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Mr. AZZOUZ (Algeria) (interpretation from French): When the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Members of the Organization thereby solemnly reaffirmed the universal validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and once again stressed that strengthening of international peace and security constituted the primary task of the Organization. The objective of the Declaration was to mobilize the efforts of States Members in order to set up an effective system of universal collective security.

It is therefore perfectly understandable that the strengthening of international security took pride of place among the concerns of the United Nations and it is therefore with satisfaction that we note that consideration of this question returns regularly to each of the sessions on the agenda, because it would be a mistake to believe that our work was already completed by the adoption of the Declaration and that we now need no longer concern ourselves with the matter. In point of fact, we believe that it is not sufficient merely to reaffirm the purposes and principles of the Charter, but over and above all we must constantly carry out an examination of the international situation in order to ensure that there is effective implementation of the provisions contained in it.

This concern has been very clearly stated in the course of the Fourth Conference of Non-Aligned Nations held in Algiers in September of this year. Examination of the evolution of the international situation, carried out by the non-aligned nations at that time, stressed the positive aspects of the evolution. Nevertheless they still stressed their concern over the future of their peoples. Obviously, no one could dream of denying the importance of the appearance of new trends towards détente among the great Powers that seems to be putting an end to the cold war period and to be a harbinger of a new era marked by the substitution of co-operation for confrontation among the super-Powers.
But it would be rash hastily to conclude that the present situation arose spontaneously as a result of a sudden display of wisdom among the great Powers of the world. In the last few years, international life has been dominated by the fear of an atomic conflict and the prospect of a world conflagration. It is the stalemate born of the balance of terror that made it less and less probable that there could be a direct confrontation between the super-Powers. Obviously the only alternative was that of dialogue and co-operation, which finally led to diplomatic events of the very highest significance, such as the different summit conferences between the East and the West and the opening of the European Security and Co-operation Conference.

The majority of speakers who have addressed the Committee in the course of the general debate welcomed this development, which is positive since it contributes to the establishment of an atmosphere of détente and understanding. Yet the exact significance of this development and its implications are not assessed equally by all members of the international community, since many of them believe that the development is limited if it applies to the developed world alone, since it would only make relations between the privileged world and the rest of humanity more difficult. But more than ever the problem of peace arises; and peace within the frontiers of the developed world itself is not necessarily peace all over the world. That is why the Heads of State and Government of the non-aligned nations stressed that:

"As long as colonial wars, apartheid, imperialist aggression, alien domination and foreign occupation and power politics, economic exploitation and plunder prevail, peace will prove limited in principle and scope. In a world where, besides a minority of rich countries there exists a majority of poor countries, it would be dangerous to increase such division by restricting peace to the prosperous areas of the world while the rest of mankind remained condemned to insecurity and domination by the most powerful. Peace is indivisible: it could not be reduced to a mere shifting of confrontation from one area to another, nor should it condone the continued existence of tension in some areas while endeavouring to eliminate it elsewhere. Détente would remain precarious if it did not take into consideration the interests of the other countries."
This assessment on the part of the non-aligned nations flows from the fear of seeing a new division of the world take place between those countries that benefit from peace and security and those condemned to live amid war or threatened by war, in one word, the division between the developed and the developing nations. In fact, if détente between the East and West has progressed, the confrontation of peoples with colonialism, racial discrimination, domination and foreign occupation, as well as neo-colonialism, imperialism and zionism is still a reality lived through every day by the countries of the third world, and thus the African continent is still, in its southern portion, suffering from Portuguese colonialism which, strong in the support and the complicity it receives from the members of NATO, continues its policies of oppression and repression against the peoples of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau. We welcome the proclamation of the Republic of Guinea-Bissau and its recent admission to membership in the family of the United Nations. That happy event is incontestably a great victory in the struggle for liberation and an encouragement to the peoples still struggling in other territories under colonial domination.

Apartheid and racial discrimination continue to afflict South Africa and Rhodesia, despite the decisions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council, and thus constitute a challenge to the international community as a whole, which can no longer withdraw into an attitude of expectation and of expressing the hope that things will improve. They are a direct attack on the right of peoples to live in dignity and are a constant source of threats to peace and security of the entire continent of Africa.

The situation in the Asian continent continues to arouse great concern in our minds despite the signing of the Paris Agreements that put an end to the long and lethal war in Viet-Nam. Those agreements were received with relief by the international community, eager as it was to see the Viet-Namese people rise from their ruins and give themselves over entirely to rebuilding their country, devastated by so many years of war. But that dearly sought peace may be completely jeopardized by the continual violations of the Paris Agreements by the Saigon régime and its allies. The Agreements should be strictly applied, and therefore every effort that may lead to a peaceful, independent, neutral, democratic and reunified Viet-Nam should be encouraged.
While on the subject of Indochina, I must say that the Cambodian peoples are still being oppressed by the authorities of Phnom Penh, illegally established following the American intervention in 1970, but the struggle of the Cambodian people under the leadership of the legal Government of Prince Sihanouk grows daily and has finally discredited the Lon Nol clique.
The General Assembly took a step in the direction of justice in this matter when it decided to include in its agenda the question of the restoration of the lawful rights of the Royal Government of National Union of Cambodia in the United Nations. We have no doubt that after the debate on that question the Government of Prince Sihanouk will regain the seat illegally occupied by the representatives of a régime that owes its survival only to foreign intervention.

The situation in the Middle East, after the latest Israeli aggression against the Arab nations, is a sharp reminder to us that détente is unfortunately very uncertain and that the very fragile balance on which peace and security rest could be broken at any moment by the escalation of a regional conflict. In other words, international peace and security are not compatible with the occupation of vast territories of Arab soil by Israel, or with the condemnation of the Palestinian people to live on international charity. Any lasting solution to the crisis of the Middle East must necessarily derive from the total recovery of the Arab territories occupied by Israel and the restoration to the Arab people of Palestine of their full national rights. The final settlement of this problem must lead to the elimination of military bases and foreign fleets from the Mediterranean and restore to that sea its historic vocation of being a highway of civilization, and not a field of confrontation for battle fleets.

The security of the countries of the third world cannot be conceived without their economic liberation, the ending of exploitation by foreign monopolies and the establishment of true national independence. Neo-colonialism extends its empire across the world and ensures its control of the wealth of the developing nations. In fact, our countries are the victims of pressures and constraints by foreign Powers and transnational firms that confine us in a state of economic dependence and subordination, making any development undertaking fruitless. That situation represents a constant threat of tension and the deterioration of the economic and social situation of our countries, which each year see a gap widening between themselves and the industrialized nations.
This rapid review of the international situation is enough to justify our skepticism concerning the effective implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The achievement of détente among the great powers is not sufficient to remove the crises and the sources of tension that are developing in the third world, or the threats to the security of our countries and the future of our peoples. That is why it is imperative that we continue to work to build a more just world, where might will not rule over right and all peoples will have equal access to peace and security.
Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon): The United Nations has been entrusted under its Charter with a fundamental mission, that of promoting international peace and security. Our activities revolve around this central vocation of our Organization. A series of long, cruel and devastating wars has led mankind to the inescapable realization that war can no longer be a means of territorial acquisition and expansion, of colonization of lands and subjugation of peoples, of assertion of power and imposition of political hegemony. The human conscience has awakened sufficiently to reject war and to denounce the use of force exercised to achieve selfish national interests. At the same time there has arisen an outcry against armaments, which have reached frightful proportions in our times and which pose a threat of annihilation to armed and unarmed nations alike.

The founding fathers of the United Nations had a noble objective -- "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". Those are the very first words of the Charter. But the mission of the United Nations has now become greater: its task is to save the world from total destruction and to make it possible for succeeding generations to come into being.

Our responsibility is a grave one. We must continue to be determined, relentless and uncompromising in our constant search for the safeguards needed to consolidate peace. The meritorious initiative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in proposing the item before us, which led in turn to the adoption, in 1970, of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, is indeed a major contribution to this common effort, as is its annual discussion. The United Nations must remain on its guard to expose and check any activity or action which threatens peace, and be ready to applaud and consolidate any achievement realized by any means, on a bilateral or a multilateral basis, to enhance the prospects of international security.

The world still suffers from past and present armed conflicts and from situations of tension and crisis. No respite is to be tolerated until their liquidation has been completed, on the basis of justice, legality and the fundamental principles of the Charter, which we have all freely accepted and vowed to respect and promote. No matter to which geographic region or political and economic system we belong, we all face the same total peril of insecurity.
History has never recorded such an era as ours, in which all peoples have stood to perish together or survive together. The new international order, based on the prevalence of the rule of law and its universal acceptance, is the best guarantee humanity has yet devised for the rejection of war and the preservation of peace.

A complex of questions dominate our concerns and discussions at every session and are jointly aimed at promoting both political and economic collective security: peace-keeping operations, disarmament, development, the strengthening of international security, the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, decolonization and renunciation of the use of force in international relations. Those are not academic problems. What we are dealing with are live, real issues whose negative forces are sufficiently powerful to undermine and endanger the peace of the world, or to rob man of the resources necessary for the improvement of his condition. Our overriding objective is to eliminate all conditions and causes of insecurity and to promote and support all endeavours which foster peaceful conditions, international co-operation and an improvement in the quality of human life.

Many beneficial and welcome developments have occurred during the last few years, developments which generally would have given rise to hope, although such hope was severely jolted by recent events in the Middle East and their ensuing consequences, especially in the economic field. Barring those events, a survey of the world scene would be a source of satisfaction. We have listened to enough discourses extolling the positive trends in international détente. We all rejoice in the fact that tension between the major Powers is giving way to co-operation, that the cold war is rapidly retreating in favour of peaceful coexistence, that military alignments are losing their lustre and that new economic and co-operative relationships are becoming more glamourous and more responsive to the needs of people.

But political détente should gradually be enhanced by military détente. Détente has been leading to more "rapprochement" between governments and peoples, to more understanding and co-operation. That is a process which needs to be encouraged, for détente is not an end in itself. The same holds
true for the concept of "peaceful coexistence". Both are welcome signs of improved international relations. They are milestones on the way to better things. They shift nations from a state of cold war, strife and confrontation to one of mutual respect and understanding. We may congratulate ourselves, and rightly so, on the progress achieved in the area of international détente; yet we cannot rest on our laurels, for the ultimate objective lies beyond détente, if that word, taken in its restrictive sense, means the absence of war. Détente must shift to a more active and dynamic course, involving States and peoples in wider, more meaningful and more fruitful co-operation with one another.
Two significant developments -- though tentative and limited in scope until now -- point the way to the kind of relations that should prevail among nations in future. The first is the agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to set joint space exploration ventures, and the second is their agreement, either directly or through their respective allies -- such as Canada and Poland -- to participate in the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East. Both developments augur well for the future and should set the pattern for what could be jointly undertaken by States, regardless of their ideologies, in order to strengthen international peace and security and to promote co-operation among nations.

My delegation shares in the general satisfaction over several developments that have changed the international scene for the better. I wish to cite a few of many significant events: the growing rapprochement between the United States and China; the improved relations between the United States and the USSR; the relaxation of military tensions in South-East Asia and the subsequent Viet-Nam peace agreements; the positive trend in relations between the two Korean States; the normalization of relations in Europe and the conclusion of accords liquidating the sequels of the Second World War; the admission of the two German States to the United Nations, thus enhancing the principle of universality; the Helsinki Conference and the current Geneva Conference on European Security; phases I and II of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the two super-nuclear-Powers; the Conference of Non-Aligned Nations held in Algiers last summer and the growing strength and importance of the Organization of African Unity. These are indeed impressive achievements that lend the concept of international security a practical meaning.

However, negative forces and developments still impede the progress required to create better conditions for international peace and security. In spite of the SALT talks, the increase in armaments has not abated. Two hundred thousand million dollars are still being directed into the coffers of military budgets. The qualitative refinement of instruments of death is offsetting whatever minimal reduction is being made in the quantity of weapons. Moreover, the non-proliferation Treaty on nuclear arms has not been adhered to by many States, some of which are
nuclear or threshold-nuclear Powers. These same Powers have also failed to support a nuclear test-ban Treaty, which has not even been expanded to include underground nuclear testing. Thermonuclear tests, which are still being conducted in various environments, are creating more and more anxiety among nations and peoples. In like manner, no agreement has yet been reached regarding the banning of chemical (biological) weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles. We are still on the fringes of meaningful agreements which would accelerate the process of complete and general disarmament under strict international control and which would release substantial human and financial resources from military expenditures and direct them to the development and improvement of man's conditions. Finally, comprehensive agreement among the permanent members of the Security Council regarding peace-keeping operations has not yet been reached despite the twenty-eight years of existence of this Organization.

It is true that some operations set up under pressing developments have played important roles in promoting peace in such areas as the Congo, Cyprus and, at times, the Middle East. However, we must recognize the fact that the recent action by the Security Council in establishing the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East was of tremendous significance in the life of the United Nations, because it was able to receive wider understanding and support from the permanent members of the Security Council as well as from many Member States. Some changes of attitude regarding peace-keeping enabled this Force to be set up promptly and efficiently in order to cope with the serious situation prevailing in the Middle East. Such action enhanced the prestige of the United Nations, giving rise to hopes that this Organization can meet the challenges of international crises and restore some of the lost confidence that peoples have put in it.

We are indeed far from attaining the objective of the full restoration of that confidence because the United Nations has suffered from an endemic crisis, which, on many occasions, we have called the crisis of the implementation of United Nations resolutions. The lack of implementation of our resolutions which have definite objectives and have enjoyed the overwhelming support of the majority of Member States has resulted in their becoming dead letters in our files.
Let me give some illustrations: International security remains threatened in Africa; the racist régime in Zimbabwe constitutes a defiance to the United Nations and its resolutions and a challenge to international public opinion; Portuguese colonialism is still more adamant and does not show any sign of responding to mounting African and international clamor for enabling the peoples of the Portuguese colonies to exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence; Namibia, despite twenty-seven years of persistent efforts by the United Nations to liberate it, remains captive to South Africa's intransigence; apartheid, so widely, unreservedly and constantly condemned by the United Nations, Governments and public opinion, is still a State policy in South Africa. All these anachronistic, immoral and defiant policies and practices constitute, in the words of the Secretary-General in the introduction to the annual report:

"... a major obstacle to the relaxation of international tensions"

and if continued

"... will inevitably have serious consequences far outside the confines of the region itself." (A/9001/Add.1, p. 7)

The consequences are clear; they are of a nature to threaten the security of Africa and the world at large.

These policies and practices are in flagrant violation of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter and of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, principles which were so clearly defined and elaborated also in operative paragraphs 18 and 23 of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, solemnly adopted on 16 December 1970 by the General Assembly on the occasion of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. If such declarations and provisions, as well as scores of resolutions overwhelmingly adopted by various organs of the United Nations, are not respected and are scorned, the inevitable result will be that the peoples whose rights are affected and whose human rights are violated will have no alternative but to resort to armed struggle with all the sufferings it entails in order to achieve their sacred national objective of liberation from foreign occupation and thus the restoration of their full human dignity.
Another example is the Middle East. The Middle East is one major area of the world where, until now, no tangible progress has been achieved in the solution of a perennial crisis, which has constantly threatened international peace and security, as well as that of the area itself.

Today, the peoples of the Middle East may be standing on the threshold of an historic era, of a just and durable peace. Events which have taken place during the last few weeks have generated a new momentum, opening more than ever before, new opportunities for a peaceful settlement. We are witnessing a determined effort, and even more important, a determined will to seize upon these opportunities and not to let them pass in vain. It is satisfying that the Security Council, the Secretary General, the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and many other concerned nations are engaged very seriously in this process. It has been considered frequently that the endemic crisis of the Middle East is one of lost opportunities. The fear is that if present opportunities are lost again by the United Nations and the great Powers, a bleak future will then face not only the Middle East, but the world at large.

The international tension and military alerts caused by the hostilities of the Middle East during the last few weeks are proof enough of how developments in the area can threaten international peace and security, and affect the economic conditions of many countries and the well-being of peoples. The fragile détente between East and West was put to a hard test and severely shaken. Relations between partners in the Western alliance have shown signs of strain.

It has therefore become more incumbent upon the United Nations and those great Powers endowed with special responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and security, to turn the crisis of the Middle East into a more hopeful opportunity for the establishment of a lasting peace in that troubled area of the world.

The dynamics of peace are at work, forecasting that a more positive future for the peoples of the area is possible: one might say that a silver lining can now be detected through the heavy clouds still lingering over the Middle East. Yet, I wish to express a word of caution that any note of optimism may not be borne out by future developments. There are still difficulties and threats of renewed hostilities hanging over our heads at this very moment, despite the
dramatic and hopeful diplomatic activities undertaken to break new deadlocks. The question remains whether or not Israel has changed its intransigent policies, its traditional refusal to abide by United Nations resolutions, and its apparent insensitivity to the world-wide positions of States and public opinion and to the serious oil crisis affecting international economic life.

So much agony, suffering and destruction could have been spared the peoples of the Middle East had Israel not obstructed systematically the implementation of resolutions adopted by the United Nations, and every effort and initiative undertaken inside and outside this Organization to settle peacefully the conflict. The refusal of Israel to withdraw from the territories it occupied in the June 1967 war and to help in the solution of the problem of the Palestinian people it has driven from its homeland, and Israel's expeditions against neighbouring States, brought about the outbreak of the recent hostilities. Warnings about the building up of an explosive climate went unheeded by many. In utter defiance of the United Nations, Israel has pursued a policy aimed at maintaining its occupation of Arab lands and denying the Palestinian people its inalienable rights, thus creating unparalleled conditions in the history of mankind where economic collective security is threatened by the energy crisis. The October war was unnecessary had Israel responded favourably to the peaceful options which were offered to it. So much violence and suffering, as well as economic disruption could have been avoided during the last six years. Huge resources needed for the economic development of the countries of the Middle East were wasted. The prolongation of the closing of the Suez Canal because of Israeli military occupation of Sinai has disrupted international trade and affected the economic conditions of many nations. An example is the fact that the shipping costs of oil transported from the Middle East to European countries have increased by $2,500 million annually over costs prevailing before the 1967 war because of that closure. This is for oil alone, let alone the shipping costs for other commodities.
Now, Arab oil has unavoidably entered as one of the major factors in the Arab struggle, thereby heightening the energy crisis. The impact of oil cutbacks by Arab States is being felt everywhere. No one can minimize any longer effects on international economic conditions and the well-being of peoples. The growing need for oil and the increased dependence on it have sobered many minds and opened many eyes to the dangers to the world economy and to the needs and comforts of peoples everywhere which can be created by support of illegitimate Israeli-Zionist designs and ambitions. A real understanding of the just aspirations of the Arab Governments and peoples is a sure guarantee for future amity, cooperation, and normalization of relations between the Arab world and other States. We are all entitled to ask whether the peoples of the world should suffer the consequences of the energy crisis only because Israel wanted to maintain its occupation of Arab lands in defiance of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions.

It is, therefore, in the interest of all of us to bring about speedily and effectively, a final and binding solution of the Middle East crisis, for we all stand to gain from the benefits of that settlement. International political and economic security will emerge more strengthened than ever before.

Lebanon has always strove for the promotion of conditions of peace in the Middle East. We have constantly upheld the principles and the actions of the United Nations. We have suffered in human, material resources, and economic dislocation, because of the unsettled conditions created by Israeli adventurism around us. We hope that this situation will soon come to an end.

Mr. JAIN (India): The item before us calls for a review and examination of the international situation to see how far international peace and security have been strengthened over the past year.
(Mr. Jain, India)

Peace is indivisible and international security must be viewed in its totality, whether the pursuit of peace is through the United Nations, through the many Declarations relating to peace and security, friendly relations and co-operation adopted in the General Assembly, or whether it is through bilateral negotiations through which agreements can be reached by the efforts of the countries directly concerned. Indeed, such agreements can be the result either of direct contact or under the auspices of the United Nations. In both cases they would have to be in the mutual interests of the parties concerned and in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. We all have a common goal, that of peace, and it is our belief that any momentum that has been developed towards that goal should be maintained.
It is for that reason that we have held that a review of the international situation, an opportunity to discuss, which is offered by consideration of this item, is a useful contribution to maintaining the speed and direction of moves towards world peace.

I shall not comment in this statement on specific issues of disarmament, peace-keeping and the crisis in the Middle East and elsewhere, since in relevant forums during the current session my delegation has set out its views comprehensively and in detail. I would, therefore, confine my remarks here to some broad and general points which must necessarily and constantly be kept in view while considering the resolution of problems of vital concern to the preservation and consolidation of peace, the adoption of measures for the prevention of disputes as well as the de-escalation of tensions arising out of the threat and use of force, perpetuation of colonial rule or economic exploitation or the gruff denial of legitimate human rights.

Much has been said here and in other forums on the significance and potential value of détente for promoting peace and facilitating co-operation for development. It is sufficient to recall here what the Foreign Minister of India said in his speech on 2 October in the general debate in the plenary at the current session of the General Assembly. Welcoming the process of mutual accommodation and the consequent reduction of tension, he observed:

"...this spirit of détente has yet to extend to all parts of the world and should not be limited to mere coexistence among the major Powers. Regrettably, such concepts as the balance of power, spheres of influence and power vacuum are yet to be discarded. Unfortunately also, the great Power rivalry continues to show itself in many ways and in many areas; this brings severe stress and strain in international relations. The power of the strong is still to be placed at the common service of mankind." (A/PV.2136, p. 47)

The Declaration on the strengthening of international peace and security is often viewed mainly as a political document. We believe, however, that world peace and security depends to a large extent on the speedy removal of economic
and social disparities. The Declaration itself affirms that there is:
"a close connexion between the strengthening of international security, disarmament and the economic development of countries, so that any progress made towards any of these objectives will constitute progress towards all of them"
and that elimination of
"the economic gap between developed and developing countries ... is closely and essentially correlated to the strengthening of the security of all nations and the establishment of lasting international peace". (General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV))

The non-aligned nations also stressed that fact this year in Algiers.

In the political declaration of the non-aligned nations, it is stated:
"In this respect, international security cannot be achieved if it does not include an economic dimension which guarantees to all countries the right to implement their development programmes free from economic aggression and any other form of pressure."

Yet what are the achievements today? Military expenditure is increasing; overall official development assistance is decreasing; while there is hope for the world in the trend towards détente, the world is faced in the Middle East with a situation which is a dangerous threat to future peace.

In the view of my delegation, therefore, the Declaration constitutes an organic whole, and efforts should be made to implement the Declaration in its totality as progress in both the political and the economic fields is vital to international security.

In our part of the world, in the Indian subcontinent, we have continued to strive through negotiations to end the era of confrontation with Pakistan. The Simla Agreement of July 1972 was a major effort towards normalization of relations. Since then, Indian troops have withdrawn from all parts of Pakistani territory where they were in position at the time the cease-fire was unilaterally declared by India. All prisoners of war taken on the Indo-Pakistan frontier have been repatriated to Pakistan. All the decisions made in Simla were implemented within a period of six months. The next initiative taken by the Governments of India and Bangladesh was the Joint Declaration of 17 April 1973, a declaration
seeking to solve the major humanitarian problems that arose as a result of the 1971 conflict. The joint offer proposed to separate the humanitarian from the unresolved political problems by outlining a programme of repatriation of Bangalees stranded in Pakistan, Pakistanis stranded in Bangladesh and the prisoners of war who had surrendered to the Indo-Bangladesh Joint Command on the Eastern Front to Pakistan. Following negotiations with Pakistan on the basis of the Indo-Bangladesh joint declaration, an agreement between India and Pakistan, with the full concurrence of the Government of Bangladesh, was arrived at and signed in Delhi on 28 August 1973. This agreement provides for the simultaneous repatriation of the three groups of persons that had been affected by the war of December 1971. Already over 85,000 persons have returned to their homes in the three-way repatriation which began on 19 September 1973 under the Delhi Agreement. By the end of November, India had repatriated over 30,000 prisoners of war and civilians who were under its protective custody. We hope that the Delhi Agreement will be fully, speedily and smoothly implemented with goodwill on all sides.

However, Bangladesh has yet to take its due place in the United Nations. Bangladesh is a sovereign country of 75 million people whose Government has expressed its willingness to abide by the principles of the Charter. It is a country that has been recognized by more than 100 countries, and is a member of almost all the United Nations specialized agencies. The continued denial of Bangladesh's right to be in the United Nations injures if not defeats -- as we have constantly maintained -- the purposes of the Charter and the principle of universality.

I should like to conclude by welcoming the trend towards the strengthening of peace in Asia and therefore in the whole world. The cessation of the war in Viet-Nam and the continuance of dialogue between the two parts of Korea are encouraging signs of a trend towards negotiation instead of military confrontation. My country has constantly held the view that dialogue and discussion are the only way in which tensions can be reduced and a way opened for promotion of the cause of international peace and security.
Mr. GAUSA (Afghanistan): We are once again debating the item entitled, "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", an issue which in importance can hardly be matched and an objective that is an end in itself. The full implementation of the Declaration will mean the fulfilment of the hopes and aspirations of all peoples to live in peace and harmony in a world free from wars and conflicts. The Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, born of the Charter of the United Nations, is a yardstick by which progress towards the consolidation of international security can be measured. It is at the same time a code of conduct for States establishing guidelines for policies to be pursued if the intention is to build an international order based on equality and justice.

It is therefore a necessary exercise to review periodically the development of events in this evolving world and to ascertain to what extent the provisions of the Declaration have been observed and where lie the causes of its non-application.

That examination will permit detection of the factors adversely affecting the cause of peace and will enable the international community to resort to corrective measures if there exists the political will to act in common to achieve the aims of the Declaration.

The Charter of the United Nations envisages a system of collective security to which all Member States must remain committed. The Declaration furnishes a methodology enabling States to adjust their behaviour and attitudes concerning the translation of the principles of the Charter into reality.
The implementation of the Declaration necessitates increased efforts with a view to accelerating the process of disarmament and promoting the development and the economic and social advancement of the developing countries. One of the essential components of international security is the securing of the right of self-determination for all peoples. Unless and until peoples living under colonial and alien domination are afforded an opportunity freely to exercise their inalienable rights to freedom and independence, the security that we are all striving for will be resting on shaky foundations.

Similarly, the Declaration will have no bearing on the shaping of a better world if there is no serious movement towards the safeguarding of human rights and unequivocal respect for the sovereign right of all States freely to dispose of their natural resources. Sovereignty over natural resources forms an integral part of the principle of territorial sovereignty and is a constituent of the right of self-determination. The complete and permanent sovereignty of the developing countries in this respect is essential for their economic and political independence and it implies their total freedom of action in determining the use of their resources.

The prevention of aggressive wars and the elimination of their consequences; non-intervention in the internal affairs of States; a wider acceptance of the principle of coexistence of States, irrespective of their social, economic and political systems; peaceful settlement of disputes; and above all, respect for the cardinal principle of equality of States, are all contributory to the strengthening of peace and security.

In the year that has elapsed, certain events that could be accepted as having favourably affected the strengthening of international security occurred on the international scene. By way of example, let us enumerate a few of them.

The Paris Agreements on Indo-China were signed in 1973; and although tensions still subsist there, a significant step has been taken towards ensuring peace in that area. Further progress was reported in the SALT talks between the United States and the Soviet Union, and a Treaty on the non-use
of nuclear weapons was signed between them. Contacts between the United States and the People's Republic of China became more frequent. The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the talks between NATO and the Warsaw Pact countries for reduction of armaments were started, clearly indicating that Europe is slowly moving towards a new understanding and the peaceful settlement of its disputes and problems.

The two German States became members of this world Organization, and a consensus on Korea, providing a framework for the two Korean States to pursue their efforts for the peaceful reunification of the country, was adopted by the General Assembly.

Last September, the Fourth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned States was held in Algiers. The contribution of that important gathering towards the promotion of peace and security is well reflected in the declarations and decisions of that Conference.

Détente between the major Powers became more tangible, indicating a willingness to co-operate and to solve disputes by resorting to peaceful means. It should be said, however, that that détente will remain precarious if it does not encompass all regions and relations between all nations. It is our hope that the détente will not be confined to Europe alone and to relations among big Powers, but will extend to the world at large, bringing about a genuine consolidation of international security.

Viewed against the background of the Declaration, those were positive but limited accomplishments. Scores of other problems continued to exist, hampering the full implementation of the Declaration and endangering the security of nations.

Vital issues of disarmament, finance and trade, important constituents of peace and security, were negotiated and often settled outside the United Nations, an Organization which is in itself an instrument for the promotion of international security. No improvement of any substantial nature occurred in the economic and trade situation of the developing countries. This has led to a growing apprehension that the modest targets of the Second Development Decade, like those of the first one, will never be attained. Thus the gap between the poor and the rich will continue to grow, resulting in tensions and affecting adversely progress towards the strengthening of international peace and security.
The human rights of peoples, especially of those in the territories under colonial rule, alien domination and foreign occupation, continued to be violated, with no end to this unfortunate state of affairs in sight. The colonial Powers and minority régimes in southern Africa cling to their anachronistic policies of colonialism, racial discrimination and apartheid, depriving the indigenous populations of the countries and territories under their rule of their fundamental rights and freedoms. These policies, which have a corrosive influence on peace and understanding in Africa, threaten the security of the independent African countries and of the continent as a whole.

In the Middle East, despite the General Assembly resolutions and the pertinent decisions of the Security Council, Israel continued illegally to occupy Arab lands. No serious effort was made to secure the implementation of the principle of the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force of arms. Security Council resolution 242 (1967), unanimously adopted, was unfortunately left to degenerate and fall into oblivion. The situation of "no war, no peace" which thus came into being encouraged Israel to launch a new war of aggression against Egypt and Syria. Those two countries had no alternative to engaging in a just war in defence of their territorial integrity and national sovereignty.

The new hostilities in the Middle East have proved once again how fragile remains the fabric of peace in that region and to what extent the arrogance of power can lead to the complete disintegration of the structure of international security. The prerequisites for the normalization of the present situation in the Middle East are the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied Arab territories and the restoration of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, recognized and reiterated by the United Nations.

One of the other areas where the principles of the Declaration have fared almost as badly is disarmament. Apart from the limited bilateral agreements to which we referred a minute ago, the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, has qualitatively and quantitatively continued unabated. Enormous quantities of armaments are being poured into various regions, breeding distrust and uncertainty. How can the structure of security be
strengthened when the immediate concern seems to be not disarmament and arms control, but rather the acquisition of ever-increasing quantities of all sorts of weapons?

In reviewing the situation prevailing in the world, one cannot refrain from stating that on the whole the principles of the Declaration have suffered rather than been upheld or abided by. The efforts of all States are necessary for achieving the aims and purposes of the Declaration. These efforts should be geared to finding ways and means for solving all problems on the basis of justice and the self-determination of peoples, with a view to achieving a genuine and lasting collective security in accordance with the principles of the Declaration and the aims and purposes of the Charter.
Mr. MESTOLA (Tunisia) (interpretation from French): The debate on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security gives us an opportunity at each session to review the international situation and to examine the events of the past year in the light of the provisions of the 1970 Declaration.

If any events of 1973 may be considered for reaching, peace in Viet-Nam and the peace prospects in the Middle East are certainly among them. The last few months have given rise to serious hopes of seeing these two parts of the world delivered from the spectre of war.

It is clear that the immense progress achieved towards peace in Viet-Nam is due largely to international détente; but can the same be said for peace prospects in the Middle East? We have heard many delegations maintain this. However, although it may be true that the atmosphere of the easing of tension in international relations has made it possible to prevent the Middle East war from degenerating into a wider conflict, it is nevertheless true that it took a war to jolt the Middle East crisis out of the dangerous state of stagnation in which it was getting bogged down.

For six years, the situation created by the Israeli aggression of 1967 — with territories occupied and peoples oppressed — prevailed in spite of the decisions of the international community, including its most powerful Members. And while the resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, as well as the principles of the Charter, remained dead letters, the small and medium-sized Powers saw to their astonishment and chagrin the re-emergence of the principle of the primacy of force and the right of armed conquest, together with the renewal of the Hitlerite theory of "Lebensraum", whereby the security of States could be ensured only by the conquest of territory — in short, State terrorism, practised openly and nakedly, proclaimed and practically acclaimed.

We had détente, and nothing could be done. We had come to believe that the maintenance of that situation of neither peace nor war but of humiliation, oppression and flagrant injustice was tolerable to the international community, acceptable to some of its Members, and even desirable for others.

We were very far from the previous war — that of the Suez crisis, as a result of which not only Israel but two other Western Powers had to evacuate their troops and restore to Egypt the occupied territories. Yet that was during the cold war in 1956.
Does that mean that we are for the cold war and against détente? Certainly not, but we are a majority of newly independent countries very anxious to preserve our independence while maintaining our security; and we are very anxious to understand the world around us and the laws which govern it.

For us, détente has meaning only if it is synonymous with security for everyone, the absence of tension for all and between all, including the weakest, the disappearance of all threats to the territorial integrity and independence of the very smallest Powers.

Having said that, we of course take détente for what it is and we recognize the positive nature of the effects it has already had on the development of international relations. Détente has helped the Middle East war to be replaced by prospects for peace; it has also contributed to the search for peace in Viet-Nam; it has also led to a number of partial disarmament agreements, and had made it possible to hold the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, with which my country has been associated.

Those are not negligible results, and if détente could lead us from the rather passive concept of peaceful coexistence to the more positive concept of active international co-operation in a world where the independence of all peoples prevails, as well as the sovereign equality of all States, and balanced international economic relations, it would then be making a decisive contribution to the strengthening of international security.

For this to be achieved, détente must be pursued within the framework of the United Nations and among the Members of the Organization; it must cover all problems of the world, even those which do not seem an immediate direct threat to international peace and security as conceived by the great Powers. It must embrace all these problems, whether it be disarmament, decolonization or development.

Tunisia finds itself at the crossroads of all these problems and, hence, can conceive of détente only if they are settled. As Africans, the problem of the subject peoples of the southern part of our continent to colonialism and racism is of the gravest concern to us, and of course we fully support the African cause there.
As Arabs, we are an integral part of the struggle being waged by the Arab peoples, particularly the Palestinian people, to regain their territories and dignity.

As Mediterraneans, we are the confirmed militants in favour of co-operation in all areas with every Mediterranean country and, which we should like to see our sea free from all military tension.

As a developing country, we are directly concerned with the struggle of the peoples of the third world to bring about more just and more stable international economic relations.

Those are our problems. If détente is not going to cover them, it will have no meaning for us; and if it were to jeopardize the solution of those problems, then détente would cause us some concern because the process of détente would then run the risk of ceasing to be a way to peace and co-operation among all, and of becoming an end in itself, a pretext for maintaining the status quo; it would be liable to perpetuate itself and the status quo.

Now, what we should like to do is to work with others to ensure that all these tensions disappear, whether they be tensions between great or small, whether they be political or economic. We live in a still uncertain world -- a world of manifold crises which détente has not settled or cannot settle; and this applies particularly to economic problems such as inflation and energy.

In this connexion the perhaps unexpected consequences of the Middle East war have shown us that interdependence in the matter of economic security is much greater and much more interlocking than was thought. This lesson, if applied to other pressing problems besides energy, might bring the richer and more powerful countries to recognize the interdependence of their interests with those of smaller States and, hence, persuade them to co-operate better, within the framework of our Organization, to resolve the problems which concern nations, such as the liberation of their territory, decolonization and development. It is this sort of co-operation and participation among all States in the search for solutions and in settling major international problems which should constitute the backdrop of international relations.
In a shrinking world, where problems are more and more interdependent, we can pursue the goal of international peace only with the support of all nations, and we can make progress towards the strengthening of international security only if we work together.

Mr. Sharaf (Jordan): International security is the central concept and preoccupation of the United Nations system. It is also the main concern of mankind. It is therefore necessary to continue to debate its meanings and concrete requirements. My delegation welcomes this opportunity and expresses its appreciation for the initiative of the Soviet Union in inviting the Assembly to keep the issue of international security under continuous review and reappraisal. The comments on the question coming from the various Members of the United Nations, and contained in the report of the Secretary-General, reflect varying degrees of emphasis, with evaluations of the state of affairs in the world today and the direction in which the goal of international security is moving.

Allow me to add to this debate my delegation’s views on the subject. While it may seem presumptuous for the delegations of small and developing countries to indulge in a discourse on a subject of such universal and almost awesome magnitude, it may in fact be useful and healthy for the debate to open itself to their angle of approach. Perhaps as small and developing countries we have a less abstract and mathematical notion of the subject of international insecurity and a more direct and concrete contact with it. Our borders and national soil are more accessible to superior unchecked force, our sources of insecurity many-sided.
And this brings me to my first point on the question. The concept of international security has undergone, or must undergo, a profound evolution in the light of some major changes in our international environment. One major change is that the framework of reference of the concept now is a universal, or nearly universal, international organization. Though the origins of the contemporary international organization and collective security may have been European, a much larger area of the world is now within the framework of the international Organization. "International security" must therefore be a comprehensive and balanced concept. No area of the world should be accorded more weight in the allocation of attention than is dictated by the seriousness of the threat and the severity of the problem. In the past, this was not the case. The international Organization displayed less sensitivity to the security, peace and rights of the peoples and nations of the less developed and less privileged world. The near indifference and lack of action during the last few years towards the agonies of the Middle East and of South-East Asia were revealing facts. Hundreds of thousands perished in the conflict in South-East Asia. Three Arab States continued to suffer from the occupation of their national territories and hundreds of thousands remained homeless and in exile while the international corrective machinery remained paralysed. Fascist outposts in Israel and South Africa continued to pursue their policies of territorial expansion and of oppression, domination and suppression without receiving the decisive punitive action they deserved from the international community, in the interest of international security. An unbalanced international reaction and remedial action to events taking place in Europe, or Asia or Africa is now unwarranted. International security is indivisible and must be viewed as such.

In this respect, I wish to make another point regarding the new concept of international security produced by our changed international environment. Peace and security are not static or negative concepts. They cannot, in our contemporary world, be strictly defined in terms of an absence of organized, conventional conflicts. The status quo has no sanctity, it is changing and must be changed. The United Nations Charter is - as much as it is an instrument of peace - an instrument for change and human emancipation. The process of decolonization is rapidly occurring within the framework of interest of the United Nations. The
issue of self determination is in the foreground now and the problem of the
suppression of national self-determination is calling for the active attention
of the world. International peace and security are as much threatened today by
colonial practices, apartheid and racial domination as by the conventional
threats envisaged by the founders of the United Nations. There can be no valid
assessment of the genuineness and dependability of present international
security without fully taking into account the progress towards fulfilment of
the legitimate aspirations of that vast population of the world still struggling
towards independence, emancipation and equal rights.

Closely connected with this aspect of international security is what might
be described as the ensuring of international social justice as distinguished
from international political justice. I have just been speaking about the latter,
but the former is of equal importance. Common concern for security should include
concern for equal economic opportunity, It is gratifying to note that the
international community increasingly feels that assisting the developing countries
to develop their resources to enter into a healthy and co-operative partnership
with advanced countries is both a moral obligation and a practical requirement
for a stable international order. International security is a creative process.
It must continue to involve the creation of prosperity and contentment in the
hitherto underprivileged areas of the world -- which constitute the majority of
of the earth's surface -- and the establishment of balanced and equitable
economic relations between them and the advanced areas of the world.

My delegation realizes that international security revolves in the end around
the concept of collective security and the control of the use of force in
international relations. The essence of the Charter is the maintenance of
international peace and security. This central concept has been dramatically
underlined by the advent of the nuclear revolution. The issue of collective
security has overnight been transformed into that of collective survival. Hence
the need for vigorous and judicious action towards control of the use of force
in international relations and the progressive reduction of armaments.

My delegation wishes to emphasize that the proper framework for the control
of the use of force and the ensuring of international security is the system
of the United Nations. The juridical and political values and procedures which
should govern the use of force in relations among States have been defined by the Charter. Paragraph 3 of Article 2 binds Member States to settle international disputes by peaceful means in a manner that would ensure international peace, security and justice. Paragraph 4 of that Article binds them to refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. Article 51 recognizes that individual and collective self-defence is an inherent right. Specific chapters and articles define the specific procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the powers of the organs of the United Nations entrusted with the responsibilities of maintaining international peace and security. The General Assembly more specifically elucidated the basic principles of the Charter in this regard in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and, of course, in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

So the principles and processes of the United Nations provide the essential legal framework and machinery for the peaceful coexistence of States and for the control and reduction of armaments, conventional and unconventional. But the world has not achieved much progress in recent years in ensuring genuine and enduring international security and an effective reduction and control of armaments. This is a fact that must be correctly understood and analysed. It demonstrates neither the inadequacy of the Charter nor the basic structure of the United Nations system, but the nature and realities of the contemporary international scene. At the risk of repeating truisms one must re-emphasize that the inadequacies and failures of the United Nations system must be attributed to the attitude and political will of Member States rather than to the system itself. The Security Council cannot act effectively to thwart aggression and enforce resolutions unless the permanent members can act in unison. The anomalies of foreign occupation and racial domination can be reversed only by a united Security Council approach, and of course progress towards disarmament is, in the end, contingent upon mutual confidence and the mutual willingness of the major Powers to exchange reasonable concessions in a spirit of compromise under adequate guarantees.
It must be acknowledged that major steps towards the reduction of international tension have been realized in recent years. East-West détente has had its impact on the international scene. Tension in Europe has been dramatically reduced and relations have been altered. The Strategic Arms Limitations Agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States were born in the atmosphere of détente. World opinion urges that quantitative ceilings on defensive and some offensive strategic weapons be reinforced by reductions and control in the qualitative aspects of the strategic arms race. Vigorous initiatives must be taken within the United Nations and by the Powers more directly concerned to encourage negotiations for the achievement of concrete steps towards general and complete disarmament.
Let me re-emphasize, in conclusion, that international security is a concept that must be redefined as well as an international situation that must be created; it is a comprehensive and dynamic concept, that super-Power détente, reduction of tensions in Europe and progressive steps in the field of disarmament cannot be separated from the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, the elimination of colonial and foreign domination and the equitable restructuring of economic relations between the privileged and the underprivileged nations of the world. The debates on this item and the comments of various States on it in past years have highlighted this link. My delegation welcomes this opportunity for debate and reappraisal. We hope that at the conclusion of this debate some concrete ideas and courses of action will emerge that can claim the broadest support of Members of the United Nations.

Mr. TRAORE (Mali) (interpretation from French): The goals of peace and co-operation laid down in General Assembly resolution 2734 (XXV), which contains the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, are far from having been achieved. While a certain trend towards détente has recently been noted, we cannot say that we have now set our feet firmly on the irreversible road to true peace.

In fact, since the last world war there has not been a single day when peace has not been violated somewhere in the world. The colonial wars continue in Africa, and violations of fundamental human rights and the frustrating of the will of peoples are noted daily. Apartheid -- that is, racism in its most ignoble form -- has now been extended to Namibia and Southern Rhodesia. Since 1948 the Middle East has not known peace. Israel continues its aggression there and the illegal occupation of Arab territories whilst the martyred Palestinian people, deprived of their inalienable right, daily suffer humiliation and harassment. Those attacks on peace would surely have led to global confrontations had it not been for the fear of the use of atomic weapons and the obvious refusal of peoples to sacrifice themselves for causes whose value they question.
But we must admit that the third world and particularly the non-aligned nations have, by their political farsightedness and their active unity, greatly contributed to lessening the risks of confrontation that face us. This action, in accordance with the profound aspirations of peoples increasingly aware of their common destiny, has greatly helped to create an international atmosphere in which dialogue tends to replace mistrust, and international co-operation, as wide as possible, national egotisms.

The Paris Agreements on the murderous Indo-China war, the talks on security and co-operation in Europe, the latest agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic arms and the prevention of nuclear confrontation, the reaffirmation of the universal nature of the United Nations and the trend towards détente in Europe -- merely to cite those few -- are certainly factors favourable to peace. The balance that seems to be evolving is, however, only apparent. The fourth Middle East war revealed in only a few days how precarious and fragile this balance is.

The development of science and technology, the economic boom of the post-war period have created among the peoples certain needs that cannot be satisfied on a national basis alone. But those factors that encourage the creation of a collective and universal awareness have been annihilated by the persistence of national and regional security systems. Faithfulness to alliances has prevailed over faithfulness to the ideals of the Charter, even when this seriously jeopardizes the self-determination of peoples and violates their confiscated inalienable rights. And, finally, certain Powers, because of their technological progress and because they possess enormous means of mass destruction, feel that they have been vested with the role of imposing their "peace" on the rest of mankind.

In other words, the strengthening of international security has been considered only as a function of national concerns and interests. The world-wide and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter, reaffirmed in operative paragraph 1 of resolution 2734 (XXV), which should have been the very foundation of our global strategy for peace, has been used only as a point of reference.
The efforts made here and there to create a certain atmosphere of international détente have in fact led to only very limited results, precisely because they were not universal in character; therefore, these aims must be readjusted.

The value attached to bilateral relations is still based on the concept of collective international security. The regional arrangements are doubtless in keeping with the provisions of the Charter, but the interdependence of the world today requires that they be integrated within the wider system of agreed measures implemented by the community of nations.

There can be no doubt that the gravest danger to the future of mankind lies in the arms race, particularly because of the degree of sophistication of the nuclear weapons being manufactured. The anachronistic adage that preparation for war guarantees peace is still believed by some. The force of weapons is still considered the only way to strengthen the security of nations. That is why the talks on disarmament and the agreements to which they have led have dealt with the quantitative limitation of weapons of mass destruction and not the qualitative aspect. That is also one of the reasons why the Committee on Disarmament, session after session, has been bogged down in interminable discussions on only secondary and marginal aspects of the question. In the meantime the Powers which possess the largest stockpiles of weapons and believe only in the balance of forces reinforce their military potential.

The 1963 Moscow Treaty and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons raised legitimate hopes that there would be a significant strengthening of the trend towards halting the frantic production and stockpiling of weapons of mass destruction; but those hopes are vanishing day by day as we see that neither the SALT agreements, nor the agreements reached between the two super-Powers in the past two years, nor the Helsinki and Geneva Conferences on Security and Co-operation in Europe have had any significant effect on the great quantity of weapons already in the hands of the two camps or on their dissemination throughout the world. Quite the contrary, certain Powers which possess these enormous stockpiles of multi-directional nuclear weapons are carrying out — along with their measures to perfect nuclear weapons — tests on means that are no less dangerous than the atom; for example, the laser.
The idea of the "atomic umbrella", put forward as a means of slowing the nuclear arms race, certainly does not calm our fears, for its centre and its range could be changed and moved as a function of changing alliances.

Balances based on such things can only be precarious. Because of their very inconsistency they could not prevent or do away with threats to peace.

If we admit that our Organization, since the end of the Second World War, has been enriched by the qualitative contribution of the new Members that have freed themselves from the colonial system, we cannot avoid admitting too that colonialism still exists and that the nostalgia for treaty trade continues unconditionally to uphold the racist and colonialist régimes that oppress so many millions of human beings.

As my delegation has already said, in matters related to peace discrimination against peoples because of their colour is evident.

The axis set up by the racist and colonial régimes in southern Africa, to which certain western Powers have unconditionally allied themselves, is strengthened and thus constitutes one of the main threats to the security of nations. No people worthy of the name can agree to live in frustration and humiliation. The events of the Far East and, more recently, those of the Middle East explode the absurd theory of localized wars and yet, if we are not careful, these crises, limited thus far to certain regions, might lead us to generalized tensions and events even more frightening than those we saw during the immediate post-war period.

Colonialism and apartheid must be energetically combated to stop the unleashing of violence in southern Africa.

The strengthening of security is therefore a collective undertaking, and it is so stated in the Charter.

A State violates that sacred principle from the moment it attacks the inalienable rights of peoples or the territorial integrity of a State, and no nation can admit to another the right to impose upon it the ways and means of achieving its destiny.

International security can be obtained only at the price of strict observance of the principles set forth in the Charter. The dangerous arms race, the scattering of foreign military bases all over the world, interference in the domestic affairs of States and the resort to puppetry are still current practices, and if they are
not energetically combated they will seriously jeopardize any action that we might undertake to give man confidence that he can build a world of justice and peace to which he has so profoundly aspired for so long.

The balance we seek — the true balance, I mean — is not compatible with a widening of the gap between the wealthy and the needy nations. The thousands of millions of dollars spent yearly in research and manufacture of means of mass destruction deprive the world of substantive resources in its struggle against wretchedness, which is the lot of two thirds of mankind, in its efforts to preserve life and improve its quality.

If international solidarity fails in this field, at least it should leave the peoples fully to enjoy and utilize their own resources. For, as in its wisdom the Fourth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Nations recently held in Algiers put it:

"... international security cannot be achieved if it does not include an economic dimension which guarantees to all countries the right to implement their development programmes free from economic aggression and any other form of pressure."

The United Nations Organization has as its mission the maintenance of peace, guaranteeing to all the right to freedom and decent existence.

It might have achieved some of its objectives set for itself, had it linked to the research for the solutions of the problems the desire to solve them and ensure that they will condition a better existence. But those recommendations will be inoperative until there is the political will and authority necessary to impose them upon the egotistical acts of Member States.

The Charter, which is clear in itself, cannot be interpreted as a function of plans for hegemony, nor can it be used to support those States, or to hide the acts of violation of States, that do violate its provisions.

In the exalting task of maintaining and strengthening the security of nations, we cannot possibly fulfil our international responsibilities unless we are aware of those primary truths. Peoples want peace. They oppose wars of domination, racism and colonialism. They aspire to an existence of calm, of tolerance and of understanding.
Those are the factors which condition the maintenance and the strengthening of international security, and they are the sole mandate which we, according to the Charter, possess, and through which we must endeavour to achieve the objectives set forth.

The CHAIRMAN: There are still six names remaining on the list of speakers for the general debate. If the Committee agrees, I intend to call on the representative of Liberia and the representative of Kuwait this afternoon, and to ask the representatives of the Byelorussian SSR, Spain, Yugoslavia and Peru to accord me their understanding and to be good enough to wait until tomorrow morning to make their statements. I propose that, when we have heard the representatives of Liberia and Kuwait, we should adjourn until tomorrow morning, thus allowing the group of members who are particularly concerned in working out a draft resolution on the item under discussion the facilities of this conference room.

The Department of Conference Services has asked me to take into account the heavy burden that rests upon the interpreters, and I think that that is a fair request which we should try to meet. The Department suggests that our discussions today, whether in the Committee or in the group of sponsors, should conclude by six o'clock. The representative of Liberia and the representative of Kuwait have indicated that they will speak for between 15 and 20 minutes each, which means that the Committee should be able to adjourn by about 5.20 p.m. That would leave 30 or 40 minutes for the sponsors, which I trust would be sufficient.

I hope that when we have concluded the general debate on this item tomorrow morning it will be possible to have a draft resolution on it introduced at that same meeting. There might even be time for some members to speak on the draft resolution. I would then propose to adjourn the debate on this item and to take up tomorrow afternoon items 30 and 31, relating to outer space, and to set a date somewhat later in the week for a final discussion and a vote on the draft resolution on the strengthening of international security, which should give members time both to consult one another and to seek instructions from their Governments.
As I hear no objection, I take it that the programme that I have proposed commends itself to the Committee. I would, therefore, ask the Secretariat to advise the Chairman of the Outer Space Committee, the Ambassador of Austria, as soon as possible, that we would appreciate it if we could start our debate on items 30 and 31 tomorrow afternoon.

As representatives will remember, the Committee's work on item 32, concerning a World Disarmament Conference, is still not completed. Hence we must find time for a final discussion on it before the close of business on 11 December. For that reason, I would not want to see us dispense with a meeting tomorrow afternoon.
Mr. HARMON (Liberia): Again we find ourselves debating the item of our agenda entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security (item 39). When I spoke in this Committee at the twenty-seventh session I indicated that my delegation was encouraged by certain positive trends in international relations which had developed during recent months and which gave historic importance to the question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, introduced by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I went further in giving some historical background, and firmly reminded the plenary meeting, where I spoke on 15 November 1972, that history required us to refer to the past in relation to the present and the future and to seek to profit by past history in adopting and accepting those principles upon which we could build with confidence for the future.

I went on to say that we should seek to require all Member States to endeavour to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security and justice would not be endangered. We should make it an instrument of national policy to reject, renounce, condemn and outlaw war. We should call upon all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other matter inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations Parties to any dispute, the continuance of which would be likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. We should seek solutions by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement. We should also resort to regional conciliatory agencies or other peaceful means of our own choice as a national policy (2085th meeting, pp. 56 and 57).

Reviewing events now, it is frustrating, to say the least, that despite the favourable situation which existed then we are not now as optimistic but, on the contrary, we are troubled by the basic problems which are emerging in many areas of our world as a result of the acceptance of the use of force as a right of self-defence and the right of peoples to fight for their freedom. When the founding fathers, with considerable skill and design, established the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, they
charged it with the responsibility of maintaining peace and security in our world. The use of force is repugnant, but countries finding themselves in the dilemma of preemptive force feel they have the right to protect their freedom.

This frustration has, therefore, brought the Liberian delegation to the point of reviewing seriously some alternative formulas that could, in our opinion, help us to attain international peace and security, rather than an annual repetition which our general debate on this issue has brought forth.

The question of strengthening international security is almost infinite in scope and in time, a "catch-all" of all our problems and the problems of mankind. It is an item that will be on the agenda of the United Nations, I assume, for decades to come, so that if succeeding generations deal wisely with their own problems, the problem of strengthening the international community, being an eternal problem, will continue to challenge the minds of men and will remain one to be solved by each generation in the light of its own situation. I speak of "generations", but in the light of the acceleration of events in the past two years, I might more appropriately speak of single years. Our discussion here takes off from the twenty-fifth session in 1970, when our Organization crowned its celebration of its twenty-fifth anniversary with the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. The general principles laid down in that historic document are still, in the view of my delegation, supremely valid as expressions of the major issues of our time and the fundamental principles they have engendered.

Accordingly, it might seem that our discussions here and now are but a mere reiteration of what was said in the hammering out of the basic concepts. But that, it seems to us, is the value of these discussions. We believe that discussions of this kind are not only valid but absolutely necessary. However, the necessity stems not from mere reiteration but from a review of our work in the light of the progress we have or have not made in furthering these principles in the progressive evolution of the international community.

Concretely, it is our view that we can profit most from such annual reviews -- and perhaps they should be annual -- by examining principles in terms of the problems facing the world in the particular year. In short,
we see this item as a kind of inventory of what has been accomplished and what has failed to be achieved, so that we may strengthen where progress has been negative, and augment where progress is the most promising.

Having defined the nature of the item itself, my delegation would like to focus its observations in the light of three basic issues, three categories of problems where a forward effort is now a crucial and compelling necessity: (i) colonialism, (ii) disarmament and (iii) economic development. I shall not attempt to discuss those three items in detail. That has already been done in the work of the Committees; they are three items which have been the major concern of this session. Accordingly, the Liberian delegation will confine itself to making a few observations on how we see these three areas, as they are emerging from this session.

The three issues have certain characteristics in common. They are all crucial in our quest for an international order, and they are evolving more and more on our agenda as closely interrelated. The concept of their relatedness is comparatively new in the experience of our Organization and I think that here is one area where there is much room for the expansion of thought, both on the part of governments and on the part of the Secretariat. Here is a field where a whole new approach is waiting intellectual and theoretical development.

It has already been said -- and more needs to be said on this -- that without the final solution of the colonial problem we shall not move promisingly on the path of peace. The remaining unliberated areas of our world are becoming the new bases, military and political, for new imperial adventures which are running counter to the main purposes of this Organization. It has already been said that the staggering armaments budgets, if they continue to grow like the proverbial cancer, will monopolize all our best energies, which are required for development. And it is already being said -- and here we are in the very first stages -- that the concept of collective security, which is but a synonym for international security, must remain an empty one if it does not embody with equal weight the concept of collective economic security.
Here is a new concept of what may be called the relativity of peace. Perhaps what is really meant -- and this is developing into a new meaning -- is that peace is indivisible; only it must perhaps be stated in new terms, namely, that the component elements of peace are indivisible.

We have many times expressed our abhorrence of partition, but in the course of time we have partitioned peace itself behind the walls of agenda items. We have expressed our abhorrence of the "divide and rule" mentality, but we have ourselves divided the programme for peace in such a way that chaos and confusion will become the new forces of domination. What appears to be needed is a kind of intellectual emancipation in our Organization, a kind of renaissance that will weave the strands of peace into a tapestry that all can understand.

In the light of these facts, my delegation believes that as regards colonialism this session has made considerable progress. A careful analysis of the implications of the resolutions it has adopted shows that this Assembly has developed a strategy of emancipation that, if pursued with vigour and determination, may be the beginning of the end of colonialism. Guinea-Bissau is the expression of that strategy. It is in this area that more effort -- sustained and determined -- should be applied.

In the realm of disarmament, it seems to us that we have moved backward rather than forward. The détente which we expected might be the beginning of a reduction of armaments is paradoxically spawning the very opposite. The Western Powers are even formulating a new philosophy based on the irony that détente -- the child of peace -- requires more armaments to defend it than the cold war itself. Liberia is a small country in Africa where there are no armaments institutions as such. We cannot pretend to offer technical advice to the great military Powers on how to manage their arsenals and their defence budgets. But Africa, being the victim of Western arms, cannot wash its hands of the problem. African States must continue to join hands with the States of all other continents to exert a counter-pressure to the new arms race in the belief that we must never give up our struggle to abolish the worship of arms as a false religion, a false concept of the nature of man and a false doctrine of the concept of a human society and a sane international order.
In my own country, under the new leadership of President Tolbert, we are constantly expanding our foreign policy, our cultural links and close ties between States. President Tolbert has consistently risked his life by making several trips to African States and abroad, whole-heartedly advocating his support for the basic principles of the strengthening of understanding and mutual trust among all nations. We sincerely hope to continue to pursue this course.

In the field of economic relations, we are at a turning-point which could determine the destiny of the developing world. The breakdown of the Western monetary and trade systems opens a new channel for a reconstructed order, in which the developing nations must be permitted to play their rightful and constructive role, preferably through such institutions as UNCTAD and United Nations resolutions, especially the provisions of the Declaration we are now discussing. In this connexion my delegation would like to call attention to the Mexican item under the heading of "Collective economic security". My delegation wishes at this time to pay a high tribute to the President of Mexico, Mr. Echeverría, whose great intellectual contribution in this field can open a new era in the economic relations of nations. The charter of economic rights and duties proposed by Mexico offers, in this new collective security concept, a new challenge for new thinking in this field.

The United Nations is the world's most operative body through which the strengthening of peace and security can be achieved. It is therefore incumbent upon every Member State to consider it a serious function and responsibility to redouble their efforts in making our world a worthy place to live and enjoy God's given right to life and happiness.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to deal with one aspect of this debate, much of which, I regret to say, deals rather pessimistically with the issue before us. We find no pessimism in our heart. Liberia is a Founding Member of the United Nations. At the founding of the United Nations there were only two other independent States on the continent of Africa -- Egypt and Ethiopia. Today the continent is on the verge of final emancipation.
Today the division of the world is not in free and oppressed peoples and nations but in rich and poor nations, and this is a kind of colonialism we shall overcome. Another division is between strong and weak nations -- the armed giants and the unarmed Lilliputians -- and this, too, is a kind of new colonialism. And this, too, we shall overcome. What is needed in the face of intransigence and defiance and above all in the face of the worst enemy of all -- scepticism -- is perseverance of effort and an unyielding faith in the Organization.

We all salute the big Powers in their concerted effort to bring about a détente by which our world can look forward to a renewed hope of international solidarity and better understanding. We appreciate the continued efforts of the USSR and the United States in particular and call upon them, as a matter of duty and responsibility, to work together with the other big Powers in bringing about a détente for strengthening international peace and security.

Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): The item on the strengthening of international security is very broad in scope and encompasses almost all aspects of the work of our Organization.

While reviewing the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, we should recall the lofty principles and purposes of the Charter. We are frequently struck by the discrepancy between what States say and what they do. There is still a wide gap between theory and practice.

On this solemn occasion, we must review any developments that may have taken place to promote peace, security, disarmament and economic and social progress for all mankind. We must also discuss the urgent need to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for maintaining international peace and security.
As a small country, Kuwait whole-heartedly reaffirms the universal validity of the Purposes and Principles of the Charter of the United Nations as the basis of relations among States and lays special stress on the requirement that the rules enshrined in the Charter should apply to all countries, large and small, irrespective of their stage of political, economic or social development.

One of the major causes of international insecurity has been the arms race among the big Powers. For the past two decades disarmament negotiations have been mainly conducted in the form of a dialogue between the two super Powers.

Though disarmament is a matter of vital concern to all countries, small countries constantly feel that they have not been able to influence the course of events on the outcome of an issue which is vital for their security and survival. Many countries, like my own, find disarmament measures inadequate and naturally feel impatient with the slow pace of the progress achieved so far.

While the two super Powers have agreed to some quantitative restrictions on the production of strategic arms they still retain an unfettered discretion in improving the quality of their weapons and increasing the destructive potential of their armaments. The destructive power already possessed by either super Power is already sufficient to put an end to human existence on this planet. One bomber, or one missile, can now carry an amount of explosives equal to that used by all belligerents throughout the Second World War.

It can thus be seen that there is little justification for the continuation of the arms race among the big Powers. Though the race has been going on for years, it has not yet enabled one super-Power to surpass the other in the quality of its arms so as to give it a clear military advantage. Moreover, the exorbitant cost involved in producing strategic arms are indeed prohibitive.
The preponderant view among the nations of the world is that the race has continued for too long and must be stopped. The more sophisticated the weapons become the less secure people feel. One of the paradoxes of the present situation is that, at an annual expenditure of at least $200,000 million on arms, one thing has been clearly established, namely, that the world cannot survive a nuclear war. Though there is a constant increase in the potential of the so-called deterrent, there is a corresponding increase in the capacity of mutual destruction. The basic fact which is of paramount importance is that no one can survive if this destructive power is unleashed.

Small countries are faced with the major problem of ensuring their own survival in a world in which strength prevails over law, in which aggression still goes unpunished and in which fundamental human rights are frequently violated. Small countries have no alternative but to strain their meagre resources in an attempt to protect their territorial integrity and safeguard their national dignity.

One of the major principles of the Charter, on which the whole structure of international security is based, is the provision requiring all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. An essential corollary of this is the general principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force.

Nowhere in the world have these principles been more wantonly disregarded than in the Middle East. First, there is the tragedy which the Palestinian people has been suffering for a quarter of a century. Then there is the problem of Israel's occupation of territories of neighbouring Arab States.

Each of these two facets of the Middle Eastern problem represents, at one and the same time, a violation of a particular Arab right and of a general international principle. Thus, the first problem represents a flagrant violation of the rights of the Palestinian people, as well as the general principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, while the second problem represents a flagrant violation of the right of Arab States to territorial integrity, as well as the general principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force. The interaction of the violations of
particular Arab rights and general international principles in turn gives rise to the third facet of the Middle Eastern conflict, namely, the continuous Israeli violation of the principles of international order and the rules of international order and international law.

The Security Council was entrusted with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The founders of the Organization had thought that because of its size and composition, this organ would be best fitted to ensure prompt and effective action. The Security Council, however, has not been able to act because of constant disagreement among the five permanent members. Chapter VII of the Charter has consequently remained a dead letter and many opportunities were missed for upholding the rule of law and safeguarding fundamental human rights.

Kuwait has consistently advocated applying coercive measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to compel South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Portugal and Israel to relinquish their outmoded policies which have caused so much suffering and turmoil, and to comply with United Nations resolutions which uphold the rights of peoples to self-determination, equality and the right to live and freedom and dignity in their homeland.

In the introduction to his recent report, the Secretary-General of the United Nations recognized that the completion of the process of decolonization is painfully slow. He stated:

"The fact that millions of people are still deprived of their fundamental rights to self-determination, freedom and independence is an anachronism which also constitutes a major obstacle to the relaxation of international tensions". (A/9001/Add.1, p. 7)

My delegation whole-heartedly shares this view and believes that we should exert all our efforts to accelerate the process of decolonization because in the absence of freedom, human rights would be meaningless.
Kuwait condemns racial discrimination in all its forms. Racial discrimination implies refusal by those who practise it to recognize the worth and dignity of the human person.

The Constitution of the State of Kuwait clearly stipulates:

"All people are equal in human dignity and in public rights and duties before the law, without distinction as to race, origin, language or religion."

Moreover, the National Assembly of Kuwait solemnly proclaimed its support for all peoples who struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination wherever they may be, and condemned practices of apartheid and racial discrimination in any part of the world.

The majority of States have been united on this fundamental issue. These odious practices have not been renounced simply because a few powerful States have deemed it fit to depart from the world consensus and thus give aid and succour to régimes which could not have resisted so long if the measures formulated by the United Nations were scrupulously observed by these few, but very influential Powers.
The United Nations has this year been engaged in the first review and appraisal of the International Development Strategy which is being carried out at the global level. That brings to mind the inadequacy of the measures taken by the developed countries in the field of aid and trade to accelerate the pace of development in the developing countries.

Though a well-formulated plan already exists, the stumbling-block is still the absence of political will in many of the advanced countries.

My country, which has for the last decade been devoting a large portion of its national income to helping other developing countries, has great sympathy for the needs of those countries and their aspirations to achieve self-sustained growth. We are looking forward to an international society in which incomes are equalized and prosperity is accessible to all countries. However, that cannot be achieved unless the developed countries fulfil the commitments of the Strategy.

World stability cannot be promoted unless there is widespread recognition of a common responsibility for the general welfare. The gap between affluence and want has very serious implications. The rising level of human expectations calls for implementation of the convergent measures of the Strategy in a spirit of disinterestedness, far-sightedness and common responsibility.

May I conclude by reiterating my country's unqualified and firm support for the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Support for the Declaration is an act of faith in the United Nations, the principles enshrined in the Charter and the legal norms which should regulate the conduct of States.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.