

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**1857th
PLENARY MEETING**

Thursday, 1 October 1970,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Muller (South Africa).....	1
Speech by Mr. Zahedi (Iran)	5
Speech by Mr. Lupis (Italy)	8
Speech by Mr. Malik (Indonesia)	10
Speech by Mr. Prevatt (Trinidad and Tobago)	13
Statements by the representative of Libya	17
Statement by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17
Statements by the representative of Iraq.....	17
Statements by the representative of Italy	18
Statements by the representative of Iran.....	20
Statements by the representative of Pakistan	20
Statements by the representative of India	25

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. MULLER (South Africa): Mr President, my delegation has already extended to you from this rostrum its warm congratulations on your election as President of this session of the General Assembly and has assured you of its co-operation at all times. I wish to associate myself with those remarks and extend to you my personal congratulations and good wishes.
2. This Assembly is no ordinary Assembly. It marks the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations and is a significant milestone in the story of the international community. It is a time for looking forward and a time for looking back. We must look back at the past quarter of a century to identify the successes and failures, to examine where our procedures have been sound and where we have been misguided, to recognize where we have tried too hard and where not enough, and to assess the correctness of our priorities, emphasis and direction. The information we derive from this necessary process of introspection must be carefully weighed so as to enable us to produce a sound programme for the future attention of the Organization, one that will help it to achieve its most important aims more effectively.
3. On looking back, the unfortunate but unavoidable conclusion is that the achievements of the Organization have not matched the high hopes of its founders. A crisis of confidence has been experienced by Members and even noted by the Secretary-General. Dissatisfaction with the lack of progress by the Organization is

reflected in the call from many quarters for a revision of the Charter with a view to improving the effectiveness of the Organization as an instrument for promoting peace and international security.

4. It is understandable that this prescription for the maladies of the Organization should appeal to some, but it seems to my Government that treatment of this kind would be misdirected; we should be attempting to cure a symptom instead of the disease. Despite its imperfections, it is not the Charter which is basically at fault, but the lack of will on the part of Members to apply it constructively. Chapter I of the Charter embodies the highest common denominator of the aspirations of the peoples of the world acting in community; but when Member States have participated in the proceedings of organs created by the Charter, they have generally acted as individuals, promoting their own or narrow sectional interests only. The rights, interests and sensitivities of other States have been relegated to a position of subordinate importance, and this has given rise to friction between nations, and the dissemination, even by the Secretariat, of political propaganda directed against Member States. This pattern of behaviour of States diverges fundamentally from the vision of the architects of San Francisco, who would "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The conclusion to which we are drawn is that in order to enable the world body more effectively to fill the role it was originally designed to play in world affairs, Member States must return to the spirit of San Francisco. My Government believes that this is the first essential step towards restoring the authority and prestige of the United Nations. The second is that States should honour the letter and the spirit of the existing Charter, being guided by the broadly defined purposes and principles set out in Chapter I.

5. It has been said, increasingly of late, that the United Nations is merely a mirror of the realities of the existing world situation. There is no disputing that. Nations tend to reach decisions, and act, outside the framework of the United Nations, according to the dictates of self-interest, and then to seek to justify their actions in this forum, or, alternatively, to find a scapegoat to divert attention. In that way Member States have tended to neglect their individual responsibilities.

6. By signing the Charter, Member States undertook, for instance, to strive for the creation of the conditions of stability and well-being which are essential for peaceful and friendly relations among nations. Article 55 of the Charter deals with that aspect. The creation of these conditions is a responsibility which falls

primarily within the sphere of action of individual States, which should ardently pursue the goals of economic and social development and the well-being of their own peoples. Signatories of the Charter, however, have also committed themselves to act, in their relations with one another, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, and they have thereby accepted a responsibility vis-à-vis other States and their peoples. Membership has, therefore, brought with it both domestic and international obligations.

7. It is the appropriate time for Members to take stock of their domestic and international achievements, measured against the standard of the Charter. I am not suggesting that the United Nations should take upon itself the task of weighing up the achievements and/or failures of any particular State or States, a course which would be in violation of the provisions of the Charter. I am suggesting rather that Member States should themselves, in this anniversary year, in the spirit of Article 56 of the Charter, direct their enquiring scrutiny at their own achievements over the past 25 years. It is not merely the question of where they stand today that is relevant, but also of where they are today in comparison with 1945. Accordingly, States should first assess their progress domestically in the fields referred to in Article 55. They might ask themselves to what extent they have succeeded in promoting higher standards of living, full employment, conditions of economic and social progress and development and respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms among their own peoples. Secondly, they should consider whether in their behaviour towards others they have acted, and are continuing to act, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

8. As for my own Government, we know that much remains to be done in the future. But I am glad to say also that much has been accomplished in the past 25 years. The general advancement on all fronts of our diverse peoples has been such that their well-being in 1970 certainly exceeds the most optimistic expectations of 1945. We, therefore, are satisfied that we are making significant headway in acquitting ourselves of our commitment under Article 55 of the Charter. Let there be no doubt that we are as concerned as any other State about the realization of the objectives expressed in that Article. We are furthermore satisfied that we shall continue to make progress in the manner which is best suited to, and is dictated by, "the particular circumstances" existing in the area under our jurisdiction—to borrow a phrase from Article 73 of the Charter.

9. Article 55 emphasizes respect for the right of self-determination of peoples. This does not mean that in multinational countries or groupings, one group or nation which happens to be in the majority should be allowed, in the exercise of its right of self-determination, to deprive other numerically smaller nations of the same right. Accordingly, in the exercise of self-determination in such multinational countries, the history and diversity of the peoples living there should be taken fully into account.

10. South Africa is a multinational country. Our population does not consist of only two elements, a black nation and a white nation. It is composed, in fact, of a white nation and several non-white nations or peoples and the distinction between them is based on the fact that their language, culture, history and traditions differ from one another as markedly as day does from night. In other words the distinction is not based solely on race or colour. We believe that in applying the principle of self-determination, the rights of each of these nations should be preserved. Since 1948, when it first came to power, my Government has actively promoted self-determination for those of our peoples not yet enjoying it, on this basis.

11. Today all peoples in South Africa possess self-government in varying forms and at various levels of development. Most of our black African peoples, for instance, already have their own legislative and executive assemblies, or councils, with the necessary administrative departments. The Xhosa people of the Transkei were the first to receive a modern parliament and their own Government after their first general election was held in 1963. During the past two years no fewer than eight new territorial Governments have been established with their own legislative and executive councils and with approximately 50 state departments already under their control. In this process of evolution towards independence the peoples of each of these territories have acquired a representative and responsible Government which is actively engaged in planning their own future and preparing them for independence in co-operation with the South African Government, in a peaceful and orderly manner.

12. On the 15th of last month, in the South African Parliament, my Prime Minister restated government policy in that respect. He reaffirmed that our policy does not constitute a denial of human dignity and added that while he claimed for himself the right of maintaining his identity as a white person, he also conceded to every non-white nation living in South Africa the right to its own identity. He continued as follows:

"Here in South Africa a Bantu person has never got into trouble for having requested and demanded self-determination for his people. Quite the contrary! We are in fact guiding them along the road to self-determination; we are in fact preparing them for self-determination; we are in the process of training them and making them and their land receptive to self-determination. If honourable members or the outside world ask me when it will happen that they go their own way, I can merely reply once again that this Parliament has passed certain legislation and that any black nation is at liberty to come to this Parliament and say that the time has arrived for it to go its own way. This Government, or whatever other Government may be in power, will deliberate and negotiate with that nation.

"I want to make the principle very clear: if there is a desire to hold discussions, we shall be obliged and ready to enter into such discussions. It stands to reason that we would prefer these discussions

to be deferred until greater development has taken place in those black territories so that they may be more viable and better prepared to stand on their own feet. But it is by no means my intention to make it a condition that they must be viable before they have the right to approach us. This is their inalienable right, which they can exercise tomorrow if they so desire.”

13. After the black peoples of South Africa have attained independence we shall not desert them. We shall continue to assist them in a spirit of good neighbourliness. We shall continue to co-operate with them to our mutual advantage and, in the nature of things, on a much larger scale than we are already doing in the case of our other newly independent African neighbours. In the long term this political development could lead to a commonwealth of independent peoples and States, living side by side on a basis of sovereign equality. They will continue to be interdependent economically, but there will be no domination of any one people or any one State by others.

14. To the sceptics who may still refuse to believe in the feasibility or practicability of the programme I have outlined—perhaps because of the size and economic viability of the Territories or homelands we are leading to independence—let me say this: the populations of the Territories in question range between 300,000 and 3.5 million, populations which exceed those of many States which belong to this Organization and are represented here today. Their areas, too, exceed the areas of many Members of the United Nations. The gross national income of several of those Territories compares more than favourably with that of some Member States. Moreover, South Africa itself has one of the strongest and fastest developing economies in the entire world. In the light of our economic interdependence and our commitment to regional co-operation, economic stability in southern Africa will be guaranteed and development in all fields assured.

15. Against that background we do not believe that we can legitimately be accused of denying the peoples of South Africa the right of self-determination. As I have said, our whole policy is aimed at avoiding domination of any one people or any one State by others. It is designed to enable each nation, while maintaining its identity, to realize its own ambitions to the full. That surely is the essence of self-determination.

16. Apart from the right of self-determination, there are other equally important basic rights. Almost three decades ago President Roosevelt outlined his four “freedoms” which are today no less important than they were then. In those, and other fields mentioned in Article 55 of the Charter, substantial progress has been made in my country. Freedom of religion and speech, the liberty of the person, inviolability of person and property and free access to courts of impartial justice are assured. But here, too, the rights of the individual must not be exercised in such a way as to deprive others of that same right. Hence, those rights can be enjoyed only within the framework of an ordered

and peaceful society. Only in such a society can high standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and educational progress and development be realized for the individual human being.

17. Other freedoms are related to the fundamental needs of man, for example, freedom from poverty and want and the need for health, education and other social services. Freedom from poverty and want is directly related to economic advancement. It is significant in this respect that the real *per capita* income of South Africa rose by 66 per cent during the 20 years from 1949 to 1969. As regards other services, we have implemented an education programme which will within one generation eliminate illiteracy and which provides opportunities for a university education to increasing numbers of students of all races; we have opened up avenues of technical instruction for non-white persons in all fields; we have established and staffed Africa’s most outstanding hospitals and heavily subsidized them, so that black African patients are charged a single fee of 70 United States cents irrespective of the complexity of the treatment they receive or the period they remain in hospital; we have built 600,000 houses in 20 years, 400,000 of which were for black African persons.

18. We do not claim that in the pursuit of the ideals set out in Article 55 we have reached the stage where we can be self-satisfied. We do not claim to be perfect; but neither are we hypocrites. We acknowledge the common ideals and aspirations of mankind and we have formulated our policies accordingly. We recognize the problems that we have to overcome; we do not, however, criticize others for their shortcomings, for we realize that no State can be perfect. But many others do not hesitate to condemn our policies on moral and practical grounds. These charges are, however, completely unfounded. How can a system be wrong which leads peoples to self-determination and enables and assists them in maintaining their national identities; which provides them with higher social, educational and economic standards that can be attained anywhere else on the continent; which prepares them for independence by providing them with technical assistance and administrative support, thus creating opportunities for all of them to gain valuable experience in the art of government at various levels; which guarantees security for all by avoiding a struggle for power between non-white and white in South Africa and also between competing and traditionally hostile African nationalisms? In the light of the realities of the world today and of the substantial progress we have made in South Africa in the field of human upliftment and in the light of the premises and objectives of our policies as I have described them, I feel that the record of South Africa can be measured honourably against the ideals set out in the Charter.

19. I now wish to refer briefly to the wider field of the individual Member’s responsibility. Here it is the duty of Member States to reflect to what extent each of them, individually, has adhered to the basic purposes and principles of the Charter. Without this, all our efforts to promote the moral and social welfare of our

peoples would be in vain. These provisions impose a duty on Member States not only towards their own peoples but also towards other States and their peoples. I wish to refer to only three of these provisions, which in present circumstances cannot be sufficiently emphasized: first, the call to the United Nations to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the purposes and principles of the Charter; secondly, the call to all Members to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and, thirdly, as a corollary to this, the call to all Members to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

20. Unless Members, individually and collectively, are willing to apply these provisions in their daily relations with others, there can be little hope of achieving the ideals of the Charter, of making a reality of the better world envisaged in 1945.

21. My Government, for its part, has made it clear time and again that we base our relations with other States, first, on acceptance of the rule of non-intervention in their internal affairs; and secondly, on acceptance of the principle that differences of political systems are no bar to peaceful coexistence and friendly relations.

22. We are of Africa. It is in this continent, especially in the southern region, that our destiny lies. We believe it to be in everyone's interest that all the countries of the region should develop and prosper, that the real enemies of Africa—disease, ignorance, poverty and misery—should be conquered.

23. It is of cardinal importance, moreover, that the security and stability of this region should be preserved. We are therefore dismayed to note the emphasis being placed in various United Nations bodies on the use of force as a means for attaining political objectives in southern Africa.

24. The strengthening of international security and the preservation of peace and order throughout the world is a major preoccupation of the United Nations this year. How can these aims be reconciled with resolutions not only condoning but actually encouraging the use of force in an area of the world where it is least likely to solve any problems? It should not be necessary for me to point out that it cannot be in the interest of any of the peoples of southern Africa to have the stability and security of the region shattered, for without stability and security the future progress and prosperity of the region are in jeopardy. I wish to state in this connexion that I welcome the stand which the Secretary-General took in a statement a fortnight ago against subversive activities and interference in the internal affairs of other nations.

25. My Government has been obliged to take cognizance of the growing threat to the southern African region and it has a duty to ensure the security of its peoples. Having said this, I must emphasize, however,

that South Africa has no aggressive designs. Indeed, any form of aggression is foreign to our history, our traditions, our outlook and our policy.

26. Two weeks ago, my Prime Minister reminded Parliament of his statement on assuming office four years ago that the independent black States on the borders of the Republic had no cause to spend a single cent on arms for their own defence since they knew that South Africa would not attack them and that they had nothing to fear from us.

27. Certain States persist, however, in questioning our good faith. In these circumstances my Prime Minister stated that he was prepared to negotiate a non-aggression treaty with any African State, whether that State was an immediate neighbour or was situated further away, such as Zambia, the United Republic of Tanzania and other States in Africa. He added that he was prepared to take the initiative in negotiating a non-aggression treaty of this nature.

28. From this rostrum I wish to invite other African States to give serious consideration to my Prime Minister's offer to conclude non-aggression pacts with them. It is our earnest hope that they will respond positively to this gesture. For my part, I shall be happy to discuss the matter further with representatives of any other African States who may be interested in our proposal or who may wish to have further information about it.

29. We have heard a great deal in the last 12 months of the Lusaka Manifesto.¹ If the spirit which this Manifesto has been said to symbolize does indeed reflect a genuine desire on the part of the African States to find a peaceful solution to the problems of Africa, one might have expected my Prime Minister's initiative to have been welcomed. This unfortunately has not so far been the case. I note with disappointment, indeed surprise, that certain African States have already rejected our offer. I hope very much that they will reconsider their attitude, for I know of nothing more that South Africa can do or say to convince them that any fears they may have of aggressive intentions on our part are totally unfounded. I trust, however, that if they should persist in spurning our offer they will at least refrain from accusing us of aggressive designs in future, for continued accusations of this sort cannot be reconciled with a rejection of a non-aggression pact.

30. For our part, we are firmly resolved to pursue policies which will contribute to the maintenance of peace and the solution of the urgent problems which will face Africa in the years ahead. We would welcome co-operating with others in this great and challenging task. The Charter enjoins us to practise tolerance and to co-operate with one another. Surely in this commemorative year it is for us to respond positively. Let us all, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the ideals of the Charter and resolve to work together to achieve greater understanding and a better future for all mankind.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes, agenda item 106, document A/7754.*

31. Mr. ZAHEDI (Iran): Mr. President, it is only fitting that on this twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, a man of your stature, who has contributed so much to a better understanding of the United Nations Charter, should preside over our proceedings.

32. You bring to this Assembly a distinguished career, not only as the representative of your country, but also as a scholar. Your works on the Charter have, from the very beginning, enriched the minds of the students of the United Nations.

33. It therefore gives me great pleasure to extend to you our warmest and most heartfelt congratulations on your election as the President of the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

34. Our principal cause for satisfaction on this twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations is the fact that the Organization has survived. These past 25 years have been the most trying and difficult period in world history. During this period, man has lived under constant threat of total annihilation.

35. Conflicts have always existed in the relations among nations. However, conflicts in our age have assumed a more dangerous character. Under the shadow of the cold war and the nuclear age, conflicts facing the United Nations imposed a much heavier and a much graver responsibility than did those which plagued the League of Nations. But the United Nations, unlike the League, still remains a reality and the world's only hope for peace and security.

36. We believe that the imminence of total disaster has further sharpened man's instinct for survival, making him recognize the imperative urgency for peace through international co-operation and conciliation. Thus, whereas the Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919 was torn to pieces within 20 years, we have now witnessed how the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union have succeeded in signing a Treaty² which holds a promise of peace and security in Europe. It is encouraging that, in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Charter, this Treaty is based on the renunciation of force as an instrument of change in the existing conditions in Europe. We regard this Treaty as a clear expression of the recognition of the need for peace through international co-operation and conciliation.

37. The recent initiative in the Middle East, which has led to a halt in the fighting and the reactivation of the Jarring mission, is indicative of another move in this direction. Despite the emotions, the complexity of the problem and the almost uncontrollable forces operating in different directions, a basis for negotiations was found.

38. It is, however, a matter of great concern that after much painstaking preparation the talks are now at a standstill. The recent peace initiative offered a ray of hope. We felt it opened the door to a peaceful

settlement of the dispute. It continues to remain our earnest hope that efforts to resume the talks will succeed. While the need for seeking peace and tranquillity through pacific means should remain a cardinal consideration, due regard must also be paid to well-established principles of conduct.

39. In the case of the Arab-Israeli conflict, those principles are spelled out in the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967 [242 (1967)], which provides the basis for a durable peace with justice in the area. In this context, Iran was the first country to declare that acquisition of territory by force is no longer admissible. This principle was later embodied in the above-mentioned Security Council resolution which, *inter alia*, called upon Israel to withdraw its armed forces from occupied Arab territories.

40. It is my delegation's sincere hope that Ambassador Jarring's efforts in this direction will lead to the realization in this area of the motto "Peace, justice and progress" which we have adopted for this anniversary session.

41. In the field of decolonization, the United Nations can rightfully boast of a great record of accomplishment on this tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

42. Largely through the power of persuasion and concerted action of this Assembly, millions of people who languished under the colonial yoke have attained freedom and independence. They have taken their rightful place in the community of nations.

43. While we must rejoice in this phenomenal development, we must at the same time express our concern for the freedom of the remaining colonial peoples, and vigilance should continue to be our guide until all territories under colonial rule are free again.

44. Much still remains to be achieved in the field of disarmament. But we must acknowledge that some progress has been made. The signing of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [resolution 2373 (XXII)] was a landmark in the long, barren and difficult negotiations.

45. To facilitate matters further in the implementation of this Treaty to which we soon become a party, as my beloved Sovereign, His Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah Aryamehr, has mentioned on a number of occasions, Iran is ready to declare the Middle East a nuclear-free zone, should other countries of the area agree to do so. The strategic arms limitation talks constitute another important step forward. While we welcome these measures, we would also like to express the hope that, in accordance with our Charter, the United Nations will be kept in the picture at all times during all phases of negotiations on disarmament.

46. I have especially outlined some of the positive aspects of developments in international affairs to show that prospects for peace and security during the next

² Signed in Moscow on 12 August 1970.

25 years are far brighter than they were at the inception of the United Nations. This is so despite the set-backs, frustrations and failures of which we are all well aware and which have greatly damaged the effectiveness of our Organization.

47. There is much that is urgent on our agenda, and much that is not on our agenda is even more urgent. I hope that at the present moment of crisis nothing will be said or done here to aggravate the perils which threaten the world in the Middle East and Far East.

48. While my Government will be expressing its views on the various items of the agenda in the Committees, I should like here to refer to certain items that are of particular interest to us.

49. As usual, development heads the list. I am sorry to say that the First United Nations Development Decade has been a failure. We had hoped that the developed nations, which had originally committed themselves to the basic objectives of that Development Decade, would play their full part in the realization of its objectives. While we recognize the difficulties which may have confronted them, we nevertheless firmly believe that a contribution of 1 per cent of national income would not impose a heavy burden on them.

50. On the eve of the Second Development Decade the gap between the rich and the poor continues to widen at a rapid rate. Unless that trend is checked in time it will be impossible to bridge the gap without serious consequences. The Second Development Decade offers a challenge, and it is our earnest hope that developed nations will assume their full responsibility in meeting that challenge. Here I must point out that the developed countries cannot absolve themselves of their responsibility for the dangerous implications that might result should the Second Development Decade fail.

51. Much has been said, and will be said, of the work of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and others, to which we attach great importance. Our views on the work of these organizations are well known. I therefore do not wish to tax your patience by repeating them. However, I do wish to say a few words on how we are to exploit the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

52. We firmly believe that the fruits of exploitation must be devoted to the common interest and allocated in the first place to the needs of development. In theory, the sea and atmosphere can be divided into marginal waters and international waters, air space and outer space. But the environment cannot be divided by national frontiers; abuses in one part are bound to have an effect on the other parts.

53. I should now like to turn to the question of security in our immediate region. In describing what is required

for peace in the world I mentioned earlier that peace is possible only through international co-operation and conciliation. I venture to say that in our case these are no high-sounding words devoid of real meaning. They constitute the corner-stone of our independent national policy. In essence this policy is based on peaceful coexistence and non-interference in the internal affairs of others.

54. We follow that policy with regard to all countries in every region, irrespective of their social or political systems. In the Middle East, our own region, we naturally take a keener interest in the application of that policy. In this area, an important step was recently taken, and the way was paved for a better understanding with the Government of the United Arab Republic. It gives me pleasure to report that relations with the United Arab Republic have been resumed. That opens the way for greater co-operation and for the consolidation of the deep-rooted ties between our two peoples.

55. The best example of our sincere and genuine desire for peace with justice through international conciliation, co-operation and understanding is the recent settlement of the question of Bahrain. In this day and age, when force still appears to be the main recourse of nations in the defence of national interests, we chose peaceful settlement as the means of resolving our differences with the United Kingdom on the question of Bahrain, to which we attached the greatest importance. That question had remained unresolved for a century and a half. The imminent departure of the United Kingdom forces from the Persian Gulf area provided a favourable atmosphere for a further effort to be made towards the solution of the problem.

56. Although the question of Bahrain was closely linked to our national interests we nevertheless felt that it was only just and fair that after a century and a half of separation from us the wishes of the people should be determined. Accordingly, we decided to seek the good offices of the Secretary-General, to whom I must pay a high tribute in this regard. To facilitate matters further, and as a sign of our good intentions, we took the unusual step of accepting in advance the findings of the Secretary-General's personal representative provided they were endorsed by the Security Council. On 11 May 1970 [1536th meeting] the Security Council endorsed the report submitted by the Secretary-General's personal representative.³ Subsequently, Iran declared its acceptance.

57. Seldom have Governments shown readiness to submit questions of national interest to the judgement and action of bodies outside their own control. In this instance, consideration for the common good, in conformity with the basic principles of the Charter, prevailed over self-oriented policies. By having recourse to the machinery of the United Nations we have shown how effective the United Nations system can be in the peaceful settlement of international disputes, provided Member States abide by the purposes and principles of the Charter.

³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1970*, document S/1972.

58. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization, the Secretary-General states: "The Bahrain settlement is a striking example of how the good offices of the Secretary-General can be used for the peaceful settlement of international disputes". [A/8001/Add.1 and Corr.1, para. 14]. Moreover, the settlement of the Bahrain issue has opened up a noble and new vista in which peace, progress and concerted efforts for the common good would characterize relations not only between Iran and our Bahraini brothers but all States and emirates in the Persian Gulf area.

59. With the entire northern coastline of the Persian Gulf belonging to Iran, my Government naturally attaches particular importance to peace and stability in that area. To that end we have spared no effort to co-operate with other littoral States and emirates.

60. The declaration of the British Government to withdraw from the Persian Gulf region which, of course, we welcomed whole-heartedly, cleared the way for such regional co-operation for the maintenance of peace and stability in this area.

61. I would have preferred to remain silent on our differences with Iraq, which happen to be the only sore spot in the relations with our neighbour. But His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Iraq yesterday [1854th meeting] chose to rehash the same old story, which he recounted to this Assembly last year. He himself concedes that he has nothing new to say this year on this subject.

62. Most of what I have to say, in order to disabuse this Assembly about baseless charges, is in fact also found in the records of the General Assembly. I wish only to declare once again that the 1937 Treaty⁴ is nothing but a dead letter now.

63. The 1937 Treaty is dead, not because of Iran, but through the action, or inaction, of Iraq. For 32 years all our efforts to persuade Iraq to live up to its obligations under the Treaty were of no avail. By its persistent refusal to honour a substantial part of the 1937 Treaty, namely, articles 4 and 5, and article 2 of the Protocol annexed to the Treaty, the Government of Iraq in effect rendered the whole Treaty null and void.

64. We cannot tolerate the legacy of imperialism in any form, nor will we accept Iraq as an heir to colonialism. The era of colonialism is over. Shatt-el-Arab, as a border river, is as much ours as it is Iraq's. We do not demand exclusive domain over it. We seek no more than is accorded to us by the practice of nations under well-established rules of international law, as shown in the case of the Danube, the Rhine and the Scheldt rivers.

65. Let me recount how the crisis between our two countries started. A few hours after midnight, on 15 April 1969, the Ambassador of Iran in Baghdad was awakened, to be officially notified by the Deputy

Foreign Minister of Iraq that Iraq would use force against vessels sailing to Iranian ports flying the Iranian national flag. Iraq went so far as to threaten to lower the Iranian flag if Iranian merchant vessels were to refuse Iraqi demands. To make its threat appear real, the Iraqi Government concentrated the bulk of its military forces along Shatt-el-Arab, facing Iran.

66. Under the circumstances, Iran was left no choice but to take firm measures to defend its sovereign rights by sending troop contingents to the border, which took place eight to nine weeks after Iraq sent its troops to the border. Subsequently, a number of countries, including Kuwait, Turkey, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Jordan, offered to mediate between Iran and Iraq. We responded positively to those overtures and we made it clear that as soon as Iraq sent its troops back to their barracks, we would do the same. Unfortunately, the Iraqi Government failed to respond. What could have been the reason for Iraq's refusal? I believe the answer has now become clear. Was it not because it wanted to have its forces on secure and safe frontiers?

67. To sum up my remarks on this subject, as I have stated in this Assembly, and as the Permanent Representative of Iran has informed the President of the Security Council several times, we are ready at any time, at any hour, at any moment, anywhere, to start negotiations with the Government of Iraq, for the purpose of reaching a peaceful settlement of the Shatt-el-Arab dispute, on the basis of the boundary to be set at mid-channel on thalweg and freedom of navigation for all countries throughout the entire river, in accordance with the accepted principles of international law.

68. We remain faithful to the pledge made several years ago by His Imperial Majesty Shahinshah Aryamehr to contribute to the peace-keeping resources of the United Nations.

69. The crises of our times give new proof each year of the importance of putting the peace-keeping function of the United Nations on a solid and permanent footing. We hope other nations will join those of us who have already done so, in earmarking troop contingents for this purpose. Realization of the end in view now depends mainly on decisive action by the super-Powers.

70. The Charter places on us the responsibility of helping to build a world in which those who come after us will feel safe and happy, materially and spiritually. That means enlisting youth activities in the cause of the United Nations. My august Sovereign saw this need early, and was the first to press the United Nations to act upon it. It is to his foresight and initiative that we owe the recommendation now before us from the Economic and Social Council [resolution 1539 (XLIX)] to establish a United Nations volunteer corps. We regard this as only a beginning of what will eventually be an important part of the United Nations structure.

71. Our goal must be a world of enduring peace and universal prosperity and opportunity, with am...

⁴ Boundary Treaty between Iran and Iraq, with Protocol, signed at Tehran on 4 July 1937.

for diversity. That appears to be our children's ideal. Let us make it our own.

72. Mr. LUPIS (Italy):⁵ Mr. President, I trust I may be allowed, first of all, to express the gratification of my Government and of the Italian delegation at seeing the representative of a friendly country, whose constant efforts have been dedicated to preserving peace, elected to the Presidency of the General Assembly. Your election is the best testimony of the unanimous esteem and prestige which you, an eminent representative of the democracy of your country, enjoy among us because of your legal erudition, your profound knowledge of international problems and your participation in the activity of the Organization since its very beginning.

73. I should like also to address myself to your illustrious predecessor and to express to Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph our deep gratitude to her for having steered last session's proceedings with charm, wisdom and competence, thus gaining the confidence of us all.

74. I also wish to associate myself with the tribute which has here been renewed to our Secretary-General. In U Thant we salute not only the symbol of the continuity of our Organization but also the faithful and devoted interpreter of the principles of the Charter. We express the most sincere wish that he may continue to serve the cause of the United Nations for a long time to come.

75. Mr. President, I should like to express to you personally and to the Assembly the sincere regret of the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs at not having been able to take part in person, as he had wished, in this debate, since he is representing Italy at President Nasser's funeral in Cairo.

Mr. Johnson (Jamaica), Vice-President, took the Chair.

76. Following the inspiring initiative taken yesterday [1855th meeting] by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, Mr. Carlos Romulo, I shall briefly summarize my statement, which is being distributed in its entire text with the understanding that it will be recorded verbatim as an annex to the minutes of this meeting.⁶

77. The significant coincidence of this session with the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations prompts me to begin my statement with a frankly realistic assessment: the results achieved by the United Nations in this quarter of a century have not so far fulfilled all our hopes, although the Organization represents a first important step in the evolution of the international community. We must, therefore, continue to concentrate our efforts with the aim of correcting the imperfections of the United Nations system in the existing institutional framework and of transforming the United Nations into an efficient and swift instrument for the preservation of peace.

⁵ Mr. Lupis spoke in Italian. The English version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

⁶ Issued as document A/PV.1857/Add.1.

78. The problems of peace and security throughout the world must be considered in a global context: any partial solution would prove sterile and ephemeral, unless it were a part of that wider design that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Aldo Moro, speaking from this same rostrum last year, defined as "the strategy of peace" [1783rd meeting].

79. Such a conclusion is particularly evident in relation to the problems on which I shall first concentrate my attention, as they are of pre-eminent interest for my country: the problems of Europe on the one hand, and those of the Middle East and the Mediterranean on the other.

80. In Europe, we have witnessed several developments bound to exert a positive influence on the consolidation of peace and *détente*. The Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union is a good omen for the dialogue which is being established between the two parts of Europe. In order to ensure a lasting contribution to the equilibrium in Europe, this dialogue must proceed in step with new progress on the road to setting up a politically and economically integrated community in Western European countries, a community which we consider as open to co-operation on all its frontiers and towards all continents.

81. To stress the constructive spirit which must lead our search for the solution of the problems of our continent, I shall recall the friendly climate which has been established in the relations between Italy and two of our neighbours: Yugoslavia and Austria.

82. Concerning Austria, the Secretary-General was kind enough to mention, as a fruitful example of recourse to the procedures for solving controversies provided for in Article 33 of the Charter, the contacts that Italy has had with the Austrian Government on the Alto Adige question. The permanent missions of the Member countries have already been informed of the substantial progress accomplished by Italy and Austria towards settling the dispute regarding the interpretation and implementation of the 1946 Paris agreement. This dispute was the subject of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in its sessions of 1960 [1497 (XV)] and 1961 [1661 (XVI)].

83. I should like to recall that the envisaged settlement is based on three elements. The first of these is the announcement made by the Italian Government in Parliament on 3 December 1969 regarding a series of measures which it intends to adopt in favour of the populations of Alto Adige. These measures aim at widening the legislative and administrative jurisdictions of the province of Bolzano. The second element is the statement made by the Austrian Government in the Nationalrat on 15 December 1969 according to which, once the measures outlined above have been carried out, it will consider as settled the controversy with Italy concerning the application of the Paris agreement. The third element is the conclusion and implementation of an agreement between Italy and Austria regarding the application of the European con-

vention for the peaceful settlement of disputes.⁷ The agreement aims at widening the application of this convention to cover controversies about facts or situations prior to the date when the said convention came into force.

84. The first two stages of the envisaged solution have therefore already been acted upon. Italy, for its part, has taken other steps in performing the operations set forth for settling the disputes. All the administrative measures envisaged in the "calendar of operations" have already been adopted. In particular, I shall mention the creation of the Preparatory Committee responsible for drawing up the draft constitutional law and the drafts of ordinary law. After 19 January 1970, in full observance of the limit indicated in the announcement of the Italian Government, we submitted to the Chamber of Deputies the draft constitutional law directed at modifying the statute of the Trentino-Alto Adige region. The competent parliamentary commission has already started its examination as an urgent matter. The drafts of ordinary laws concerning the further measures envisaged are under preparation. They will be submitted to Parliament in December, as announced.

85. The Italian Government is following with constant attention the progress of the Alto Adige populations and will continue in its endeavours to carry out the measures envisaged. It expects that, on the Austrian side as well, all the necessary steps will be taken to fulfil the commitments undertaken. The Italian Government hopes that in the light of the initiatives already taken and those which it aims to undertake in the future, the relations between Italy and Austria will develop in a renewed climate of trust and concord, opening the way to an ever more intensive and rewarding collaboration.

86. The hopeful note that has inspired my considerations on Europe must yield to the most serious anxiety when I proceed to reviewing the situation in the Middle East and the Mediterranean, at a time when we must mourn the untimely demise of President Nasser.

87. In joining in the unanimous tribute which has been paid to his memory from this rostrum we express the firm belief that the new leaders of the United Arab Republic will pursue the action undertaken with such determination by President Nasser in order to find a political solution to the conflict.

88. All the recent events must spur us to renew our efforts towards the re-establishment of peace in the Middle East with the observance of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) and the fulfilment of the need for security of all the parties involved in a balanced context, in which the future of the Palestinian people will no longer be considered solely in the light of its humanitarian aspects but also in that of its political elements. The security and integrity of the State of Israel, a Member of the United Nations, is a permanent aim of Italian policy as much as the security, integrity

and development of the Arab countries. Equally essential is the need to set the desired solution of the conflict in the framework of a system of guarantees to be completed by a system for monitoring the supplying of armaments. Along those lines Italy has directed its action, which is aimed at overcoming tension and radicalism in an area of the world so near to it. Italy is always prepared to make a sensible contribution to ensure that stability, security and peace prevail in the Mediterranean. That was stated by the President of the Italian Republic, Giuseppe Saragat, in his address welcoming President Nixon to Rome.

89. I should like to conclude my considerations on the Mediterranean by mentioning, not without regret, the relations between Italy and Libya. The measures of confiscation of property and of expulsion imposed upon the Italian community in Libya do not appear to us to have served the cause of Libya and its people. If a problem existed between the two countries, which are neighbours because of history as well as geography, it could have been solved in mutual agreement and through negotiation, so as to avoid the violation of international obligations and decisions taken by the United Nations, and in the light of the spirit of understanding and co-operation which has always inspired Italy's relations with all Arab countries.

90. We are still convinced that a solution through bilateral negotiations to problems pending between Italy and Libya might constitute the basis for the resumption of fruitful co-operation between the two countries. We hope that such a solution may be reached in conformity with the principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter.

91. Although the problems I have tackled most directly affect the interests of my country, they represent a detailed aspect of a broader problem, that of directing a global strategy of peace, as we conceive it, towards the settlement of regional conflicts jeopardizing peace and security, and of gradually eliminating the political, military, economic and social imbalances that cause tensions and conflicts.

92. As far as the first aspect is concerned we must note with deep regret the enduring crisis in South-East Asia and the lack of substantive progress towards that political and negotiated settlement which, by respecting the will of the populations concerned, is the condition for restoring a lasting peace in that tormented area.

93. On the other hand, we recall with deep satisfaction that peace has returned in Africa following the solution of the conflict which has shed the blood of the people of a great country, Nigeria. May that country, in a climate of reconciliation and concord, resume its place in the work for progress and peace upon which all the countries of that continent must embark.

94. As far as the second aspect is concerned, I should now like to remark that the problem of eliminating the instruments of destruction remains before us in all its complex essence. In Geneva, the Conference

⁷ Signed at Strasbourg on 29 April 1957 under the auspices of the Council of Europe.

of the Committee on Disarmament has achieved some progress in the field of so-called collateral measures—for instance, in the case of the agreement on the draft treaty on the denuclearization of the seabed.⁸ On the other hand, difficulties persist in relation to the banning of biological and chemical weapons, while there has been no initiative at all to extend the prohibition of nuclear tests. That is but a new argument to stress the need—consistently voiced by the Italian Government—to consider the problem of disarmament as a unified whole, without limiting the discussion to collateral measures, and, instead, facing the task of outlining an organic programme for the actual reduction of armaments. In this context we are following with interest the development of the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on the limitation of strategic armaments. We express the wish that those talks will lead to results that will take into account the security requirements of non-nuclear-weapon countries and represent a first real step towards halting the arms race.

95. No less important than disarmament for the renewal of international order is the elimination of any form of human discrimination and oppression. Colonial régimes and systems of *apartheid* are, from this viewpoint, intolerable and inconsistent with the international community as we conceive it. We therefore advocate that the action of the United Nations in that field be directed through peaceful means at re-establishing a more humane and democratic order in southern Africa.

96. The celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is a reminder of the Organization's responsibility in this field. The same ideals of solidarity and understanding extolled in that Declaration must also inspire our stand on the problems of development, as we firmly believe that the establishment of a greater social justice throughout the international community is also an essential condition for building peace.

97. The global strategy of development for the next decade provides the basis for organically programming development and rationalizing the use of available resources, including the aspects concerning the necessary co-ordination and simplification of the intervention carried out under the aegis of the United Nations.

98. The structural and functional strengthening of the United Nations also implies the need to face the problem of giving a truly universal dimension to the Organization as is required by its functions and responsibilities. In this context we hope that the People's Republic of China, with which Italy is negotiating for recognition and establishment of diplomatic relations, will take on the international responsibilities facing it and contribute to the strengthening of peace in the world.

⁸ See *Official Records of the Disarmament Commission, Supplement for 1970*, document DC/233, annex A.

99. If we really want to strengthen the United Nations it is necessary that all Member States be willing to sacrifice "*la raison d'Etat*" to the reason of peace, which requires respect for a universal order founded on law and aimed at progress and co-operation among peoples.

100. Although the results achieved by the United Nations towards this end may appear modest, nevertheless the Organization offers us the potential of its structures, means and systems that we shall use, provided we realize the logic of the present evolution consisting in a gradual process for overcoming national interests in order to arrive at increasingly organized forms of collective solidarity. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations provides a favourable occasion to embark upon this gigantic political and moral effort, directed at achieving the three aims which inspire this United Nations General Assembly: peace, justice and progress.

101. Mr. MALIK (Indonesia): On behalf of the Indonesian delegation, may I be permitted first of all to extend our most sincere congratulations to Ambassador Hambro on his election as President of this memorable twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

102. His election to this high office is not only a recognition of his personal qualities and accomplishments, but is also, I am sure, a tribute to his country and the Norwegian people. It is our conviction that his competent leadership, special knowledge of and experience in the United Nations will bring us closer to the realization of the ideals and principles embodied in the Charter.

103. I should like to take this opportunity also to express my deep appreciation to the former President of the General Assembly, Her Excellency Mrs. Angie Brooks-Randolph, who guided us admirably through all the difficult proceedings during the last session.

104. I should like further to pay tribute to our esteemed Secretary-General U Thant and express our appreciation for his patient and single-minded endeavours in the cause of peace, and to assure him of Indonesia's unwavering support towards that end.

105. It was a great shock to me to learn upon my arrival here of the death of President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic. His death is not only a great loss to the Arab world. He has consistently championed the cause of the non-aligned and developing nations. For this we are greatly indebted to him. I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to extend, on behalf of my delegation, my deepest sympathies and feelings of grief and sorrow to the delegation of the United Arab Republic, and through it to the bereaved family and to the Government and people of the United Arab Republic on the sudden demise of their beloved President.

106. My delegation also joins me in expressing our deepest condolences to the delegation of Malaysia on

the occasion of the passing away of Mr. Radhakrishna Ramani. May I request the delegation of Malaysia to convey our sympathies to the bereaved family and the Government and people of the Federation of Malaysia.

107. This regular annual session of the General Assembly is marked distinctly by our programme to celebrate the silver jubilee of this Organization. Speaking from a personal point of view, we find it a most happy coincidence that, as this august Assembly commemorates the twenty-fifth year of the United Nations, Indonesia too rejoices in celebrating the twenty-fifth year of its independence, the more so since this Organization played a not insignificant part in the final stages of Indonesia's struggle for independence. In this respect I should like to confirm the remarks of His Excellency Mr. Luns, Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, that the solution of the question of West Irian last year, through the good offices of the United Nations, has indeed strengthened the relations between our two countries.

108. For both the United Nations and Indonesia it is indeed a time for sober analysis, not so much to reflect on our achievements in the past, but rather to measure whether we could improve the implements of the present to build a better future. This is the task that awaits us. The next generation has already reminded us seriously of this task when it met here during the World Youth Assembly. The theme "Peace, justice and progress" should not merely be a commemorative trimming; it must be translated into a more tangible meaning to be fully enjoyed by the generations that will succeed us. These are their hopes and aspirations. We must not fail them.

109. In assessing the present international situation, my delegation shares the views of many of the distinguished speakers who have spoken before me and expressed some degree of satisfaction on the *détente* among the major Powers.

110. Last year we were heartened by the statements on the ending of the cold war confrontation, signalling the beginning of a new era of negotiation. We have followed closely the developments of the strategic arms limitation talks between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. The world will indeed be grateful if these talks can open the way to broader agreements on disarmament and related matters.

111. We also welcome the German-Soviet non-aggression Treaty of 12 August 1970 as an important milestone in the history of international relations in post-war Europe, and as a concrete step towards reducing tension on that continent. Likewise we have followed also with great interest the preparations that are being made for a conference on European security.

112. Hopeful as the foregoing may appear, we are, however, still deeply concerned about developments in other parts of the world. The Middle East crisis, which constitutes perhaps the most dangerous of our immediate concerns, not only remains unsolved but has even deteriorated.

113. In August this year, with prospects for a settlement within our grasp, we were full of hope when the initial efforts of the United Nations mediator, Ambassador Jarring, produced a 90-day cease-fire. However, we feel obliged to express our serious misgivings about some of the latest developments, which have caused the situation in the Middle East to become more and more explosive. We have still time to arrest it. We began the cease-fire with 90 days in which to work. There are still 38 days left. Indonesia's position on this issue remains unchanged, and I can only repeat what I said last year. We feel that our vital interests are involved with the outcome of the struggle of our Arab brothers in the Middle East. We cannot condone acquisition of another's territory by military force. We believe that a just solution can be reached on the basis of Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. The withdrawal of Israeli forces to the lines they occupied before the June war, therefore, constitutes a key prerequisite for a negotiated settlement. Furthermore, no lasting solution can be attained without the full restoration of the inalienable and lawful rights of the Arab people of Palestine. My Government will continue to give full support to the further efforts of Ambassador Jarring, and it appeals at the same time particularly to the parties concerned to render him the necessary assistance and co-operation to carry out his difficult task.

114. Turning to our area, the Viet-Nam war has been aggravated by the events of March and April this year in Cambodia. This led to the expansion of the war in Viet-Nam. Concerned about these developments, Indonesia took the initiative of convening in Djakarta in May 1970 a conference of Foreign Ministers of countries in Asia and the Pacific to discuss the situation in Cambodia. We did not presume that a solution could be achieved by simply convening a meeting. That would be tantamount to doing great injustice to the gravity of the situation. On the other hand, Indonesia was of the opinion that the countries of South-East Asia could not remain mere onlookers awaiting their fate while the exigency of the situation became more and more threatening to the peace and tranquillity of South-East Asia as a whole. Something had to be done. The Djakarta conference was not designed to point the finger of judgement as to who was wrong or who was right. It was only to remind the countries and the international bodies concerned of their obligations and their responsibilities and to appeal to their conscience to initiate action of some sort which could at least alleviate the hardships and tribulations of the people of that region.

115. Those nations that have experienced wars of independence, as we have in Indonesia, should be aware of the sufferings, the years of devastation and tragedy that the people of Viet-Nam have had to endure as a result of foreign intervention. And the latter pattern, unfortunately, has again appeared in the internal development of Cambodia. Here too, outside interference and intervention from abroad have seriously afflicted Cambodia's internal affairs. The Djakarta conference therefore demanded among other things that all foreign troops be withdrawn forthwith from Cam-

bodia in order to facilitate the cessation of hostilities. It furthermore requested all parties to respect the sovereignty, independence, neutrality and integrity of the territory of Cambodia and to abstain completely from interfering in the internal affairs of that country. It also requested the co-Chairmen and all the participants of the Geneva Conference of 1954 to reconvene and to reactivate the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Cambodia.

116. I may add that the summit conference of non-aligned countries in Lusaka⁹ also expressed the hope that the Paris talks could help in finding a peaceful solution to the problems of Laos and Cambodia.

117. Surely, those are not impossible demands. On the contrary, they merely reflect a fervent hope, a sincere appeal to the parties concerned to help to restore in that part of the world conditions that are conducive to a life of peace and tranquillity.

118. Another long-standing and burning world issue which, in spite of our untiring efforts, remains unsolved is the liquidation of colonialism. Admittedly, many of the once colonized territories now have registered membership in the United Nations as sovereign and independent nations. We must, however, not be blind to the fact that approximately more than 40 million of the world's citizens are still suffering under colonial oppression.

119. In southern Africa, this problem has become even more aggravated by the condemnable policy of *apartheid* and racialism of South Africa, Portugal and the illegal minority racist régime of Southern Rhodesia. In this particular context, I should like to mention the cases of Namibia, Zimbabwe and the colonial territories of Portugal—Angola, Mozambique and Guinea (Bissau). If allowed to remain unchecked, such a policy may yet cause the outbreak of a racial war.

120. Indonesia will continue to support the struggle for freedom and independence of the oppressed peoples and resolutely condemns the policy of *apartheid* and racialism now being perpetrated in southern Africa.

121. Permit me to add a word on the question of hijacking as a most disturbing and dangerous means of political expression. Forcible diversion of civil aircraft in flight cannot be condoned as a means of bringing attention to a cause or giving vent to grievances, irrespective of their merits. My Government fully endorsed resolution 2551 (XXIV), and in accordance with that resolution is currently engaged in drafting a law on the relevant matter.

122. I should like now to turn to some of the specific issues on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly.

123. As an archipelago on the cross-road of two continents and two big oceans, Indonesia attaches great

importance to international activities with regard to questions concerning the sea in general, to the peaceful uses of the sea-bed and ocean floor and to the developments in the law of the sea in particular. We first welcomed the idea advanced last year by the United States and the USSR on a treaty on the demilitarization of the sea-bed and ocean floor, and we hope that a treaty to prohibit the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the sea-bed can soon be agreed upon.

124. The question of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond national jurisdiction seems to be very complicated. As we had agreed last year, we had hoped to see this year a complete set of principles governing the use of the international sea-bed area which would form the basis of an international régime and the future machinery to regulate the exploitation of sea-bed resources. We note the different views of the delegations in the Committee¹⁰ and the inability of the Committee to complete its task. But we also note certain areas of agreement. We hope that, as the Chairman of the Committee stated, a report can be produced by the middle of November so that we may be able to discuss it in our present session.

125. The question of the representation of China should be considered in the context of the principle of universality of the United Nations. In this respect, my delegation would like to reiterate its position that the People's Republic of China should be given its rightful place in this world body. Based on the same principle, modalities should also be studied in order to enable countries outside the United Nations, including those which are still divided, to participate in the activities of the Organization and its agencies.

126. My delegation is fully aware of the importance of the problems relating to disarmament. They are all aimed at strengthening international peace and security. Towards that end my delegation will continue to co-operate with other delegations when the matter comes up for discussion in the First Committee.

127. Of pressing and utmost importance among the items on our agenda is no doubt the question of the Second United Nations Development Decade.

128. Ten years ago the United Nations initiated a framework of programmes to direct a major, concerted attack on the global issues of economic and social progress by launching the First Development Decade. Since that time, new institutions have been established and new measures taken, designed to meet specific problem areas. Despite these commendable actions, however, countless millions of people in the developing part of the world still suffer the agonies of hunger, disease, malnutrition, illiteracy and unemployment. In addition, these are compounded by the problems of race, urbanization, population pressures and the deteriorating human environment. The exigencies of these problems, both old and new, require an integrated approach to bring about their solution.

⁹ Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka, Zambia, from 8 to 10 September 1970.

¹⁰ Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

129. A review and appraisal of the efforts of the last ten years have established that a major stumbling block to achieving the goals of the First Development Decade was the lack of determined commitment on the part of some industrialized countries. The reluctance of these nations to follow up their verbal endorsement of those aims with the political and financial commitment for their implementation is, I believe, rooted in their preoccupation with military and other considerations. This leads to an over-emphasis of the role of defence and security as compared to the other equally urgent requirements of economic and social welfare. This fact is readily evidenced by the disproportionate amounts spent by the industrialized countries on military expenditures, amounting last year alone to over \$200 thousand million dwarfing the comparatively small amounts allocated as aid to the developing nations.

130. We have come to realize and value the inherent connexion between international peace, social justice and economic progress. However, if nations continue to view international considerations in a limited perspective of restricted national interests, and if they maintain their present system of priorities, then the Second Development Decade will be doomed to suffer the same fate as its predecessor. Therefore, it is imperative that participating nations go beyond the narrow, nationalistic considerations which have, until now, governed the priorities of industrialized countries.

131. If we are to solve the interrelated issues of world peace and global development, then we must adopt a broader concept of world order, and establish new standards and priorities by which to reallocate resources and to guide our future actions along the path of global development.

132. Therefore, my delegation appeals to all the countries concerned, regardless of their political, economic or social systems, to assume this broader perspective of global order. Recognizing that the continuing economic and social disparities prevalent in today's world constitute a volatile situation which threatens world peace and security, we call on the international community to resolve the problems of economic and social dichotomies between the developing and the developed nations. We urge all Governments to give their full support to the completion of the international development strategy and the launching of the Second Development Decade, in a spirit of true collective responsibility and international solidarity.

133. Like the United Nations, Indonesia too enters this year its twenty-sixth year of existence as a member of the international community of independent nations. We have survived the sufferings caused by the normal diseases of infant years, including attempts to break up the unity and integrity of the nation, or even to change the state philosophy, the *Pancha Shila*. All those attempts met only with failure. The unity of the nation on the basis of the *Pancha Shila* has grown stronger than ever before.

134. In the true spirit of the *Pancha Shila* we have intensified our efforts to accelerate the country's economic development and to strengthen our regional co-operation schemes. Special mention in this regard must be made of the the Association of South-East Asian Nations—or ASEAN—which has already entered its third year of existence. It is with satisfaction and deep appreciation to the other members—Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and the Philippines—that we should like Members of the Assembly to take further note of its progress and achievements in the economic, social and cultural fields. Our joint projects are well under way. We will continue to strengthen ASEAN, in the spirit of the principles of "peace, justice and progress", and in the conviction that world peace is built on the foundations of peace with our neighbours. It is through the realization of peace with our neighbours that we can more positively contribute to peace for all mankind.

135. Mr. PREVATT (Trinidad and Tobago): Before commencing my statement, I should like to refer to the untimely and tragic death of President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic. President Nasser was a great statesman and leader who had made an invaluable contribution to the progress of the third world and I wish, on behalf of the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago, to associate myself with the eulogies so fittingly paid to him by previous speakers, and to extend to the Government and people of the United Arab Republic our sincerest condolences.

136. It is with great pleasure and satisfaction that I extend to Ambassador Hambro, on behalf of the Government and people of Trinidad and Tobago, congratulations and best wishes on his election to the Presidency of this Assembly. My delegation pledges its full co-operation, and is confident that he will successfully guide us in the important and far-ranging discussions that lie before us.

137. As we celebrate at this session the twenty-fifth anniversary of this Organization, it is fitting that we should give some thought to our past record so that we may draw from it such lessons as may enable us to make in the next 25 years more substantial progress in achieving the aims and objectives of the United Nations.

138. The first major point my delegation would wish to make concerns the principle of universality. It is the view of my delegation that acceptance of this principle by all the present Members of the United Nations would contribute immensely to the usefulness of the Organization as an instrument for peace and security. If this august Assembly shares my hope that the next 25 years of its existence may see more meaningful purpose and direction in its affairs, then it is time to ensure that those States which remain outside this world body are brought into it. To attempt to shape the future without the participation of those States, representing in one instance approximately one quarter of the world's population, is to deny the Organization the greater effectiveness of which it is capable.

139. It has now become obvious that the machinery of the Organization is out of date, and unresponsive to the changing demands of international life. We believe that it is urgently necessary to take steps to streamline our procedures, and we look forward to fruitful and constructive suggestions when we discuss the item on our agenda entitled "Rationalization of the procedures and organization of the General Assembly".

140. Our esteemed Secretary-General has found it necessary to call attention to the growing tendency for States to rely on the use of force as a means of settling their international differences. Such a tendency is particularly alarming for small States such as ours which find it impossible to protect their independence and territorial integrity against larger States, which are capable of mobilizing superior forces. I wish to reiterate my country's position: Trinidad and Tobago is unequivocally opposed to the use of force in the settlement of international disputes.

141. One approach to the task of achieving a peaceful and orderly world is through disarmament. The case for disarmament is irrefutable. Every peace-loving State, every State which is concerned with the survival of the human race, must, of necessity, lend its active support to efforts at ending the arms race and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and at reducing existing stockpiles of weapons. While it must be conceded that the United Nations has in the past made efforts to achieve this most desirable goal, the results so far have not been substantial, and we look forward to meaningful progress in this field in the not-too-distant future.

142. Peace cannot be finally attained simply by disarmament and non-recourse to war. We cannot have real and lasting peace if there is no hope for the underdeveloped, which in today's world comprise 80 per cent of the population but have access to no more than 20 per cent of its wealth.

143. The accelerated pace of the decolonization process in the past 25 years and the consequent increase in membership of the United Nations, from 51 Members at its inception to 126 Members at the present time, have transformed the world body in more than mere numerical terms. The United Nations has been brought face to face with the economic problems and needs for development assistance of most of the new nations in the Organization. It is to the credit of the United Nations that it has responded to the needs felt by the large majority of its Members and that increasing proportions of its attention and resources are concentrated upon programmes of assistance in the field of economic and social development.

144. It was the preoccupation of individual Governments with the problems of development, and the recognition on the part of the international community of the need for a combined attack on these problems, that led to the decision of the General Assembly on 19 December 1961 to proclaim the 1960s as the Decade of Development [*resolution 1710 (XVI)*]. I do not intend

to speak again of the expectations that were aroused by the First Development Decade and the disappointments that ensued by the end of it. Suffice it to say that for some of us the Decade was largely characterized by innumerable studies and analyses which identified the needs but which did not result in any significant fulfilment of those needs. These innumerable studies, reports, analyses and diagnoses are the foundations on which we can and must move forward to positive action.

145. In the Second Development Decade it is incumbent on us to arrive at concrete solutions to concrete programmes. That is why Trinidad and Tobago, together with the rest of the developing world, is convinced that in the development strategy for the 1970s, we must define in quantitative terms both the goals and targets for development in the Decade as well as the requirements to be met for the realization of those goals. We must also set ourselves a clear time-table for the adoption of the required policy measures if we are not to repeat the failures of the First Development Decade.

146. But, in the final analysis, however much opinions may differ about the nature and level of the targets to be set and the kinds of policy measures to be agreed upon in the international strategy for the Second Development Decade, it is the element of commitment, on the part of both developed and developing countries, which is crucial and indispensable to any effective approach to a concerted development effort. If this individual, mutual and reciprocal commitment to the strategy is lacking, we will have been engaged in another fruitless and wasteful exercise in formulating the development strategy for the 1970s.

147. It is impossible to deal here with all the problems of development. I should like merely to refer specifically to some of Trinidad and Tobago's major concerns in international economic relations. We do not think it unreasonable to ask developed countries to permit entry into their markets of goods produced in developing countries on the basis of a comparative advantage in the manufacture of such goods. At the root of this problem of access to markets is the fundamental question of the division of labour between the developed and the developing countries. We recognize that developed and developing countries have a certain number of persons engaged in the same lines of production. We feel, however, that other avenues can be found more easily by the developed countries for training or retraining such people, or absorbing them in other endeavours, and that they should be phased out of operations which result in the denial of markets to developing countries making valiant efforts to diversify their economies and employ their own people. We regard this question of the international division of labour as one of the more fertile fields for the manifestation of true co-operation in the international community. As yet, the developed countries have not been prepared, on the whole, to give up minor trading advantages that may be shown not to be of real, long-term interest to the developed countries themselves.

148. One well-known impediment to the economic development of the new nations, and a limiting factor in our trade relations, has been the fact that traditionally the developing countries have been linked not with one another but with a metropolitan Power, and we in the Caribbean, for example, were induced to compete with one another for limited benefits rather than to work together to enlarge the benefits which regional co-operation can confer. It has been one of our cardinal objectives in Trinidad and Tobago to preserve and strengthen our traditional links with the metropolitan countries, and at the same time to forge new links with our natural and immediate neighbours. Success so far is encouraging. The Caribbean Free Trade Area is functioning and the Caribbean Development Bank has begun to operate. Trinidad and Tobago will continue to seek to play a constructive role in promoting regional co-operation and closer harmony, not only between the islands of the Caribbean, but also between those islands and all our sister countries of Latin America.

149. In his address at the opening of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council in Caracas in February this year, the Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, speaking of regional and hemispheric economic solidarity, made specific mention of the question of the resumption of economic relations with Cuba. On that occasion my Prime Minister suggested that Cuba should not be excluded from efforts at regional economic co-operation in the Caribbean and in Latin America. We are happy to note that at this General Assembly there has been expression of acceptance of that view.

150. As regards financial resources for development, we in the developing countries are totally convinced of the paramount importance of the mobilization of domestic resources to supply as much as possible of our capital needs. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has promoted with substantial success, and is continuing to promote, the establishment of indigenous financial institutions. Nevertheless, because of our shortage of resources we need foreign private capital and foreign aid as adjuncts to our internal efforts, though these should never become the centre-piece of our development strategy. But we in the developing countries are engaged in an attempt to redefine the relationship between the developed countries and the developing countries so as to give economic content to our political independence. For that reason, given the need for financial and technical assistance from external sources, this need is best filled if such assistance is multilateral rather than bilateral, thereby easing somewhat the restrictions which are a part of tied aid.

151. The United Nations budget estimates for the financial year 1971 provide for sizable increases over last year's. But notwithstanding the tangible over-all budgetary increase, the tiny percentage allocated to new development projects remains virtually unchanged. I have already stated that Trinidad and Tobago favours the multilateral approach to development financing. We are therefore concerned at the more

tight-fisted attitude taken by major contributors in recent times in allocating funds to international organizations.

152. It has become commonplace to insist that the brunt of development efforts rests and must continue to rest with the developing countries themselves. We whole-heartedly agree with that principle and we are doing whatever is possible to inspire in our own people the dedication, the will and the effort needed in the development process. We wish to make the point, however, that it is in the interest of developed countries to support our efforts by adequate complementary measures, since our development will lead to stability, increased purchasing power, and therefore to a better atmosphere for trade, development and the lessening of world tension.

153. The permanent sovereignty that States possess over their natural resources is indisputable. It is a sovereignty that is all-embracing and carries with it the totality of rights of ownership. The General Assembly, in its myriad resolutions on this subject, has expressly recognized and reaffirmed the inherent right of all States to explore, conserve and exploit their natural resources, whether those resources are on land or in the marine areas adjacent to their coasts.

154. We are all agreed that the resources of the sea-bed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof lying beyond the limits of national jurisdiction belong to all mankind. My delegation envisages that the benefits to be derived from the exploitation of the resources of the area of the international zone will assist considerably in redressing the economic imbalances and inequities between developed and developing countries. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has nevertheless noted the warning sounded at the Geneva session of the sea-bed Committee of the consequences that might follow if consideration were given solely to the problem of the distribution of the benefits which may accrue from the exploitation of the marine resources, and not to all the economic and financial aspects of such exploitation as a whole. Justice demands that the exploitation of the resources of the sea-bed should be so conducted that it would not adversely affect the economy of developing countries, which are in many cases producers of commodities that are to be mined from the sea-bed and ocean floor. Over-production, with consequent market disruption and price fluctuations, could well offset any benefits developing countries may derive from the exploitation of the resources of the international sea-bed zone.

155. An urgent need therefore arises for rational and equitable management of the area and its resources. An international régime—including international machinery—for the international zone must be established at an early date if that common heritage is not to be consumed by wasteful exploitation and if we are to avoid abrasive colonial-type conflicts in this area. In the absence of a balanced and comprehensive declaration of principles governing activities in the zone, peace and order are not likely to prevail in the marine environment. My delegation wishes to express its pro-

found regret that the sea-bed Committee was unable to reach agreement at its August session in Geneva on such a declaration of principles. We participated actively in that session, and in spite of the unsatisfactory results we are nonetheless optimistic. We take comfort from the fact that on some important questions there is near agreement. What is heartening is that full agreement has been reached on the principles regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes and the promotion of scientific research.

156. At that session also the need to strengthen the scientific research capabilities of developing countries was stressed. Training is in the view of my delegation an integral part of the process of economic development. Training of personnel from the developing countries in sea-bed operations must be an essential activity of any international machinery to be established. We strongly recommend that prior to the establishment of an international régime for the international sea-bed zone, and its subsidiary body, the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and other agencies within the United Nations family should consider intensifying, expanding and expediting their programmes for the training of nationals of developing countries in the various aspects of marine science and technology.

157. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago attaches the greatest importance to this question. It is our hope that the specialized agencies will take positive action towards strengthening the scientific infrastructure of the developing countries, and we would suggest that the United Nations Development Programme, in the context of the Long-Term and Expanded Programme of Oceanic Exploration and Research, should direct its attention to the establishment and funding of regional oceanographic institutions in the developing countries. Developing countries will be able to participate meaningfully in the international sea-bed régime when it comes into force and effect, hopefully in the near future, only if such programmes for training are intensified and such oceanographic institutions established at an early date.

158. The problems of the law of the sea are intimately interrelated. The law of the sea as it now exists is the creature of the developed countries, especially of the maritime Powers, which formulated it with their own interests in mind. Moreover, in the Conferences on the Law of the Sea held in 1958 and 1960, many of the developing countries were unable to participate, as they got their independence only in the last decade. My delegation, during the last session of the General Assembly, was one of the main proponents of the view that a new conference on the law of the sea should be convened to deal comprehensively with all the organically interrelated problems of the marine environment. In the 12 years since the adoption of the 1958 Geneva Convention rapidly developing technology has in fact made the law obsolete. These conferences did not provide substantive rules for the exploration and exploitation of the resources of the international zone. As developing countries, for far

too long we have had to abide by laws made for us by the major metropolitan countries. The time has now come when we must ourselves assist in a progressive development of the law in this area. If a new conference is held to deal with these matters, a large number of the Members of this Assembly will be pronouncing themselves on these questions for the first time. For all these reasons, and especially because the problems of the law of the sea are intimately interrelated, Trinidad and Tobago supports the holding of a new conference to deal comprehensively with these matters and rejects any piecemeal approach.

159. The importance of non-economic factors in the process of development is universally recognized. Development is as much a human and social problem as it is an economic problem. The goal of development is to assure to each and every citizen his or her full measure of human dignity by building in each country a humane and equal society with its own political, economic and cultural identity. Even if a country is economically developed, if the overwhelming majority of the citizens of that country are denied their fundamental human rights and freedoms, such a country must be deemed to have denied itself the rights and privileges enjoyed by civilized States, and free men everywhere are obliged to assist in bringing freedom to its oppressed citizens.

160. At the third non-aligned summit conference recently held in Zambia, where I led my country's delegation, Trinidad and Tobago unreservedly endorsed the Lusaka Declaration. Trinidad and Tobago uncompromisingly asserts the right of the peoples who are not yet free, to freedom, self-determination and independence. We support the legitimate struggle of the people of southern Africa and people everywhere against the policy of *apartheid* and racist discrimination in their search for the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and in the spirit of the United Nations Charter we demand the complete liquidation of colonial structure wherever it exists, and more immediately in southern Africa, in Namibia, in Zimbabwe, in Angola, in Mozambique and in Guinea (Bissau).

161. I have tried to articulate the hopes and expectations of Trinidad and Tobago as a member of the developing world. In addition to the inevitable change which the increase in the Organization's membership has brought about, the developing nations have brought to the world body a wider conception of what constitutes a threat to peace and activated the provisions of the Charter enjoining the employment of international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples. Development can take place only in an ordered community, in which inter-State relations are conducted in accordance with the rule of law. We are therefore particularly pleased to see the word "justice", which is the mother of all good law, inscribed in the motto marking the silver jubilee of our Organization.

162. With faith in the future of our Organization and with confidence in our ability to live up to the principles

and ideals of our Charter, we look forward to the next 25 years.

163. The PRESIDENT: Several States have indicated their wish to exercise their right of reply. It is proposed to call upon them in the order in which their requests were received.

164. Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) (*interpretation from French*): I am sorry to have to take the floor at this late hour, but I had no choice.

165. I listened with interest to the statement made by His Excellency Giuseppe Lupis, Head of the Italian delegation and Cabinet Minister. Mr. Lupis expressed his regret for the problems which have arisen between Libya and the Italian Republic during the past few years. We for our part regret that he saw fit to refer to those problems between Italy and Libya here in this Assembly. We regret this above all because we are at present in contact with and having discussions with the Italian Government in order to remove those problems which are the vestiges of a colonial past. We had hoped, and we continue to hope, that this matter will be settled by common consent between these two neighbouring and friendly States.

166. The steps which have been taken in Libya by the revolutionary council and by the Revolutionary Government of Libya were in fact national necessities. They were part and parcel of the liberation of our country from the vestiges and marks left by our colonial past. Those measures were in fact and should be considered as being necessary prerequisites to bringing about normal relations between our country and democratic Italy.

167. I hope that the Italian delegation, which represents modern democratic Italy, will not try to defend before this august gathering a community which was created by settlers who were themselves the remnants and vestiges of a colonial past of which our Italian friends are well aware, and from which we Libyans have suffered so much.

168. The Head of the Italian delegation referred to international law and to international traditions. May I simply say to him that, in modern international law and present-day international relationships, decolonization has become a basic rule underlying all international activities. What Libya did should have been done 20 years ago. We did it, like most countries represented here which belong to Africa or Asia and which have emerged from a colonial past, but we did it a little later. Only a year ago did we carry out our national revolution, our progressive revolution.

169. When Libya did away with foreign bases, when Libya got rid of the last foreign soldiers, it was quite normal that it should rid its economy and its life of those problems which remain a barrier to genuine friendship between us and the Italian people.

170. We in Libya were under Italian occupation for approximately 35 years. The Libyan people suffered

the rigours of foreign occupation at a time when there was neither a United Nations nor any international community as we have them today. More than one third of the Libyan population was wiped out. We fought against Italian fascism, we fought for the liberation of our country and we achieved our independence. We have nevertheless maintained relations with our former colonizers and have established normal relations with Italy. But there remained the problem of those settlements and of the property which had been wrested and stolen from the Libyan people. All that the Libyan revolution did was to restore to the Libyan people the property which was theirs.

171. I do not wish to say more. I do not wish to paint a gloomy picture of the past, of which we are all aware, but I reserve my right, on behalf of my delegation, to speak again after having studied the document which has been distributed and which contains the statement made by the Minister of the Italian Republic.

172. I only wish to say that discussions are now going on between the two countries. I have just received a statement made by the Foreign Minister of Italy in the Chamber of Deputies on 24 September, when he referred to this problem. He said then that he had received "a friendly and courteous" letter from the new Foreign Minister of Libya and added that "discussions between the two countries are under way". He likewise confirmed the "express desire of the Libyan Government to resume co-operation between the two countries".

173. I do not wish to speak at any greater length on this point, but I would reserve the right of my delegation to speak again. I would simply have wished that the Italian delegation had not referred to this problem here while the discussions between our two Governments are still under way.

174. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): In his statement this morning the representative of Syria stated that the British Parliament had taken a decision to supply arms to South Africa. I simply wish to point out that that statement was inaccurate. No such decision has been taken by the British Parliament or by the United Kingdom Government.

175. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): When I listened this afternoon to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Iran I nurtured a glimmer of hope when he spoke about the question of Bahrain and specified that a genuine desire for peace with justice through international conciliation, co-operation and understanding was his country's policy. I was particularly hopeful because his statement came after the reasonable and generous offer made by my Foreign Minister in his statement in the general debate yesterday [*1854th meeting*]. I thought that at long last Iranian foreign policy would be forever rid of the last vestiges and traces of territorial aggrandizement.

176. We know that Iran had laid a claim to Bahrain that was totally rejected by its people, as was shown

in the report of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General.¹¹ It was totally ignored and never taken seriously by the international community, and at long last Iran has shown an appreciation of the realities of the international situation and accepted the face-saving formula that was found.

177. In my opinion, that is a way out of an illegal and inadmissible situation. I felt that here was an opportunity whereby Iran could also extricate itself from a position that was illegal and unacceptable. Unfortunately, when I listened to the statement of the Foreign Minister of Iran I was very disappointed and distressed.

178. As I mentioned earlier, it was disappointing because my Foreign Minister said yesterday that wherever and whenever there was a dispute between Iraq and Iran regarding the provisions of the valid Boundary Treaty of 1937 between the two countries, Iraq was willing to abide by the ruling of the International Court of Justice. We said that in complete faith and complete solemnity, but apparently it was not accepted by the Foreign Minister of Iran.

179. The second reason for my disappointment is this: Iran is a country with a long history of international relations. Its representative, the man most responsible for formulating its policy, informed this august body that a solemnly ratified and binding Boundary Treaty between two countries is, to use his words, a dead letter. I feel that that statement, coming at a time of respect for the sanctity of treaties between States and adherence to the principles of the Charter among which is respect for treaties, is not only disappointing but shows a total disregard for the sense of occasion of this particular session and this body, which is essentially based on respect for law and the willingness of States to abide by their contractual obligations.

180. When Iran unilaterally abrogated its border Treaty with Iraq, that action was accompanied by the massing of troops and statements threatening to use force against Iraq in support of that illegal act. Among those who made such statements was the Foreign Minister of Iran. It was done publicly, and privately to a number of personalities who tried to intercede on that issue.

181. The concentration of troops, threats, violations of Iraqi territorial integrity and interference in the internal affairs of Iraq reached an intolerable level in January 1969. We used the utmost restraint. We felt that we should resort to international machinery, which can be most useful and is able to deal with such explosive situations. We requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to send a representative or representatives to the border between Iraq and Iran to see the dangerous and provocative nature of the Iranian concentration of troops and to judge the invalidity of Iranian allegations that there was a similar concentration of troops on our side of the border.

182. Now the Foreign Minister of Iran has come and told us that Iran concentrated troops on the border because we did so first. Then, at the end of his statement, he said that Iraq had chosen a safe sanctuary for its forces. I cannot judge the ability of Iranian troops, but do they think that makes it safe for Iraqi troops?

183. I do not want to take any more of the time of this august body, and I know the hour is very late. But Iraq and Iran are neighbours. Relations between the two peoples are so historically bound through tradition, culture and inter-marriage that I am sure they harbour nothing but love for each other. It is the Government of Iran that must respect its treaty obligations, the rule of law and the accepted ways and norms for States to deal with each other. It is called upon to show such respect. As my Foreign Minister said yesterday, if Iran has any quarrels, disputes or complaints regarding the provisions of the Treaty of our conduct regarding those provisions, then the International Court of Justice is the body to which it can resort, and I solemnly declare from this rostrum that we are willing to accept its judgment.

184. The Foreign Minister of Iran comes and tells us that he is willing to start negotiating with Iraq. Now, what would those negotiations be about? To be clear on this matter, I am sure that all representatives here are fully aware that what the Foreign Minister has invited Iraq to negotiate is the establishment of a new border between countries who have for thousands of years—for all eternity—been living next to each other, who are bound by a Treaty defining their borders that has been in effect for the past 50 years. I am sure all representatives realize the unacceptability of that logic. And, in addition, what faith, trust or value can we place in new negotiations or a new treaty when, with such ease, with such whimsy, a binding, legal, solemnly ratified Treaty can be called a dead letter?

185. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I regret that the Italian delegation has to speak again in this meeting in order to exercise its right of reply. Since I have to do so, may I first of all offer our condolences to the delegation of Malaysia on the passing away of Ambassador Ramani. He was well known and highly esteemed in our midst since his first term of office as Permanent Representative of his country to the United Nations. He was a distinguished diplomatist. He left many friends and many affections here. We share sincerely the mourning of the Malaysian Government and the Malaysian delegation.

186. This morning we were gratified to hear from the Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Unity and Foreign Affairs of Libya what sounded like a strong rededication to the principles and purposes of the Charter as well as a firm pledge to abide by the resolutions of the United Nations. Permit me, Sir, to quote from his speech. He stated:

“ . . . the United Nations has repeatedly failed to implement scores of resolutions and recommendations adopted in the past twenty-five years, concern-

¹¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fifth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1970*, document S/9772.

ing the rights of oppressed peoples, self-determination and the achievement of the goals of social justice, economic development and the protection of human rights.” [1856th meeting, para. 117.]

187. In another part of his statement he said:

“We believe that the cause of the Organization’s shortcomings lies less in the United Nations than in the failure of certain countries to honour their obligations under the Charter.” [Ibid., para. 119.]

188. Finally, the Chairman of the Libyan delegation, in dealing with the Middle Eastern question, recalled the

“... United Nations resolutions calling for the return of the Palestinian people to their occupied homes, lands, property, and farms, or for compensation for those who do not wish to return.” [Ibid., para. 121.]

189. I should like to make it clear that I am not identifying every single position. But the statement that we have heard this afternoon from the representative of Libya raises many serious questions about the value and the meaning attributed by his delegation to General Assembly resolutions and to obligations originated by treaties freely entered into by States. We deeply appreciate the very moderate and kind terms in which His Excellency Mr. Kikhia has just spoken. I want to make this quite clear: we are not questioning, we are not discussing now, the arguments which have been put forward by the Libyan delegation. We are certainly not discussing or questioning here the process of decolonization. My country has always supported that process and we will always do so with the strongest conviction. And I think everybody can testify to the fact that Italy has done its best to accelerate that movement for the emancipation of African Countries.

190. However, since we are speaking about resolutions and obligations in the international field, I must recall in this connexion that the situation of the Italian nationals in Libya was extensively regulated by General Assembly resolution 388 A (V), article VI of 15 December 1950 and by the agreement provided for by that resolution and concluded successfully between Italy and Libya on 2 October 1956. After becoming a Member of the United Nations Libya took part in the work of the General Assembly for the full implementation of resolution 388 A (V).

191. The Libyan Government expressed its approval of General Assembly resolution 792 (VIII) which recalls resolution 388 (V). The Libyan representative expressed his approval—I am speaking of the Libyan representative of that time—of the measures adopted by the General Assembly for the implementation of resolution 388 (V), for instance at the 465th meeting of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly on 29 November 1955. The Government of Libya subsequently expressed its approval of resolution 988 (X) of 6 December 1955, which also confirms resolution 388 (V), and contains measures for the implementation of that resolution, thus accepting in full the said resolu-

tion 388 (V). Article VI of resolution 388 (V) contains provisions for the protection of the rights and interests of the Italian nationals in Libya. It states, in fact, that the property and rights and interests of the Italian nationals in Libya shall be respected and shall not be treated less favourably than the property, rights and interests of other foreign nationals. Pursuant to that resolution, the Italian and Libyan Governments on 2 October 1956 signed an agreement whose article 9 reads:

“The Government of Libya declares”—also pursuant to the provisions of article VI, paragraph I of the same resolution 388 (V)—“concerning the respect of the rights and interests of the Italian nationals in Libya that no claim, even by individuals may be moved against the property of the Italian nationals in Libya because of deeds by the Government and by the former Italian administration of Libya accomplished prior to the establishment of the State of Libya.”

192. Paragraph 2 of the same article contains the following provision:

“The Government of Libya guarantees, therefore, to the Italian nationals, owners of property in Libya, within the observance of the Libyan law, the free and direct exercise of their rights.”

193. I believe that to be in a position to advocate—and I refer to what I said at the beginning of my statement—respect for the resolutions of the General Assembly, any delegation should feel as its first duty to respect all resolutions, creating obligations for it or any international instrument or treaty to which its country is a party.

194. Now, contrary to the obligations I have just spoken about, taken by the Libyan Government, this Government, on 21 July 1970, issued a decree confiscating, without indemnity, the real property of the Italian nationals living in Libya. The decree specifies that the term “real property” covers the agricultural, non-agricultural and desertic lands and all immovables of any kind, including whatever there may be on or in them: fixtures, means of transportation, livestock and all working tools. Moreover, after the confiscation resulting from the decree of 21 July 1970, the Libyan Government issued a series of other measures against the Italian nationals that constitute many violations of the general principles of international law, of the Italian-Libyan Agreement, and of the United Nations resolution.

195. There have been serious measures taken to restrict the personal liberty of the Italian nationals, who were not allowed to leave their farms. Italian nationals calling on our diplomatic and consular offices were searched and there have been sequestrations of valuables that they were carrying. Bank accounts were frozen and an invitation was issued not to pay the credits of the Italian nationals.

196. Now, how can these measures be considered consistent with the obligations taken by Libya in

accordance with the aforesaid resolution, with the Treaty signed by the Libyan Government, and with the United Nations Charter altogether? That is the question I put.

197. The Chairman of the Libyan delegation has spoken of the Italian inhabitants in Libya in such terms as to identify them with European settlers elsewhere in Africa, or, even worse, with fascism. It is a well-known fact that fascism was overthrown in Italy 27 years ago. Is it possible to consider 20,000 Italians, many of them, if not most of them, born after 1943, as belonging to the fascist party which no longer exists since the Republic of Italy was established? These are all questions that I wanted to put here before the Assembly.

198. I am ready to follow our colleagues from Libya when they say that they want to handle this issue which has been raised, not by us, or through any initiative on our part, but by the measures that I have just listed. In short, how can we deal with this problem if there is not the same spirit, the same will, to respect not only the spirit of the Charter but also the resolutions of one of the principal organs of the United Nations when they create obligations?

199. I think it can hardly be said that Italy is not always willing to hear the other side, to try to come to terms, to try to negotiate. We have shown on several occasions that we are. The head of the Italian delegation today has indicated what we have done with regard to other neighbour countries. We are always ready to negotiate, but certainly not under duress. Is this in accordance with the resolution? We do not pretend, furthermore, that resolutions are eternal. We do not pretend that international treaties are eternal. But there are procedures to be followed; there are ways to proceed in accordance with the Charter. We have all accepted obligations under the Charter and we are all faithful—we should all be faithful—to the Charter. But to show that we are faithful to the Charter, we must first of all show that we respect and implement the provisions of the Charter and General Assembly resolutions which have not been objected to by the delegations concerned.

200. Now I go back to the offer to go on with our negotiations. It certainly is our will. The Chairman of the Libyan delegation mentioned the statement made by our Foreign Minister before, I think, the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the Chamber of Deputies. May I call the attention of Mr. Kikhia, the Chairman of the Libyan delegation, to the fact that the Chairman of our delegation stated exactly the same thing this afternoon? Even in the summary which he gave of his own statement, after having made a very short mention of what has happened in relation to our countries, he ended by using the following words which I would like to quote again:

“We are still convinced that a solution through bilateral negotiations to problems pending between Italy and Libya might constitute the basis for the resumption of fruitful co-operation between the two

countries. We hope that such a solution may be reached in conformity with the principles of international law and of the United Nations Charter.” [See para. 90 above.]

201. I think that what I have said is exactly in the spirit of that statement. In taking note of what the representative of Libya has just said, I should like to draw his attention to this final statement.

202. Mr. VAKIL (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): Yesterday, I announced from this rostrum [1854th meeting] that our Foreign Minister would provide the necessary explanation today in the statement which he was going to make before the General Assembly, in connexion with the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Iraq. The representative of Iraq immediately asked for the floor and he came up to this platform to reply to questions that we had not yet raised. He replied to questions which we had not raised, because I had said that my Foreign Minister, during his statement today, would provide the necessary information with regard to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Iraq.

203. I wonder, then, where this misunderstanding originated. Perhaps we do not use the same terminology. Perhaps the language which we use is not very well understood by our neighbours from Iraq.

204. To give a single example, the efforts of peace and conciliation which we have made to resolve the question of Bahrain were unanimously applauded by the Security Council. The Secretary-General was good enough to mention them specifically in his introduction to his annual report [A/8001/Add.1 and Corr.1]. The Permanent Representative of Iraq then came up to this platform to qualify our attitude as being a manoeuvre to save face.

205. I think that that really is where the difficulty has arisen. I think that is why we do not succeed in making our Iraqi friends understand us.

206. I do not want to take up the time of the Assembly to reply to questions which he raised today. I have already said yesterday that all those questions appear in letters which not only he himself but also his predecessors addressed to the President of the Security Council and to which I replied on behalf of my Government. There is absolutely nothing new in what his Minister said yesterday and today, and I therefore do not want to take up any more of the Assembly's time. But I insist on telling him that Iran maintains relations of good-neighbourliness, friendship and co-operation with all the adjacent countries except Iraq. Thus, no one can accuse us of not showing sufficient goodwill to improve our relations. He said that there were very close relations between the people of Iraq and the people of Iran. Naturally. But to overcome this crisis and to resume those relations, goodwill and sincerity are required. I can assure him that we are ready to undertake conversations with Iraq in that spirit.

207. Mr. RASHID (Pakistan): In an Assembly session which has peace, justice and progress as its theme

recriminations are out of place. I regret that, on Tuesday [1853rd meeting], in reply to my advisedly moderate statement on India-Pakistan problems, the Foreign Minister of India thought fit to make some intemperate remarks, freely resorting to invective. While his strong words can easily be ignored, his allegations need to be refuted. However, before I do so, comment is necessary on three elements in his statement.

208. The first of those elements consisted of insinuations meant to create a wedge between Pakistan and its Arab brethren. The Indian Minister has the temerity to attempt to draw a parallel between Pakistan and Israel. In doing so he seemed to be ignorant of the laws of Israel or of Pakistan or, more probably, of both. There is no law of ingathering in Pakistan. Muslims number more than 500 million around the world. No Muslim State now or in history has attempted to ingather them or declared such ingathering as its aim. The Muslims of Pakistan are the indigenous people of the land who fought for and won independence for themselves. If that fact had not been still rankling in certain chauvinistic Indian hearts, the Indian Foreign Minister would not have made such an insinuation. But he did not rest content with it. He forgot himself so much as to bring in the revered memory of the departed Arab leader whose passing we mourn. Mr. Swaran Singh accused us of trying at this time to "create discord between two neighbouring countries" [ibid., para. 236]. One would have thought that the memory of the departed hero was too sacred to be dragged into India-Pakistan disputes. But to Mr. Swaran Singh it is just grist to the mill of his propaganda. He knows well that the dispute between India and Pakistan has existed for 23 years and continues, and, because of India's intransigence, shows no sign of easement even today. Is there any concord between India and Pakistan which we are trying to upset?

209. It is no use talking of the Tashkent Declaration¹² in the manner that the Indian Foreign Minister did. That Declaration was meant to be the beginning of a process of peacefully resolving all outstanding disputes. When a peaceful solution is being persistently obstructed by India, it is not honest on the part of India to refer to that Declaration as if it embodied a final settlement. To do so is to be unfair not only to Pakistan but also to the intentions and policies of the third party, the Government of the Soviet Union, whose good offices brought about that Declaration.

210. The second element was the note of sanctimoniousness, the self-flattering posture which has become a habit with India. There was the usual talk of "free press in India". A picturesque phrase was added: "wide and intense freedom". That intense freedom was exemplified only a month ago by the closing of the offices in New Delhi of the British Broadcasting Corporation, an agency of wide repute. As *The New York Times* reported on 27 August: "The action came after a television documentary about poverty and religious rites of India led to an angry dispute between Britain and India."

¹² Signed by the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan on 10 January 1966.

211. The documentary shown was produced by a well-known French film producer and had been critically acclaimed in France. But its artistic merit notwithstanding, it incurred the wrath of the Government of India simply because it sought to depict Indian realities objectively. So much for "the wide and intense freedom" in India. I presume the Foreign Minister of India does sometimes listen to statements made in the Indian Parliament. Do I have to remind him of what members of the opposition say about the denial of economic opportunity, the persecution, the suppression of minority groups and dissident elements?

212. The third element in the Indian Minister's statement seems to be based on a complete ignorance of the purposes of the general debate in the General Assembly. What is the general debate meant for if it does not give Member States an opportunity to express their viewpoints on international problems as these impinge on them? India always says that it will not mention the India-Pakistan question during the general debate. Of course it does not do so—for the simple reason that it wants the world to forget the problem. It is in forcible occupation of Kashmir; why should it wish the world to be reminded of that fact? But Pakistan is the aggrieved party. How can it not mention Kashmir in its statement? The India-Pakistan question is not something outside the agenda of the United Nations: it is a question of which the Security Council is seized and which it has been unable so far to resolve. It is a question on which India refuses serious negotiations. Can we bury it in silence? Is it a waste of time to talk about unresolved disputes? There is only a slight difference between what India says about Pakistan wasting the Assembly's time by talking of India-Pakistan problems and what certain Powers say about African States wasting the time of the United Nations by talking about conditions in southern Africa.

213. There was another insinuation in the Indian Minister's statement. It was rather puzzling. He said that the future rulers of Pakistan "... may even draw from the lesson of modern trends in Europe and elsewhere" [ibid., para. 220]. Let me tell him that the rulers of Pakistan, present or future, will look to Asia and Africa, to the great forces of liberation, the self-determination of peoples, the search for economic justice, the movement for regaining the dignity of man as the source of inspiration.

214. With regard to Europe, we wish that India would draw the proper lesson from the experience of those countries which forcibly tried to impose alien régimes on other peoples. If it did so, it would change its attitude on Kashmir as France so wisely did on Algeria.

215. Let me now come to some concrete points in the Indian Minister's statement which can be briefly answered. He talked of opening trade and travel facilities between India and Pakistan. What are these compared to the settlement of those disputes which have persistently hampered the establishment of good relations between the two countries? Are these not just peripheral issues? We urge on India the necessity to realize that it is no use pretending that there is a

secure peace when it does not in fact exist. Time and again India rejects this approach. The Indian Minister said that, in discussion between the two countries, "there should be no insistence that one side must accept in advance the priorities of the other side" [*ibid.*, para. 219]. That seemingly innocuous statement is only a cover for India's insistence that minor matters be discussed between the two countries and that the major dispute, the one concerning the state of Jammu and Kashmir in particular, be frozen and shelved. The priorities we suggest are not our priorities; they are the priorities of peace. Settle major disputes, and everything else will follow. But India's approach is: settle all minor matters and leave the causes of tension alone. That is the approach that foredooms all attempts at establishing good-neighbourly relations between us.

216. Then the Indian Minister, in resisting the idea of self-determination for the people of Kashmir, went so far as to say that India and Pakistan do not owe their independent existence to the principle of self-determination. In saying so he has done less than justice not only to my country, Pakistan, but also to his own. To his way of thinking Pakistan and India came into existence "as a result of a political settlement between the Indian National Congress, the Muslim League and the British Government" [*ibid.*, para. 222]. To his way of thinking, therefore, both India and Pakistan are nothing but the gifts of imperial Britain. In fairness to both India and Pakistan I must correct his notion. What was there behind that political settlement except the overwhelming will of the two peoples for independent nationhood? The exercise of self-determination admits of many modalities, but every one of these has to satisfy one basic criterion: it has to ensure the uncoerced expression of the will of the people concerned. In the circumstances prevailing in the sub-continent on the eve of independence, elections and referendums were the appropriate modalities and these were employed with a fairness which was not questioned by any side.

217. It is this free exercise of self-determination which is being denied to Kashmir. The Indian Minister should be familiar by now with the jurisprudence of the United Nations, which does not and cannot accept that elections organized by any interested party can be a substitute for the ascertainment of the will of a people under impartial auspices. In this context India's position is identical with that of the colonial Powers. In many situations those Powers asserted that they had held elections in a certain Territory and that that was the end of the matter as far as that Territory's self-determination was concerned. It is not without significance that a certain colonial Power once cited India's arguments on Kashmir as clear support for its own attitude.

218. Next, the Indian Minister asserted that India had said at the very outset that the accession of Kashmir to India was complete in both law and fact. Let me refresh his memory by quoting the following statements which were made by India and are on the record of the Security Council. At the 234th meeting of the Security Council, referring to the acceptance by India of

the accession affected by the Maharajah, the feudal ruler of Kashmir, the representative of India stated:

"The Indian Government was careful . . . to stipulate that it was accepting the accession only on the condition that later, when peace had been restored, the expression of the popular will should be ascertained in a proper manner. It was on that condition, and that condition alone, that the Indian Government accepted accession."¹³

219. Then at the 239th meeting another Indian representative stated:

"As the Security Council is aware, the Government of India is fully committed to the view that, after peace is restored and all people belonging to the State have returned there, a free plebiscite should be taken and the people should decide whether they wish to remain with India, to go over to Pakistan or to remain independent, if they chose to do so."¹⁴

220. Indeed, a distinguished representative of India, the late Sir B. N. Rau, who was a famous jurist and later became a member of the International Court of Justice, stated in the Security Council—I refer to the record of the 463rd meeting—that Kashmir had acceded to India "tentatively". I repeat: "tentatively".

221. With regard to the Indian Minister's statement in the context of Kashmir that an integral part of a country cannot be separated by a plebiscite, let me tell him that Kashmir is not a part of India. He would also profit from consulting the statement made by one of his predecessors, Mr. Krishna Menon, who was particularly venomous against Pakistan, at the 767th meeting of the Security Council, when he said:

"If, as a result of a plebiscite, the people decided that they did not want to stay with India, then our duty at that time would be to adopt those constitutional procedures which would enable us to separate that territory."¹⁵

The word "duty" deserves to be stressed.

222. Actually, by his statement relating to Kashmir the Indian Foreign Minister confirmed the truth of my remarks. By saying that India's "position remains unchanged" [*1853rd meeting, para. 222*], he himself brought out the hollowness of his other statement that his Government is prepared to discuss with Pakistan all matters, including Kashmir.

223. Then he repeated the familiar Indian allegation that "Pakistan occupies by force a large part . . . of Kashmir" [*ibid.*, para. 226]. He even added the rather threatening remark: "This must end" [*ibid.*]. Let me remind him of Pakistan's standing offer, solemnly made and repeated before the United Nations and the whole world, that in fulfilment of the international agreement

¹³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, 234th meeting, p. 217.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 239th meeting, p. 328.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, Twelfth Year, 767th meeting, para. 68.

between India and Pakistan we are prepared to withdraw all our forces from Jammu and Kashmir as soon as India undertakes to do likewise, so that the people of Kashmir will be free to decide their future without any outside interference, pressure or coercion. Let India fulfil its part of the agreement; it will not find us stalling. There will not be a day's delay on our part. As to whether we committed aggression, the best authority to answer that question is the people of Kashmir. Let them answer the question. The only way they can answer it is by being enabled to vote either for India or for Pakistan in a plebiscite. But why is it that India avoids the plebiscite while Pakistan is eager for it?

224. Mr. Swaran Singh quoted a certain statement published in *Dawn* of 8 September. By doing so he refuted his own allegation that the press has no freedom in Pakistan. He does not seem to be familiar at all with the volume of critical material that is appearing in the Pakistan press. Let the Indian rulers fulminate against the present administration in Pakistan but anyone visiting our country can judge that it has a free and vigorous press.

225. Representatives will recall that when I spoke of the plight of the large Indian Muslim community, I said that it was not a subject for polemics and that I did not wish to draw up an indictment against India. Is it not deplorable that the Indian Minister should have failed to respond to my remarks in the spirit in which they were made?

226. He talked of India's "pride and glory" that different religious communities "manage to live together in spite of occasional friction and disturbances" [*ibid.*, para. 228]. Would he have us believe that it is India's "pride and glory" to call the killing of thousands "occasional friction"? If that is just "occasional friction" what, I shudder to think, in India's lexicon, could be called serious disorders?

227. I wish that the Indian Minister had not provoked me to quote some pertinent facts. He says that it is wrong to leave the impression that "in these riots the victims belong to only one community" [*ibid.*]. Let me refer to the statement made by his own Home Minister in the Indian Parliament on 11 May 1970 when he said: "In Bhiwandi, the overwhelming majority of those who suffered were Muslims and in Jalgaon it was Muslims alone who were killed and whose houses were burned".

228. *The Illustrated Weekly* of India on 31 May 1970 said:

"Communal riots have become ugly facts of our daily lives. We know that nine out of ten killed are Muslims. Nine out of ten homes and business establishments destroyed are Muslim homes or enterprises. To add to the tyranny and injustice, the vast majority of those apprehended and victimized by the administration are also Muslims. Is it any great wonder that an Indian Muslim no longer feels secure in secular India?"

As I already indicated in my statement two days ago, Muslims in India are about one-tenth of the total population.

229. Let me also refer to another statement in the Parliament made by Mr. Jyoti Basu in which he said: "Today there is one communal riot in India every 54 hours." Does the Indian Minister not know that from 1950 to the end of February 1970, 3,188 riots occurred in India, resulting in 6,919 dead and 29,548 injured? These are figures gleaned from the Indian press—figures, according to Mr. Swaran Singh, of "occasional friction".

230. I said in my statement that Pakistan, being close to India and being a party to the Liaquat-Nehru Agreement,¹⁶ cannot remain silent when thousands of Muslims are slaughtered in India. What kind of an answer is the one made by the Indian Minister that Pakistan should not try to be the advocate of Indian Muslims? Pakistan expects every Member State of the United Nations to be an advocate of any community that is victimized, persecuted, threatened with loss of life or property. Since Pakistan knows the facts regarding one such community, the Indian Muslims, it is bound by duty, by justice, by honour, to bring these facts to international attention. The Indian Minister says that this embarrasses Indian Muslims. If so, it only shows the extent and depth of the persecution to which Indian Muslims are subjected. I would invite the Indian Minister to ponder whether his remarks evince an attitude of which he should be proud.

231. As regards the Indian charge that Pakistan does not treat its minorities well, I have made the solemn statement that we are not afraid of any impartial inquiry in this respect. However, the charge that 200,000 members of the minorities fled to India this year is grossly exaggerated. It is true that there has been some migration this year, but it is due to two factors. First, there is the deliberate campaign mounted by India to lure the Hindus of East Pakistan to India. Each Hindu migrant from East Pakistan is offered land and cash assistance in India. Second, there were crop failures. Is it any wonder that, in a low-income economy, especially when there are floods and crop failures, a substantial number of people should migrate, especially when they are offered enticements on the other side, where they have their relations? *The Guardian* of London, in its issue of 14 May, reported "but there is no evidence of any large scale Hindu migration from East Pakistan". *The Statesman* of New Delhi, in its issue of 16 May 1970, reported that the Indian High Commissioner had toured East Pakistan and found that "the situation all over the country was peaceful".

232. I may mention here that we gave the Indian High Commissioner complete freedom to tour East Pakistan, while India rejected the Pakistan High Commissioner's request for permission to visit the riot-torn areas in India. Is this not an indication as to who has something to hide and who has not?

233. I must also mention the fact that, of all the Hindu emigrants to India, 86,000 have returned and been

¹⁶ India-Pakistan Agreement on Minorities, signed on 8 April 1950.

resettled in Pakistan in the last 20 years. Would they have returned if there had been persecution in Pakistan, and if they had not been disillusioned in India?

234. Lastly, the Indian Minister's remarks about Pakistan's Constitution hardly merit an answer. The world knows that Pakistan is in the process of evolving a new Constitution and democratic institutions which will be genuine, strike roots in the minds of the people and not be a mere sham and an imitation. I would suppose that one of the aims which the framers of our Constitution will keep in mind is not to forge one for show only.

235. Mr. KIKHIA (Libya) (*interpretation from French*): I wish merely to clarify certain points mentioned by Mr. Vinci, ambassador of Italy. It would appear that the Italian delegation has prepared a very adequate dossier. For our part, we came here with no expectation that the Italian delegation would refer to this issue in the General Assembly.

236. We have been in touch with the Italian authorities in Rome; I arrived only the day before yesterday. We were at that time in contact with Rome by telephone and were certain that, as the bilateral negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily, there would be no need to have this problem discussed. Actually, it is a minor problem when we take into account what is happening in the world today, particularly in recent days.

237. I simply wished to say that Mr. Vinci alluded to General Assembly resolution 388 (V) and stated that Libya had voted in favour of it. May I be allowed to correct him? Libya entered the United Nations as a Member on 14 December 1955 in the famous "package deal" which involved 16 States entering at the same time. Italy and Libya joined on the same day—I believe that it was 14 December 1955, in other words some years after that resolution was adopted.

238. May I also correct another point? Ambassador Vinci referred to the Italian colony in Libya, and he said it could not be compared with other European minorities in Africa.

239. The Italian colony in Libya is made up of Italian settlers who arrived during the Italian occupation and remained after the independence of Libya. They were privileged persons under colonial domination: the Italian Government confiscated the property of Libyans who were fighting against the Italian occupation and gave it back to the Italians. The same happened in Algeria and in many African countries. We cannot, therefore, draw a distinction between the Italian minority in Libya and the other white minorities in Africa.

240. Ambassador Vinci said that it was not a fascist minority. I believe I am correct in saying that I did not refer to the word "fascism" because I did not wish to recall past misfortunes. I did not utter the word "fascism": I referred to Italy's colonial past which was a fact, because Italian occupation started in 1911; Italy's aggression against Libya occurred in 1911. At

that time Mussolini, the founder of fascism, was the editor of the progressive newspaper *Avanti*. And he was against the war waged by Italy. That is perhaps one of the ironies of history. From 1911 to 1922 it was democratic Italy which waged war against the Libyan people and which exterminated thousands of Libyans before the fascists came to power. The fascists simply finished where the others had begun.

241. After fascism, after the war, our problem was discussed here in the United Nations as if it were a slave market. Our problem was discussed in an atmosphere of conspiracy. We know the famous Bevin-Sforza plot which was hatched outside the United Nations, aimed at dividing our country and leaving it under colonial domination. And if that attempt failed here in the United Nations it was by one only vote; there was no two-thirds majority. That vote was cast by a country very dear to us, a country linked to Africa by blood ties. It was Haiti's vote which saved Libya's destiny.

242. Thus, even after the war, Italy did not easily renounce its designs in Libya. I did not wish to refer to this. But fascism has been mentioned—and I hope I will not be accused of being cynical—because fascism now bears guilt for the whole colonial past.

243. We had reserved our right of reply until such time as we had studied the documents which were distributed. I hope that the discussion will not continue and that this point will not now become a problem in the United Nations. I hope that we will now cease these statements. If there is any further reason to refer to this problem here, this reason will have nothing to do with the item we are discussing and does not facilitate the task of finding a reasonable solution to the problem of establishing normal relations between Libya and Italy.

244. We have many friends in Italy now. Many Italian personalities have applauded the measures that were taken in Libya because they understand well the meaning of history. We hope that the Government of the democratic republic of Italy will also understand the realities of the present-day world and that our Governments will be able to discuss our mutual relations in a spirit of frankness and sincerity, and that we can close a chapter of the past and open one for the future, a new chapter of relations between my country and Italy. The solution to the problems of the Italian colony in Libya is, as I said, *sine qua non* for bringing about normal relations between us.

245. Mr. EL-SHIBIB (Iraq): I must humbly apologize for having taken the rostrum again—I know how late the hour is—but I promise to be very brief.

246. You have listened with me to the reply of the representative of Iran, Ambassador Vakil. I am sure we all know how able he is, but he has surpassed himself with his reply this afternoon by producing a masterpiece of evasiveness. I had asked many questions, and I was anxious to receive a clear reply.

247. I repeat our questions very briefly: we have a boundary treaty with Iran. Does Iran respect it or not? If they have any dispute with us, we abide by the compulsory ruling of the International Court of Justice. Would they abide by that or not? I was looking for answers to those questions, but I must say I was deeply disappointed; I received none.

248. The representative of Iran mentioned in passing that Iran had a border problem only with Iraq. I need not answer that, as I am sure that Iran's neighbours can provide the best answer; and those of you who know the history of the region know the answer too.

249. Iran spoke about its good relations with other countries. I know that in the Arab world alone Iran has broken diplomatic relations with at least three countries in the past. I would merely mention Lebanon, Syria and the United Arab Republic. Relations with the latter have just been restored.

250. Furthermore, there is a principle which governs international relations and which is essential to the maintenance and preservation of respect for law and relations between States, and that is *pacta sunt servanda*—treaties are to be observed. It seems that our Iranian brothers have not heard of that principle. Ambassador Vakil accused us of not understanding the Iranian language. My only fear is that we understand it only too well.

251. Lastly, we know that the practice of treaty-breaking has brought only great dangers to the world, and to its perpetrators not the best of fates.

252. The PRESIDENT: I have three rights of reply yet to be exercised, those of India, Italy and Pakistan.

253. Mr. Swaran SINGH (India): I am sorry to have asked for the floor at this late hour. I will try to be very brief. We exercised our right of reply within two or three hours after Pakistan had spoken. Now, the representative of Pakistan, 48 hours later, has come to the forum to reply to what I had said, in order to establish the self-evident truth that Pakistan's facts and arguments are not only different from ours but also take longer to think out and present.

254. Under the pretext of the right of reply, the representative of Pakistan has treated this Assembly to a long tirade of abuse and untruths against my country. Representatives will have noticed that the Home Minister of Pakistan spoke for 30 minutes on the strength of what he called a right of reply. He has delivered a statement which is longer than that of most other representatives in the general debate. That merely illustrates what I said the other day that Pakistan has persistently sought to exploit this august forum for its narrow, sectarian purpose of propaganda against India instead of the more constructive purpose of making a contribution to common international issues during this silver jubilee of our Organization.

255. The Home Minister of Pakistan has repeated the false charges about the maltreatment of minorities

in India. I should like merely to say that these accusations are politically motivated to further Pakistan's hostile designs against my country and I reject all these allegations as incorrect. The world knows very well the record of India in the field of human rights, individual freedom, democracy, secularism and the equality of opportunity enjoyed by all the minorities of India, which has enabled members of minority communities in India to occupy the highest positions in the States.

256. I regret that the Pakistani representative has continued this afternoon with the familiar barren debate on Kashmir. I say "barren" because he knows very well that whatever the differences on that issue may be, they can be settled only in bilateral negotiations between our two countries. India is always willing to enter into bilateral negotiations with Pakistan on this and on all other Indo-Pakistan differences without any preconditions.

257. The day before yesterday I mentioned article 4 of the Tashkent Declaration in which both India and Pakistan pledged not to indulge in propaganda against each other. If Pakistan is serious about settling Indo-Pakistan issues it should honour this commitment. It should realize by now that neither propaganda nor even the use of force is going to make us forsake our duty of defending the territorial integrity of our land. Unfortunately for Indo-Pakistan relations, Pakistan had hoped, ever since its establishment, to use outside powers to settle this bilateral problem for Pakistan. It may now realize that this dependence on other Powers will not solve this problem.

258. Since the Pakistani representative became eloquent on the right of self-determination and on the desirability of honouring commitments, may I restate the position of Kashmir to show the incorrect basis of Pakistan accusations. First, Kashmir has been an integral part of India from the time that that State acceded to India. We said this to the United Nations, the first time that we addressed it, in our letter of 1 January 1948 complaining of Pakistani aggression on Indian territory in Kashmir.¹⁷ That position cannot be changed and has not changed.

259. Secondly, the issue in Kashmir is basically that of Pakistani aggression against Indian territory. All aggressors try to justify their aggression by trying to raise a dispute about the area on which they commit aggression. Some speak of secure frontiers and others of kith and kin.

260. Thirdly, India's efforts to come to an amicable settlement are based on our genuine desire to develop and strengthen good-neighbourly relations with Pakistan. Our hope in the early days that some compromise formula might be worked out was frustrated by Pakistan's refusal to pull out of Kashmir, which was to be the first step towards any settlement of this issue. Indeed, it was Pakistan which failed to honour its commitment to the United Nations; its aggression

¹⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Third Year, Supplement for November 1948*, document S/628, pp. 139-144.

in 1965 shows absolutely clearly what regard Pakistan has for its commitments to the United Nations.

261. Fourthly, India and Pakistan are obliged under the Tashkent Declaration to discuss and settle all their differences, including those about Kashmir, bilaterally and peacefully. In spite of the threats and provocations from Pakistan, we continue to adhere to that Declaration and are willing to enter into bilateral negotiations with Pakistan on all Indo-Pakistan issues without any preconditions. I repeat this offer here and now to the Government of Pakistan: let us sit down and discuss ways and means of implementing all the provisions of the Tashkent Declaration rather than create greater difficulties by making sharp and barren statements against each other.

262. I should like to assure the delegation of Pakistan that we in India want to develop good-neighbourly and friendly relations with the Government and people of Pakistan. After the 1965 armed conflict the Heads of Government of Pakistan and India signed at Tashkent the Declaration which clearly spells out the obligations willingly undertaken by the two countries. I should like to remind the Minister leading the Pakistan delegation that we have agreed to renounce the use of force for resolving whatever may be the differences between our countries. We have agreed to show restraint in the use of language even in matters on which there may be lack of agreement.

263. In this spirit I should like to repeat the offer that India has been making that these matters should be settled by bilateral talks and this offer of ours, a genuine one made with the best of intentions, requires a positive response from the delegation of Pakistan.

264. Mr. VINCI (Italy). I regret to have to speak again, but I think that I must set the record straight.

[The speaker continued in French.]

265. My first clarification is the following. In the first place, I did not say—and I think the verbatim record will bear this out—that Libya had participated in the adoption of resolution 388 (V). Obviously, I could not have said that, since Libya was not yet an independent country.

266. But Libya did subsequently become an independent country, and its representatives at the United Nations have confirmed resolution 388 (V)—for example, by expressing its approval of resolution 988 (X) of 6 December 1955, which flowed from resolution 388 (V). Hence, it is difficult to deny that Libya freely approved resolution 388 (V).

267. Moreover, Libya negotiated an agreement with Italy. In order to negotiate a valid international agreement, both parties must be determined to do so. This agreement was concluded on 2 October 1956, and resolution 388 (V), to which I have referred, was its basis. That was the first clarification I wished to make.

268. The second is this. It was far from my mind to refer to fascism. Unfortunately, the head of the

delegation of Libya, Mr. Kikhia, alluded to fascism. The verbatim record will show that to be so. I do not remember the exact words that he used, but he said something to the effect that the Italian community in Libya was a residue—and I ask to be forgiven if that is not the word he used—of that period. I wish it to be clearly understood that it was far from my mind to make any reference to fascism.

269. I wish to make another clarification. We did not intend to raise the question of Italian nationals in Libya before this General Assembly. The head of our delegation, Mr. Lupis, referred in his statement to Italy's relations with its neighbours. Indeed, it would have been very strange if he had not spoken of a neighbour such as Libya, with which Italy has had relations throughout its history. Mr. Lupis simply indicated that our relations had not been able to progress in the same direction as those that we had with other neighbours; rather, they had moved in the opposite direction. He concluded by expressing the hope that those relations could be improved and that it would be possible to find a solution to the questions that had been raised as a result of the measures taken against the Italians in Libya, a bilateral solution in conformity with the principles of the United Nations Charter. I emphasize: with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

270. Finally—and this will be my last clarification—we have spoken of these resolutions having in mind the precise meaning of the duty of each State Member of the United Nations to respect resolutions of the Organization which entail obligations for the Member States. That is the main duty of each Member State, if we wish the recommendations, resolutions and decisions of the United Nations to be respected and the prestige and authority of the United Nations to increase. I repeat what I have already said: if one wishes to ask that certain resolutions be put into effect, then one must be the first to respect resolutions to which one raised no objections.

271. Those were the only clarifications I wished to make. I ask the delegation of Libya to believe me when I say that I had no intention other than the one I have just indicated, and that certainly there was no intention to raise this question before the General Assembly. I have given these clarifications so that the situation may be properly understood. I have spoken twice and I hope that I shall not have to speak again.

272. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): In order not to give the representative of India cause again for a grievance about the time taken by Pakistan to reply to his statement of two days ago, my delegation has decided to take this rostrum immediately. However, I should like to assure the Foreign Minister that if we did take time it was because we attached importance to his pronouncement and we thought that it deserved a considered rather than an off-the-cuff reply. However, at this moment I shall depart from our normal practice and try to answer certain charges which the Foreign Minister of India has made against my country.

273. First of all, the Foreign Minister stated that the Home Minister of Pakistan launched a tirade against India and that his statement was full of untruths. But the Foreign Minister of India did not point to a single statement of my Minister which was untrue. Is it a responsible way of dealing with a neighbouring country to say that, no matter how well-documented and authenticated its statements are, whatever it says is simply to be brushed aside as untrue? We should be most grateful to know which of these statements are untrue and we would be prepared to document our statements.

274. The Foreign Minister stated that we had brought false charges against India about the treatment of the minorities and that we were politically motivated against India and had hostile designs against it. Let me say in all sincerity that it would be madness for Pakistan to have any hostile designs against India. India is a country of 550 million people. Pakistan has a population of 125 million people. India has four times the area of Pakistan. In any situation involving a military conflict it has much greater defence in depth. India's gross national product is four or five times that of Pakistan; it has a great defence production capacity; it has powerful friends and it has *de facto* allies. Therefore we in Pakistan are realistic enough to know that if we entertain any hostile designs against India, they do not stand a chance of being realized. We need not be given any credit for good intentions, but at least we could be given credit for a little intelligence and a little sense of realism.

275. The reason we talk about the minorities in India is that time and again, almost every year, *pogroms* take place. The Indian newspapers and the statements of Indian parliamentarians are full of these harrowing accounts of slaughter. We have been careful not to bring any charges against the Government of India. But can it be denied that organized hate groups and murder gangs exist in India, whose sole object is physically to exterminate people of different religions, and people of the Muslim religion in particular, whom they consider to be the residue of certain historical situations which existed ages ago?

276. We have no desire to challenge the record of India on human rights, on secularism and democracy. All we desire is that the benefits of those human rights, of secularism and democracy for which India stands should be made meaningful, real and applicable to the helpless Muslim minority of India, as to any other segment of the Indian population. When minorities are attacked in a planned, organized manner every year, every month, and more often, is it enough to say that the Constitution of India provides for secularism, democracy and human rights? We know that in the Charter there are very noble phrases about human rights, and if these are grossly and systematically violated it is one of the primary duties of this Organization to concern itself with those situations. Otherwise this Organization serves no purpose whatsoever.

277. Now, in regard to the question of Kashmir, the Foreign Minister of India stated that it can be settled

only on a bilateral basis, and our debate is barren. How many times have we not tried to approach India on a bilateral basis. President Ayub made repeated attempts in 1958, 1959, 1960 and right up to 1965. He approached Prime Minister Nehru, then Prime Minister Shastri, for a settlement on a bilateral basis. There was no response. Then, after the 1965 war, thanks to the great peace initiative undertaken by the Soviet Union, leading to the Tashkent Declaration, it was agreed that we should try the bilateral approach again, and we did try. The Foreign Minister of India led a most able delegation to Pakistan in March 1966, and again the negotiations foundered on the rock of the Indian position that Kashmir is not negotiable. If we are going to negotiate the status of Kashmir, and if the Indian side says that Kashmir is not negotiable, we ask our selves: What are we to discuss in these bilateral talks? Would the world expect Pakistan to enter into talks with India in order to sign, seal and deliver Kashmir to India?

278. All we want is that both parties should enter into the talks with an open mind, without preconditions, and if only India were not to say, just before those talks take place, that Kashmir is not negotiable, those bilateral talks could take place. But unfortunately, every time an attempt has been made to approach the matter on a bilateral basis, India again says that Kashmir is an integral part of India. The Foreign Minister of India just now made that very observation. He said that India did say at the time that it brought the complaint to the United Nations that Kashmir was an integral part of India—although Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru sent telegram after telegram to the Prime Minister and founder of Pakistan, who was then the Head of State, Quaid-I-Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah, that the accession was provisional and that there would be a plebiscite in Kashmir. This was a promise he was making to Pakistan, to the people of Kashmir and to the world. Therefore this is something which causes us infinite sorrow, when they say that Kashmir is an integral part of India and simultaneously offer to open negotiations on Kashmir. We do not understand this.

279. If India is more clear on this point and assures us that there could be bilateral talks on Kashmir without preconditions on either side and that negotiations on the status of Kashmir are not ruled out, then there could be a basis for a bilateral dialogue.

280. In regard to the charge of aggression, this has been made innumerable times and for many years in the Security Council, and after hearing all these charges and deciding on them, the Security Council adopted resolutions on the right to self-determination of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. In any case, my Home Minister has replied to this charge.

281. In regard to the point that Pakistan refused to pull out its forces from Kashmir, we made no such refusal. We agreed that Pakistan forces should be withdrawn and, under the terms of the agreement concluded under the auspices of the Security Council, India agreed to withdraw the bulk of its forces. Negotiations

took place between the two sides so as to synchronize these withdrawals. Then, after several years of negotiations, India just refused to carry on these negotiations for the demilitarization of the State any further. My Home Minister said just now that we would be ready to withdraw our forces from Kashmir if India is also prepared to abide by the terms of the agreement about the withdrawal of its forces.

282. Finally, I should like to reiterate our strong desire for good-neighbourly relations with India. We should like them to be peaceful and friendly, and if the two countries are to establish the basis of peaceful, constructive, co-operative coexistence, it is absolutely necessary to eliminate the outstanding cause of the tensions between us—the Jammu and Kashmir dispute—because the Charter of the United Nations calls upon nations not only to abjure the use of force, but also to settle their disputes peacefully. The two go together, and we are prepared to respond to any overtures by India on the basis of the renunciation of the use of force and the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, through the modalities which are available to the Security Council under Article 33 and its rules of procedure.

283. Mr. NADIM (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): May I apologize for taking up the time of the Assembly at this late hour, but I can assure you that I shall be extremely brief.

284. Responding to the last statement of the representative of Iraq, during which he replayed a record which is all too familiar in this Assembly, I would simply say—as the representative of Iran said here yesterday [1854th meeting] and as our Foreign Minister repeated today—that the so-called treaty of 1937 is a dead letter, because Iraq failed to observe its main provisions. Consequently we cannot enter into any negotiations, or appear before international authorities, on the basis of a treaty which is null and void. As far as our relations

with other countries of the region are concerned, I should only like to say that it ill befits Iraq to speak about good neighbourliness; that country should be the last to mention the subject.

285. Mr. SEN (India): We are very glad to learn that Pakistan has no hostile intentions against India. However, that lack of intention did not prevent Pakistan from attacking India several times.

286. Pakistan wishes to have all the details of the many allegations it has brought forward in this forum. We shall give Pakistan all the details which will probably amount to a very sizable number of documents, and refute all the allegations when Pakistan is ready to sit with us and discuss all these matters.

287. Pakistan claims to be right on all points, and alleges that India is wrong on all points. I wish it were that simple. Obviously Pakistan believes it is.

288. We have no wish to follow Pakistan's example and turn this Assembly into a forum for the discussion of Indo-Pakistan affairs. That would be an abuse of our rights and wasteful of the Assembly's time. I shall merely state that we completely and categorically reject all that the Pakistan delegation has alleged against India.

289. We reiterate our offer to discuss with Pakistan all matters that stand in the way of friendship between our two countries.

290. Even when the representative of Pakistan spoke of possible agreement on opening talks, he attached conditions. Pakistan says it will pull out its troops from Kashmir. Why has it not done so all these years? Let the representatives draw their own conclusions.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.