the continuing debate of the item on the strengthening of international security as a regular feature of the agenda of the First Committee. A broad and frank exchange of ideas among all Member States can only help to improve the political climate and will undoubtedly represent a valuable contribution towards the identification of areas ripe for negotiation and agreement.

37. Let us allow some time to elapse before passing final judgement on the response of the international community to the Declaration. Meanwhile, making full use of the Declaration as a basis for our work, let us explore all possible avenues that might give new political strength to the United Nations. Let us be imaginative enough to convert possibilities into probabilities, thus contributing to the creation of an area of predictability in international relations and hastening the process of the strengthening of peace and security for the benefit of the international community as a whole. The alternative is disaster, complete and final, even though not necessarily immediate.

38. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I thank Ambassador Frazão of Brazil for his warm congratulations to the Bureau and to the Chairman.

39. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): Mr. Chairman, I represent Kuwait, a country which you visited two years ago. I was honoured to meet you there, privately and officially. Your visit contributed considerably to strengthening the relations between our two countries. I am sure that your discretion, wisdom and patience will guide us constructively in our deliberations. I warmly congratulate you and extend my equally warm felicitations to the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

40. All nations of the world still live under the shadow of thermonuclear horror. This threat, however dormant it may be at this time, is the predominant concern of every human being. The survival of man should not be left to the whims of an individual who may, unwittingly, or through misjudgement, unleash a nuclear war which will end in a global holocaust.

41. International security is a term that has great appeal. Since the beginning of life, the conflict between good and evil has been going on incessantly in a vicious circle. The strong instinct of man towards the good is always confronted by an equally strong instinct towards evil. Man is a mixture of good and evil. The Prince of Denmark in Hamlet was driven to madness by his mother's participation in his father's assassination. Ophelia strolled to her death because of Hamlet himself. This is not a fictitious Shakespeare I am

quoting from but an image of the immense insight the great poet had in understanding the human psyche. What was reflective of human nature then is still valid today. However, man yearns for a peaceful life and a tranquil existence.

42. In this Committee all of us should transcend our normal limitations as human beings and seek the welfare of mankind. The work demanded from us requires an increasing effort of self-denial and idealism. Our work, in brief, is to reconcile the attitudes of the major Powers, which must set an example of flexibility and compromise. Only through accommodation which stems from full respect for human values can we lay down the foundations of peace and security.

43. We note with satisfaction the recent agreements between Moscow and Washington aimed at the reactivation of the talks on limitations of strategic nuclear arms. We are also satisfied with the four-Power agreement on Berlin. Nevertheless, the factors that threaten the security of nations are still undiminishingly vigorous. The South African racist régime continues its policy of *apartheid* with utter contempt for basic human values and disregard for United Nations resolutions. Only a few days ago a contingent of South African forces crossed the borders of Zambia and killed a number of peaceful Zambians. The crime remains unpunished except for a mild reprimand from the Security Council, which is by no means a consolation to the relatives of the victims and to the Zambian people.

44. Backward Portugal still maintains the ridiculous concept that Mozambique and Angola are inseparable territories of the mainland. Some of the major Powers are unfortunately closing their eyes to the pernicious policy of Lisbon and Pretoria. The atrocities perpetrated against the indigenous people of Angola and Mozambique have been condemned in the Organization, but the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council calling for sanctions against South Africa and Portugal fall on the deaf ears of certain major Powers.

45. How can we achieve international security if those who have the tools to realize it are contemptuously silent to the calls of conscience? My delegation takes the view that the United Nations lacks proper peace-keeping machinery. We alluded to this question last year in the First Committee. However, we thought that the Special Political Committee would be the right forum for taking effective action. We want the United Nations to establish generally accepted procedures for authorizing and financing peace-keeping operations. The absence of these procedures has prevented the United Nations from acting promptly in time of crisis. My delegation had these considerations in mind when it submitted a draft resolution in the Special Political Committee at the twenty-fifth session, calling for the establishment of a permanent fund for peace-keeping operations financed by compulsory contributions.⁵ The draft resolution provided that the main financial burden should be shouldered by the permanent members of the Security Council with a substantial contribution from the

other developed countries and a smaller amount from the developing countries, whose contribution should not exceed their economic means. The fund would be placed under the authority of the Security Council and resources which were not depleted by peace-keeping operations would be placed at the disposal of the United Nations Development Programme and the World Bank to be utilized for accelerating economic and social development in the developing countries. The draft was referred to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations for consideration. We hope that action will be taken on it this year so that the establishment of a viable peace-keeping operation will be rescued from its present impasse. Administrative and military staff should be trained and should always be ready to assume command of peace-keeping operations and a team of observers should always be available for active duty in any trouble spot.

46. The people and Government of Kuwait continue to be gravely concerned about the problem of regional security in the Middle East, both for its own sake and because of the threat to world peace inherent in it. As the Secretary-General has rightly pointed out in his report on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: "The Middle East remains a source of serious danger to peace for the world at large". [*See A/8431, para. 8.*]

47. It is our firm belief that the principles enunciated in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] constitute a firm foundation for the creation of a just and lasting peace in our region; what is lacking is the application of those principles and the discharge of the obligations they entail.

48. Paragraph 5 of the Declaration reaffirms, *inter alia*, "that the territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation" or "of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force". Yet, as is well known, the most immediate aspect of the problem of the Middle East is precisely the continued occupation, since mid-1967, of territories of Arab States by Israel and the intensified efforts of Israel to transform conditions in the occupied territories—demographic, social, economic and juridical—in such a manner as to render the occupation permanent. Continued occupation and attempted permanent acquisition of the territory of some Member States by another Member are among the greatest challenges not only to the Declaration but to the Charter of the United Nations, and they are at the heart of the crisis in the Middle East, a crisis which the passing of time has aggravated instead of ameliorating.

49. Continued occupation and attempted annexation are in themselves a menace to both regional and international security—but they are even more so in the case of Israeli occupation of Arab territories because of the policies and practices of the occupation authorities in the occupied territories. The international community hardly needs to be informed about those policies and practices, since it has already established more than one investigative body, and examined the relevant reports to discover the facts about Israeli actions in the occupied territories and has, after careful study of the findings of those investigative bodies, censured and condemned the policies and practices of Israel

⁵ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fifth Session, Annexes, agenda item 36, document A/8175, para. 4.

in dozens of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and other organs.

50. Recent events require that the United Nations pay special attention to the policies pursued by Israel in two of the occupied territories in particular: Gaza and occupied Jerusalem. The aggravation of conditions in Gaza has been the subject of a special report circulated by the Secretary-General less than a month ago in document A/8383; the situation in Jerusalem engaged the attention of the Security Council until late last month, and the Council is momentarily awaiting receipt of a report by the Secretary-General on the implementation by Israel of the latest resolution adopted by the Council on the subject of Jerusalem, resolution 298 (1971).

51. Apart from their threat to regional and international security by virtue of the fact that they clearly represent a formal policy of transforming the occupation into permanent annexation, Israeli actions in Gaza and Jerusalem, as well as continuing actions in the other occupied territories, also endanger security and constitute a challenge to the principles of the Declaration in the hardships which they create for over a million human beings and in the resulting violations of the basic human rights and fundamental freedoms of the population of the occupied territories.

52. Paragraph 22 of the Declaration translates one of the most significant principles of the Charter and reaffirms that “universal respect for and full exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms and the elimination of the violation of those rights are urgent and essential to the strengthening of international security”.

53. Israeli violations of the human rights of the inhabitants of the occupied territories, including those inhabitants who are now displaced persons outside those territories, constitute therefore another affront to the Declaration and another source of serious danger to peace for the region and for the world at large. In addition, they are a direct violation of the provisions of certain international conventions governing the conduct of occupying authorities, mainly the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949⁶ and the Hague Convention of 1954.⁷ By refusing to apply these Conventions or even to recognize their applicability, contrary to the findings of several United Nations organs and in defiance of their demands to this effect, Israel further violates another principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and reaffirmed in paragraph 2 of the Declaration, namely, “that States shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the Charter”.

54. Finally, the root of the whole problem of the Middle East remains virulently menacing, posing the gravest threat to regional peace and international security. I refer to the deprivation of the people of Palestine of its fundamental human rights and its national rights and, most importantly, the rights of Palestinian refugees and displaced persons to

⁶ Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 973).

⁷ Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 249, No. 3511).

return to their country and their homes and the right of the people of Palestine to self-determination. That these rights have been reaffirmed by the international community is too well known to require elaboration at this stage; that they have been defied by Israel and continue to be denied is equally well known. But, as the General Assembly declared in resolution 2672 C (XXV) of 8 December 1970, “full respect for the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine is an indispensable element in the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East”. The principle behind this belief, which is enshrined in the Charter, is reaffirmed in paragraphs 2 and 4 of the Declaration.

55. In short, as far as peace and security in the Middle East are concerned, the facts are not in doubt, and there is no uncertainty about the principles that apply to the situation nor about the relevance of those principles to the crisis in the Middle East. What is lacking is not guidelines for resolution of the problem; what is supremely lacking is the desire on the part of Israel to put the principles and guidelines and resolutions—of which there is indeed an abundance—into effect, and to desist from continued and intensified defiance of their provisions. No responsible review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security can be adequate if it fails to take into account the supreme challenge to that Declaration manifested by the policies and practices of Israel.

56. On Friday, 15 October, we read in *The New York Times* that Mr. Rogers had indicated that the United States would increase its arms aid to Israel. One wonders how a major Power, which is sitting with us in this Committee, reconciles the attitude of its Secretary of State with the item we are discussing, that is, the strengthening of international security. How can we hope to achieve international security if the United States provides an aggressor—which occupies territories of three Member States of this Organization and which has complete disregard for the United Nations Charter and its resolutions—with Phantom aircraft and other highly sophisticated weapons. The aim of the United States is, obviously, to consolidate the Israeli occupation of the Arab land, at the expense of any possible settlement based on justice and honour.

57. I suggest that this Committee, collectively, deplore such action and consider it as an utter violation of the spirit of the Declaration, the implementation of which we are discussing.

58. Mr. KLUSAK (Czechoslovakia) (*translation from Russian*): Comrade Chairman, allow me first of all to congratulate you sincerely and warmly on your election as Chairman of the First Committee of the General Assembly. I should also like to express our congratulations to the other officers and to the appropriate members of the Secretariat of the United Nations. I should like to add a few personal words to the welcome of the Czechoslovak delegation, as an expression of my sincere and profound respect for you, my dear old friend and friend of my country and its people. During the years in which I have had the honour and good fortune to work with you, especially here in the United Nations, I have come to know your rich experience, knowledge and personal qualities, as well as your genuine

devotion to the cause of peace, which we must further in our activities. That is why I am convinced that your guidance of the Committee's work will help us to deal successfully with the questions on our agenda in a responsible manner and in the best possible way.

59. In his statement in the general debate [1947th plenary meeting] the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, Ján Marko, declared that the period following the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations could be the start of a new phase in the activities of our Organization. In the years ahead the United Nations should devote itself to unrelenting effort to ensure consistent respect for the principles of the Charter and the achievement of its fundamental aim—the maintenance and strengthening of universal peace and international security. This is why we feel that the significance of the historic mission of our Organization lies in concentrating first and foremost on questions within its purview, with a view in particular to discharging its principal responsibility. This was indeed reaffirmed last year at the commemorative session of the General Assembly in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)].

60. The Declaration, based on the principles of the Charter, became a programme, a manifesto, pointing out the direction and defining the scope for further action and specific measures on the basis of which the firm and solid structure of a complete system of world security could be gradually built. This is how we view that document, the various provisions of which must now be implemented and the concepts of which must be further developed and, most importantly, applied in practice.

61. The meaning of our work—especially as regards international security—does not and cannot lie merely in adopting programmatic declarations and giving no thought to their implementation. Needless to say, solemn manifestos by themselves will not eliminate any conflict and will not lay the foundations for peace, but they can and must inspire us to persistent efforts and action to achieve these objectives. Plans of action and concrete measures must be prepared, organized and carried out, but of course we must also monitor and evaluate the results of such plans and measures. That is why the consideration of questions relating to international security in this forum must in essence be a review and a periodic examination of the way in which the United Nations is discharging its principal responsibility, and not only of how the Organization itself does this but at the same time of how Members of the Organization approach this responsibility and do their part to meet it.

62. Although the general debate gave evidence of a wide and substantive divergence of views and positions regarding contemporary events in the world, consideration of the question of international security can and must lead to a certain synthesis of conclusions. Such consideration must be conducted in a business-like manner and must identify the most promising opportunities for reducing tensions and settling unresolved problems. On the other hand, it must unflinchingly point out conflicts and crisis situations, explaining the reasons for them and their dangerous consequences; it should provide advance warning of im-

pending and incipient new crises; it should examine the need for and the possibility of a more intensive struggle against aggression with a view to strengthening peace among nations. To this end our attention and efforts must be focused on fundamental problems. This, indeed, is where we see the utility of and the need for a debate in our Committee on the question of strengthening international security as well as the logical need for a resolution on the subject which would sum up and formulate relevant conclusions.

63. Consequently, we think it natural to regard the adoption of the Declaration last year not as the end of the work of the United Nations on contemporary problems of international security but rather as the beginning of the effective pursuit of that work.

64. The basic provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security are by now well known. They boil down to appeals to adopt measures which in present-day conditions would directly strengthen international security or create the essential prerequisites for this. These measures are realistic and entirely within the possibilities and competence of our Organization. To carry them out the United Nations has and will always have the preponderant support of world public opinion. Questions of peace and international security are coming to the fore with increasing urgency among the day-to-day concerns of all peoples. The continuing conflicts and the threat of a world-wide holocaust are mobilizing peace-loving forces to combat everything that increases tension in the world and gives rise to dangerous confrontations and conflicts. One cannot help but note that the increasing activity of the forces for peace is exerting an ever greater influence on the contemporary international scene.

65. The favourable developments in Europe, the progress being made towards the solution of certain aspects of the problem of disarmament and the constantly growing support for demands that controversial international problems should be settled by negotiation—these are the positive elements which were pointed out and duly weighed during the general debate at this session of the General Assembly.

66. However, our efforts to ease international tension, abolish the legacy of the cold war and lay the foundations for peaceful international co-operation are only in their infancy. Whether there will be progress and what results will be achieved depend, of course, on many factors and above all on the success obtained in reaching a settlement of continuing conflicts and crises and eliminating their dangerous and pernicious consequences. Included in the list of such conflicts and crises are the continuing ruthless war against the Viet-Nameese people and other peoples of Indo-China, the direct violation of all the principles of international coexistence, in the Middle East the continuing occupation by Israel of the forcibly seized Arab territories, the artificial perpetuation of the division of Korea with the help of foreign troops, and the blatant manifestations of colonialism over wide areas, particularly in southern Africa.

67. The solutions to these military conflicts, particularly the conflicts in Viet-Nam and in the Middle East, are well known. In the first case, solutions have been put forward in the widely circulated proposals of the Provisional Revolu-

tionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and endorsed by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. In the second case, solutions are provided in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which the Arab States, in particular the Arab Republic of Egypt, would willingly implement. If we delve further into the reasons why no progress can be made in the peaceful settlement of these conflicts, we see that what they have in common is the fact that the States responsible for creating and perpetuating these conflicts do not in their actions evince any readiness to apply consistently the principles of our Charter and the fundamental provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

68. During the general debate reference was also made to the tense situation which has arisen between India and Pakistan in connexion with the events in East Pakistan. The problem here is not only the millions of refugees who are a tremendous burden for the economy of India and who must be given the possibility of returning home safely; the central issue is that a new crisis posing a threat to peace and security has arisen in that region and should under no circumstances be allowed to develop into open conflict.

69. The questions of security on the European continent are of vital importance for Czechoslovakia as for other European States. The member States of the Warsaw Pact last year again made major efforts to foster collective international security in Europe and to develop good mutual relations with other European countries. The conclusion of treaties by the Soviet Union and the Polish People's Republic with the Federal Republic of Germany was generally warmly welcomed, as was the conclusion of an agreement relating to West Berlin. Czechoslovakia has also actively taken the initiative in developing and expanding mutual contacts with Western European countries in the most diverse fields. Our negotiations to normalize relations with the Federal Republic of Germany are continuing.

70. At the conferences in Prague and Budapest the member countries of the Warsaw Pact, Czechoslovakia among them, drew up a draft agenda for an all-European conference on international security and co-operation in Europe, which takes into account the proposals made on all sides and creates the best possible basis for a general agreement.

71. The bilateral talks held thus far between European States have largely clarified the question of the participation in such a conference. We consider that this has created realistic preconditions to enable us to proceed with the actual organization of the conference, to prepare its rules of procedure, to agree on the date for convening it, and so on.

72. With the conclusion of an agreement on West Berlin, which NATO countries had put forward as a prior condition for an all-European conference—a stand which we never considered to be correct—it seems that all obstacles have now been removed. At least we presume that no further conditions will be put forward, if of course one is to take seriously the statements of the Western European countries in the general debate and on other occasions to the effect that they attach importance to and recognize the need for a regularization of the situation in Europe. We

cannot permit ourselves the luxury of standing still and be content merely with the fact that there has been some abatement of tension between the peoples of Europe. If we want to continue this positive process and to solve the painful problems still outstanding, we must take further measures and not overlook any favourable conditions.

73. We are convinced that the time has come for potential participants in the conference to proceed with multilateral preparatory negotiations to accelerate the entire process of convening the conference. That is why we favour the proposal made in this regard by the Foreign Minister of Finland, Mr. Väinö Leskinen, during the general debate [*1941st plenary meeting*], and we consider it necessary to take immediate action on it.

74. If we succeed in bringing to fruition the great idea of an all-European conference, progress on the question of peace and security will result not only for Europe but for the whole world. Peace and security are inseparable concepts. The conflicts in Indo-China, the Middle East and Africa have such a direct bearing on the situation in Europe that the reverse is also true: a further relaxation of tension in Europe and the solution of European problems would have a direct and positive influence on the development of the international situation in other parts of the world. That is why we also in principle favour the proposals and efforts to establish or to strengthen in various regions of the world the regional measures designed to ensure international security in accordance with the interests and lawful rights of peoples and on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

75. The concept of international security encompasses not only key questions of war and peace but also questions of the peaceful coexistence of States, disarmament, social problems and problems of economic and cultural co-operation. Along these lines was drafted the reply of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic to the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of the Declaration. Therefore I do not intend to speak at length about these matters but shall limit myself to a few remarks. First of all, I should like to emphasize that the cause of peace and security is the cause of all States of the world; if we want to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations in this field, the principle of universality must here also finally carry the day. We must admit both sovereign German States to our Organization and also restore the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China, a matter which is now being discussed in plenary meetings of the General Assembly.

76. As a neighbour of the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia has the opportunity to be convinced by its day-to-day experience that this dynamically developing socialist State fulfils all the conditions laid down by the Charter for admission to our Organization.

77. The Government of the German Democratic Republic evinced its active interest in the question we are discussing here in its statement in document A/C.1/1015. In it the German Democratic Republic expresses its full support of the provisions of the Declaration and associates itself with the aims set forth therein.

78. In connexion with international security, the problems of disarmament also come prominently to mind. Our

Committee will have an opportunity to deal with these problems in detail when we take them up in pursuance of the programme of work we have adopted. I would just mention in this regard that the solution to the problems of disarmament is interdependently and indissolubly linked to the whole range of problems of security.

79. International security also encompasses equal rights, elimination of all discrimination and the right of peoples to self-determination. It is unthinkable without the final elimination of colonialism, racial discrimination and *apartheid*, whose continued existence prevents our planet from becoming a safe place for the creative development of every nation.

80. In order to strengthen international security we must create the most favourable conditions for economic development and the expansion of economic, scientific and technical co-operation among States with different social systems, and we must also find ways of making resources available for the development of the national economies of the developing countries. Solution of the burning political problems would unquestionably have a positive effect on the development of economic relations throughout the world and would open up new horizons and opportunities along those lines.

81. Thus we are confronted with a whole series of problems which demand solutions. These problems must be dealt with by the United Nations, which was established for that purpose. We are considering many of them in the context of the various items on the programme of work of the General Assembly. However, our discussion in this political committee must lead to some relevant conclusions whose implementation would help to reinforce the positive trends in the development of the world today and to eliminate the remaining obstacles to progress. Herein also lies the significance of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and its implementation.

82. Accordingly, at this very session we must stress the need to take concrete measures that would contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security. Among the most important provisions of the Declaration are, in our view, the obligation to refrain from the use of force and the principles prohibiting the acquisition of foreign territory by force. Indeed, the violation of these principles almost always leads to wars and dangerous situations such as those we are witnessing at this very moment. Thus, practice has proved that these provisions of the Declaration are one of the basic corner-stones on which rests the entire edifice of the safeguards of world security.

83. These conclusions have been expressed in the draft resolution which Czechoslovakia has submitted jointly with the other socialist States for the consideration of this Committee [A/C.I/L.566]; we recommend its adoption.

84. The CHAIRMAN (*translation from Russian*): I thank the representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Comrade Klusák, for his statement and the warm words of welcome addressed to the officers and the Chairman.

85. Mr. NJINE (Cameroon) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. Chairman, I should like first of all to discharge a

particularly pleasant duty by expressing my delegation's warmest congratulations to you on your election to the chairmanship of this Committee. The bonds of happy co-operation and sincere friendship which we have created and maintained in the recent past have given me the privilege of greatly appreciating the brilliant qualities of the great diplomat you are. Thus we are convinced that, under your wise chairmanship, the work of our Committee will be crowned with success.

86. My delegation also wishes to address through you our warmest congratulations to each of the eminent officers.

87. It is gratifying to note that it is under your enlightened chairmanship that our Committee will once again have an opportunity to proceed to a calm examination of conscience in regard to the serious problems which for so many years have constantly been a challenge to mankind and have dangerously impeded the total development of man and the attainment of his most legitimate aspirations.

88. In the matter of the strengthening of international security, what quite naturally comes to mind are the problems created by armed conflicts and the reckless arms race, which are detrimental to a peaceful coexistence correctly understood and practised by all States. In my delegation's opinion these are not the only factors of insecurity in the world. There are, indeed, other factors such as colonialism, racial discrimination and underdevelopment. However diverse their aspects, all these problems constitute direct and permanent threats to international peace and security and they concern us all, it being true that the common destiny of mankind confers on each one of us a share of responsibility which we cannot avoid.

89. Colonialism, that shameful disease of our twentieth century, should no longer be anything but a bitter memory of history. But, unfortunately, millions of men and women still languish on the African continent, held in the shackles of the most anachronistic, retrograde and inhuman colonialist régimes in our history.

90. Because of his origin, as recognized by theologians and scientists, as well as because of the uniqueness of his species and his destiny, man should be a friend to man and not a wolf. Unfortunately, the most elementary truths, the most strikingly obvious facts and the most natural and fundamental rights are daily trampled underfoot and ignored here and there throughout the world, particularly in Africa in regard to millions of human beings who are barely recognized as being men. Now, as His Excellency El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the Federal Republic of the Cameroon, has said repeatedly: "To deny the humanity of a single man is to threaten the dignity of all men."

91. In the name of peace, that precious possession of all times, in the name of justice and in the name of the dignity of all mankind, we believe that the time has come—that it is indeed high time—for colonialism finally to be part of the forgotten past of history.

92. While colonialism constitutes a lasting and dangerous threat to international peace and security because it embodies, in an equally permanent way, the deliberate and conscious violation of all the purposes and principles of our

Organization, racial discrimination, for its part, is the total negation of those same principles. Now, the main objective of the aims of our Charter is to maintain international peace and security by developing and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

93. My delegation considers the practice of racial discrimination as a provocation, a challenge launched against all mankind by all those who use as their standard the colour of the skin to refuse a right to men who are not the same colour as theirs.

94. Our Committee must seek the ways and means capable of putting an end to this explosive situation rapidly, a situation which exists because of the persistence of racial discrimination throughout the world, particularly in Africa. Indeed, the reaction of legitimate self-defence of the victims of racial discrimination runs the risk of plunging mankind soon into a period of violence the consequences of which are unforeseeable.

95. My delegation is convinced that, if all nations were to make the necessary efforts to avoid any armed conflict, international peace and security would be really safeguarded for the greater good of mankind.

96. One of the ways to reach this goal seems to us to be the complete halt of the armaments race with which the present-day world is living. Could this be achieved—and my delegation whole-heartedly wishes it—another scourge which also threatens the peace of the world could be easily eradicated: I refer to the problem of under-development.

97. To conquer outer space and for a human being to set foot on lunar soil is truly spectacular. Frenetically to embark on a race of arms of mass destruction is, in our opinion, signing in advance the death certificate of the human race. Yet, both devour enormous amounts of capital, only an infinitesimal part of which would suffice to overcome ignorance, disease and poverty in the third world. Thus, a final halt of the arms race would give the third world increased opportunities to win one day the battle of development, assuming that national selfishness will increasingly yield to a better sense of human solidarity.

98. My delegation will support any draft resolution intended to put an end not only to armed conflicts and to the arms race but also to backward colonialism, as it is still manifest in the world, and to racial discrimination—any draft resolution favourable to a more balanced development of the world. As my delegation sees it, such a draft resolution would constitute a manifestation of our determination to seek a better world, because we believe as did William of Orange that “Enterprise is not conditional upon hope, nor perseverance upon success”.

99. Mr. OSMAN (Egypt): Since this is the first time my delegation has spoken in this Committee, allow me, Mr. Chairman, to extend to you our most sincere congratulations on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. We are fully confident that your wisdom, experience and enlightened leadership will bring our work to a successful conclusion.

100. May I also be permitted to welcome our most distinguished and able Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Rhada Krishna Ramphul, and our most competent Rapporteur, Mr. Migliuolo.

101. The delegation of Egypt is cognizant of the paramount importance of strengthening international peace and security. In that connexion it is appropriate to renew our appreciation to the delegation of the USSR for the timely initiative Foreign Minister Gromyko took during the twenty-fourth session by requesting the inscription of the item under discussion. It is a source of gratification for all peace-loving countries to participate in a serious consideration aimed at probing the obstacles facing the international community in living up to its responsibilities and safeguarding world peace.

102. As much as my delegation welcomes the Committee's deliberations on this important item, it cannot conceal a justified fear that the great problems we are trying to tackle may be transformed into another chronic item on our agenda, and that each year we may repeat previous statements and adopt similar resolutions which may be shelved and never heeded. We do sincerely hope that that will never materialize.

103. The rationale behind the inscription of this item was to establish the requirements that would effectively promote the strengthening of peace. Thus it was necessary to initiate a complete reappraisal movement with a view to strengthening international security by the revitalization of United Nations capabilities in the maintenance of world peace. It was the intention to bring to an end the dismal international situation prevailing today, which allows for the continued commission, with impunity, of grave breaches of the peace, especially against the peoples of Asia and Africa.

104. Never before was international security so essential for the very existence of mankind. No wonder high hopes have been placed on the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], adopted by the General Assembly last year, as an instrument which may help humanity avert the holocaust of another world war. That is why all delegations have rightly stressed the exceptional character of that Declaration. We should like to think and hope that we are on the threshold of a new era in the history of international relations. All Member States should therefore embark on a serious and dedicated effort aimed at devising measures to put the Charter conception of the maintenance of international peace and security, as reflected in the Declaration, into practical effect.

105. It is in that spirit that the delegation of Egypt participates in the debate today, hoping to make a modest contribution to the difficult and vital tasks ahead of us.

106. In essence the malaise affecting the United Nations is a reflection of the tendency to drift away from the original Charter philosophy. It has been aggravated, moreover, by the policy and behaviour of a lawless minority to undermine the Charter's fundamental principles, attempts that have not been promptly suppressed. The law of the Charter is gradually giving way to the rule of force, which was

expressly prohibited by the Charter. Manifestations of illegal practices abound. By way of illustration, one finds that, in the Middle East, Israel has invaded by armed force the territory of three Member States and continues to occupy their land notwithstanding a clear Security Council decision calling for withdrawal. In southern Africa, three racist Governments pursue pre-Charter policies against the lawful inhabitants with complete impunity. In South-East Asia, American forces have been resorting to force against the Viet-Nameese people regardless of world-wide condemnation of their actions.

107. Our efforts should thus be focused on attempts to rededicate ourselves to abide faithfully by the provisions of the Charter and not to abdicate our responsibilities under the Charter. It should be recalled that primary responsibility for the maintenance of world peace was conferred on the Security Council. The instrument innovated to undertake this vital task was enforcement machinery based on a system of collective security. As is rightly stated by our Secretary-General in paragraph 142 of the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization for 1971⁸: “The primary function of our Organization—the maintenance of international peace and security—cannot be fulfilled by a retreat from collective security and collective responsibility into collective weakness and collective impotence”.

108. The Security Council was designed as an action-oriented executive organ for the whole United Nations structure. At the San Francisco Conference, in 1945, particular attention was devoted to establishing the appropriate relation between the General Assembly and the Security Council so that neither would impair the orderly functioning of the Organization. It therefore seems appropriate to consider that relationship in the right perspective. The relationship was succinctly described by the representative of Bolivia in his capacity as Chairman of the responsible Committee at San Francisco. He stated:

“If we view as a whole the results of our labours two fundamental aspects appear. The Assembly, as the supreme representative body of the world, is to establish the principles on which world peace and the ideal of solidarity must rest, and, on the other hand, the Security Council is to act in accordance with those principles and with the speed necessary to prevent any attempted breach of international peace and security. In other words, the former is a creative body and the latter an organ of action”.⁹

The Charter has, therefore, in Article 10, empowered the General Assembly to make recommendations to Member States and the Security Council on any matter within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and function of any organ.

109. The General Assembly pronounced its views on the requirements for the strengthening of security when, at its twenty-fifth session, it adopted its resolution 2734 (XXV), entitled, “Declaration on the Strengthening of International

Security”. But should our endeavours to ensure survival for mankind be limited to that?

110. We are indeed gratified at the adoption of the Declaration. However, we fully realize that its adoption does not suffice to rectify the existing inadequacies in the United Nations system. The important elements contained in the Declaration should be scrupulously followed up. It is of the utmost importance that the provisions of the Declaration be effectively and promptly carried out, and not be allowed to vanish in the heaps of United Nations documents.

111. By way of illustration, it is pertinent to recall some of the salient features of the Declaration which have a direct bearing on international security. In the Declaration the Assembly recognized the need for effective, dynamic and flexible measures, in accordance with the Charter, to prevent and remove threats to the peace, and to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. The Assembly therefore recommended that the Security Council take steps to facilitate the conclusion of the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter in order to develop fully its capacity for enforcement action as provided for under Chapter VII of the Charter.

112. One year has already elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration and, to our knowledge, the Security Council has not yet embarked on the requisite steps, stipulated in the Charter and reiterated in the Declaration, to develop its still dormant enforcement powers.

113. Another important element which reflects the concern of the United Nations membership is contained in paragraph 5 of the Declaration, which provides that:

“... the territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, that the territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force, that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal . . .”.

114. Israel has persisted in its defiance of the United Nations Charter and United Nations declarations and resolutions. In so doing, Israel is violating international peace and security by keeping the Middle East, one of the most serious points of tension and friction in the world, since its aggression against and occupation of the territory of Arab countries. It is, in fact, the responsibility of the United Nations to take the necessary measures until all its resolutions are genuinely and effectively carried out. To defy the requirements of resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council will have far-reaching repercussions on the capabilities of the Organization and on its capacity to act for peace and justice in the future. Indeed, it raises serious doubts as to the very reasons for the existence of the United Nations as an international body charged with the maintenance of international peace and the promotion of peace through justice.

115. Moreover, there are still some States which look for ways or means to challenge the provisions and principles of the Charter under different excuses and pretexts. The

⁸ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Supplement No. 1 A.*

⁹ *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, Commission II 21 June 1948, vol. VIII, p. 196.*

principles most challenged and ignored by those States are the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, the principle of the sovereignty of States over their own territories, and the principle of the territorial integrity and political independence of States.

116. In addition to the grave concern about the violation by some Members of the United Nations of the basic norms of the Charter relating to the outlawing of war as an instrument of national policy and the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest, there is also grave concern about the persistent denial on the part of some States of the right of peoples to self-determination and national independence and about the suppression of national liberation movements and the struggle of peoples for the attainment of their inalienable right to self-determination.

117. Wars, foreign occupation and hot beds of crisis in the world, particularly in the Middle East, South-East Asia and southern Africa, are constantly threatening international peace and security. The lack of any substantial progress in solving long-term problems, such as those of economic development, colonialism and neo-colonialism, *apartheid*, racial discrimination, and disarmament, which burden the international community and are a constant source of unequal relations, encourages the policy of power politics, foreign domination and the subjugation of peoples. The complete eradication of all these forms and manifestations is a prerequisite for peace and security.

118. In upholding the rule of the Charter, and in defence of all the values for which the struggle of the peoples of the United Nations has been waged, the peoples of the world, which twice in this century have stood up to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, are called upon today to stand up through this Organization and resist these destructive trends.

119. The Security Council has the primary responsibility to suppress aggression and to take measures and action to ensure respect for these principles—and, in particular, the principle of the territorial integrity and political independence of all States. Thus, according to the Declaration, the Security Council is called upon to ensure respect of the principles of the Charter of the world Organization, and to take effective measures with a view to implementing resolutions of the Organization, especially those relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. Failure to shoulder this collective responsibility would result in the eruption of escalating conflicts in regions of high tensions, with the danger of their widening in scope and dimension.

120. This alarming prospect makes it incumbent upon the world Organization, and particularly the Security Council, to approach the question of the maintenance of peace and security with a firm decision to take the necessary steps for prompt compliance with its resolutions by all Member States.

121. At the twenty-fifth session, in the course of the statement made by the delegation of Egypt on this item, my delegation expressed the hope that the Security Council would consider:

“... the setting up of the structural arrangements for the enforcement action envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter, and that it will then consider the desirability of establishing a subsidiary organ to follow up, oversee and report on the full implementation of the decisions of the Security Council, which the Members of the United Nations have pledged to accept and to carry out under Article 25 of the Charter.” [1734th meeting, para. 24.]

I do not have to emphasize the urgent need to carry out those two modest steps.

122. The inadequacies we all feel are not to be found in our Charter, but only in our practice. In conclusion, viewing the question of the strengthening of international peace and security with respect to the problems affecting the peoples of Africa and Asia, my delegation would like to state that the peoples of Africa and Asia have welcomed with relief, from the rostrum of the General Assembly and in meetings of the non-aligned nations, the recent favourable development in Europe, the easing of tension and the beginning of a *détente* between East and West.

123. On the other hand, the peoples of Asia and Africa cannot but be amazed that they have been the object of wanton and premeditated aggression, that their legitimate rights have been trampled upon, their political independence violated, their territorial integrity crushed. Diplomatic, political and military support is lavished on those who have committed these acts of aggression against them. The principle of collective security, as we all know, came into being as a result of the First and Second World Wars. When those peoples look to the United Nations and invoke the principle of collective security to suppress the acts of aggression and restore their rights, they encounter a deaf ear.

124. So they are entitled to ask, why is it that collective security as envisaged in the Charter stops short of their continent? Why is it that its application is paralysed when it comes to acts of aggression against them?

125. Some 25 years have elapsed in the life of this Organization; a year has elapsed since the adoption of our Declaration. People in Asia and Africa will watch closely what the United Nations is going to do about the genuine implementation of the principle of collective security when it comes to their problem.

126. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time that my delegation has spoken in this Committee, I should like to present our warmest felicitations to you on your election as Chairman. I should also like to congratulate our Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Ramphul, and the Rapporteur with whom I have had occasion to work and whose qualities I esteem.

127. As for you, Mr. Chairman, having had the privilege of working with you closely in your former capacity as the Ambassador of Bulgaria during the past few years in the various organs of the United Nations, I know that your deep understanding of men and matters will enable you to pilot our discussions to a successful conclusion.

128. Last year the General Assembly, responding to the will of Member States to rededicate themselves to the

purposes and principles of the Charter, adopted a most significant resolution. It was fitting that at that time, that is, during the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the General Assembly should reaffirm the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as the basis of relations among States irrespective of their size, geographical location, level of development or political, economic and social systems. Having done so, Member States must now, and in the future, strive for the strict observance of those principles. The imperativeness of this is greater today than ever before, because man's survival has never been so dependent on the realization and fulfilment of that need. It did not carry the same urgency previously, when the destruction wrought by opposing armies was relatively minor and of a localized import. Man had yet to develop the "push-button" ability to devastate entire continents thousands of miles away. The nature of the nuclear threat which hangs over mankind cannot be more geographically described than in the words of an esteemed former colleague of ours, Ambassador Charles Yost, who describes it in his book *The Insecurity of Nations*. Although the quotation that I will now read out will be rather long, I am sure that the Committee will bear with me because we need to remind ourselves from time to time of the consequences that would ensue from a nuclear war, if only to shake ourselves out of the complacency and the apathy which have taken hold of us because we have so far been able to live with the threat of a nuclear holocaust over our heads:

"... a general nuclear war could cause as many as 100 million casualties on each side within days or hours. That would be only the beginning. Many would be stricken or maimed by fallout. What is most difficult to realize is that, in the closely knit industrial societies of Europe and America, where far more than half their populations are massed in cities and towns, wholly dependent for food, water, heat, light and medicine on intricate and vulnerable systems of transport and communications, even the areas only moderately damaged might be subject to almost total breakdown under such conditions and incapable of helping those more massively hit. If half the population were casualties and more than half the cities destroyed or totally disorganized, it would be likely that the nation as a whole would be unable to cope with the situation in any effective or civilized fashion.

"Law and order would break down wholly, those city dwellers who were alive and capable of movement would pour into the countryside in desperate and ruthless search for food and water, diseases of all kinds would break out, production and distribution on all but the smallest and most local scale would halt, pillage and murder would become the normal way of life, in the circumstances, which would constitute something much worse than any historical Dark Age, even the course of human evolution would be distorted. Those fittest to survive would no longer be the ones adapted to the civilized way of life—the scientists, the industrial managers, the professionals, the skilled workmen, the bureaucrats, the artists—but would be precisely those most unfit for such a life, those that modern society is trying to reform or root out—the delinquent, the bully, the psychopath, the hoodlum, the congenital savage. These would be the ones most likely to survive, to be the rulers of what was left of

the human race, the progenitors of whatever might come afterwards."¹⁰

129. Therefore, in this context, a further proliferation of nuclear weapons would be a retrograde step, increasing considerably the already existing insecurity among nations—especially among the small and medium-sized non-nuclear-weapon States which are still looking for adequate guarantees against the nuclear threat. No less negative a development for such States would be the acquisition of nuclear weapons by some threshold nuclear weapon Powers, non-signatories to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], which are reportedly planning to produce and explode so-called peaceful nuclear devices. As the non-proliferation Treaty makes no distinction between nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes and nuclear weapons, such policies would be tantamount to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Consequently, universal adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty is essential if international security is to be strengthened. But, even with such a consummation, the danger of proliferation will not have been contained. The non-proliferation Treaty needs to be complemented by an appropriate instrument of control over nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes to ensure that the objectives of the Treaty are not circumvented through a régime with provisions for spreading the benefit of such explosions as an international service.

130. The year that has passed has witnessed some developments of a highly significant nature in the direction of strengthening international security. The four-Power agreement on West Berlin, the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the agreements concluded between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union and also between the former and Poland, and the draft convention on the prohibition and elimination of bacteriological weapons endorsed by the Committee of the Conference on Disarmament¹¹ must be welcomed as rational steps, the beneficial effects of which are already being felt by the international community. And if these developments can serve to promote a conference on security and co-operation in Europe and talks on mutual and balanced force reductions between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Warsaw camps, we cannot but welcome them.

131. Even more hopeful is the prospect opened to the world by the forthcoming visit of President Nixon to the People's Republic of China, to be followed by a visit to the Soviet Union. While we need to guard ourselves against undue expectations, who can suppress altogether the hope that talks among the three most powerful countries of the world at the summit level may at long last initiate the process of mutual accommodation of legitimate interests and usher in an era of true peaceful coexistence for themselves and also for the rest of the world? The great leaders of the United States, China and the Soviet Union are now presented with an opportunity the like of which is seldom given to statesmen to grasp. If they can rise to the challenge, they may well turn the course of history away from the perils and towards the promise of the nuclear age.

¹⁰ Charles Yost, *The Insecurity of Nations* (New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1968), pp. 206 and 207.

¹¹ *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1971*, document DC/234, annex A.

132. The restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations without any further delay would form the most auspicious background to the summit talks and infuse them with the spirit of goodwill and amity so essential to the successful outcome of negotiations on some of the most complex and difficult issues that will confront the leaders of the three great Powers.

133. I have touched on the more outstanding of the positive developments affecting international peace and security that have taken place since last year; but the negative side of the picture cannot be ignored if we are not to be overcome by a false sense of euphoria.

134. In the Middle East, peace has not returned to that tormented region. The territories of Arab States occupied by Israel have not been vacated. Measures to annex Jerusalem have not been rescinded. The attempt to alter the historic personality of the Holy City has not been abandoned. The agony of the Arabs of the occupied territories has not been ended. Thus, the basic principle of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXX)], adopted last year, the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by war, remains a dead letter. The efforts to achieve an interim agreement to reopen the Suez Canal, linked to a peace settlement, have so far proved infructuous.

135. In Indo-China, the war continues, although with diminishing violence. The peace talks in Paris remain stalled, despite more than three years of negotiations.

136. The arms race accelerates, while progress in disarmament negotiations remains painfully slow and insubstantial; and we have yet to see the first fruits of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

137. Turning to our own continent, the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation has been claimed by the parties to it to be a historic event. Both parties maintain that it is not directed against any third country. However, there are contrary indications within India itself. The news media are placing a somewhat different interpretation on the use to which such a treaty will lend itself. They claim that the Soviet Union has now been brought around to accepting the Indian viewpoint on the developments in East Pakistan and that the Soviet leaders have given an assurance that the Treaty will not impose any shackles upon India's freedom of action with regard to "Bangladesh". The ruling Congress Party organ, the *National Herald*, has said that the joint statement issued in Moscow was an affirmation of Soviet identity with the aspirations of the people of "Bangladesh". The Government-owned All-India Radio on 1 October 1971 claimed that the Soviet Union had taken note of India's intention to take whatever steps it thought necessary for the solution of the refugee problem. It is reported that Prime Minister Kosygin has made it clear that in such an eventuality India will have Soviet support and sympathy.

138. We in Pakistan cannot lightly dismiss what the official organ of news dissemination in India—or for that matter Indian Government officials—are saying about the political and other implications of the Indo-Soviet Treaty.

The difference between the two interpretations leads us to the conclusion that the Government of India has spoken differently to the international audience and to its own people. We have ample reasons to be wary, because it is not inconceivable that elements in India that nurture animosity towards Pakistan may be tempted to draw sustenance and encouragement from the Indo-Soviet Treaty to unleash an armed attack against Pakistan despite the interest of the Soviet Union in preventing an armed conflict. Nor can we altogether discount the political pressures that will be exerted on the Soviet Union to align itself with forces seeking the dismemberment of Pakistan. That the fear that such pressures will be or are already being generated is not baseless is clear when we read a paragraph like the following in the joint statement issued after the visit of the Indian Prime Minister to Moscow:

"The Soviet side took into account the statement by the Prime Minister that the Government of India was fully determined to take all necessary measures to stop the inflow of refugees from East Pakistan to India and to ensure that those refugees who were already in India returned to their homeland without delay."

Since "taking into account" is rather different from "agreeing with" or "endorsing", we certainly do not interpret this paragraph as carrying the implication that the Soviet Union approves India's designs against Pakistan. Yet it is fair to say that the language of the paragraph, "fully determined to take all necessary measures", without the word "measures" being qualified by the word "peaceful" or the word "co-operative" to imply that these measures will be peaceful measures or co-operative measures, is not altogether reassuring as far as peace in the subcontinent is concerned.

139. The Indo-Soviet Treaty can be judged only by its results: will it act in restraint of war or will it precipitate it? Should a conflict occur, it would indeed be a matter for profound regret, especially when all the recent pronouncements and deeds of my Government have been aimed at defusing the tense situation between India and Pakistan. The President of Pakistan has publicly declared our aversion to war unless it is forced on us, as wars solve no problems and are outlawed by the Charter. My Government accepted the stationing of representatives of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees on both sides of the border between India and East Pakistan to facilitate the voluntary repatriation of the refugees. India rejected that proposal. Pakistan welcomed the initiative taken by the Secretary-General, in his memorandum of 20 July addressed to the President of the Security Council, to curb the threat to international peace in the subcontinent. In particular, Pakistan proposed the idea of a good offices committee of the Security Council for India and Pakistan to help bring about a reduction of tension between the two countries.

140. Are these the actions and deeds of a country seeking to destroy the fabric of peace in the region? If the answer is no, then do these initiatives not merit a better response than a categorical rejection by India and a lack of appreciation from the world community?

141. It is not given to all States to make contributions of equal consequence to universal peace and security, but each

nation can strive for the fulfilment of that goal to the best of its ability. The medium and small Powers do not possess the capability to seek, preserve or enforce a world-wide peace. Not even a super-Power can do so, unless it acts in concert with others. As one among many, Pakistan seeks a peace of security from aggression and the preservation of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

142. In recent months, my country has faced the kind of ordeal that other countries of the world have seldom had to face. Since representatives have followed the exchanges between India and Pakistan in the general debate which ended in the General Assembly on 13 October, I shall not take up the Committee's time by repeating our complaint. I shall merely outline very briefly the most serious grievances.

143. The borders of Pakistan have been incessantly violated, its people and territory subjected to the fire of mortars and artillery. Elements inimical to the preservation of the territorial integrity of Pakistan have been unleashed into East Pakistan to perpetrate wanton acts of sabotage, violence and destruction. Not content with waging a war by proxy, the leaders of India have openly threatened Pakistan and have demanded a solution of its political problems in accordance with their own wishes. According to a Reuters report a few days ago, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the Defence Minister of India, in a speech made at Kapurthala on 17 October, declared that if Pakistan launched a war, India would occupy the towns of Lahore and Sialkot in West Pakistan and not withdraw, "come what may".

144. The President of Pakistan has repeatedly stated that an armed conflict cannot resolve the refugee problem and yet the Defence Minister of India talks of the acquisition of Pakistan territory by war while here in the United Nations we ceaselessly keep affirming that such acquisition of territory is totally inadmissible. According to the same source, namely, Reuters, Mr. Jagjivan Ram also maintained that India would keep its troops close to the border until the East Pakistan problem was settled. This is not the first time that the leaders of India have uttered such threats. It is, however, regrettable that the Defence Minister should have threatened to conquer Pakistan territory when President Yahya Khan had offered to pull back forces from the borders to defuse the tension.

145. We in Pakistan, twice subjected to armed attack in the short history of our existence, have come to realize more than ever that peace can only be ensured if the Charter machinery can be activated to bring about a peaceful adjustment or resolution of situations and disputes which endanger international security. It is for that reason that we have sought at every possible opportunity to open a dialogue with our neighbour. The President of Pakistan has offered to meet the Prime Minister of India "anywhere, anytime". It was our urgent anxiety to preserve peace that prompted us to make such gestures. All of them have been rejected by India. And we are still awaiting a response to the four offers that I put to the representative of India from the podium of the General Assembly on 13 October 1971 [1965th plenary meeting]. We find it odd that India should try to get the United Nations involved in our internal problems and yet reject every effort the United Nations thinks fit to make, under the rules of the Charter, to resolve them.

146. While we are naturally discouraged by India's silence over, or rejection of, our efforts towards peace, the President of Pakistan has nevertheless made an important pronouncement and at this very moment is engaged in an earnest effort to defuse the grave and tense situation which now obtains in the subcontinent. The President has made public the text of the letter which he sent to the Secretary-General on 22 October. Considering India's refusal to pull back the forces to peacetime stations, the President of Pakistan, in a fresh bid for peace, has proposed the withdrawal of forces, along with armour and artillery, at least to a mutually agreed safe distance on either side of the border. He has also recommended that United Nations observers on both sides of the border should oversee the withdrawals and supervise the maintenance of peace. Furthermore, he has accepted the Secretary-General's offer of good offices and has expressed the hope that the Secretary-General can pay an immediate visit to India and Pakistan to prevent war between them. The President of Pakistan has offered full co-operation to the Secretary-General in all his efforts to arrest the deterioration of the situation. I put the question: is this the clenched fist which the Indian Prime Minister said she could not shake hands with? Let India accept the Secretary-General's good offices. A situation which spells war or peace in the subcontinent is not a matter between East Pakistan and West Pakistan. It is a matter between India and Pakistan.

147. What more positive proof could my country offer of our adherence to the ideals enshrined in the Charter? That we continue to seek, with single-minded devotion, all possible opportunities to bring stability to our region may deserve no particular attention. But to do so in the face of total rejection and intransigence merits at least a modicum of recognition.

148. Without meaning to lay particular emphasis on any one principle embodied in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security we find ourselves drawn, because of its current relevance to the developments affecting Pakistan, to the solemn affirmation undertaken last year that States must fully respect the sovereignty of other States and the right of peoples to determine their own destinies, free from external intervention, coercion or constraint, especially involving the threat or use of force, overt or covert, and refrain from any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of any other State or country. That this principle figures in the operative part of General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV) is testimony that respect for its observance is one of the corner-stones of international security. Consequently, we must assume a weakening of international security to the extent that this principle has been violated.

149. The respect for this principle derives from, and underscores, yet another principle of international behaviour, namely, that of non-interference in the internal affairs of other States. This last-named principle was deemed important enough for the General Assembly to adopt in 1965, with only one negative vote, a resolution entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty" [resolution 2131 (XX)]. Paragraph 1 of this Declaration states:

“No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned.”

In paragraph 2 of the same Declaration we find the following:

“...no State shall organize, assist, foment, finance, incite or tolerate subversive, terrorist or armed activities directed towards the violent overthrow of the régime of another State, or interfere in civil strife in another State”.

The value of these obligations has been clearly recognized in paragraph 4 of the Declaration, which states that their strict observance:

“... is an essential condition to ensure that nations live together in peace with one another, since the practice of any form of intervention not only violates the spirit and letter of the Charter of the United Nations but also leads to the creation of situations which threaten international peace and security”.

150. I regret having to quote extensively from the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States, but members will grant that all three clauses cited above are extremely relevant to the situation now confronting my country, a situation which is causing anxiety throughout the world. I equally regret having to bring them to the notice of our colleague from India, as his country was a member of the Committee which drafted that Declaration. But we find it necessary to do so in view of the Indian reply to the Secretary-General contained in document A/8431/Add.2, which, even while declaring India's adherence to all the principles embodied in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, misses no opportunity to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. India's reply speaks of the “decision of Pakistan to hold national elections on universal adult franchise for the first time since it achieved independence 23 years ago” and of “Massive violation of conventions and declarations regarding genocide, human rights and other fundamental rights . . . in East Pakistan . . .”.

151. That India should choose to repeat these charges in practically every organ of the United Nations when they have been repeatedly refuted—and most recently in the general debate at this very session—points to only one conclusion. The conclusion is that India is not interested in a rational dialogue, but that its propaganda war is only a manifestation of its relentless hostile designs against Pakistan. The fact that only the federal intervention of 25 March saved hundreds of thousands of peaceful, law abiding and innocent citizens of Pakistan and foreign nationals living in East Pakistan from massacre by the secessionist elements aided and abetted by Indian nationals, is altogether suppressed.

152. It is true that the internal events of Pakistan have led, unfortunately, to some 2 million displaced persons going to

India. But does that justify a hostility of such magnitude on the part of our neighbour? Does it justify an interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan, especially when my Government, fully alive to the humanitarian aspects of the problem, has done and is doing its utmost for the return of the refugees to East Pakistan? Indeed, India has spared no effort to thwart the return of the displaced persons to Pakistan in conditions of peace and security. By misrepresenting conditions in East Pakistan and by belittling all the concrete measures adopted by Pakistan towards a feasible solution of this tragic problem, our neighbour is making it psychologically impossible for the refugees to contemplate a return to their homes. India has not only rejected the help and assistance of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees through the presence of his representatives as observers, but has kept the very borders which the refugees must cross in a state of constant turmoil and active tension. Reports of increased military activity in India along all its frontiers with Pakistan are pouring in with frequency. President Yahya Khan's appeal and offer to withdraw Pakistan soldiers from the borders if India would also pull back its forces has not caused any abatement in the massing of Indian troops and armour against Pakistan. We cannot but deplore the fact that India should seek to use the refugees, these unfortunate human beings, as a political weapon for the dismemberment of Pakistan.

153. The fission or disintegration of a validly constituted State poses a danger for most nations composed of pluralistic societies. Any confusion between this issue and that of self-determination is most dangerous. To place the matter in its proper perspective, we must first bear in mind that it was the people of East Pakistan who, in 1947, in a unique exercise of the right of self-determination, brought about the creation of one Pakistan as it stands today. There is no comparable example in the world of a more voluntary association of a people with a State than that of the people of East Pakistan with Pakistan. This was, and is, an association brought about, not by the accident of territorial contiguity, but wholly by the will of the people, by true self-determination, by the shared history, the common experience and identical aspirations of the people of East and West Pakistan. What State, so validly constituted, will not fight against the forces that seek to destroy its political independence and territorial integrity?

154. The free exercise of the right of self-determination constitutes a definitive act producing irrevocable results. These results cannot be left in a state of challenge. Otherwise, there would be endless instability with the perennial danger of a dismemberment of validly constituted sovereign States. In East Pakistan we are not dealing with a case of self-determination for the people, but with a case of the preservation of the national unity of a State Member of the United Nations.

155. Those who still insist to the contrary must, in their own States, be prepared to grant the same right of “self-determination” to their own ethnic or linguistic or religious segments of the society as they demand for East Pakistan, though the overwhelming majority of the people of East Pakistan want only regional autonomy.

156. We therefore ask representatives to pause and reflect on the fact that few multilingual or multicultural States are

immune from the danger of fission and disintegration. Those who have attempted to justify secession in East Pakistan on the basis of cultural and linguistic differences would be well advised to ponder the grave repercussions such a precedent would have for all multinational States.

157. We have heard a number of otherwise friendly countries call for a political solution of the internal problem of Pakistan so that the displaced persons may return to their homes. The President of Pakistan has repeatedly declared that he will fulfil his pledge to transfer power to the elected representatives of the people. He is moving forward with determination towards that very end, despite formidable obstacles. But India demands that power be transferred to the secessionist elements. Will any régime dedicated to the preservation of the State surrender to those who would dismember it? Why does not India, which is aiding and abetting these anti-Pakistan elements but which has made it treasonable for Indian nationals to advocate secession, persuade those elements to forswear secession so that they may cease to disqualify themselves from receiving power?

158. Turning from the specific to the more general in the context of the strengthening of international security, we cannot help but remark that the stability of relationships among rich nations is affected by the stability of the institutions of the poor nations, and in the long-term perspective, stability in the poor nations is a function of development. Consequently, two obligations devolve on the world community. First, to strengthen, wherever possible and whenever possible, institutions that have the potential to eradicate social, political and economic unrest in a given society or region; and secondly, to promote welfare—both with material well-being and with non-material goods, essential to the fullest development of the human personality. The promotion of those economic and social objectives is vitally related to the pursuit of peace. It has been recognized in the Charter that in order to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” it is necessary to “promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom”.

159. So far the debate on the subject of strengthening international security has developed progressively and has followed a logical pattern. The year before last a large number of delegations spoke on this subject and outlined what they considered the essential concomitants of strengthening international security. Basing itself on the

opinions expressed, the First Committee recommended last year to the General Assembly the adoption of a most comprehensive declaration which now constitutes resolution 2743 (XXV). What this Committee does this year should form part of the same progressive, logical pattern and should be designed to carry the discussion on this item a step further. It is the opinion of my delegation that a mere reiteration of some of the principles already outlined in the Declaration will have the effect of detracting from the importance of that document, which should be allowed to stand in its entirety.

160. Certainly it would be most undesirable to single out portions of the Declaration and place an unwarranted emphasis on them, thus creating an unavoidable imbalance. The Pakistan delegation would therefore like the First Committee to take note of both the positive as well as the negative developments that have taken place since last year in the matter of strengthening international security, and to recommend to the General Assembly that it call for the total observance of all principles forming part of the Declaration.

161. Finally, I would reserve the right of my delegation to intervene on any draft resolution that may be tendered in the Committee.

162. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on representatives for very brief statements only, one minute for each speaker.

163. Mr. N. SINGH (India): His Excellency Ambassador Agha Shahi has indulged in many fables, foibles and fabrications—I repeat, fables, foibles and fabrications—in his statement about what India has done or has not done in the interest of international security. In due course during the debate we shall explain the true facts regarding these allegations and regarding Pakistan’s actions in East Pakistan and against our country, which have amounted to a massive violation of the United Nations Charter, as well as of several specific provisions of the Declaration, the implementation of which we are discussing.

164. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): This is just to say that I shall not have recourse to alliteration to reply to the representative of India. I have adduced facts. I shall look forward to his reply.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.