

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



1944th
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 29 September 1971,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 9:

General debate (*continued*)

Speech by Mr. Calvani (Venezuela)	1
Speech by Mr. Sharp (Canada)	4
Speech by Sir Alec Douglas-Home (United Kingdom) . .	7
Speech by Mr. Abouhamad (Lebanon)	10

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 9

General debate (*continued*)

1. Mr. CALVANI (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. President, on behalf of my Government, I wish to convey to you our most sincere congratulations upon the special distinction conferred on you by the Assembly in electing you its President for its twenty-sixth session. We are greatly pleased with this election because of the special ties which the defence of the legitimate rights and interests of the developing countries has forged between our two countries. Your election is a token of appreciation of your contribution to the cause of the independence of your country and your long and distinguished career in the service of Indonesia and in defence of the lofty ideals of the international community. It is, likewise, a tribute to the age-old continent, the cradle of civilizations, to which your country belongs.

2. We should also like to pay a tribute of thanks to your distinguished predecessor, Mr. Edward Hambro, who conducted the activities of the last session of this Assembly with skill, prudence and balance.

3. We are especially happy, on this occasion, to extend a cordial greeting to the new Member States of the Organization: Bahrain, Bhutan and Qatar.

4. In this general debate, we shall refrain from giving our position in detail in relation to specific agenda items. Our delegation will give its views thereon in the relevant debates.

5. I should like, instead, to turn my attention, in this unique forum of the nations of the world, to fundamental principles that my Government regards as essential for the consolidation and progress of international order.

6. Technological advances have brought profound changes to means of social communication and transportation in general. As distances grow shorter and as relations among

people are made easier, our earth has become smaller and we who inhabit it feel closer to one another. When man reached the moon, a new, vital dimension was created: the space age. More than ever we are aware of the unity and interdependence of the peoples of the world, that we are all members of the human race and that the whole earth is our great home. Can international borders perchance be seen from outer space?

7. In addition, this revolution in time and space offered to us by technology has created on our earthly planet a new situation: a similarity in the way of life. We are all beginning to have similar problems, similar dwellings, common concerns, identical preoccupations, similar customs. Thus, on the one hand, national communities are becoming aware of their own individuality, while, on the other hand, we are coming to realize how the fate of one affects the fate of all.

8. Gradually, in a somewhat confused though perfectly perceptible manner, we note that States that were regarded yesterday as a whole are today no more than parts of a greater whole: our earth. Thus there emerges a new concept: that of mankind. We think of mankind as all the peoples of the world and, thus conceived, mankind appears to us as a world-wide society which encompasses us all and which is in opposition to individual societies or States, having their own lives, it is true, but dependent on the development of that greater society.

9. We understand that society—both national and international—seeks not only to satisfy certain needs but rather to organize collective life in order that it may lead to the development of mankind as a whole. This modern concept of development has placed co-operation, both at the national and international levels, in a completely new perspective.

10. The collective task is the development of civilization—in other words, of man and of all men; of each people and of all peoples. There is need, therefore, for a social discipline capable of co-ordinating the activities of all for the benefit of all. Today we can therefore speak, even in strictly scientific terms, of a universal duty to co-operate devolving upon all individuals and all communities. We, in fact, are here on earth to carry out together a common task: the development of mankind.

11. The harmonious and human development of a civilization goes far beyond divisions within and between States. Art, science, philosophy and literature are today, more than ever before, the fruits of our collective work. It is thus that, over and above the particular characteristics of each nation, perhaps still not clearly defined but quite perceptible nonetheless, there progressively emerges the concept of the

Universal Common Good towards which the interests of all peoples on earth should be directed.

12. In my earlier interventions in this same Assembly on relations between peoples, international order and peace, I emphasized the fact that we should seek to achieve an international order inspired by International Social Justice and oriented towards the Universal Common Good. I had occasion to refer only to International Social Justice. Today I should like to speak about the Universal Common Good.

13. Man does not stand alone. Society guarantees him a full life and his right to seek perfection. He has obligations towards the community where he lives. Therefore man must devote his endeavours to collective tasks, to the common good, that is to say, the good of all individuals—in other words the good of individuals taken as a whole. Society constitutes a whole, because it unifies the action of its members for the benefit of all. It is thus that it has been possible to define the common good as the combination of all social conditions enabling the human person fully to develop all his faculties and perfect himself individually and socially. This is the concept of the common good taken from the point of view of a State.

14. However, States are not alone, nor are they isolated in the concert of nations. Health, economy, agriculture, science, the arts, in short all man's activities in the contemporary world, are intimately dependent on the activities of other men and other peoples. Thus, then, as it does internally where each State seeks the realization of the common good of all its citizens, in the universal society of nations there is also need for a Universal Common Good which is the objective and *raison d'être* of international authority and of the action of each of the States making up mankind.

15. That Universal Common Good requires a contribution from all peoples on earth. Our international structures must be adapted to the realization of the Universal Common Good. That adaptation requires that we replace the erroneous and harmful concept of national egotism with the idea of sovereignty and patriotism prompted by solidarity between peoples in the light of the current values in International Social Justice.

16. Thus from an international order based on bilateral agreements between Governments we must turn to another where, through multilateral agreements, it may be possible to have institutions created by peoples.

17. From the sphere of national autarchy we must move towards the creation of a supranational society, through successive stages of integration.

18. We stated last year in this Assembly:

"The third condition for peace is the establishment of active solidarity which will truly bind the different peoples of the world together. This solidarity will be dynamic only to the extent that it is directed towards the universal common good, and only if it is based on international social justice." [1841st meeting, para. 128.]

19. In effect, the Universal Common Good demands and requires active solidarity among nations. Mere coexistence, where perhaps the disintegration of others is expected or perhaps deliberately encouraged in a struggle for world predominance and triumph, is not enough. Far from it, the common good demands that we pass from coexistence to living together. We must turn from a system of relations, whatever they may be—whether of domination or exploitation or use of one State by another—to relations based on profound respect for the dignity of each State, while creating conditions for the liberation of everyone.

20. The Universal Common Good requires a system of organized co-operation at all levels and in all sectors. In other words, it is necessary to pass from a system of international disintegration, where there is no harmony or over-all goals in the world, to a system of international integration, where we work with responsibility and a full awareness of what we are trying to do.

21. The contents of the Universal Common Good are to be inspired by International Social Justice, in whose name we have the right to demand burdens and responsibilities that are in keeping with the possibilities, the power, the degree of development or wealth of some peoples in comparison with others.

22. Thus we are faced with a logical development. Peace has a new name, and that name is development. International order cannot exist without harmonious, just and balanced development among nations, and this is only possible if it is oriented towards the Universal Common Good.

23. The achievement of that Universal Common Good, as we have said, calls for the co-operation of all peoples on earth. The principle of the universality of the United Nations lies, in fact, in that same perspective. We are convinced that our Organization will fulfil more efficiently its lofty purposes to the extent that we can ensure the participation of the largest possible number of countries in the world.

24. With this conviction, the President of the Republic of Venezuela on 4 March 1971, at his weekly press conference, stated the following:

"There is no doubt that the United Nations, in order to be more effective must, if possible, obtain the representation of the whole Universe. A country so powerful and highly populated, so important in many respects, as continental China should undoubtedly play a role in the world forum that the United Nations represents. In this connexion, we shall raise no obstacle, and we sincerely hope that some of the problems connected with the entry of that country will be solved. For instance, we maintain diplomatic relations with the Republic of China, whose Government is in Formosa, and that country's representation should not be scorned by us. We sincerely hope that this problem will be considered and analysed in a truly suitable and satisfactory manner. I believe, moreover, that this question should be settled in a positive manner and in the not-too-distant future."

25. These statements by President Caldera will guide the attitude of the Venezuelan delegation in the very difficult

debate that will take place on this item—and I say a difficult debate because this problem is highly complex. We must endeavour to reconcile divergencies of view through an open and forthright dialogue in order to arrive at a formula that will allow for the full participation of continental China without the expulsion of the Republic of China.

26. Mr. President, within each State the Common Good presupposes respect for the fundamental rights of the individual. Similarly, the Universal Common Good implies and demands respect for and recognition of the rights and the fundamental personality of different human communities. Moreover, just as each individual, by reason of the very demands of the Common Good, should be the architect of his own destiny, each State must be allowed to carry out its historic mission and to be primarily responsible for its economic and social development.

27. That Universal Common Good calls for the redistribution among peoples of the wealth that has been unjustly accumulated by a few countries which we have come to call the developed countries. From that need for redistribution flow several conclusions or corollaries.

28. It is not compatible with the concept of the Universal Common Good to sacrifice some peoples for the sake of one's own development. In time past the world has seen ritualistic cannibalism which was carried out at the individual level: one man was sacrificed. Today, it is fair to speak of social cannibalism, between nations and peoples. Under the cloak of technological development or "economic assistance", human communities and peoples are swallowed up. In fact, in order that some may develop, the very *raison d'être* of the developing countries is taken away from them: their lawful right to forge their own destinies.

29. The introduction of a subtle neocolonialism is incompatible with the idea of the Universal Common Good. Apart from unilateral benefits derived from primary commodities, in the interests of better technological conditions, the use and exclusive development of new resources such as those of the sea and the atom and outer space are sought by some.

30. Nor is the system of foreign investments in the developing countries compatible with the Universal Common Good, when such investments are not oriented towards the development of those countries. Foreign investments that are made only for the sake of gain and one's own benefit are not in keeping with the concept of the Universal Common Good; quite to the contrary, they are a denial of that Common Good since they stem only from egotistical interests that have no social function.

31. In a recent document a very important religious figure in the contemporary world stated:

"Under the impulse of new production systems, national frontiers are coming down and we see new economic powers emerging—multinational enterprises which, because of the concentration and flexibility of their means, can carry out autonomous strategies to a very large degree independently of national political powers and, consequently, without control from the

point of view of the common good. By extending their activities these private organizations may lead to a new abusive form of economic domination in the social, cultural and even political fields."

32. Neither can we reconcile with the Universal Common Good the struggle for predominance by blocs, their arms race and the expenditures involved in maintaining the balance of power. Those sizable investments are in essence the clearest demonstration of how international relations take precedence over the Universal Common Good.

33. In the name of the Universal Common Good we must question the pattern of development of today's industrialized nations. That pattern has led to the division of peoples on earth between the haves—an exclusive closed club—and the have-nots. But this is not in keeping with the concept of the Universal Common Good. To continue on that line is to march towards suicide because that would increase the differences among nations and peoples. This cannot be the fate which history has reserved for mankind.

34. The Universal Common Good presupposes, moreover, a system of international distribution of production. In other words, it is necessary for all countries members of the community of nations to become part of a real and effective universal economic system encompassing all stages of economic activity. This necessarily implies the formulation of a global integral policy of world economy oriented towards the development of mankind—the Universal Common Good—and not towards the development of a small group of privileged countries.

35. In this connexion we must also point out that the Universal Common Good calls imperatively for the establishment of an international monetary system. But such a system cannot be effective without the genuine co-operation of all the countries concerned.

36. We note with fear that the so-called Group of Ten seeks to assume and maintain the privilege of being the only ones in charge of the operation, alteration and reform of the monetary system. Once again, the developing countries have not been allowed a say in the decisions which so seriously affect them.

37. In international forums the risks involved in the monetary system have been pointed out consistently but the absurd struggle to maintain an untenable national prestige prevented the adoption of realistic decisions with the participation of all nations.

38. Measures adopted unilaterally, and contrary to the Universal Common Good, today seriously endanger the less developed countries.

39. In this great forum, it is fitting for Venezuela to reiterate an earnest appeal to the conscience of the developed countries made a few days ago in international meetings held in Geneva and Panama.

40. It is incompatible with the ideal of a Universal Common Good for a State to seek to set itself up as the sole possessor of truth and the monopolizer of the meaning of history, and it is even more incompatible when that

State tries to impose its brand of the truth with violence. People must be persuaded to accept the truth, not forced to accept it. No nation—unless it is willing to be held in contempt by others—can regard itself as the sole possessor of truth. Truth is to be found in the authenticity, in the nobility of peoples and individuals.

41. The political State is not in itself an absolute. Its general mission is that of being the nucleus and driving force behind the development and the progress of communities and the human institutions it encompasses. If due to the moral corruption of power a State assumes the iniquitous right of deciding on the destinies of other peoples as its political oligarchy sees fit, that State violates the Universal Common Good. There exist peoples that are prisoners of their Governments. In such cases their moral right to determine their own destinies is usurped by their Governments.

42. The Universal Common Good must not be only a set of material profits and benefits. It is also and fundamentally a multi-dimensional balance between the human person, societies and nations, and other human communities and nature in general. That Universal Common Good is and must be material, intellectual and moral to allow the development of the material, intellectual and moral potential of all peoples. All this presupposes a keen awareness of those realities on the part of the developing countries.

43. It is quite obvious that participation in the international community cannot be based on the selfish and negative idea of benefiting from political or ideological domination or economic exploitation of other peoples.

44. And yet such a state of affairs cannot be removed unless the developing countries are able to set aside their partisan national egotism and unite in order to deal with an unjust international order.

45. Perhaps members think this is Utopian. This same question was asked last year from this very rostrum. Is it, however, not more illusory to continue along the path on which we are embarked at present? Is it, perchance, the way to the development of peoples and peace among nations?

46. In making these final remarks I cannot fail to invoke the figure of our Secretary-General, U Thant. For many years, in the performance of his functions, U Thant has devoted himself to the defence of the great moral principles that should guide relations among peoples. He, too, believes that only by pursuing great ideals will it be possible for mankind to realize its aspirations for peace and justice.

47. History teaches us that only human actions inspired by ethical principles have lasting value. We must therefore defend them in the international arena with the persuasive power of truth if we are to free ourselves from the coercive power of violence.

48. Mr. SHARP (Canada): May I first offer you, Sir, the full support and co-operation of the Canadian delegation in the performance of the great responsibility you have accepted as President of the General Assembly. Canada

welcomes your presence in the Chair and offers its good wishes to the people of Indonesia, whom you have served with such distinction in this Organization. It is indicative of the scope and variety of our Organization that the presidency should move from the representative of one of the northernmost countries of Europe to one of the southernmost countries of Asia without any disruption in our continuing work.

49. I should like at this time to thank the previous President, Mr. Edvard Hambro, for the skill and judgement he showed as our presiding officer at the last session.

50. It is a matter of deep regret in Canada that this should be the last session at which U Thant will occupy the Secretary-General's chair. U Thant has carried out his heavy responsibilities and fulfilled his arduous obligations with a serenity and steadfastness that have been an example to us all and have won the respect and admiration of all men everywhere. I am sure his quiet and authoritative voice will continue to be heard in the councils of the nations, and on behalf of the people of Canada I wish him well in his future endeavours.

51. This twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly opens a new quarter-century in the life of our Organization, and I suggest that it may mark a turning-point in our history, and the opportunity for a new beginning, if this Assembly moves promptly and effectively to seat the People's Republic of China in the seat of China. China is a charter Member of this Organization and a permanent member of the Security Council. The only question before us, I suggest, is who should occupy the existing seat of China. The Canadian position is clear: the Government that has responsibility for the overwhelming majority of the Chinese people must now take its proper place here—the Government of the People's Republic of China. The searing of the Peking Government in this Assembly and in the Security Council will bring the effective Government of a quarter of mankind into our councils.

52. Canada endorses the principle of universality of membership and looks forward to a time when the divided States, too, can be properly represented here. But principles must always be conditioned by facts, and before this ideal can be reached there are serious practical problems to be solved. There would be no particular advantage for the United Nations or for the divided States themselves were they to do no more than import their special problems and conflicts into the wider forum of this Organization.

53. I have said that Canada endorses the principle of universality, and in the Canadian view there is an important principle involved. The communications explosion has annihilated time and distance, two factors that used to isolate problems in one part of the world from those in another and frequently contributed to the solution of such problems by allowing a breathing-space in which good judgement and common sense could be brought to bear. International problems can no longer be localized easily; every such problem is a world problem and involves the world community, which is, in effect, the United Nations. The simple theorem that universal problems call for universal solutions is almost a tautology. And universal solutions are likelier to be found by a body that is universally representative.

54. I should like to illustrate what I mean by touching briefly on four problem areas: armed conflicts, the physical environment, arms control and disarmament, and world trade.

55. As we look around the world today we see armed conflict or the seeds of armed conflict in many parts of the world. Those cases where international disputes involve Member nations, as for example the Middle East, fall clearly within the responsibility of the United Nations. Where conflicts are contained within a single State, established practice at least suggests that they do not so fall. This leaves with us a question which I will pose and discuss but to which Canada has no definitive answer to offer: at what point does an internal conflict affect so many nations to such an extent that it can no longer properly be accepted as a domestic matter?

56. I sense a growing world concern that tragedies are unfolding and that nothing is being done about them by the world community as represented by the United Nations. The capacity of this Organization to resolve conflicts, whether domestic or international, is limited by two realities: the terms of the Charter and the will of the Member nations.

57. I need hardly say that we do not here constitute a supranational authority. I do not believe that the world is ready for such an authority, for any kind of world government. Today, most of the nations of the world, older and newer equally, are preoccupied with internal problems. Certainly Canada is no exception. Canada is facing internal problems of both an economic and a political nature. Canada believes that domestic problems are best dealt with by domestic solutions, and others feel the same way. The question is: how can the international community best assist in a situation where an internal problem has got beyond the capacity of the Government concerned? The mere fact that the nations are preoccupied with internal problems and questions of sovereignty in the foreseeable future does not excuse us from making the best possible use of the instrument we have, the United Nations. The United Nations can and should move promptly and effectively, as it often has done, to ameliorate human suffering and protect, to the extent possible, the innocent non-combatants that often bear most of the suffering. This is a noble end in itself and can be a means toward the settlement of a conflict by creating a better and saner atmosphere.

58. No move in the direction of universality can in itself offer any great hope for easier solutions to the problems that are troubling our world, but it could offer a strengthening of our Organization that should help us to come to grips with them.

59. Turning to the second great universal problem, how to preserve a natural environment that will continue to support life on earth, the United Nations has recognized its global nature by setting up the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, to be held in Stockholm next year, with a distinguished Canadian public servant, Maurice Strong, as Secretary-General of that Conference.

60. Canada has a special interest in environmental questions, if only because we occupy such a large part of the

earth's surface. Despite its vast extent and relatively small population, Canada has serious air- and water-pollution problems of its own. It also, inevitably, is a recipient of the pollution of others through the Great Lakes system and oil-spills on its coastlines, to name only two examples. This is why Canada is concerned about the inadequacy of existing international law relating to the preservation of the environment in general and the marine environment in particular.

61. Canada is working toward the development of an adequate body of law in this field. At the national level, the Canadian Government has adopted laws for the protection of fisheries from the discharge or deposit of wastes, for the prevention of pollution disasters in Canada's territorial waters and fishing zones, and for the preservation of the delicate ecological balance of the Arctic. At the previous session of the General Assembly¹ and last month in a draft resolution submitted jointly with Norway to Sub-Committee III of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction [A/8421, annex V, sect. II], Canada invited other States to take similar measures at the national level to prevent and control marine pollution as a move toward the development of effective international arrangements.

62. Canada is working towards a multilateral treaty régime on safety of navigation and the prevention of pollution in Arctic waters, with other countries having special responsibilities in the Arctic regions.

63. In a wider multilateral context, Canada is participating actively in the preparations for the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, the IMCO International Conference on Marine Pollution and the third conference on the law of the sea. These three conferences, taken together, present a unique opportunity for the development of a comprehensive system of international environmental law. As the first and widest-ranging of the three, the Stockholm Conference will be of particular importance in helping States to come to grips with the apparent conflict between environmental preservation on the one hand and economic development on the other.

64. Canada is usually and properly classed as a developed nation, but it is still in the course of development, still importing capital and know-how, still engaged in building its industrial base. This makes Canadians aware of the conflict between the need to develop, essential to economic growth, and the need to preserve and, where necessary, to recapture a viable natural environment, essential to the survival of life.

65. For this reason Canada has a special understanding of the dilemma seen by the developing nations, where the highest priority must be given to economic and social development as the means to achieve a standard of living that will offer dignity and opportunity to all their citizens, and where the preservation of the physical environment, however desirable in itself, would seem to come second. But I would suggest that this dilemma is wrongly posed.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, First Committee*, 1784th meeting, para. 97.

66. Technology has now reached a stage where the industrialization needed for economic development need not disturb the environment to an unacceptable extent. And it is by no means the rule that an ecologically sound industrial or other project must be more costly than one that is not. With far-sighted planning and careful attention to design and ecological considerations there need be little or no added cost. The pollution befouling the Great Lakes system largely results from wasted opportunities, from dumping into the water by-products that in themselves have value if properly recovered. The Canadian Government is working with the Governments of the United States and of the United States and Canadian provinces bordering on the Great Lakes system to establish water-quality standards, achieve them in the shortest possible time and see to it that they are maintained.

67. The discussions now going on between the various levels of the Governments in Canada and the United States will set into motion a programme for the rehabilitation and preservation of the Great Lakes which will cost billions of dollars and call upon vast human and technological resources. These astronomical expenses would not have been incurred had we and our neighbours been able to foresee and forestall the damage we have done to the largest fresh-water system on earth.

68. I urge my friends in the developing nations to balance the costs of anti-pollution measures against the cost of pollution and the mindless waste of limited resources it so often represents. Everyone in this room is looking and working for the day when the prosperity now enjoyed by the few can be shared by all. Economic and social development is the route to prosperity. We should all take advantage of the fact that advances in technology mean that we can follow this route without poisoning the air we breathe, the water we drink and the soil that gives us sustenance, without disturbing the ecological balance that supports all life.

69. My third illustration of the universality of human problems is the whole field of arms control and disarmament. Canada firmly believes that, until the People's Republic of China is playing its part in our deliberations here and in the detailed studies and negotiations being carried on in the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, agreements in this important area will be at best incomplete and at worst ineffective. This is not to downgrade the excellent work that has already been done, as evidenced by such achievements as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof [*resolution 2660 (XXV), annex*], and the current work on a biological weapons treaty, in all of which Canada has had an active and essential part to play. Nor does it make any less welcome the encouraging and fundamental negotiations now taking place between the United States and the Soviet Union to curtail the strategic arms race.

70. Earlier this month in Geneva I had the privilege of addressing the Fourth International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. I took advantage of my

being in Geneva to speak to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament at its 536th meeting about a subject to which my country attaches the greatest importance; the need for a complete ban on nuclear testing, including underground testing. This Assembly will soon be seized of the special report on nuclear testing [*A/8457-DC/234*] by the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, and for this reason I should like to make again here some of the points I made in Geneva.

71. Before a complete test-ban can be achieved, there are political and technical difficulties to be overcome. Canada is not alone in believing that these very difficulties call for a determined and speedy effort to reach a total ban on underground nuclear testing. There are steps which could be taken at once before international agreement is reached, steps we believe all Members of the United Nations would support. Those Governments which are conducting nuclear tests could limit both the size and the number of tests they are now carrying out, starting with the biggest, and announce such restraints publicly. This would represent no difficulty nor involve any complication.

72. There is little time left to us to ensure that the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons becomes fully effective. All the measures needed to make that Treaty viable should receive the highest priority, and the ending of all nuclear tests must come first. Many Governments are anxious to see all obstacles to the full implementation of the non-proliferation Treaty removed, before the precarious equilibrium among the nuclear weapons Powers is further disturbed—whether by on-going scientific and technical developments or by the emergence of new nuclear Powers. Canada is at one with those Governments in their concern and in their determination.

73. The continuation of nuclear weapons tests is at the root of the problem. The ending of all nuclear tests by all Governments in all environment is of the greatest possible importance for Canada and for the whole international community.

74. The safety of all is the concern of all. For Canada there is, if possible, an additional concern. The detonation by the Soviet Union in the last few days of a large underground nuclear explosion and the possibility of a considerably larger test in our own neighbourhood by the United States emphasize that the rate and the size of underground testing on the increase. Competitive testing must not be advanced by the nuclear Powers as a justification for maintaining the momentum of the arms race. The danger is that it will, and this brings home to us all the urgent need for a complete ban on nuclear testing.

75. I turn finally to my fourth illustration of the universality of problems today. I suggest that there is no part of the world and no country that is unaffected by the difficulties now being experienced in the monetary and trading arrangements arising out of the chronic balance-of-payments deficit of the United States. Developing countries are well aware that problems among the fortunate few are of great importance to them. They are affected directly in two ways: by the adverse effect upon development assistance and by increased barriers to the trade that, in the long

run, offers the best possibility of economic betterment for their peoples.

76. Socialist economies are steadily increasing their trade with market economies, to the benefit of all. As exchanges in the fields of science and technology multiply, the economies of all the world's nations become more interdependent—a trend that should be welcomed, not only for the immediate benefit it brings, but also as a proven means of reducing tensions.

77. The truth is that all of us—rich or poor, developed and developing, with socialist or market economies—have an interest in minimizing obstacles to trade and in facilitating trade by the maintenance of a workable system of monetary exchanges. All of us suffer when trade is impeded by the setting up of new obstacles to its free flow or by instability in world monetary arrangements.

78. Trade is more than a matter of dollars and cents, more than a struggle for economic advantage. It is the only means we have to create a world economy that will support all the world's inhabitants at a level that will enable us all to enjoy the social justice that is our birthright and to achieve fulfilment in peace and dignity. It is to that end that so much of the best work of the United Nations family has been directed in the past and it is this great goal which must continue to call forth all that is best in us for the future.

79. Sir Alec DOUGLAS-HOME (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I should like in the beginning to join with those of my colleagues who have spoken in saying how happy I am that we meet under your guidance and to express my full confidence that you will steer us with complete success through the many difficult problems which face us. I am happy, too, that the honour which is done to you is reflected on your country, Indonesia, with which we have and still maintain the closest and most friendly relations.

80. I have found myself on this platform on a number of occasions compelled to call attention to a feature of international life which has plagued for far too long the lives of ordinary men and women. It is in short the abuse of the function of politics and diplomacy by what I may call the cult of confrontation and the denial of dialogue. To promote dialogue is the essential function of this Organization, and, indeed, it is implicit in the very name "United Nations". So it is here, above all, that we should show concern at a development that threatens to drag civilization backwards, down the road to violence.

81. Confrontation may develop as an internal problem, as the distinguished Foreign Minister of Canada has just reminded us. I speak today from experience.

82. In Northern Ireland a terrifying manifestation of the old danger of religious confrontation has reappeared, complicated in this case by other political and social problems.

83. All through history, in every corner of the world, religion has been the reason or excuse for wars which caught up peoples in their toils and left a trail of misery for ordinary people behind. In the last century or two

dogmatic political ideology has supplanted it. But the danger is the same—and in fact as we survey the world's scene it is greater than ever. With the rapid communication of ideas, the sophisticated propaganda, these divisions can be exploited, and exploited on a vast scale. Millions—and we see this every day when we look at the modern means of communication—are duped into adopting the prejudices of the few even though they have little or no idea what the confrontation is about. The way is thus open for the anarchist who believes in revolution and sees nothing beyond his nose and no formation of society beyond that; he believes in revolution by destruction. The way is open, too, for the terrorist who wishes to enforce one point of view and rejects compromise and reason.

84. In the unhappy situation which exists today in one part of the United Kingdom, such people care nothing for the beliefs and legitimate views of Roman Catholics or Protestants. Their snipers and bombs and land-mines are intended to bring about the total disintegration of society. They are able to exploit the fears and prejudices of others, to intimidate witnesses and even to stir up children to destroy, to throw fire-bombs and to harass forces whose only task is to keep the peace.

85. I illustrate my theme with this example because our experience of it is first-hand. And though it is our own internal problem in Britain, and it is not always possible so easily to compare internal and international confrontations, the lesson to be drawn is surely universal. It has application to every one of the intractable international problems which face us in this Organization. Each of us has the means to redress legitimate grievances within our own community; that is what gives us the right to insist that violence within the borders of our State shall not be used. But international confrontations cannot be so easily resolved.

86. We have not yet succeeded in providing effective remedies for international wrongs. Peace-making is at a discount because we have no means to impose solutions, and a tiny minority interest, therefore, which is interested in confusion can thwart the majority will. I think we are all familiar with the perennial agenda of problems before the international community, situations that have threatened peace in the past and situations that could do so in future. I do not underrate for one moment the difficulty when the parties believe that their vital interests in security, or even their survival, are at stake. But I think the evidence must be—and it has accumulated in these last few dangerous years—that time does not resolve many of these confrontations. On the contrary, time works for the anarchist. Sooner or later, uncompromising confrontation leads to violence; neighbours who will not live together will one day fight together. When intransigence escalates into violence the anarchist will find his opportunity and the innocent will be drawn in and will suffer and will die.

87. I remember last year on this platform, speaking in the context of hijacking of aircraft, I drew attention then to this danger of anarchy—anarchy superseding the law of nations—and with it the inherent challenge to all governmental authority. For us to face the fundamental dangers of condoning those who take the law into their own hands I said:

"We must call on those who have taken up arms to lay them down... even though they claim to be carrying them in the name of justice" [1848th meeting, paras. 128-129].

88. Last year's General Assembly resolution on aerial hijacking [resolution 2645 (XXV)] and the subsequent Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft,² which my Government has signed and will shortly ratify, have brought encouraging progress in this particular field. Last week my Government also signed the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation.³ I hope that as many nations as possible will sign and ratify both those Conventions so that this particular form of anarchy can be stopped. It may be modest progress, when we survey the whole field, but it is some progress.

89. This year my plea goes wider. It is that in every case where there is international confrontation, existing or threatening, a conscious and urgent effort should be made by all the parties engaged, taking each situation one by one, to achieve a *modus vivendi* before the stage of open violence is reached, before the anarchist, armed with all the modern techniques of terror, infiltrates and takes charge and levies his fatal toll on society and on the law. This obligation lies plainly on each and all of us. But I think the effort must first and foremost be made within the framework of the United Nations. Our Charter has equipped us with a whole range of remedies for these situations. There are the traditional diplomatic tools of mediation, conciliation and inquiry. If these fail us we are bound by the Charter to seek other peaceful means, and it provides new powers to investigate and to recommend.

90. I think if we are honest with ourselves in this Organization we must admit that we have failed to make full use of this potential. Our Secretary-General—whose coming retirement deprives us of a devoted and wise counsellor—has lately given us a timely reminder of the true character of his role as a peace-maker as envisaged by the Charter. We have not allowed him or his predecessors to realize that capacity to the full. He has also made recently an important comment on the influence of this Assembly in peace-making. He said:

"... the majority must make it plain that they will listen to both sides of a case and not only to the larger faction. The majority must prove that they will seek a realistic way out of difficulties rather than resort to condemnations or threats" [A/8401/Add.1, para. 95].

I feel that he is right; but we have not taken those words of his seriously enough as yet. Too often in this Assembly and in the Security Council undisguised propaganda and the search for tactical advantages by this or that group block efforts to reach a just and a comprehensive solution of a problem.

91. But until we can perfect the remedies which the United Nations offers I must also address this plea concerning confrontation to those who find themselves at

this moment in direct and dangerous dispute. At this time of day challenge and confrontation are—to put it in plain language—just too dangerous. Compromise may be dull, but it is the sole recipe for peace and, with patience, it can usually—I am tempted to say always—be had in honour.

92. The confrontation which today carries the greatest risk of war is that between Israel and the Arab States. It is one which could draw into the lines of antagonism the most powerful countries in the world.

93. A whole generation has matured in the Middle East in the shadow of war. A generation on the one side has grown up as homeless refugees; a generation on the other side has been brought up in the fear of being swept by force into the sea. Violence and counter-violence have been the order of the day; and war has been and remains very near. And that war—so great has been the escalation of armament in the area in recent years—would be fought with modern weapons amply reinforced by the greatest Powers.

94. This dispute is concerned with the most emotional of all issues: the security, and therefore the life, of those who confront each other. The Arabs are totally convinced that the Israelis want to expand their territory at the Arabs' expense, and Israel is convinced that the Arabs want to encircle and destroy it.

95. In such circumstances, what can others, or the United Nations, do? For unless action is taken, that war will come. I take it that we are resolved, in so far as we can influence events in this United Nations, that on this issue there should be no war. It would be catastrophic. We have, in fact, taken one positive step to help to avert it. Few can doubt that Security Council resolution 242 (1967), although not perfect, contains the essential ingredients of a peaceful settlement. I know it will be tempting to try to change that resolution for another. I consider, myself—I think that perhaps the great majority here would be with me—that it is the only resolution upon which we can count to command substantial support in this Assembly and in this Organization.

96. We have, too, in the context of trying to find a solution to this problem, within the grouping of the four Powers, indicated a readiness to guarantee the terms of a settlement between the parties. That is not a task which any of us particularly relishes, but where distrust has run so deep for so long, we must take risks, and it may well be the only way to build the confidence which will lead to a permanent peace, taken together with, of course, measures for demilitarization and for the placing of United Nations personnel in evacuated areas.

97. But if war is to be avoided, those who are in confrontation must actively help to promote a dialogue. The main ingredients of peace are known, and I will not rehearse them. On the one hand practical proposals have been put forward which would satisfy the Arab desire for Israeli withdrawal, and these are contained in Security Council resolution 242 (1967); on the other hand, there are ways and means of meeting the legitimate Israel need for permanent physical security. I will not debate the particular possibilities here in a programme of peace-making in this dispute, but I will say this, and positively: that, unless a

² Signed at The Hague on 16 December 1970.

³ Signed at Montreal on 23 September 1971.

mechanism of dialogue can be established, sooner or later—and maybe sooner than later—the fighting will start again.

98. Confidence can only be established in this case through dialogue: here an interim arrangement providing for phased withdrawal and the opening of the Suez Canal, with a link to the next and final stage of withdrawal, could serve to build confidence and to prove to the parties on the ground that there is more to be gained by dialogue and coexistence than by war. I still believe that Mr. Jarring has a crucial role to play in this process of establishing contact. But whoever stages this dialogue, the tempo of it must be quicker than it has been until now, and it must be at closer range. When there is distrust between the parties of this depth and scope, it cannot be removed by long-distance correspondence, and the onus of adopting dialogue must rest with those who now confront each other in arms. It is for us to help them to find the way to do it—and I emphasize again that the time is short. This is a case where dialogue must supplant confrontation.

99. In spite of the experience of wars in Europe and the Middle East, new confrontations loom. In Asia the world watches the frontiers of India and Pakistan with increasing anxiety. India, by reason of civil disturbance in Pakistan, has been faced with a problem of refugees which distorts its economy and stretches its resources to the limit, and beyond. It has been valiant and resilient in meeting this burden. It has rightly asked for international help. Much has been given through this Organization, but we shall need to mobilize a lot more help in cash and kind than we have yet done.

100. There is now an added danger of famine in the months to come in East Pakistan, arising mainly from a break-down in communications following civil strife. Relief will be needed here too on a massive scale. I hope that we are all conscious of an obligation to help, and to help urgently, because there could be no greater tragedy for the world—even including that in the Middle East—than that India and Pakistan should find themselves unwillingly at war. The United Kingdom has given £8 million to relief in India and £1 million to East Pakistan, and we are ready now to add substantially to that. Relief is beyond the capacity of Pakistan. Therefore, the machinery of the United Nations on the ground must be strengthened, and if it is to be adequate to the task of recreating the necessary network of communications, then action must be taken to meet local conditions of famine and to meet them in time.

101. Again, there is not much time, for recently this problem between India and Pakistan has assumed a new and appalling dimension. Guerrilla warfare and sabotage are adding to the fear and are hampering rescue. I am not sure if we yet understand the scale of the guerrilla warfare in that area; but the operations of the guerrillas, taking advantage of this situation, could create another panic in East Pakistan and start another avalanche mass movement of population from Pakistan into India. So this situation could run both countries unwillingly into war.

102. Reconstruction of the Constitution of Pakistan must be an internal matter for the people of Pakistan. But the risks to peace, if they fail in that reconstruction, are

appalling, and the truth of the matter is that the danger will be finally averted only when there is a return to civil government in East Pakistan which gives confidence to all Pakistanis to stay at home, to return home, and to develop their country in peace. Meanwhile, let the United Nations do the humanitarian work. It must never be said of the politicians that we met here and argued about who was to distribute food while millions of innocent people starved.

103. In Africa we see the evil of *apartheid* and the frustration of many at its continued existence. Frustration and impatience can lead to violence. And as we have seen so often that violence, from which the innocent suffer, provokes counter-measures, and the lines of war thus become more sharply drawn.

104. I am glad to see that, in spite of the deep feelings aroused by *apartheid*, which we share, the urge to dialogue grows and it is being to some extent put into practice. There in Africa, as elsewhere, neighbours have no choice but to live side by side; and ultimately dialogue must be resumed and must take charge.

105. In the Far East, we have seen that China has for too long isolated itself from the world community. That had its dangers. When it plays its full part here in New York, a mighty voice will be added to our counsels and a major step will have been taken towards the true representation here of the balance of world power and world opinion, from which consensus can be hammered out, however painful at times that process may be. With all the difficulties, I think the majority here recognizes that the future lies, not in isolation, not in confrontation or in ostracism, but in dialogue.

106. I hope that in Western Europe after centuries of conflict we have learnt our lesson. The confrontation of Germany and France which nearly destroyed civilized life on our continent was ended because two great nations—and two great statesmen—were willing to take a risk, to pull down the historic barriers between them and peaceful coexistence. Those two great statesmen in particular took a risk with public opinion.

107. On that essential political foundation is being built already the integrating Community of the Six, the European Economic Community. The United Kingdom and other European countries will, we hope, soon expand the Community to one of ten. That should usher in a new era of economic expansion and greatly enhance the prospects for peace. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of France, Mr. Schumann, yesterday, in one of his most felicitous phrases, described that enlarged community as a “community of hope” [1942nd meeting, para. 50]. I would underline that forecast. That Community is already committed, by reason of the many special provisions for territories once connected with France and the United Kingdom, to be outward-looking. It exists to encourage trade, and that is the healthiest form of assistance.

108. Nevertheless, aid from the developed to the under-developed countries is a vital need, and my country and the Community recognize their duty in this. I am glad to be able to announce today that my Government has decided to increase its contribution to the United Nations Develop-

ment Programme in 1972 to \$19.2 million, an increase of one third. We had also made an advance pledge of \$50 million to the International Development Association, to remedy the failure of the third replenishment this summer. Yesterday in Washington we announced that we were raising this to \$103,680,000, which completes our first year's contribution to that replenishment. We hope in this way not only to enable the International Development Association to continue its work but to encourage others to take action also.

109. There is nothing we in Western Europe should all like better than closer economic and political relations with the countries of Eastern Europe. It was the policy of the Federal Republic of Germany again with a German statesman taking a risk to seek accord there, and thus open the way to East-West agreements, in particular agreement to ease the conditions of life for the people of West Berlin. Once that has been achieved, it should be possible to prepare a conference on the security of Europe. If that is to have any chance of success, each country must demonstrate that it respects the security of others: that is a *sine qua non* of co-operation, and that alone can give confidence. With confidence we can do much; without it we can do very little. If this essential respect for one's neighbour is shown, then in Europe we shall be embarking on a *détente* which is embracing and on which better and more enduring relations can be built. The trend, then, in Europe is to turn away from confrontation to *détente*.

110. I have been concerned today to stress the responsibility we all bear to find the peaceful way out of our difficulties and differences. I believe that the first essential is to make a conscious effort to get back to a climate of good-neighbourliness, with those with whom we disagree as well as with our friends.

111. We have been exhorted to do more about last year's Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)]. I have no quarrel with that; but general declarations are of no avail unless our basic approach is the right one. Surely the right approach is laid down quite specifically in the Preamble to our Charter, where we declare that we are determined "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours". "Tolerance" is a word that is all too seldom heard today in these halls. I suggest that it is as important now as it was in 1945, when the Charter was drafted. When differences and disputes nevertheless arise, neither side can escape the duty of looking to negotiation to secure the peace. Nor can we collectively escape the duty of overcoming the obstacles which stand in the way of the United Nations making an effective intervention before dispute hardens into confrontation and confrontation into conflict.

112. Peace-keeping is the centre of the problem, because so often peace cannot be made until all concerned are confident that it will be kept. The Charter foresaw the need. The machinery exists and it is available for our use. What has been lacking—and I hope is not now lacking—is the will to use it or to support it.

113. There is even, I regret to say, at the present time one operation of peace-keeping, established by the Security

Council, that is involved in a serious financial shortfall. I refer to the endeavour that has successfully maintained the peace for more than seven years in Cyprus and consequently in that part of the Mediterranean. There is now a deficit of up to \$70 million, half of which relates to former peace-keeping accounts, and this deficit is growing every year. Therefore I share the Secretary-General's view that unless a remedy is found in the very near future it will no longer be possible for us to fulfil the basic purpose and objective of the Charter.

114. We must not slide backwards in peace-keeping. Every symptom of division in the international field urges us to do better. So let us each and all bend our minds to positive peace-making and positive peace-keeping. Let us prove it in each case where the danger of confrontation raises its stubborn head.

115. To break the present stalemate in a number of the confrontations will not solve the problems of the world; but we can in this Assembly give the world a sharper instrument for peace. That will narrow the area for the anarchist and his operations and broaden the rule of law.

116. Mr. ABOUHAMAD (Lebanon) (*Interpretation from French*): Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I associate myself with the speakers who have preceded me and address to you my warmest felicitations and those of the Lebanese delegation and express our deep satisfaction in seeing such an eminent representative of our continent presiding over the present session of the General Assembly. The valuable experience which you have acquired during your brilliant career and your great qualities as a statesman assure us that you will conduct our debates with competence and authority.

117. It is a pleasure for me also to pay a tribute to Mr. Hambro, who exercised the functions of President of the last session with such competence.

118. I should like to pay a special tribute to Secretary-General U Thant, who brings to the fulfilment of his lofty functions his qualities of heart and spirit, his wisdom, his fairness, and whose untiring efforts to promote international peace and security fully deserve our deep gratitude and confidence.

119. I join those speakers who have preceded me at this rostrum in expressing satisfaction at the admission to our Organization of Bahrain, Qatar and Bhutan, a satisfaction which Lebanon shares. My country will co-operate fully with these three new Member States, to which we are bound by traditional links of friendship.

120. A year ago our Organization celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary. That was a special occasion when illustrious representatives of Member States reviewed the balance sheet of a quarter century and, examining their conscience in a world-wide sense, and guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter, congratulated themselves on the success and achievements, but also noted the lacunae and recalled the deficiencies. In the solemnity and fervour of that occasion, with renewed faith in the noble ideals of our Charter, new hopes arose, hopes for a better world corresponding to a greater degree to the aspirations of humanity thirsting for peace, progress, freedom and justice.

121. But beyond this glimmer of hope, great tasks were darkening and still darken the horizon of our universe. Conflicts and injustices are being perpetuated and new centres of tension arise.

122. In our region, the Middle East, we are at the very heart of a most poignant tragedy—which has continued since the very creation of the United Nations. It is the tragedy of the people of Palestine, robbed of their country and evicted from their homes by the use of violence. This tragedy, which was born of a flagrant injustice more than 20 years ago, continues to shake our region and to inflict upon our population destruction and suffering. Since June 1957, territories belonging to three States Members of the United Nations have been occupied by Israeli forces, and since that date Israel has continued to sabotage all attempts at a political settlement, continuing its military occupation, multiplying its aggressions and subjecting the inhabitants of the occupied territories to a régime of coercion, violence and terror, defying law, equity and the most elementary humanitarian principles.

123. The situation in Jerusalem is for us a subject of deep concern. The horizon of that city, so peaceful and holy, familiar to millions of human beings, is today disfigured. A systematic plan aimed at depriving Christendom and Islam of their inalienable rights to the Holy City is applied with obstinacy. Pressures of all kinds are exerted on the Christian and Moslem population to force them to expatriate themselves. By expropriation and confiscation, the occupier seizes property which does not belong to him and whose historic and spiritual value is often beyond estimation. He carries out massive destruction, construction of new habitations, in order to present the international community once again with an accomplished fact. But the same community has categorically condemned the acts which have been undertaken by Israel and has declared that they are illegal and invalid. Several resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council have been adopted in that regard.

124. The Security Council's most recent resolution, resolution 298 (1971), adopted on 25 September 1971, is eloquent in that respect. That resolution expresses the firm will of the international community to oppose categorically the acquisition of territory by force and any modification of the sacred and universal character of the Holy City.

125. Everywhere, in Gaza, in Sinai, in Golan, and on the banks of the Jordan, we find the same affecting spectacle of tortures, demolition, destruction of homes and of whole villages, deportations and expulsions of inhabitants, expropriations and confiscations—all of them contrary to the international conventions and to resolutions of the United Nations.

126. It is true that Lebanon and Israel are still bound by the General Armistice Agreement of 1949; yet Lebanon considers that it is directly concerned in the establishment of a just, equitable and lasting peace in the Middle East.

127. For the establishment of such a peace, Lebanon is convinced that it would be vain to seek an equitable and lasting solution without the total evacuation of Israeli forces from the territories occupied since June 1967, and

without due respect for the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

128. Lebanon also considers that until that solution has been achieved, the services, which are already insufficient, provided by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency to the Palestinian refugees, cannot be reduced without grave consequences, and therefore appeals to all Governments to make up the deficit of the Agency by voluntary contributions. Is it necessary to reaffirm once more the responsibility of the international community as a whole in the creation and perpetuation of this human drama, as well as its obligation to alleviate the situation and, in fact, to put an end to it?

129. At a moment when I am speaking of the conflict in the Middle East, how can I fail to recall and to stress that my country has suffered and continues to suffer from Israeli aggressions under the most fallacious pretexts which entail loss of human life, the lives of innocent civilians, destruction of property and migration of populations? The Security Council has been repeatedly seized of these complaints by Lebanon.

130. Since June 1967 efforts aimed at bringing about a political settlement have been exerted by the United Nations, by the four great Powers and by other countries. These efforts have been sabotaged by Israel.

131. By its delays, its evasions, its refusals, Israel has in fact brought the mission of Mr. Tarring to a dead end. Has it not already created in the Middle East a state of tension which threatens international peace and security, a situation which is being aggravated day by day?

132. It is not enough to speak of Israel's defiance of the United Nations and the international community. It is essential to put an end to it.

133. The United Nations has on several occasions been seized of complaints aimed at putting an end to actions of Israel that violate international law and relevant resolutions adopted by the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights. Invariably the international community has condemned Israel. It has been condemned for its aggression against Lebanon and for its behaviour in Jerusalem and in the other occupied territories. Its policies and actions have always received condemnation, and severe warnings have been addressed to Israel. On some occasions even very specific threats have been formulated to invoke and apply more effective procedures.

134. Unfortunately, all those resolutions have remained dead letters. Israel has never complied with them. It continues to act as though the United Nations did not exist, or as though its resolutions had never been adopted. Our Organization is therefore confronted with a situation involving the risk of its losing all the credit it still retains—not only in the eyes of States but also in the eyes of world public opinion.

135. The choice must be made: to be or not to be. For a country such as Lebanon, which is attached to peace and international order, and which places its hopes in the

United Nations, the alternative involves no hesitation. The United Nations should not allow any of its Members to scorn and continue scorning its decisions. How can the United Nations allow a representative of a Member State to describe a Security Council debate on Jerusalem as a scenario? And how can it allow a Minister to say that General Assembly resolutions are as predictable as they are insignificant? And how can it allow another Minister to declare that his country will refuse to apply the resolutions of the United Nations even if they are adopted unanimously?

136. As recently as 26 September 1971, the Israeli Government rejected resolution 298 (1971) on Jerusalem, adopted on the previous day by the Security Council, and declared in the most categorical terms its absolute refusal to implement it.

137. The practice of the last 25 years has unfortunately drawn our Organization away from certain principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The first signatories of the Charter, the founders of the United Nations, certainly wanted to create a powerful Organization that would be effective and capable of ensuring a new international order. They certainly endowed the Security Council with powerful means of maintaining international peace and security.

138. In case of a threat to the peace, the Charter, in Chapter VII, contains provisions on the possible application of sanctions. That Chapter must now be invoked by us and be the centre of our concern, because we have unfortunately arrived at a position where only the possibility of applying sanctions can produce salutary results. It is, in our view, high time for the United Nations to react vigorously to obtain respect for international order and also to safeguard its own prestige and authority. If the United Nations fails to do so, I am afraid that international law will become void of any meaning and content and will be entirely supplanted by the law of the jungle. And if force eventually wins in inter-State relations, what nation, no matter how strong it may be, can say it will always be sheltered from insecurity and aggression?

139. Lebanon, certainly, is a small country. But far from being ashamed of that we claim, on the contrary, on behalf of small States, as a matter of pride and confidence, the privilege of having linked our destiny to law, of having identified our own cause and our own security with the cause of law.

140. The acuteness of the drama in which we of the Middle East live cannot make us overlook the state of international relations in the rest of the world, nor the great political, economic and social problems still confronting our world on the threshold of the new decade.

141. The representatives who spoke before me expressed from this rostrum their concern at the armed conflicts still persisting in various parts of the world. However, timid glimmers of hope appear on the horizon. Prospects of settlement appear in the light of recent contacts among interested Powers. Lebanon can only rejoice at all the efforts undertaken in that direction, and we hope and wish that those efforts may bring about a just peace that ensures

the primacy of the principles of our Organization and its universality, and also takes into account the political realities and the legitimate rights of peoples.

142. Last year the Assembly solemnly affirmed, in its Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the fundamental principles that must guide States in their conduct. It is important to see that those principles are applied and translated into deeds.

143. Despite the undeniable achievements and efforts of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, peoples continue to struggle to achieve recognition of their national identity, to accede to freedom and independence. Some timid progress in the negotiations on disarmament, partial agreements and special arrangements recently made—evident signs of the will to attain a *détente* between antagonistic blocs—are welcome, but cannot make us forget the arms race; in history, an arms race has always preceded great conflicts. We are still very far from general and complete disarmament.

144. Today, the peace of the world rests mainly on reciprocal fear and a balance of terror.

145. It would be illusory to aspire to bringing about true international peace without radically confronting the poignant problems of underdevelopment, because it is inadmissible for hundreds of millions of people to continue to live under inhuman conditions, a prey to ignorance, sickness and hunger.

146. One certainly cannot ignore or minimize the actions undertaken by the United Nations and its various agencies on behalf of economic and social development, but the road before us is still long and difficult because the gap between the standard of living of the developing countries and that of the developed countries is getting wider. Just as a great disparity in the standards of living of the nationals of a country is a source of domestic instability, a great disparity in the standards of living of States is a source of international instability. That is why Lebanon hopes that the next United Nations Conference on Trade and Development will erase the feelings of apprehension which the last such Conference has aroused.

147. The participation of the People's Republic of China in the work of the United Nations will consolidate international co-operation, security and peace. It will no doubt contribute to the realization of the objectives and ideals of our Organization.

148. Recent developments in relations between India and Pakistan are a matter of grave concern to us. Lebanon, which maintains traditional relations of friendship and co-operation with both India and Pakistan, is convinced that every effort must be exerted to normalize relations between those two great countries and to find a solution to the humanitarian aspects of the situation.

149. In our world—ever more dominated by the imperatives of power, military or economic, by the narrow demands of national selfishness, implacably caught in servitude to material progress—Lebanon, a small, peaceful

country, firmly believes in the primacy of law and of moral and spiritual values.

150. Situated in a region which was the cradle of the three monotheistic religions, a region at present suffering the ravages of violence resulting from a misguided mysticism of force and racist domination, Lebanon is the land of spontaneous democracy, a country in which several communities coexist in a climate of tolerance, freedom and close co-operation.

151. This is why we are firmly convinced that the full and complete implementation of the purposes and principles of our Charter depends upon the place that is to be accorded to these values. It is under these conditions only that we can achieve some day the golden age of humanity, that ancient dream of all mankind for a future of peace and progress in freedom and justice.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.

