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Mr. IMAM (Kuwait): My delegation has consistently welcomed taking part in the deliberations on this item because it affords us a rare opportunity to examine the dilapidated structure of international security and to review recent trends and developments which have a marked impact on the cause of international peace and security.

Perhaps one should start by singling out the fortunate developments. My delegation had more than one occasion to express great satisfaction over the change in policy of the new régime in Portugal and to commend its efforts to recognize the liberation movements in Territories which were previously under its rule. We take this opportunity to express the hope that Portugal will without further delay recognize the independence of Angola so as to complete the programme of work which it initiated when it recognized the independence of Guinea-Bissau and Mozambique. While paying a tribute to Portugal, we cannot but express our indignation over the obstinacy and intransigence of the reactionary régime in Pretoria. Both South Africa and the illegal régime in Southern Rhodesia still behave as if it were their prerogative to persecute indigenous patriots, practise apartheid against them and deprive them of their inalienable rights to self-determination and independence. We hope that the action taken by the General Assembly against South Africa recently will help to bring it to its senses and convince it of the futility of pursuing its inhuman policy of apartheid which is a crime against humanity. South Africa had better follow the example set by Portugal, so that it may be welcomed once more within the fold of the human family. Otherwise, South Africa and the illegal régime in Rhodesia must soon suffer the fate of tyrants who will be reminded by the inexorable march of events that the latter part of the twentieth century has no room for colonialism, apartheid and those who tenaciously cling to these obnoxious and outmoded practices.
Another encouraging sign this year was the decision of the General Assembly, in its resolution 3237 (XXIX), to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) to participate in the sessions and the work of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer, to invite the PLO to participate in the sessions and the work of all international conferences convened under the auspices of the General Assembly in the capacity of observer, and to state that it considers that the PLO is entitled to participate as an observer in the sessions and the work of all international conferences convened under the auspices of other organs of the United Nations. My Government, which recognizes the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole representative of the Palestinian people, believes that granting observer status to the PLO at all international conferences is a constructive step that will allow the people of Palestine to express their views on matters which concern their future and destiny as well as on all matters which concern members of the family of nations.

Another encouraging sign was the adoption by the General Assembly of resolution 3236 (XXIX), which reaffirms the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people in Palestine, including the right to self-determination without outside interference and the right to national independence and sovereignty. It also reaffirms the inalienable right of the Palestinian people to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced and uprooted, and calls for their return. We particularly welcome the provision in this resolution which recognizes that the Palestinian people is the principal party in the establishment of a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

In his statement before the General Assembly on 13 November 1974 the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kuwait said:

"The Palestinian people is the principal party to the problem of Palestine, which in turn is the basis of the Arab-Israeli conflict."

..."Kuwait believes that peace will not be established in the Middle East unless the Palestinian people comes to exercise its right to self-determination without outside interference; that a just and lasting
peace cannot be attained unless the Palestinian people achieves its national independence on its land; and that the region will remain a zone of conflict and a battlefield as well as a threat to world peace and security as long as the world continues to ignore those truths."

(A/PV.2289, p.71)

During the lifetime of the United Nations economic and social progress has taken place at a rapid rate. Much more could have been done had the industrially advanced countries been willing to increase the volume of aid and change the terms of trade. However, the balance of economic power is gradually changing and there is a great deal to make us view the future with satisfaction and hope. It is unnecessary to enumerate the achievements of the United Nations in accelerating the pace of decolonization or in promoting human rights. In many vital fields the United Nations has an impressive record. The failure of the United Nations, however, has been manifested in the field of international peace and security.

One cannot broach the question of the strengthening of international security without adverting to the role of the United Nations, which is still the hope of mankind for saving future generations from the scourge of war. Richard Hiscocks, in his recent work on the Security Council, had this to say on the shortcomings of the United Nations:

"The failure of the United Nations, in so far as it has failed, has had two main causes: the lack of will and ability in men throughout the world to give it effective support and the deliberate choice of Member States to use it as an instrument of national policy, rather than to make the sustained effort necessary to build it into the great instrument of international co-operation it was intended to be."

While subscribing to this logic, my Government believes that it is the big Powers, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council, which are primarily to blame for the present difficulties and predicaments of the United Nations. Small nations like my own do not use the United Nations as an instrument of policy. Rather, they like to see it as a bastion of freedom and human rights and as a protector against tyranny and oppression. Our efforts to strengthen the United Nations and improve its efficacy are
thwarted time and again by big-Power politics and the selfish policies of some permanent members of the Security Council. It is impossible not to come to the inevitable conclusion that the United Nations has been made a scapegoat, as if it had an existence independent of the Governments and peoples of its Member States. If the United Nations fails to live up to the principles enshrined in the Charter it is not our Organization but we who have failed; and in apportioning the blame we should not neglect to emphasize the actions and omissions of the big Powers.

The CHAIRMAN: I have to inform the Committee that Cyprus and Cameroon have become sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.706.
Mr. TOLCHOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from Russian): The unanimous adoption in 1970, at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security is an important contribution of the Organization to the cause of stimulating the processes of détente in international relations. The particular role of the Declaration is determined by two factors. First, it once again confirmed the extremely noble principles and goals of the United Nations Charter and, secondly, it contains an appeal to all Governments to adhere to these principles and goals and to adopt concrete measures to strengthen international peace and security. That is why the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches particular importance to the discussion of the question of the "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security".

The time that has elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration is characterized by a further confirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, strengthening the expansion of international co-operation in all fields of human activity. In the actual practice of international relations, the fundamental rules of contemporary international law are being ever further confirmed, that is to say, renunciation of the use or threat of force in respect of the sovereignty of countries, the right of peoples to self-determination without outside interference, the solving of international controversies by peaceful means and the obligation of States to co-operate among themselves in accordance with the United Nations Charter, the sovereign equality of States, voluntary implementation by States of obligations assumed by them under the United Nations Charter, and so on.

The process of détente, which has now become the prevailing trend in international relations, is creating ever more favourable conditions and opening up ever newer prospects for the taking of measures for the further strengthening of international peace and security. This process is taking place in very difficult circumstances, in a situation where there is a constant change in the balance of forces in favour of peace and progress. In the complex process of the development of international political life, a decisive role is being played by the relations between the socialist and the major capitalist Powers, which have become known as East-West relations. These relations represent,
in our view, a fundamental factor which decisively influences the climate of international relations as a whole. Experience has shown us that we should attach particular importance to relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. An improvement of relations between these two Powers, two countries which are the principal representatives of the two social economic systems, has a very favourable effect upon international relations as a whole. That is why we welcome the efforts of the leaders of these two Powers, which are aimed at ever broader implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence. We welcome the agreements that they have achieved between each other, particularly in the field of disarmament in order to prevent a thermonuclear conflict and in order to limit strategic nuclear weapons and so on.

The intensification and strengthening of Soviet-American relations, in the view of our delegation, are not, as some people are attempting to suggest, a dangerous plot between two super-Powers against the other peoples of the world. Quite the contrary, they are a positive development in international relations with profound and lasting favourable consequences for the cause of peace and security of all peoples. We welcome the agreements that they have achieved and we are in favour of continuing these worthy efforts on the part of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America and of the further strengthening of trust between these two Powers on the attainment of new results in their political, military and economic relations.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security calls upon countries to adhere to the principle of renouncing the use or threat of force and also to resolve all disputes on the basis of the peaceful means indicated in the United Nations Charter. In the circumstances of détente, new prospects are opening up for the enrichment and the multiplication of ways and means of peaceful settlement of international disputes. Along with direct negotiations, among interested countries, the practice is gaining ground of seeking the assistance of the United Nations, primarily of the Security Council, in resolving military conflicts. This trend demonstrates the enhanced authority of the Organization and, in particular, that of the Security Council, which bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.
The adoption of swift and effective measures for calling a halt to hostilities in the Middle East in October last year, and the creation of a United Nations Emergency Force under the direct guidance of the Security Council, show that it is precisely the Security Council which is the effective organ of the United Nations that is able to consider and effectively resolve problems connected with the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Declaration stresses the role of regional measures too in the maintenance and strengthening of security. In this regard we should like to point to the positive role which should be played by the Conference of Security and Co-operation in Europe, which was convened on the proposal of the socialist countries. This is a Conference which is an unprecedented event in the life of the States of the old continent and is already having a favourable effect on bilateral and multilateral relations between the Eastern and the Western countries of Europe. A recognition of realities which have arisen as a result of the Second World War, and the fact that they have been enshrined in international treaties, has opened up broad prospects for comprehensive development of political, economic, cultural and other links, and European peoples can only gain from that.

Our delegation would like to express its conviction that in the near future participants in the Pan-European Conference will consolidate their efforts and be able to congratulate each other upon the adoption of a document of historic significance which will lay the foundation for a Pan-European system of security and co-operation. The development of relations between European countries, in our view, most convincingly demonstrates how, on the basis of the observance and application of universally acknowledged principles of international law, in actual fact it is possible to drive a breach in the wall of mistrust and hostility so that, regardless of the significant difficulties which exist, it will be possible to create fundamentally new relations between States and peoples.

We consider that the example of the participants in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe is worthy of imitation. It is easy to understand why the proposal of the Soviet Government to create a system of collective security in Asia, a continent which has so often served as an arena for considerable military conflicts which have inflicted innumerable disasters upon its peoples, is meeting with widespread support among the peoples of this continent.
In our view, the substantial and positive significance for the development of relations among the Powers of the Western hemisphere will be played by the decision of the Latin American countries to lift the economic blockade of Cuba, which was imposed in other circumstances. We cannot fail to regret the fact that considerations of prestige have prevailed among certain countries at the recent meeting of the Organization of American States and that no decision was taken which would be fully in keeping with the spirit of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Unfortunately, peace and security have not yet been established in Indo-China and Korea because of the continuing intervention of forces which do not belong to either of those two regions, nor have the reasons been removed for possible exacerbation in relations which may lead to further hostilities in the Middle East because of the very well-known refusal of the Government of Israel to acknowledge the principle of the inadmissibility of the conquest of other peoples' territory by force and also because of its refusal to recognize the right to self-determination and statehood of the Arab people of Palestine. Is there any need to demonstrate in the discussion of this item of the agenda that the policy and actions of the Israeli authorities are in total contradiction to the principles of the Charter and the Declaration.

We are firmly convinced that the creation of regional systems of collective security in individual regions will help to extend détente.
The observance of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, also implies a renunciation by colonial Powers of their policy of domination and also the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples. We cannot help noting with satisfaction the fact that the new Government of Portugal has acknowledged the right to self-determination and national independence of the peoples of the Portuguese colonies and is carrying out a programme of granting independence to those peoples. We consider that by that policy and its actions the Government of Portugal is making a valuable contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and security in an area which has been and still remains a potential source of tension and armed conflict.

The question of the total elimination of colonialism is not exhausted by the actions of the Government of Portugal. In South Africa there still remains a serious source of tension where the colonial domination is accompanied by a policy of racial discrimination and apartheid. In the view of our delegation, the decision of the General Assembly of the United Nations with regard to South Africa will have favourable results, although superficially for some time they still might not be perceptible. We consider that the international community, the United Nations, should step up its efforts to show solidarity with and offer assistance to the African population in its struggle for the total elimination of this source of tension so as to ensure peace and security in that part of the world too.

The remnants of colonialism in other parts of the world too should be swiftly eliminated by means of the setting of definite deadlines in the course of which the administering authorities would be obliged to take appropriate action on the basis of the programme of implementing the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

The strengthening of international peace and security requires that the easing of tension should embrace other spheres of international relations, apart from the political. If measures in the military field are added to those in the political field, this would, in the view of the Bulgarian delegation, promote an intensification of the process of the strengthening of peace and security. Peace and security cannot be built on the basis of a balance of terror.
The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria notes with satisfaction that at the present time questions of limiting the arms race and reducing armaments and armed forces, however complex they may be, are really the subject of negotiations at certain international meetings both inside and outside the United Nations framework.

A source of hope for eventual success is the agreement which has been reached that the solution of these complex problems should be sought in the only way that is possible in the subject under consideration, namely, on the basis of the strictest possible observance of the principle of equal security of countries and the inadmissibility of acquiring one-sided advantages.

In this connexion, it is necessary to stress that in the discussion on the solution of problems of disarmament, all States should take an active part, primarily the nuclear Powers. Refusal to take part in talks should not be viewed as anything but an attempt to hinder the adoption of swift and effective measures in disarmament. Justice requires that in this connexion the active and permanent efforts of the Warsaw Pact countries, and primarily of the Soviet Union, should be highlighted: efforts which are aimed at the attainment of realistic results in the field of limiting armaments and the reduction of armaments, i.e. arms race and armed forces, which would be a major contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

In order to confirm what I have said, it is sufficient to indicate the fact that the international agreements which have been signed recently in this field are the result of the initiative of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, the questions that are under consideration in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament have also been introduced fundamentally by the Soviet Union. At the same time the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria would like to point to the growing interest and activities of a group of non-aligned countries in the field of disarmament. We are convinced that as a result of the common concerted efforts of those two groups of Powers further success will be achieved in the field of disarmament to the benefit of all the peoples of the world.
Having dwelt on some fundamental elements and factors in international security and co-operation which have found a clear and concentrated expression in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security of 1970, I should like once again to stress the significance which my delegation attaches to one of those fundamental elements, that is to say, the role of international co-operation in the field of economic, commercial, scientific and technological exchange. The development of that kind of co-operation creates a material basis on which it is possible to strengthen trust between peoples in order to ensure lasting international peace and security.

I do not believe there is any need to demonstrate once again the negative effect on the situation in the world of the still persisting policy of discrimination and plunder which certain developed capitalist countries are continuing to pursue in international relations. It has long been obvious that an improvement in political relations and the creation of a healthy international climate, are inconceivable if we, at the same time, preserve discrimination in the field of trade credit, and so on. It is an old truth confirmed by the ages, that where there are equal rights and mutually advantageous trade, war is an unwelcome guest. Good trade partners are good partners in resolving disputes by peaceful means. Furthermore, the world would be throwing off, in a very fundamental way, the cumbersome legacy of colonialism and imperialist oppression. Dozens of countries have won their national independence and have adopted a course of building their independent economies. However, they are coming up against something which has been a practice established in quite different circumstances.

Multinational monopolies in imperialist circles of capitalist countries are doing everything in their power to preserve their economic domination, as has been demonstrated by recent events. A serious source of tension in the world, which has often led to armed conflict and also to reactionary coups d'état are the efforts of the multinational corporations and imperialistic circles to hinder the implementation of democratic structural reforms in individual countries and also the implementation of the sovereign right of countries over their own natural resources. Governments of more than one developing country have come up against that kind of practice. The Bulgarian people understands the aspirations of the peoples of developing countries to
ensure an independent economic development for their countries. For that reason we supported the demands of those countries at the sixth special session of the United Nations with regard to the establishment of a new economic order in international relations and also the text of a charter of economic rights and duties of States.

The foreign policy of the People's Republic of Bulgaria is determined by the very essence of the socialist system of our country. It is inspired by the ideals of peace and friendship between peoples which are dear to all ordinary people on the earth. Its purpose is to exclude war forever from the life of mankind in order to bring about the triumph of mutual understanding and brotherhood among peoples. Its task is to promote the development of comprehensive co-operation among all countries on the basis of equality, non-intervention in internal affairs and respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of countries on the basis of mutual advantage.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria is a small country, but, as a member of the socialist community, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, along with fraternal countries which are members of the Warsaw Pact, and primarily with the Soviet Union, it is doing everything in its power to ensure lasting peace and security in the world and to create peaceful conditions for the development of all peoples.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria has signed and acceded to agreements in the field of disarmament. Our country is taking an active part in the work of the pan-European Conference on questions of co-operation and security. The People's Republic of Bulgaria builds its relations with its neighbouring countries having different social systems on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence. It takes an active part in all regional initiatives in the Balkans.
The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and Chairman of the State Council of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, has said that socialist Bulgaria is struggling by every means available to it, and will continue to struggle, for new relations in the Balkans, for good neighbourly relations and co-operation in the interest of peace throughout the world.

Within the United Nations, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria supports any initiative aimed at the genuine strengthening of the democratic and peace-loving forces in the world; peaceful, just and durable solutions to controversies in various parts of the world; the expansion of international co-operation by all States; and the confirmation in international relations of the universally acknowledged principles of international law proclaimed in the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Mr. ROSSIDIS (Cyprus): Fundamentally, international peace and security are dependent upon the development and observance of an international legal order. Indeed, it could not be conceived otherwise. In the absence of an international legal order, nations are unavoidably left in a state of anarchy, although there is a pretence that there is no anarchy, and are caught in the shifting sands of alliances, transient centres of power and soluble and fragile commitments to short-term arrangements of so-called convenience.

There can be no world security in such a situation, and it is futile to seek international security in a world of anarchy as we are doing today. Our Charter was devised to provide the overarching framework of an international legal order. The necessary elements for such a legal order, as basic elements, are indisputably contained in the Charter. They may be imperfectly developed; they may be inadequately expanded or delineated. But the vital ingredients for an international legal order are there and have been acknowledged and subscribed to by all the States that have become Members of the United Nations.

It is precisely because the founding Members of the United Nations and all the States that have since become Members are aware of the absolute necessity of an international legal order in the world at this time in history, which alone
can provide this legal order, peace and security, that the United Nations and its Charter exist and that the United Nations is now an almost universal organization. This is due to the inevitable recognition by all States that there must be a kind of international legal organization to preserve a legal order. They have that feeling, but how far do they go towards implementing that legal order? That is the problem.

Yet there is no alternative to the implementation sooner or later of an international legal order as defined in the United Nations Charter -- as it is, even without its being amended. But that order has not been implemented at all. And what is lacking in this world today is implementation, not expressions of dedication. We hear so many. All States subscribe to the Charter and vie in expressions of dedication to its principles. But how far do they go in implementing or giving effect to these declarations?*

We have reached a time in history in which there is an unprecedented dichotomy between solemn expressions and unabashed contradictions of those expressions in everyday political conduct and particularly in the sphere of military operations. Therefore, to strengthen international security, we must first see whether there is any sense of international security to be strengthened. We cannot strengthen something that does not exist. We have to give it substance and existence. And how can we give it substance and existence if we deny the very first requirement of international security provided for in the Charter, which is nothing but the implementation of the decisions of the organ of the United Nations entrusted with international security, which is the Security Council. If the Security Council is unable, unwilling or reluctant to implement its resolutions -- I would not go so far as to say its majority resolutions, its unanimous resolutions -- what need is there to look for the strengthening of international security, if we lack the elements of international security, by our disregard, our violation of the fundamental purposes and principles of the Charter as described in its relevant parts, in Chapter VII, Article 39, which requires the Security Council to decide upon any case of aggression or breach of the peace:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, ...".

* The Chairman took the Chair.
We do not have much difficulty with that. They do make recommendations. But what about Articles 41 and 42, concerning implementation? Those are completely ignored, and to a very large extent they have been thus ignored from the very beginning. And the United Nations is striving for international security while taking no steps and not calling to order those responsible for not implementing the resolutions of the Security Council. That is another kind of dichotomy between thinking and action, between verbosity and actual practice.

How can this world survive under such circumstances? In his history throughout the ages, man may have passed through many phases and had many failings, and there may have been many lapses in civilization. Perhaps he did lack today's technological knowledge or scientific progress -- though whether they are blessings or otherwise is another matter -- but he was a whole human being, not a dichotomized human being, one half pretending to be one thing and the other half acting to the contrary. This really is philosophically and psychologically the greatest problem with which the United Nations is faced. We cannot deny it. Let us be frank for once. We can say a lot of nice things here and go to our homes very much satisfied with what we have said and what we have heard; to be sure, that could be very satisfactory. But what is the effect? The world is going downhill morally; and in that moral degradation, physical and political degradation are implicit. We are moving in that direction. Therefore we welcome the discussion on this item, if we are going to say some really true things.
This is a case in which I am concerned. We have a Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Let us look at that Declaration. We have to look at it. I praise it for it is a very good Declaration; it is the good side of the dichotomy. The Charter principles are reaffirmed there in paragraph 1 and in paragraph 2 it calls for adherence to them. Then, in paragraph 3 it deals with a most important aspect for international security and stresses the primacy of the obligations of all States under the Charter, by stating that their obligations under the Charter shall prevail over other obligations under any other international agreement.

Now that defines contemporary international law since the Charter. It states the principle *pacta sunt servanda*, which has prevailed, and rightly so. Pacts and agreements must be implemented. But it supplements and clarifies that principle by saying that as long as they do not conflict with obligations under the Charter, *pacta sunt servanda*, subject to the Charter obligations. If they conflict with the Charter obligations, then the Charter obligations prevail, in accordance with Article 103 of the Charter. So that is an excellent point that is given priority in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The next in sequence is paragraph 4, emphasizing the sovereign rights of States to determine their own destinies without external interference, without coercion, without constraint, and calls on all States to refrain from any attempt at the partial or total disruption of the unity and territorial integrity of any other State or country.

This principle appropriately takes a place of priority as it touches on the very core and origin of the most difficult and dangerous present-day problem: that of partitioned countries. That problem gives rise to explosive situations of almost endemic war and human suffering, as we see wherever we turn in our world of today, whether in Europe or in Asia or in any other part of the world. It poses the greatest threat to international peace and security, as we can see from the items that come before the Security Council. Ninety-nine per cent of them are cases of partitioned countries or countries about to be partitioned.
The Declaration, after reaffirming in paragraph 5 the duty of every State
to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity and
political independence of any other State, proceeds pertinently, in paragraph 6,
to deal with the peaceful settlement of disputes and urges Member States to seek
improved implementation of the means and methods provided for in the Charter
under Article 33.

Yet no effort has been made to provide the methods and the procedural
modalities for the peaceful settlement of disputes, leaving the matter in the air,
as the Charter has it: the means, that is, inquiry, mediation, arbitration and
so on. They leave it at that, although there could be modalities developed that
would facilitate the application of those means for peaceful settlement of
disputes. There is complete neglect of that.

Two or three years ago my delegation put forward a draft resolution whereby
machinery would be set up for developing those modalities, but it received no
great respect or support, probably because no one wanted to have such modalities
which would create an obligation to proceed otherwise than by the law of force.
Now in subsequent paragraphs in the Declaration dealing with the implementation
and enforceability of Security Council resolutions, those who ought to be
preeminent called for particular consideration and attention to this in a review
of world developments. Now, at this session, as a Committee has been set up to
review the Charter, it would be an appropriate occasion to examine this
situation in connexion with the Charter review, and decide upon the question of
implementation. Either some way will be found of having Security Council
resolutions implemented after all, as they were intended to be -- for what is
the meaning of Security Council resolutions that are not implemented -- or else,
in the review, means must be sought to bring such elements into the Charter as
will make implementation possible.

So I think the discussion of this aspect regarding the implementation of
Security Council resolutions is very pertinent. That is the very core of the
problem upon which the whole edifice of the United Nations stands or falls,
because if it cannot implement its resolutions, it really loses its prestige,
its authority, its credibility and everything else. So perhaps it is possible
even at this late hour to think of means of implementing the resolutions of the
Security Council.
I cannot refrain from mentioning the example in which my country was involved this summer, in which we had repeated unanimous resolutions in the Security Council for a cease-fire, for immediate cessation of foreign military intervention, for the withdrawal of foreign troops from the Republic of Cyprus. And nothing has been done towards their implementation.

On the contrary, while those resolutions were repeatedly unanimously adopted, one on 20 July, and the second, more forcefully demanding the same thing -- it was so important that they were unanimously adopted by the Security Council -- nothing was done for their implementation.

The Articles of the Charter referring to implementation were ignored and no effort was made, no influence exerted in any other way to get implementation -- as if the duty of the Security Council and the world community, and those entrusted with the world order -- the so-called order that exists -- only had to adopt the words of a resolution, and close their eyes as to its effects.

That is another instance of the dichotomy to which I have just referred, the dichotomy between words and action. It goes through and through and reaches the highest organs of the United Nations and it reverberates in other aspects of world development.

This is, I think, a fundamental problem. It all turns -- the whole question of international security, the whole question of international legal order -- upon the implementation of Security Council resolutions. I am really astonished to see, indeed it is surprising, and in a sense may be taken as a sign of hope, that the world, in spite of all these things, has been able to survive to this day. It is really amazing that in a world of such disorder, humanity has survived and even presents not insignificant instances of progress.
We live in a world in which the arms race goes on escalating. It has now reached the highest peak it has ever reached; it has now reached a cost of $560,000 million. And there is no hope for any reduction, because our experience with the SALT negotiations has shown that those negotiations are based on a balance of power, and therefore they can only feed the arms race. There can be no balance of power without an arms race. No matter how some people may think it possible in theory, in practice there can be no balance of power without an arms race. The two cannot be separated. Balance of power is based on mistrust, lack of confidence, inimical feelings, a refusal to co-operate. Each side must be ready with its armaments -- with balanced armaments, because if there is no balance of armaments, one side will spring against the other and destroy it. So they must have that balance of power.

Now, is that compatible with the Charter? Is that theory of the balance of power, that theory which is the object of so much praise and admiration, one on which international security can be based? Can you blend international security and legal order with a balance of power? -- which is really the very essence of anarchy, only staying off anarchy by weapons and more weapons. If we spend and continue to spend so much on weapons and armaments, how can there be any hope for development? How can there be any hope of being able to solve the growing global problems: the dearth of resources, the limitations on growth, the population problem, and all the other problems that follow upon and are consequences of the arms race? As was pointed out by our lamented former Secretary-General in his warning to the world in 1969, the arms race must be brought to a halt so that global problems can be tackled. But the arms race is not being brought to a halt, and therefore, by continuing, it makes impossible any legal order, any international security, and creates the problems that we have to deal with.
As I said before -- although I did not want to have to refer to that -- the recent instance in Cyprus is a sign of definite moral and political degradation. The Security Council collapsed completely. International security through the United Nations has collapsed, with very ominous auguries of what is going to happen to the world. We had a situation in Cyprus in which that country -- a non-aligned country which belongs to no alliance and therefore receives no military assistance from any side at all -- remained dependent upon the principle of international security. And what happened was that it was slaughtered. For weeks on end and continuously, a big Power -- I do not say a major Power, but a fully-armed Power, a member of an alliance, using the weapons of that alliance -- has been attacking and destroying Cyprus, with the result that more than one third of its territory is under foreign military occupation. I need not enter here into the situation resulting from that occupation, nor need I go into details about this matter; but looked at from the point of view of international security, what does it portend for the world? What does it mean? Has it no meaning, has it taken place in a vacuum? It has not. It is part and parcel of our interdependent world. What happens to Cyprus has direct consequences and effects for every Member nation of the United Nations, no matter how big or powerful it may be. The fate of any nation in a world of anarchy is not going to be very much different from that of the others.

As a result of this degradation we can see the worsening of the situation in the Middle East, where it is not unlikely that we could have a nuclear war, beginning with "mini-nukes" and ending we do not know where. Surely, if there is going to be a confrontation, it will start in the Middle East. There is no doubt about that.

So then, where are we heading? Are we here, in our discussions, really concerned about the future of humanity? If we are, then let us turn and look at what happened in Cyprus. There we can see an example and get an idea of what may happen to the world. Once there is anarchy, there will be anarchy everywhere -- an anarchy international. Therefore we cannot escape the fact that this world is one and indivisible, and that whatever happens in one part of the world affects every other part of the world.
I am sorry if I say things that are not very pleasant. I could have made a speech that would perhaps have been very pleasant, about international security, one that would have given hope to all of you. But if we do not want to realize the truth, if we do not want to face the realities and dangers involved, we shall have to abide by what may happen afterwards. We will have to live with the consequences for the whole world of a situation in which there is no international security. Let us therefore turn now and see what we can do.

What we can do is, first of all, to see that in the future the Security Council's resolutions are implemented, and not by depending on the goodwill, or the political will of States. We hear it said so often that the Charter is not being implemented because there is no political will on the part of the Members of the United Nations. Obviously, there is no political will. But did the founding fathers of the Charter depend on political will? They said that there should be implementation, and they provided the means for it. And without such implementation, we cannot proceed.

By my statement, therefore, I aim at the following: First, every effort should be made for the sake of strengthening international security through the implementation of the Security Council's resolutions -- implementation under the Charter, whether as it stands or after review. Of course, it would be very good to say that implementation is not only the result of a resolution, but also of the goodwill and political will of all the nations involved. We have heard about that from the very first day of the United Nations existence, but it has not had much effect. Therefore, let us implement the Charter and get it working, so that the aggressor may know that he will be subjected to the sanctions that are intended for aggression, that he cannot go about without caring what happens in the world or what resolutions there are against his actions.

And secondly, we must turn our attention to improving methods for the peaceful settlement of disputes, as I said before.

So we must work in these two parallel ways: by enforcing the Charter through its provisions for preserving international peace and security, and by improving the modalities for the peaceful settlement of disputes.
Mr. NEUGEBAUER (German Democratic Republic): The delegation of the German Democratic Republic attaches exceedingly great importance to the consideration of agenda item 36, concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, which is one of the most important documents adopted by the United Nations.

The outstanding significance of this Declaration lies in the fact that it is a programme of action for the implementation of the Organization's main purposes: to maintain peace and safeguard international security, to eliminate colonialism in all its manifestations, and to develop international co-operation on the basis of equal rights. With this Declaration, the United Nations gave itself an effective tool for translating the purposes and objectives of the Charter into action.

The exchanges of views on the implementation of the Declaration held each year at the sessions of the General Assembly provide favourable opportunities of evaluating the progress made in international relations. At the same time, they serve the purpose of mobilization and orientation in the struggle to widen and deepen the process of détente in international relations.

Indeed, last year, when this important agenda item was being discussed at the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic took the opportunity of making a number of observations on the implementation of the Declaration. Permit me, in this connexion, to point also to the reply of the Government of the German Democratic Republic to the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Declaration, which is contained in document A/9696 of 7 October 1974.

This year, too, we are fully justified in saying that further positive results have been achieved in putting this document into practice.

Speaking in the general debate, the head of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic to this year's General Assembly noted that:

"Conditions for the United Nations to work in the interest of international security, disarmament, the liquidation of colonialism and racism, of international co-operation among States on a basis of equality have improved. At the same time, the activities of the opponents of détente underscore the need for the United Nations to make a greater contribution to the normalization of the international situation."

(A/EV.2243, pp. 62-65)
With full justification the Political Consultative Committee of the States parties to the Warsaw Treaty noted at its session in April this year that at present the trend towards détente is the predominant element in the development of the situation in the European continent and the world over. Despite the obstinate resistance of the opponents of détente, the fundamental positive transformation of international relations is going on.

No doubt, this process has advanced most in Europe. There, a turn towards peace and security has taken place; and the post-war settlement, which was delayed for almost three decades, has been completed. But positive changes which open up hopeful prospects of a secure peace are noticeable in other parts of the world, too.

The efforts to achieve a further recovery of the situation in Europe centre on the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. That Conference is an event of historic moment which promises to become a starting point for new relations among the participating countries.

In this connexion we welcome the fact that the First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Leonid Brezhnev, and the President of the French Republic, Giscard d'Estaing, share the view that there are good conditions now for an early conclusion of the all-European Security Conference, for the holding of its third phase and the signing of the final document at the highest level.

Moreover, we are firmly convinced that the outcome of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe will have a favourable impact on détente elsewhere in the world and on the establishment of concepts of collective security -- for instance, in Asia.

Of special importance for international developments is the improvement of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America. This is borne out, in particular, by the results achieved at the summit meetings of the leading statesmen of the Soviet Union and the United States in July and November this year. In the Soviet-American communiqué of Vladivostok, both sides stated that they:
"... intend to continue, without a loss in momentum, to expand the scale and intensity of their co-operative efforts in all spheres as set forth in the agreements they have signed, so that the process of improving relations between the USSR and the United States will continue without interruption and will become irreversible."

The German Democratic Republic notes with satisfaction that in the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States particular attention was paid to measures designed to eliminate the threat of war and halt the arms race. The new arrangements on further steps to limit strategic armaments and settle other pressing disarmament problems reduce the risk of military confrontation.

In paragraph 17 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security Member States are urged to fully respect their obligations under international law in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter. The significance of this principle cannot be underlined often enough, as my delegation would reiterate, particularly in view of the well-known set of treaties concluded in Europe, including the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin.

The German Democratic Republic always attached maximum importance to these Treaties and Agreements. In our view, they provide a firm and reliable foundation on which relations can develop in line with the principles of peaceful coexistence. In the process of normalizing relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany further progress has been achieved and fixed in binding form. The German Democratic Republic considers that there is every possibility of bringing about good-neighbourly relations if the Treaties and Agreements concluded are fulfilled in letter and in spirit.

At its twenty-eighth session the General Assembly adopted resolution 3185 (XXVIII). In it the General Assembly referred to new and topical aspects in connexion with the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. In so doing, the General Assembly considered that political détente must be complemented by military détente. This link is particularly emphasized in operative paragraph 6 of that resolution.
This objective is served in particular by the resolution on the Prohibition of Action to Influence the Environment and Climate for Military and Other Hostile Purposes Incompatible with the Maintenance of International Security, Human Well-being and Health.

The proposal to call a world disarmament conference is also in line with the appeal made in resolution 3185 (XXVIII). We hold that the results of the process of détente and the bilateral and multilateral agreements on arms limitation and disarmament so far concluded have created more favourable conditions for the early calling of such a conference. Practical preparations for, and the early convocation of, a world disarmament conference would be in full harmony with the purpose of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Now as before, the delegation of the German Democratic Republic believes that the time is ripe for making concrete preparations for such a conference.

In the view of the delegation of the German Democratic Republic, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security calls for making every effort in order to eliminate dangerous hotbeds of tension.
The situation in the Middle East, which threatens peace and security in the area and all over the world, gives rise to serious concern among all peace-loving peoples. This situation has arisen because Israel has for years pursued a policy of aggression and is not willing to implement the decisions of the United Nations. It is high time to bring about a settlement of the Middle-East conflict on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and of the recent decisions taken by the United Nations General Assembly. For this purpose it is indispensable that two principal demands -- the withdrawal of the Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and the safeguarding of the national rights of the Arab people of Palestine -- should be fulfilled.

We hold that such a settlement can be achieved by way of an early resumption of the Geneva Middle-East peace conference whose decisions must guarantee the legitimate rights of all peoples of the region, including the Palestinian people.

The United Nations is faced with the task of helping to preserve peace in the Mediterranean area as part of its efforts to strengthen international security.

The unanimous adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of the draft resolution in document A/L.759 and A/d.1 (resolution 3212 (XXIX)) on the Cyprus issue has created more favourable prospects of finding a peaceful solution to this conflict.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic continues to believe that in accordance with the most recent resolution on Cyprus a conference on Cyprus within the framework of the United Nations should be called, and that the States permanent members of the Security Council should assume guarantees that will exclude the possibility of another threat to international peace arising in the Mediterranean area.

A major contribution to strengthening international security was made, in the view of the German Democratic Republic, through the agreement on the restoration of peace in Viet-Nam. It is therefore necessary that the Saigon régime should be prevented from thwarting the implementation of that agreement and consequently, a political settlement of the conflict.
(Mr. Neurebauer, German Democratic Republic)

The course taken by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam has our full backing because it is aimed at the unqualified and full implementation of the Paris Agreement.

We reiterate our demand that our Organization should normalize its relationship with the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Viet-Nam and should ensure that all parties to the Agreement are treated as equals by the United Nations.

What has been said in the debate at the General Assembly and in other United Nations organs has made it clearer than ever before that the continued existence of colonialism and racism in Africa is a serious threat to peace and security in the African continent.

It is not by accident therefore that the apartheid policies pursued by the Republic of South Africa were condemned by the overwhelming majority of United Nations Member States, and that corresponding conclusions have been drawn. Never before has South Africa, with its few remaining allies, been so isolated as it is today. This has also created new conditions which make it possible to successfully carry on the struggle against the remnants of colonialism and apartheid.

The German Democratic Republic has always given consistent support to all peoples fighting for the implementation of the right to self-determination and for national independence and sovereignty. In the past it has strictly observed all sanctions imposed by the Security Council and the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly concerning the elimination of colonialism and racism. It has for years supported the national liberation movements of the African peoples. The German Democratic Republic considers that coming out against colonialism and racism helps remove existing hotbeds of conflict, promotes the process of détente and serves the Purposes and Principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic will take part, with all the means at its disposal, in the Decade of Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.
The German Democratic Republic considers that strict observance of the Charter and full compliance with the declarations, decisions and resolutions adopted on the basis of the Charter is an essential prerequisite for, and a decisive contribution to, the strengthening of peace and international security.

By adopting or considering a number of important resolutions and documents, such as the definition of aggression and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly has already made an important contribution to the implementation of the Declaration. My delegation considers it necessary that in the draft resolution on agenda item 36, also to be adopted this year, the principal tasks should be defined that will have to be solved in the near future in the interest of a further improvement of the international situation.

This includes, in the first place, the demand that the process of détente should be promoted, that no actions should be permitted that are detrimental to the continued development and intensification of the positive trends in inter-State relations, and that the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between States with differing social systems should be fully applied.

The delegation of the German Democratic Republic holds that the draft resolution submitted by a large number of Member States in document A/C.1/L.706 does justice to the basic concern of continuing to implement the aforementioned Declaration. It therefore supports that draft resolution.

Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): The purpose of promoting, preserving and strengthening international peace and security is amongst all other purposes, the raison d'être of the United Nations. It remains at the core of its structure.

The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, proclaimed as a basic legal, political, and moral document at the twenty-fifth commemorative session of the General Assembly, elaborates on and elucidates the fundamental Purposes and Principles of the Charter related to peace and security. Together they form the precepts and guidelines by which conduct should be governed in international relations. What is most important is their implementation through effective measures designed to make international peace and security a reality.
At this time, I should like to concur with the various delegations which have expounded on and lauded the positive trends in international relations generated by the spirit of détente which is gaining ground every day in the relations amongst the major Powers. The political and military détente must be encouraged, pursued and strengthened for its results are beneficial to humanity as a whole. My delegation did not participate in the discussion of the items on disarmament, and was not a sponsor of any of the draft resolutions adopted by this Committee, and later by the General Assembly.

However, as a matter of principle, we voted for all of them because they contained encouraging elements, though insufficient and marginal, which tend to enhance international peace and security.
We welcome particularly the resolution adopted regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. Adherence to and ratification of the non-proliferation Treaty by all the States in the area would enhance international peace and security. Lebanon was one of the first to take such action.

While we are on the subject of disarmament, permit me to express some general views. Though obvious and often repeated, nevertheless they should be stressed continuously. Disarmament is the surest means of securing and strengthening peace and security. We all welcome the agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union regarding the limitation of strategic weapons. However, the problem of disarmament must be tackled in a more radical way if it is to be meaningful and to allay the genuine fears of mankind. Although it has become common knowledge and is stated so often, as I have said, we should never tire of repeating that over $200,000 million is spent every year on armaments and for military purposes generally, 95 per cent of it being spent by the developed nations. Those huge expenditures are made year after year and their progression is constant. By 1980 they may reach $500,000 million a year. In this so-called Second Development Decade over $2 million million will have been spent on weapons and military establishments: that is, on unproductive goods and mostly idle human resources -- in other words, a waste of human and material resources on weapons novel today and obsolete tomorrow. Only war industries and establishments benefit from technological advances in weaponry: mankind as a whole is the loser. The prospects for permanent world peace and security are constantly in jeopardy. Development to satisfy human needs for food, clothing and shelter is the sufferer. The justification of spiralling expenditure on armaments by the need for self-defence is no longer sufficient to satisfy the minds of younger generations. The young people of today are intellectually liberated from old concepts which justified war, expansion and armaments. They are morally opposed to them. They are more committed to the quest for a better life, more peaceful, more productive, more generous and more responsive to human needs.
We hear and read so much nowadays about how to recycle the financial resources accruing to the oil-producing States, for instance. Those States have for the first time in their history come face to face with resources which may benefit the well-being of their peoples, yet they are begrudged their wealth. Nevertheless, a substantial portion of that wealth will be, and is being, recycled into the international economy as a matter of course through aid, trade and investments abroad. Such recycling will adapt itself to the normal play of economics. But what about the other programme of recycling resources from the field of armaments to the field of development by means of disarmament? Who will be the major beneficiaries of that recycling? The answer is clear. They will be the peoples of the developed, industrialized and technologically advanced countries themselves. Resources released from the wasteful arms build-up will be abundantly available to meet their requirements for furthering the social and cultural progress and the well-being of their peoples. The peoples of the developed countries themselves will likewise benefit from the liberation of resources earmarked for armaments. Consequently, productivity in the developed countries will rise significantly and their gross national product will be such as to enable them to provide the required assistance to the developing countries, especially the least developed among them.

While we are still on the subject of disarmament and its relation to international security, I wish to refer to another aspect of the problem. At least two Member States have been the subject of several United Nations relations containing provisions concerning either an arms embargo or condemnation, or both, because of the abhorrent policies and practices of those States against basic human rights or their violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter and international law by committing acts of aggression against neighbouring Member States and the occupation, in some cases, of their territories.

The United Nations and its membership have a prime and grave responsibility for ensuring that an arms embargo, where applicable, is strictly adhered to and enforced, and for depriving a State which is the subject of an embargo of any and all means of securing arms. Any infringement of that embargo is a breach of international law, defiance of United Nations resolutions and a threat to international peace and security.
Member States assume equal responsibility as regards a State which makes aggression, territorial occupation and expansion its cardinal State policy. To disarm the aggressor must be one of our major concerns. A country which is widely and repeatedly condemned by our Organization and by the majority of the civilized world must be the subject of an effective embargo in order to restrain it from embarking on new adventures of war and aggression, to make it realize that the law of the nations must prevail and understand that peace can be secured by redressing the wrongs it has done.

The Security Council, which assumes primary responsibility for the preservation of peace and the strengthening of international security, has been paralysed and prevented from playing its role by the use of the veto power held by its permanent members. Its contribution to the question of disarmament is the best means of guaranteeing peace and, in turn, security. Its failure to impose sanctions, which should of necessity have included an arms embargo, against the aggressor has encouraged the aggressor to persevere instead of restraining it from persevering in its adventurous policy of aggression, occupation, annexation and spoliation of the fundamental and inalienable rights of peoples.

An aggressor cannot be left loose and at large. It must be curbed. The best way to curb it is to deny it the weapons which embolden it in its criminal tendency. The time must certainly come, and come soon, to take effective measures in the United Nations against providing a State which is the subject of condemnation because of its aggression with means of death and destruction, and to this end to enlist the support of nations which provide it with such arms.
Another discussion is at this stage taking place in the General Assembly regarding the "Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security". My delegation made its views known in that debate, and I would only add the following.

Twenty-nine years have elapsed since the signing of the Charter, and the General Assembly and the Security Council, despite some progress achieved by the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations, have not yet been able to adopt the guidelines needed to set up, on a permanent basis and according to defined guidelines, a United Nations force capable of preventing the outbreak of war or meeting promptly and decisively any aggression launched against a Member State.

Armed threats, breaches of the peace and armed assaults continue to go unchecked by the United Nations. The Security Council in most cases rushes to set up peace-keeping operations after a conflagration has broken out, but not in time to prevent it. The principal Powers entrusted with the distinct responsibility of preserving international peace and security continue in their academic debate regarding the interpretation of the Charter provisions related to peace-keeping. The roles of the Security Council and of the Secretary-General also remain at the centre of the debate. The Military Staff Committee remains idle and ineffective. Its achievement, according to one of its members, resides in the fact that it meets once a week for five minutes and its members, bored with such purposeless meetings, confine their activities to mere handshakes.

At a time when strong doubts are being raised about the role and the effectiveness of the United Nations, we must be on our guard against any attempt to weaken this institution. To make it more powerless is to destroy it and, with it, to destroy the hopes of mankind for a better and more peaceful world. Despite all its deficiencies, the United Nations remains our best anchor for peace. To break away from it is an invitation to return to a world totally dominated by power politics and warfare.

The discussion of international security is wide and complex. It embraces so many aspects, such as racism, apartheid, decolonization, military bases. Unfortunately, there are also many troubled areas in the world and many crises, such as in Korea, South-East Asia and Cyprus. I do not wish to dwell on these
aspects at this stage. I believe that, at this particular stage, what is more important for me as a representative of Lebanon is to dwell on matters concerning peace and security in the Middle East and in Lebanon itself.

Even today -- a few hours ago and later as I came into this room -- Lebanon is being subjected to a new series of murderous attacks by the Israeli air force. The outskirts of Beirut have been bombed and are being bombed at this time. Israel has conducted a sustained policy of aggression against Lebanon. Lebanon's sovereignty is constantly breached. Hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed or wounded. Scores of towns and villages have been destroyed or damaged. Farmlands have been devastated. The whole population of southern Lebanon lives under the constant threat of terror. Though I do not wish to dwell on this question at this stage, my delegation considers it its duty to discuss international security in general as it relates to my country and to the area in which it is situated.

No discussion of international security could be conducted without due reference to the ever dangerous problem of the Middle East. The peace in that area is inseparable from that of the world. Furthermore, the notion is widely held that world security to a large degree hinges on the security of the Middle East. The international community can no longer take undue risks. The dangers are there for all to see. The consequences of the October war of 1973 are still with us. Their disturbing impact on the international political and economic life cannot be minimized. The political factors have become so closely intertwined with the economic factors that they cannot be divorced totally from each other. We are all aware of the facts, and this is not the time nor the place to delve into an economic discussion. But let us remind ourselves that there was widespread recognition that the energy crisis, which was already at hand in the years 1971, 1972 and 1973, might assume more dangerous proportions if the political situation in the Middle East were to be allowed to drift aimlessly. The perils both to the peace and to the world economic order were obvious. Warnings have been repeatedly sounded, but not taken seriously. The instability of the Middle East situation fed into the instability of the world economic situation. It is always wise to draw a beneficial conclusion that the improvement of the political climate in that troubled area would be a factor contributing to the betterment of economic
conditions. Once political irritants have been removed on the basis of fairness
and justice, the interplay of solely economic factors and considerations is bound
to bring about more harmony in international relations. To allow the
situation to be cast adrift again is to invite more dangers to an already
untenable situation, which is endangering international peace and security.
It has often been said that the problem of the Middle East is one of lost opportunities. The United Nations and some of the major Powers have let many opportunities slip by. Bold, decisive and imaginative statesmanship often defaulted. Procrastination and power-politicking, coupled with Israeli military arrogance and political stubbornness, prevented any progress. Such behaviour paved the way for a succession of wars and acts of aggression to be committed by Israel against its neighbours and impeded the success of all efforts for a peaceful solution. The question of the Middle East has not been discussed during this session. An opportunity is being given to quiet diplomacy to pursue its course with the hope that it may produce reasonable results within a reasonable time. We believe that the step-by-step approach to the solution of the problem has its merits and could produce such results as may be helpful to the eventual over-all solution. At the same time, we believe that the reconvening of the Geneva Conference also has its merits. It has the advantage of bringing all the parties together in an effort to find detailed agreements to the problem in its entirety. We must reckon that neither a slow motion step-by-step diplomacy or a stalemated Geneva Conference are of such a nature as to enhance the chances of a final just and total solution. Only an accelerated, persistent and unswerving action by the two means converging on the same avenue could avert new warfare and bring us closer to real peace.

Following the fruitful debate on the question of Palestine, a unique opportunity is being offered for an over-all solution. We have constantly maintained that no solution of the Middle East problem can be achieved without solving the problem of the Palestinian people. The General Assembly has acted wisely in recognizing the inalienable rights of that people, chief among them the right to return to their homeland and properties and to self-determination and political independence. The Palestine Liberation Organization was recognized as its legal representative and accorded the status of observer in the United Nations and its agencies. The PLO has emerged as a real force, assuming its due and responsible role on the international level. We are confident that its enlightened and wise leadership recognizes the value of the trust placed in it by the international community and that it will act accordingly.
On the other hand, Israel can no longer ignore its existence. The PTO's participation in diplomatic efforts to solve the Middle East question is a necessary condition for their success.

That is the statement that I had in part prepared for this discussion. But, I should not like to conclude my statement without a special reference to you, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, this has been the first time that I have spoken in the Committee under your leadership. Perhaps it is too late to congratulate you on your election, but it is never too late to congratulate you, and I think it is timely to do so, on the efficient, wise manner in which you have conducted the very difficult deliberations of this Committee during the last three months. Your wisdom, your qualities as a very fine and refined statesman and leader, have won you the admiration and gratitude of my delegation and I am sure of all other delegations. It has been a pleasure for me to sit opposite you, admiring you in your performance, and at the same time seeing a great son of a great country, Argentina, for which Lebanon has a special affection, presiding over our deliberations. I extend to you, Mr. Chairman, the best wishes of my delegation and address to you its gratitude for the splendid task that you have performed.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to thank the Ambassador of Lebanon for the kind words which he directed towards my country and towards myself. I call again on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): In last year's debate on the strengthening of international security, my delegation, together with two other delegations, introduced a draft resolution. The draft resolution was sponsored by Cyprus, Kenya, and Malta and asked that international security should extend beyond the ordinarily understood meaning of international security under the Charter and beyond the added international security which, in respect of the economic aspect, is called economic security, and that it should be extended also to environmental security, that is, security of the physical environment and the new threats posed thereby to the life and security of the peoples of all nations, having in mind that the international community became aware in more
concrete terms of these new threats as a result of the Stockholm Conference and the Declaration on the Human Environment which followed the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Therefore, at the time of the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security such threats to the life and security of nations from the environment were not in the minds of the peoples and nations. We introduced that draft resolution last year which affirmed that international security in the present realities of our contemporary world must include the security of nations and peoples from serious dangers threatening their physical environment, the very source of their life, and we requested the Secretary-General to prepare, with the co-operation of the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, Mr. Maurice Strong, a study on the relationship of the environmental aspect of security to the whole problem involved in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and to submit a relevant report to the General Assembly.

That draft resolution introduced last year met with a positive response, particularly from the delegations of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, India and Sweden, which, at the same time, because of lack of time, asked that the draft resolution be deferred until the coming year so that there would be more time to consider it. The "coming year" is the present year. But in the present year we have not submitted that draft resolution for the following reasons.

First, because the subject of that draft resolution was already partly, but very effectively, covered by the draft resolution introduced by the Soviet Union and other countries -- Afghanistan, Argentina and others -- with regard to the "prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military and other purposes incompatible with the maintenance of international security, human well-being and health."
In that respect, the draft covered it to a great extent, though not wholly, because it is concerned only with military operations or preparations for military operations that affect the environment, whereas that draft covered every kind of serious deterioration of the environment by war or peaceful means. However, as it is well covered in this respect by the aforesaid draft resolution -- which was, fortunately, overwhelmingly adopted by the Sixth Committee and would be adopted by the plenary -- we consider it unnecessary at the present time to proceed with that draft resolution. That is the first reason.

The second reason is that inclusion of the question of economic security under the strengthening of international security really extends the international security intended under the Charter, which is the military aspect, of course -- the question of the use or threat of force -- extending it to the economic aspect, and then to the environmental aspect, implies that it is satisfactorily proceeding in respect of its main purpose -- that of preserving and maintaining international peace and security -- and it could be extended to other spheres of necessary international security. But, having in mind what has happened this last year, not only in Cyprus but also in other parts of the world, we see that the strengthening of international security is not improving; rather, it is failing in its main purpose -- that of maintaining and preserving international peace and security from the threat of war, aggressive actions and military operations.

Therefore, we think for that reason also it is a little futile to try and extend it to the protection of the environment when it has not so far succeeded in any way in preserving international peace in this main aspect -- that of the non-use of force in international relations in accordance with the Charter.

However, we do not despair. Hope springs eternal in the human breast. So we hope the time will come when it will be possible to proceed further and to protect the environment from a real source of danger to humanity as a whole, a common enemy of humanity that should unite human beings beyond their differences, nationalistic or otherwise, which are already bypassed in the progress of humanity through technology. Therefore we look forward to the time when it will be logical, practical and realistic to proceed with a resolution on the protection of the environment under the chapter of international security.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call upon those representatives who wish to exercise their right of reply.

Mr. ERELL (Israel): I can identify with at least one element of the speech we heard from the representative of Lebanon, and by that I mean the tribute he paid to you, Mr. Chairman. Unfortunately, I could not agree with most of the rest of the things he said.

I feel, and my Government feels, that the time has come for the Government in Beirut to understand that it is impossible for it to keep on its territory murder organizations which cross into Israel and send people into Israel to murder civilians -- women and children -- indiscriminately, as some did last night in a cinema in Tel-Aviv, and yet expect that those murder bases on its territory will enjoy the protection of its sovereignty. That is simply impossible, quite apart from being unreasonable and almost inhuman.

Day after day and night after night, murderers come from Lebanon. Everybody knows where the centres of such activity are located, and by the simple necessity of self-defence as well as by the simple logic and justice of self-defence, it is imperative to accept -- and we feel the Government of Lebanon will have to do so -- that the country which is the target of these murderous attacks will hit back at the bases of the murderers. That must be understood.

Secondly, the representative of Lebanon rightly said that the absence of peace in the Middle East cannot continue for ever. That is perfectly correct, and I take it that he needed a certain amount of courage to say that, because, as he well knows, there are Arab Governments which do not wish to see peace brought about in the Middle East. They still wish to see the elimination of the State of Israel.

It is unfortunate that he did not have a little more courage and say to those Governments and to other Governments that the first essential for peace in the Middle East is recognition of Israel's right to exist and Israel's sovereignty. I believe that the principle of the sovereign equality of States is a very fundamental pillar of the Charter of the United Nations, and if the representative of Lebanon had addressed himself to that point his statement would have been more useful.
It is very, very difficult, I would suggest to him and to the Committee as a whole, to talk simultaneously about the need for peace and the need to support a murder organization whose avowed purpose is to bring about Israel's destruction. It is impossible to do that.

The representative of Lebanon went even further. He spoke of the leadership of that murder organization in terms of people who are wise and enlightened. They are very enlightened indeed in the way they send their murderers to kill women and children in Israel.

I believe some of these remarks apply equally to the statement made by the representative of Kuwait, and I need not go further in reference to it.

But I should like to say a word about the statements of the representatives of Bulgaria and East Germany.

The Bulgarian representative expressed a number of views that are completely valueless in terms of the search for peace in the Middle East and completely without usefulness. I believe that in his speech he followed the tradition long established by Bulgaria in the United Nations. Members of the Committee will remember the discussions in the Security Council late in May 1967 and early in June 1967, after the Government of Egypt decided to drive away the United Nations Emergency Force from the Sinai and brought about the crisis. When the Security Council was making efforts at the instance of certain Western Governments, and when the then Secretary-General of the United Nations was making every effort to avert the crisis that was about to explode, the representative of Bulgaria -- and this is almost incredible, but it is a fact -- sat in the Security Council and said he could not understand why the Security Council had been called into session, that there was absolutely no need for the Council to meet at that time. Obviously he was expecting Egypt and other Arab countries to be successful in the offensive against Israel they were then preparing, and he did not want the Security Council to intervene. The value of the position taken by Bulgaria at that time is about the same as the value of the position it has taken in the Committee today.

Finally, one brief word in relation to the statement made by the representative of East Germany in his reference to the Middle East. There was only one useful
point among his references to the situation in the Middle East, and that was his reference to Security Council resolutions 338 (1973) and 242 (1967). I believe he spoke of them as the basis for peace in the Middle East. That was the only useful thing he said. But if he read those resolutions, and if he knows what they contain, he will surely realize that in certain very, very important points those resolutions are at variance with some of the other views has pronounced to us this morning.
Mr. JAMAL (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Israel always defends one single principle, and that is the principle of defending Israeli barbarism. We have all heard this morning about the brutal and atrocious Israeli attack against Palestinian refugee camps and on the suburbs of Beirut. This action on the part of Israel constitutes a challenge to our Organization and its Charter and constitutes a challenge, likewise, to this Committee itself, since we are now considering the question of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

My delegation firmly and strongly condemns these actions which only lead to increasing tension in the Middle East. My colleague, the representative of Lebanon, in his statement, made clear to the Committee the seriousness of the situation in the area. Until this very moment the number of victims and casualties of this atrocious attack has not been calculated, but they are estimated at dozens.

Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): It is in line with a long series of falsehoods that the Israeli representative continues to blame Lebanon for activities taking place in the area. In the Security Council, on some occasions, we were told that the proof's that Israel had in its possession were shoes, either made in Lebanon or footprints on the ground that fitted the shoes that were worn by the Palestinians who perpetrated some acts within Israel.

Today, we heard some incredible falsehoods that Lebanon must be responsible for an act that took place yesterday in a cinema in Tel Aviv. The information available at this stage is that the perpetrator of this act was of non-Arab nationality who lived in a different country and who arrived in Israel by plane, and I do not know where from, with a foreign passport. And because of that, the Israeli military establishment, in retaliation, has staged a murderous and devastating attack on the outskirts of Beirut today. Already we know at this stage that scores of people have been killed and injured and that many shelters have been destroyed.
Every time there was an act, anywhere, Israel came up with the statement that Lebanon was responsible for the occurrence. The Israelis forget that they are responsible for the whole situation prevailing in the Middle East, for wars of aggression, for occupation, for stifling every effort to achieve peace. And now the representative of Israel wants me and wants us, all of us here, to believe that the absence of peace in the Middle East is due to the actions of Arab States and not because of the presence of the armed forces of Israel on large territories of Arab States, not because of its continued attacks on its neighbours.

Israel knows very well that had it acted in time to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations, by cooperating with those who were deploying efforts to bring about peace, peace could have been achieved and the war of 1973 could have been averted. Israel assumes the sole and the principal responsibility for the disturbing situation prevailing in the Middle East.

Mr. Abdel-Meguid (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): With reference to the statement of the representative of Israel, I believe that he has not even once participated in the objective debate of this Committee on the item concerning implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The representative of Israel sitting before us here has not discussed the matter under consideration. I have asked myself why he does not express his own views on this question. But the answer is clear to me.

First of all he has nothing to say on the subject under discussion at present. Therefore, silence would be the best policy for the representative of Israel seated here before us. Secondly, the behaviour and attitude of his Government are always against the strengthening of international security and therefore it would be better for him not to unveil and unmask himself before this august Assembly and speak of strengthening international security. This is true because his Government continues to occupy territories of three Arab States and his Government perpetuates acts of aggression as the ones we have just listened to against the sister State of Lebanon, and his Government denies the existence of the Palestinian people who, whether the Israeli representative or the Israeli Government wishes it or not, exist and are struggling for their own existence and their rights.
Thus the representative of Israel here is a true example of the Israeli Government, and his Government could find no better representative to occupy his seat. For like the Government of Israel itself, he resembles the ostrich, which puts its head into the sand, seeing nothing and hearing nothing. He withdraws his head from its hiding place only to use his right of reply, then goes back once more to bury his head in the sand.

I challenge the representative of Israel to contribute something to the item currently under discussion by this Committee. I challenge him to that. I challenge him to speak on the item on the strengthening of international security and not to restrict himself to the use of the right of reply to answer representatives who are speaking on the item. Perhaps he could try to reply in all honesty; but the fact is that he distorts the facts and the truth, imagining that the world has forgotten that in 1967 Israel was in fact the aggressor and Egypt and the other Arab countries were the victims. That is why I wish to ask him to reply, but not to try to make fun of the members of this Committee. They are, after all, much more intelligent than he believes.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the lateness of the hour, those delegations still wishing to exercise their right of reply will be given an opportunity to do so at the end of this afternoon's meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.