

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records



**2003rd
PLENARY MEETING**

Tuesday, 7 December 1971,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 102:

Question considered by the Security Council at its 1606th,
1607th and 1608th meetings, on 4, 5 and 6 December
1971 (continued)

1

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 102

Question considered by the Security Council at its 1606th,
1607th and 1608th meetings, on 4, 5 and 6 December
1971 (continued)

1. The PRESIDENT: The draft resolution which was introduced this morning by the representative of Argentina will be issued shortly as document A/L.647.

2. I call on the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who would like to make a brief statement.

3. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: Mr. President and distinguished members of the General Assembly, first of all I must say that I have been deeply touched by your very moving manifestation of affection for me and by your most gracious expression of best wishes to me, which I received last month when I was in hospital. Of course, on a later occasion and at a suitable time I hope to be able to express my heartfelt thanks and appreciation to all of you in a more appropriate manner.

4. This afternoon I want to make a very brief appeal in the context of the item under discussion in this august body.

5. In the confused and fluid situation which exists in the subcontinent and in the absence as yet of a decision by either the Security Council or the General Assembly on the political and military aspects of the situation, I feel it is my duty as Secretary-General to speak up on behalf of those who are likely, through no fault of their own, to become the innocent victims of the crisis.

6. Since the events of March, I have taken a number of initiatives in an attempt to mitigate from a humanitarian point of view the consequences of the situation in East Pakistan, as all of you are no doubt aware. Among these initiatives were the setting up of the United Nations East Pakistan Relief Operation and of the focal point for co-ordinating humanitarian assistance to the refugees from East Pakistan now in India. These and other initiatives have been reported on in detail to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

7. With this background in mind I now appeal to all the parties to the conflict, no matter what their allegiance, to take every possible measure to spare the lives of the innocent civilian population which is afflicted and threatened by the present hostilities.

8. In this connexion I am maintaining close contact with the International Committee of the Red Cross, which, in its traditional humanitarian role, will endeavour to implement as fully as possible the terms of the Geneva Conventions. I appeal to all parties to observe the terms of those Conventions and to do their utmost to ensure that the present developments do not give rise to yet another senseless sacrifice of human lives on a vast scale.

9. As a practical matter, I have instructed my representative in Dacca to examine urgently, in full co-operation with the International Red Cross, what practical measures can be taken to this end. I will keep the General Assembly and the Security Council informed of further developments in this matter.

10. I am reporting separately to the Security Council and the General Assembly on efforts to arrange for the evacuation of United Nations and other international personnel, numbering more than 300, from Dacca, and on interim measures to be taken for their safety.

11. Mr. RAHAL (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): I should like first of all to express our joy at seeing the Secretary-General of the United Nations among us today, and again in his place on this dais. For me this is an occasion to reiterate to him all our feelings of friendship, and to wish him a prompt and complete recovery, at a moment when more than ever before our Organization requires the benefit of his wisdom, his competence and his vast knowledge.

12. We believe also that this is not the time for speeches or debates: what are necessary are immediate decisions—decisions called for by a situation that is sufficiently tragic and dangerous to cause both disquiet and concern.

13. I shall be brief, but in so doing I must express here the deep feelings of the Algerian people at the unfortunate events that have pitted India and Pakistan against one another—these two countries to which we are attached by deep ties of friendship.

14. The Government of Algeria has deployed its own continuous efforts to bring the leaders of the two countries to put an end to the violent conflict and forthwith to cease hostilities. Both sides must know that we feel very deeply the sufferings of their peoples and that our haste to bring about an end of the armed conflict is first of all inspired by

our fraternal preoccupation that the existing situation should not continue and should not become more deathly and inhumane than before.

15. War cannot settle human problems; the hatred it creates and the damage it does can only be overcome with great difficulty. It is not up to us to point out the guilty or to pass judgement. What must be done—and urgently—is to end the war so that the military forces can return to their respective frontiers. Once this is achieved, we must examine the situation in order to solve the problems and relieve the pressures whose importance no one would underestimate. In this connexion, the Algerian Government has had occasion to state that a solution to these problems must be sought within the framework of a number of clearly enunciated principles based both upon the Charter of the United Nations and the basic principles of the third world, namely, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States and respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity.

16. Consequently we make an anguished appeal to the two sides to heed the voice of reason, a voice which in our case is that of friendship and fraternity.

17. My delegation fully supports the draft resolution [A/L.647] submitted to us this morning by the representative of Argentina. We hope that this draft will be supported by the largest number of delegations at the Assembly and with the least possible delay. The responsibility of our Organization is at stake, as are also the lives of peoples swept into the horrors of war. Moreover, international peace and security are also at stake, since this situation is a direct and most grave threat to them.

18. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): On behalf of the delegation of Ceylon, I should like to express our deep satisfaction at seeing our esteemed Secretary-General once again in our midst. It is a happy omen that he should be present with us when a question to which he has devoted himself with his deep sense of humanity and with unremitting zeal is being discussed in the General Assembly.

19. The delegation of Ceylon studiously refrained from participating in the Security Council debate on the deteriorating situation on the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent for good reasons. We did not wish to delay action on the part of the Security Council by lengthening its discussions, and we preferred that that responsible body should discharge its responsibility with the utmost speed. A far more cogent reason was that, as one of the closest neighbours of India and Pakistan, and because of the bonds that hold us together—bonds of ethnic, cultural and religious affinity and fervent friendship, which are more enduring than any treaty—we desired to remain strictly neutral. Any involvement in the discussion and in the dispute would have impaired our effectiveness as a common friend of long standing. That might have appeared to be an abdication of responsibility, but we kept our silence to give others an opportunity.

20. We cannot, however, remain detached any longer. My Prime Minister has just directed me to express to the Secretary-General her grave concern over the reported outbreak of hostilities between the two countries, both of

which are very good friends and neighbours of Ceylon and are among the leading nations of Asia. She has added that the close ties which we have with those countries make this conflict between them a matter of personal regret and distress to her, and she has therefore appealed to the Secretary-General to use his good offices and to take all possible action, through the United Nations, to effect a settlement. Events have, however, moved too rapidly for us.

21. From the very start, as far back as April of this year, there was an imminent threat to international peace and security, justifying prompt action by the Security Council. There could have been recourse to the various alternative means contemplated in and provided for by Article 33 of the Charter. Why, then, did the Security Council adopt the Nelson touch, and avert its gaze from the clouds that were gathering over the eastern portion of the subcontinent? It will be the historian's task to seek the answer to that question, in order to save this Organization from a similar dereliction of duty in the future.

22. The hour is too late to investigate the origins of the conflict. We have to forget the law of reason that the answer to any problem cannot be found in isolation from its origins. Genesis comes before exegesis, but we cannot afford, in the present situation, the luxury of comfortable analysis. The situation and the events that led to it were exceptional; we must therefore find exceptional means of dealing with it, and we cannot allow our actions to be governed exclusively by the established rules of international conduct, which could never have contemplated such a situation. What we now have to deal with is a situation of fratricidal conflict, and we all know that of all forms of conflict none can be more ferocious and frenetic than a conflict between brothers. The best service we can perform to the parties to the dispute is to stop the slaughter and the destruction, and to set in train the process of reconciliation.

23. We have to deal simultaneously with two problems. One is the preservation of the integrity and unity of the State of Pakistan as a whole, taking into account and making due allowance for its unique form, with its two sections separated by a distance of a thousand miles and its communications exposed to sudden interruption in any crisis. There is no State in the world that has been faced with such a formidable impediment to its economic viability and even to its political survival. Let us take those circumstances into account, and show some understanding.

24. In doing so we do not have to absolve the Government of Pakistan from any responsibility that some might feel should properly be attached to it. I am speaking with the utmost candour, and I trust that my friends on both sides will accept any statement of mine which may appear to be criticism as being made in a spirit of friendship and with a genuine desire to restore harmony between the two parties. I feel sure that the Government of India itself does not wish to see the disintegration of Pakistan. I speak with personal knowledge, gained over many years of assignment in that country.

25. While seeking to preserve the integrity and unity of the State of Pakistan, we have an equally sacred duty to ensure the safe return of the refugees to their homes—a humanitarian problem of the first magnitude. I must make

it quite clear that we do not think that, in the circumstances existing today, this can be treated as an entirely and exclusively internal problem. I hope my Pakistani friends will not disagree with me. We cannot detach the refugee problem from the rest of the problem. The United Nations, if it is asked to intervene and if it has a duty to intervene, must treat the problem as a whole.

26. Ambassador Bush stated in the Security Council that what is called for is compassion. I wholeheartedly agree with him. We can settle this problem only if we show compassion and free ourselves of passion and prejudice.

27. The Soviet Union, in the draft resolution it presented to the Security Council,¹ called upon the Government of Pakistan, simultaneously with a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities, to take effective action towards a political settlement in East Pakistan, giving immediate recognition to the will of the East Pakistan population as expressed in the elections of December 1970. If that was meant to be a reference to the six-point programme of the Awami League, as included in its election manifesto, we would consider such a request to be reasonable, since the six points were declared in advance, were announced to the electorate and to the entire country, were known to the Government of Pakistan and could not be repudiated.

28. Starting from the premise that we must seek to stop the bloody conflict, to preserve the integrity and unity of Pakistan as a single State and to ensure the safe return of the refugees to their homes, thereby solving a grave humanitarian problem and relieving the Government of India of an intolerable burden, as well as to restore friendly relations between Pakistan and India, we would suggest the following measures:

29. First, there should be an immediate cease-fire, a cessation of all military activities and withdrawal of the troops of India and Pakistan from all sectors to their respective territories. That would mean the withdrawal of Indian troops even from any territory claimed by what has been called the Government of Bangladesh.

30. Secondly, we should appeal to the Government of Pakistan to enter into immediate consultations with the acknowledged leaders in East Pakistan to reach agreement on measures and procedures which would enable the refugees to return to their homes in East Pakistan with all reasonable assurance of immunity from reprisals of any sort. In return, those leaders should agree to renounce all secessionist demands. That would necessarily involve the rescission of the declaration establishing the Government of Bangladesh.

31. Thirdly, we should appeal to the Government of India to extend its good offices in the furtherance of a settlement that would relieve it of the crushing burden of the refugee problem. This would, however, not give it the right to intervene in the internal settlement to which I referred in the second point.

32. These three measures must, we suggest, be set in train simultaneously and the Secretary-General should be re-

quested to supervise their implementation. The General Assembly should also agree on the need for international assistance to alleviate the plight of the refugees and to ensure their rehabilitation with the help of United Nations agencies and the International Committee of the Red Cross. Likewise, we should like to see a special programme of economic assistance for reconstruction in both countries being organized.

33. Finally, the Secretary-General should be requested to keep the Security Council informed of progress in the implementation of these measures. The Security Council itself would no doubt wish to take any such initiatives as may be necessary for the effective implementation of these measures.

34. A word of explanation is necessary in regard to some of the proposals that we have made. We have asked for the withdrawal of the troops of the two countries from all sectors to their respective territories. We cannot reasonably expect the Government of Pakistan to enter into negotiations with the acknowledged leaders in East Pakistan as long as foreign troops which have, for whatever reason, lent their support to those leaders and their party, remain on Pakistan's soil. Nor can the Government of Pakistan reasonably be expected to negotiate with avowed or prospective secessionists. This is surely not a liberation movement in the classic and universally understood sense of the term. We would be creating a deadly precedent if we regarded it as such. It could be claimed that it is not only majorities that have a right to be liberated but, and even more logically, minorities. Most countries in this Assembly have substantial minorities—my country has—and must bear in mind the implications of treating the East Pakistan Awami League movement as a liberation movement. If there is to be a reconciliation, the East Pakistan leaders must renounce all secessionist demands. We do not, however, question their right to negotiate secession with the Government of Pakistan, but we cannot condone or encourage the use of force in the pursuit of their objective.

35. We need India's co-operation as it has already announced its recognition of what has been referred to as the Government of Bangladesh. We need its co-operation to relieve it of the embarrassing burden it now bears.

36. We offer no apology for presenting these proposals, except the apology that a friend owes to a friend and a brother to a brother, for presuming to help in healing a rift, in composing a quarrel which, if left unsettled, will for all time embitter relations between the two countries and their peoples and for all time endanger the stability of all Asia. Less altruistically, we in Ceylon have a vital stake in the solution of this problem, a very substantial geopolitical stake. It is that concern which has prompted us to make other proposals for peace in this area.

37. This is the United Nations darkest hour. We still have a chance of transforming it into its finest hour. Nations, large and small alike, need the United Nations. Today its very existence is threatened. Its principal organ charged with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security has failed to take effective action. We do not need to diagnose the reasons for that failure. It is the small nations that need the United Nations and I hope I can

¹ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10428.

presume to speak on their behalf in pleading for its survival. I hope equally that we can avoid writing the epitaph of the United Nations in the words of Virgil: "*Sic transit gloria mundi*."

38. Mr. PENJOR (Bhutan): My delegation has followed the recent development in the Indian subcontinent with grave concern. This concern arises not merely because hostilities have broken out between India and Pakistan but primarily because these hostilities have erupted right on our doorstep. It is therefore natural that we should view the recent developments in the Indian subcontinent with a sense of utmost anxiety and concern.

39. My delegation has also followed the recent debates in the Security Council with great attention. It is indeed true that almost all delegations who took part in the Security Council debates underlined the urgent need to restore peace in the area. My delegation shares this conviction and sincerely hopes that peace will be restored in the subcontinent. We have, however, noted with regret that the Security Council, which is entrusted with the task of protecting peace in the world, has been unable to address itself to the basic cause which has given rise to the recent unfortunate developments in the area.

40. This Assembly is aware that, following the events of March 1971, the Pakistani army unleashed a reign of terror in East Bengal, resulting in the exodus of over 10 million refugees into the neighbouring State of India. This Assembly is also aware that the Pakistan Government sought to undo the will of the people of East Bengal, clearly expressed through free elections held under the auspices of the Government of Pakistan. It is therefore but natural that the people of East Bengal should now seek to translate their desire expressed through the ballot into reality. My delegation believes that the will of the people should not and cannot be suppressed by any force; it must be permitted to prevail.

41. The Security Council merely addressed itself to the consequence and not to the cause of the recent developments in East Bengal. It is the view of my delegation that no solution which merely takes note of the consequence and not of the basic cause can be permanent or lasting. To ignore this reality will only be fraught with dangerous possibilities. My delegation regrets very much that the Security Council was unable to come to a unanimous decision on this question. We are convinced that this question must be viewed in its entirety. Therefore my delegation appeals to this august body to address itself to the very root cause which has given rise to these unfortunate developments during the last few days. Indeed, my delegation has consistently maintained this view and had stated this in a recent debate in the Third Committee of the General Assembly.

42. My delegation will therefore support any move which aims at removing this basic cause of tension in the area. It is the hope of my delegation that reason will prevail and that this Assembly will not permit the will of 75 million people of East Bengal, as expressed by them in the recent elections, to be sacrificed; for ultimately it is the people who matter and they should have the right to shape their future destiny in accordance with their wishes. It is the

fervent hope of my delegation that, in considering any proposal put before this Assembly, representatives will keep the above considerations in mind.

43. Mr. CSATORDAY (Hungary): On behalf of the delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic, I express our deep satisfaction that our highly respected Secretary-General, U Thant, has appeared amongst us, even briefly, after recovering from a very serious illness. Indeed, we need his presence, participation and wisdom in treating critical problems of the world. We wish him good health and offer him our devoted co-operation in discharging his heavy duties.

44. My delegation has followed with great anxiety the recent events for a number of months and the Security Council discussions for the last few days. We regret to see that people—and so many millions of people—are suffering because of warfare under very tragic conditions in a very difficult situation, and we are the more anxious to see a settlement of this problem since we have very cordial relations with the parties most concerned in this problem, with the Governments of both India and Pakistan.

45. The problem before us is not a new one. What we are witnessing today is the most recent stage of a problem already about nine months old. Despite their experience and the lapse of time, many speakers in the Security Council and also in the General Assembly have not touched upon the roots of the problem but have treated the whole question in a superficial manner and on an *ad hoc* basis. According to the Charter of our Organization, the equal rights and self-determination of peoples should be guaranteed. This is considered one of the basic principles of our Organization. In the Hindustan subcontinent we are witnessing today gross violations of human rights, of democratic political rights, and a denial of efforts for autonomy, for self-government, which have been suppressed by armed forces; mass atrocities have been committed. Thus the peace of the region has been gravely disturbed. In the wake of these events armed resistance has developed on behalf of the people of East Pakistan, in self-defence, in order to protect their basic political rights; and under the pressure of terror, about 10 million people have fled from their homes to India, where they are living under very difficult, almost intolerable economic, social and other conditions which have been created by the denial of their rights in their homeland.

46. The refugees and the freedom fighters in East Pakistan are one people; but since they are now on the territory of East Pakistan as well as on the territory of India, their fight for independence, for self-determination, for the attainment of basic political and democratic rights, has broadened the conflict into an international one transcending national borders.

47. During our debate this morning, we regretted hearing some remarks of a hypocritical nature made by one of the representatives of a great Power when he said that he recoiled in horror as this tragedy unfolded before us. But in fact this great Power condemns all sorts of fights for independence, all movements for national self-determination; indeed, in the very neighbourhood of the Hindustan peninsula a war has been going on for years in order to

suppress the rightful claims of the people for self-determination and for independence. Why did not this great Power propose a cease-fire and a withdrawal of foreign military forces in South-East Asia? For the moment it seems that it has forgotten that this problem also exists, and indeed it is a very heavy burden on the shoulders of all nations of the world.

48. While watching the debates in the Security Council, we could not help being surprised that one delegation, while claiming to be the champion of all liberation movements in the world, called the leader of one such a liberation movement, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, a quisling. It is really a surprise to hear such a statement at this moment. It will most certainly open the eyes of the peoples and it will be very hard to find a proper explanation for such an attitude.

49. If the Security Council was unable to adopt a proper resolution, we wonder how the General Assembly will be able to cope with the situation and adopt an effective resolution to meet the present situation. Certain proposals were made this morning, and documents have been circulated; but in our view they offer only a very superficial approach. Most of the draft resolutions presented in the Security Council, as well as the statements that were made there, avoided the crux of the issue. They only attempted to treat accessory symptoms, avoiding the basic problem.

50. In the well-considered opinion of the Hungarian delegation, a political solution to this situation should be found along the following lines. First, the democratic political rights of the overwhelming majority of the people of East Pakistan, as expressed in the elections held in December of 1970, should be recognized. Second, the free return of all refugees from India to their homes should be guaranteed. Third, simultaneously with these steps, a cease-fire should be carried out between India and Pakistan. If these proposals, these principles, are not followed in practice by actual deeds, we can scarcely see any chance of defusing the situation in the Hindustan subcontinent and it will indeed be very difficult to restore peace. We hope that this Assembly, in its wisdom, will be able to formulate a decision which will help to resolve the problem in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the Organization.

51. These considerations govern the attitude of the Hungarian delegation to the problem in general and to the proposals which have been submitted in particular.

52. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) (*interpretation from French*): The Lebanese delegation is deeply concerned over the situation which is deteriorating in the Indian subcontinent. We associate ourselves with the many other delegations who regretted the incapacity of the Security Council, after a long debate, to assume its proper responsibilities under the Charter.

53. The attitude of my Government is based on the principles of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, non-intervention in the internal affairs of other States and a just, humanitarian settlement of the Pakistan refugee problem. My country is particularly moved by this bloody conflict because we have the best possible relations with both India and Pakistan. That is why we

associate ourselves with the urgent appeal issued to the Governments of India and Pakistan to do everything in their power to bring about an immediate cease-fire, to stop hostilities, to withdraw armed forces to their respective frontiers and to find a humanitarian solution to the problem of the East Pakistan refugees.

54. My delegation unreservedly supports draft resolution A/L.647, submitted this morning by the representative of Argentina and announces that it will vote for it when it is put to the vote.

55. Mr. HOVEYDA (Iran) (*interpretation from French*): The extreme gravity of the situation in the Asian subcontinent, which pits the two fraternal peoples of India and Pakistan against each other, prompts me to make my statement as brief as possible.

56. Our concern is particularly great because India and Pakistan are not only our neighbours, but also countries to which we are bound by cultural and historical ties reaching far back into history.

57. My Sovereign has, personally, spared no effort in trying to achieve a peaceful solution to the problem. We regret that these efforts, which have been going on for many months, along with other efforts undertaken on all sides—particularly by the Secretary-General—have not succeeded in preventing the present confrontation. It is clear that the conditions which led to the tragedy are extremely complex and require very detailed examination of all the human and political problems which gave birth to it. The question does present certain clear features which fall within the competence of the United Nations. This is the regrettable situation that developed in East Pakistan and that provoked the human tragedy of the refugees—a tragedy which was the point of departure of the events which led to armed intervention on the part of India against the national territory of a Member State, and also led it to interfere in affairs which were essentially within the national jurisdiction of Pakistan. This action on the part of India, whatever the reasons for it, is hence entirely unjustifiable. No matter how grave has been the situation of Pakistan with regard to the humanitarian question of the refugees, nothing can justify armed action against the territorial integrity of a Member State. To approve such an action or to cover it up by connivance and silence would be tantamount to undermining the very foundation of the system of international relations upon which our Organization is based.

58. I must stress here with vigour that there are two principles, the absolute respect of which is a *sine qua non* of the very existence of our Organization. We cannot compromise with the national sovereignty or territorial integrity of any Member State. It is essential and urgent for us to take concerted action to find an immediate and total solution to the Indo-Pakistani tragedy and to do so within the framework of the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

59. This solution should begin by putting an immediate end to military operations. We must stop violence and carnage. We must bring about without delay an unconditional cease-fire, without which no long-term solution can be conceived. The withdrawal of troops from the territories

occupied by both sides is the natural corollary of that first essential step.

60. But there is no doubt that, for political and humanitarian reasons, this withdrawal of troops cannot be contemplated without setting up a supervisory instrument which would see to it that this was carried out in the best possible conditions. It is all the more essential that this withdrawal of troops should not lead, by a chain of reaction, to new human tragedies, particularly in the form of local repression or an aggravation of the refugee problem. It is therefore indispensable that it should take place under the control of an international organization enjoying the necessary authority and the confidence of the parties most directly concerned. That authority can only be that of the United Nations.

61. We are therefore in favour of sending a United Nations observer mission which would be installed on both sides of the frontier. That mission should enjoy maximum authority and maximum resources in order to be in a position to carry out all the tasks that would be entrusted to it by the Assembly.

62. We hope that the intervention of the United Nations will make possible not only a solution to the most immediate political problems that have arisen as the result of the war but also and particularly a long-term solution to the human problem of millions of refugees and make possible the voluntary repatriation of these refugees to their country of origin.

63. That last aspect of the problem should receive the greatest possible attention from the whole of the international community. I very much hope that any draft resolution approved at the end of this debate will include the considerations that I have just set forth to the Assembly. That is why my delegation supports draft resolution A/L.647, submitted to us by the representative of Argentina this morning.

64. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I wish to join previous speakers in expressing our warm and sincere satisfaction at seeing the Secretary-General back in our midst. At such a crucial moment for the international community and the United Nations, his presence and assistance are most welcome.

65. I come to this rostrum after three days and nights of hard work, continuous consultations and lengthy and sometimes tense debates in the Security Council. I come with a feeling of sadness and anguish—sadness as a member of the Council because of the failure of that main organ of the United Nations to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security while there was still time to do so even before the last three days and anguish because, while the world Organization continues its deliberations, people suffer and die in the Hindustan subcontinent.

66. I therefore fully share the feeling so eloquently expressed by many other colleagues from this rostrum: this is not the time for words; it is indeed the time for deeds, above all in order to alleviate the plight of millions of innocent human beings. Let us not forget that those who are either directly or indirectly affected by the hostilities

which have broken out represent one fourth of mankind and that their agony will be borne on the conscience of everybody in this Assembly if we once again fail to fulfil our duty.

67. It was in the face of this rapid deterioration in the area and of the danger of a full-scale war that my delegation decided with other delegations to request an urgent meeting of the Security Council. As soon as we were convened we felt that, when open warfare begins, the first step to be taken without delay must be directed at stopping all military activities. I was, and still am, ready to admit that that approach takes care of only one side of the problem confronting us—the short-term one, so to speak. But I am more than ever convinced that that was the immediate task dictated by the tragic events of the last few days.

68. If my plea to the members of the Council was strong and unconditional, it was because my Government had since last March expressed in words and in deeds the most sincere concern for the long-term problem which represents the root cause of the present crisis.

69. In view of the time-limit wisely set by the President for our statements, I shall not quote from any official statement of the Italian Government. Suffice it to recall that since last March the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Italy, Mr. Aldo Moro, both in the Italian Parliament and in meetings of the European Economic Community and the Western European Union has repeatedly drawn attention to the gravity of the situation arising from the events in East Pakistan. We spared no effort up to the last moment. In fact, on 2 December Minister Moro addressed an urgent appeal to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of India and Pakistan. A similar message was sent on 3 December to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, by our Prime Minister, Mr. Emilio Colombo.

70. Against that background the memorandum of the Secretary-General of 20 July could not possibly remain without a keen response on our part. Following the first action taken by Ambassador Kosciuszko-Morizet of France in July, I considered it my duty, acting as President of the Security Council—the more so when the contents of the memorandum were made public on 2 August—to enter into immediate consultations with all the members of the Council to seek ways and means to cope with a situation the alarming prospects of which were evident to all of us. I put three questions to my colleagues: Should we exchange informal views about the problem? If so, should we try to see if the Security Council is in a position to do something? In case there is something we can do, how do we do it? And I am glad to repeat in front of the whole membership of the United Nations that their response was unanimously favourable in so far as the first and second stages of the consultations were concerned. We did therefore engage on the arduous avenue of exploring a possible course of action by the Security Council. The complexity of the situation, involving as it did difficult constitutional, juridical and political aspects of all sorts, however, foreclosed the possibility of selecting any initiative which at that time could have commanded the unanimous support of the Council. And it was certainly gratifying for my delegation to take note of the acknowledgement made in the last three meetings of the Security Council of the

impartiality of the Italian action, an acknowledgement made by a number of members, in particular by the representatives of the two main parties concerned, India and Pakistan. That is all the more true as my Government entertains the most friendly relations with both countries, with which we also have excellent relations of close co-operation.

71. During the three-day session of the Security Council everybody was no doubt aware, just as has been the case for many months, of the seriousness of the situation in East Pakistan, of the heavy toll of life taken among a people torn by civil strife, of the tragedy of millions of refugees, of the heavy burden which ensued for the Indian Government. But what was required from us, as members of the Security Council, in the first instance was to stop the fighting, to stop the shooting, to stop further and increased bloodshed.

72. My delegation was moved by this main concern, by this main purpose—none other—in all the initiatives it took in the Security Council. We were not taking sides. We were siding only with the United Nations. In particular when we submitted our short cease-fire draft resolution,² we knew that it could be unpleasant to one side or the other. But we thought our first duty was to spare as many lives as possible. We were moved in doing so by the same concern and motives as were reflected in the moving appeal made today by U Thant. The same concern has inspired the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.647 to revise their text by introducing a new paragraph reading as follows:

“Urges that every effort be made to safeguard the lives and well-being of the civilian population in the area of conflict”.³

73. I have explained the motives which inspired us in our action in the Security Council. We did not succeed in that body when perhaps there was still time. We will not go over the reasons now. The records are there and anyone can draw his own conclusions. There is no time either for recriminations.

74. We are here to repeat that when people die, Governments cannot remain indifferent; and this Assembly, which represents the conscience of mankind, must appeal to the Governments concerned to stop all fighting.

75. We all know that the problem has two aspects: the situation in East Pakistan, which requires a political solution, as we have constantly advocated; and the open warfare and the crossing of borders by troops, which concern all Governments because it is the primary duty of our Organization to maintain peace and security, and because, moreover, there is a danger of the extension of the war beyond the present limits.

76. The draft resolution I have just mentioned covers both aspects. On one side it clearly expresses the need for a return to normalcy in East Pakistan and, therefore, for a political settlement on a democratic basis in that area. But at the same time, the draft resolution reiterates the urgent need for an immediate cease-fire and for the withdrawal of

all armed forces. The draft resolution represents only a first step, and certainly both the Security Council and the General Assembly will need to consider the matter again in order to explore what else should be done to restore peace to the area, to alleviate the misery of millions of people, to bring the refugees back to their homes and to rehabilitate them.

77. In that spirit and with those purposes in mind, I join previous speakers in expressing the sincere hope that the draft resolution of which Italy is a sponsor will receive the overwhelming support of the General Assembly.

78. Before concluding, I would like to announce that the following delegations wish to become sponsors of the revised version of draft resolution A/L.647: Brazil, Colombia, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Morocco, the Netherlands, Uruguay and Zambia.

79. Mr. AKE (Ivory Coast) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation is very happy to see Secretary-General U Thant back among us and hopes that his recovery is full and complete.

80. Our delegation followed with sadness the long debates in the Security Council on the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. While war is continuing on the subcontinent, with all its devastation, destruction and loss of innocent lives, the Security Council, whose principal responsibility is the maintenance of international peace and security, has once again demonstrated that it is powerless to act promptly to end bloodshed. This is a result of the negative position of a large Power, a permanent member of the Security Council, which in other circumstances has proclaimed itself the champion of international peace and security. This is also the result of the disturbing reservations of other great Powers.

81. Instead of uniting their efforts to put an end to the war, these great Powers have seen fit to stress again—if that were necessary—their own disunity and their partisan positions that are so prejudicial to the maintenance of peace and security and so conducive to the continuation of the war. That particular responsibility that the Charter has vested in those great Powers is no longer placed at the service of the cause of peace, but at the service of a will for predominance: they wish to profit from the sufferings of others in order to extend their spheres of influence and to consolidate their egotistical interests.

82. Consequently, one could ask oneself, what is the purpose of the Security Council if, through an abusive use of the veto power, it is paralysed and unable to adopt even the most provisional of measures to stop an open war which creates a danger for international peace and security, or to stop that war from spreading? In view of the impasse in which the Security Council found itself due to the systematic obstruction of one of the permanent members, the General Assembly, which represents the whole of the international community and world-wide public opinion, cannot remain indifferent at this time. Consequently, quite rightly, a number of the non-permanent members of the Security Council asked that the problem be transmitted for consideration to the General Assembly so that the latter should act in the absence of any action by the Security Council.

² *Ibid.*, document S/10417.

³ Subsequently circulated as document A/L.647/Rev.1.

83. We are glad that the President of the Assembly has acted promptly on the letter of the President of the Security Council [A/8555], thus permitting the members of the General Assembly to express their feelings on this painful conflict. It is true that the General Assembly can put forward only recommendations, but we feel that, in view of the failure of the larger Powers to act in concert in the spirit and in the letter of the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security, those recommendations of the General Assembly should be as binding as decisions of the international community itself. Otherwise we, the smaller Powers, would no longer have any guarantees for the future and our independence could be seriously compromised by these repeated recourses to force in the settlement of disputes which are another proof of the power politics that led to the demise of the League of Nations.

84. My delegation cannot condone the policies of force or fait accompli. It is consequently categorically in favour of an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops to their respective frontiers. It exhorts both India and Pakistan, with which it maintains excellent relations, to silence their guns, to co-operate in seeking a pacific and satisfactory solution to their problem in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and, naturally, a solution of the humanitarian problem of the refugees. We hope that once peace is restored the Pakistani authorities will create a situation whereby the voluntary return of refugees to their homes will prove possible and that they will be helped in this connexion by the international community. Finally, we wish to appeal to the great Powers that they set aside their sterile quarrels and act in concert to restore peace to the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent. Thus, they would heed the call of the international community and that of all those who still believe that the United Nations is and always will be acting for peace.

85. It is in the light of all these factors that we fully support the Argentinian draft resolution, of which our delegation would like to become a sponsor [A/L.647/Rev.1]. We hope that this text will be adopted, if not unanimously, at least by the overwhelming majority of the members.

86. Mr. EL AWAD (Sudan): We find ourselves today in one of the cruelest situations possible, involving two sister countries that are tied to our own by many bonds, by bonds of the struggle against colonialism and for the establishment of a better world order, as well as by bonds of faith and common interests. We feel that the situation created now in the India-Pakistan subcontinent, which we are now meeting to discuss, poses a great danger not only to the countries involved but to the world at large.

87. What makes the situation more tragic and frightening is the pitiful failure of the major organ of this Organization, responsible for peace-keeping, to grapple with the basics of the situation, due either to the halting indifference of some or the cynical attitude of others in frustrating the will of the majority. My Government has been reviewing the situation with the utmost concern and issued the following statement in Khartoum yesterday, 6 December 1971:

“The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan appeals to the two Governments in the name of

the friendly ties she enjoys with both of them to withdraw their armed forces to their own borders and to put an end to the bloodshed. The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan further appeals to them to resort to the accepted international principles concerning the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries and avoidance of interference in the internal affairs of other countries. In pursuance of these principles, the Sudan Government states, first, that it respects and upholds the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Pakistan; second, that whatever happens within the territory of Pakistan is an internal matter and concerns the people of Pakistan. The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Sudan, aware that the war between India and Pakistan can cause incalculable harm to the people of both countries and constitutes a threat to world peace, reiterates its appeal to both countries to put an end to the war.”

88. This is no time for speeches; there is nothing that I can add to the self-explanatory statement of my Government. I only wish to add that in taking this position my Government has been guided by its unshakable belief in the principles of the United Nations Charter, the principles of non-aggression, respect for the territorial integrity of States, non-interference in their internal affairs and the peaceful settlement of disputes. Those are the principles which my country and all our friends in the non-aligned world have repeatedly affirmed. It is for those reasons that we have become sponsors of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

89. The Algerian delegation has authorized me to announce its sponsorship of the same draft resolution.

90. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Three weeks ago the delegations of the Netherlands and New Zealand submitted a draft resolution in the Third Committee on the humanitarian problems on the subcontinent.⁴ The sponsors made a careful effort to produce a balanced draft indicating which minimal steps, in their view, were essential to meet the human problems involved and, in the end, to solve them. The sponsors also stated that if their suggestions were acted upon in the spirit in which they were intended, there might be beneficial side-effects on future developments. Unfortunately, events have taken a different turn. The very worst things imagined by the authors of the Charter have come to pass. There have been threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, acts of aggression, armed attacks by regular and irregular troops—in brief, war with all its attendant horrors has broken out and may spread.

91. The first responsibility of the international community now is to restore peace and security. The deplorable failure of the Security Council to tackle the problem in time and to live up to its primary responsibility has presented a sorry spectacle to the world. Immediate first steps must be taken now by the Assembly, and the Netherlands delegation gladly sponsors the draft resolution submitted to the Assembly.

92. We welcome the request to the Secretary-General, embodied in the text, to keep the Security Council

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 58, document A/8544, para. 10.

promptly and currently informed on the progress achieved. This is, in our view, a modest but healthy reminder to the Council to realize where its duties lie. We would urge all Council members to reflect on steps that may usefully be taken by the Council in conformity with the spirit of any recommendation of the General Assembly on this extremely grave matter.

93. Last, but not least, we subscribe particularly to the view expressed in the draft that the root of the problem lies in political conflict and that political reforms in East Pakistan are essential for the restoration of tranquillity in the area and for the return of refugees.

94. Mr. FRAZÃO (Brazil): It is with great satisfaction that the Brazilian delegation sees the Secretary-General present again among us. We are certainly in need of his advice and personal co-operation.

95. The Government of Brazil has observed with increasing apprehension the tragic events taking place in South Asia. Brazil not only maintains very close relations of friendship with both Pakistan and India, but also is genuinely concerned with the fate of the populations affected by this tragic situation.

96. We have witnessed for many months now, and especially since Saturday last, the failure of efforts carried out through the Security Council. The organ of the United Nations on which the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security devolves has come to complete paralysis, a situation which is an ill omen for our Organization and for the international community at large.

97. Brazil has always proclaimed the need to strengthen the United Nations as a means for creating an international environment conducive to peace and security. Many times my delegation has expressed its concern that sudden events could reverse the trend towards *détente* and confront us with a situation of crisis and conflict.

98. We are now faced precisely with such a situation and it is imperative that, in keeping with our collective responsibility for international peace and security, steps should be taken to facilitate the restoration of peace and security in the Hindustan subcontinent. I should not fail to mention that, despite the efforts of its members, both permanent and non-permanent, the Council took no action in the months intervening between the aggravation of tension in the subcontinent and the outbreak of open warfare. Indeed the Council failed to have recourse to the ways and means made available to it by the Charter, especially those provided for in Article 29. Once a full-scale conflict had started, and a threat to international peace and security had become clearly present, the Council proceeded to consider the question in a rather mechanical way, losing precious days and nights while untold suffering was visited upon an innocent population.

99. This is not, however, the time for recriminations and it is not my intention to blame anyone. The General Assembly, as an organ of last resort, must act promptly and firmly. At this juncture the General Assembly cannot but base its deliberations on strict adherence to the purposes

and principles of the Charter, which are a guarantee of international legality for all States. We have to work together to remove the threats to peace. Quite recently, during the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority and with the affirmative votes of all parties interested in the present situation, adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)] which solemnly reaffirms the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter. My delegation would draw the attention of the General Assembly to operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 of the Declaration, which provide an adequate framework for our consideration of this matter.

100. Thus, it is with those considerations in mind that my delegation has decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

101. My delegation believes that this draft resolution rightly contains the three basic elements on which the General Assembly should base its deliberations. First, it calls upon the Governments of India and Pakistan to take all necessary measures for an immediate cease-fire. Secondly, it calls for a withdrawal of armed forces from foreign territories. Thirdly, it urges the creation of conditions for the voluntary return of the East Pakistani refugees to their homes. This draft resolution has also a further merit: it is strictly oriented towards a concrete solution to the immediate issue before the United Nations.

102. The Brazilian delegation is convinced that this is the correct attitude for the General Assembly to take at this moment. It would be inappropriate to start a sterile discussion here on the remote causes of the present situation in the subcontinent. Perhaps that should have been done before. Perhaps we will have to do it at a later stage. What is incumbent upon us now, however, is the responsibility to act on a concrete emergency situation, on a *de facto* threat to peace. As many representatives pointed out in the Council, during the debates on this item, the United Nations cannot remain silent when there are overt hostilities, when the purposes and principles of the Charter are menaced, when, finally, the prestige and authority of this Organization are at stake.

103. If the Council has been unable to cope with this problem, if its membership, despite the efforts of the majority of the non-permanent members—to which the Brazilian delegation is deeply grateful—declares itself incapable of acting, the only alternative is to take a decision here in the General Assembly, where participation is open to all Member States and where, incidentally, no special responsibilities can be claimed.

104. We are well aware of the fact that through the inaction of the Council we may have already lost the opportunity to take concrete and more enforceable decisions. However, that should not prevent us, I submit, from discharging our responsibilities and from exercising the moral coercion that the people of the world are fully entitled to expect from us, in order to help bring the parties concerned to a settlement conducive to a just and lasting peace.

105. I have been asked to inform the General Assembly that Costa Rica is also a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

106. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has before it a very important problem directly connected with the cause of international peace and security.

107. For some days the Indian Government has been embarked upon an act of armed aggression against Pakistan, an independent and sovereign country and a Member of the United Nations. The Security Council for three consecutive days discussed in a long-drawn-out fashion this very serious problem and was not able to reach any result, because of the obstructionist attitude of the revisionist Soviet Union, which, in abuse of its right of veto, blocked the adoption of relevant measures to call a halt to aggression and to restore peace in that part of the world.

108. The development of events in the Security Council was truly tragic. Although an act of criminal armed aggression was committed against a sovereign State and people, the Security Council adopted a course contrary to the provisions of the Charter. The work of the Security Council over the last few days is a blot on the escutcheon of the United Nations and once again exposes the imperialist Powers for what they are. There is no doubt that the people of the world will draw the necessary conclusions.

109. No State has the right to intervene in the internal affairs of Pakistan in any way whatsoever. The Government of Pakistan has proposed that the question of the refugees of East Pakistan be resolved by negotiation, but the Indian Government has obstinately rejected this proposal of the Pakistan Government. The recent course of events, and particularly in the last few days, shows that the lack of good faith in this regard on the part of the Indian Government is connected with its aggressive aim and its desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan. All the factors in the situation indicate clearly that the armed aggression by India against Pakistan was carefully premeditated and organized long in advance.

110. The purpose of India is to create a separatist State in East Pakistan headed by a puppet government under Indian influence, in order to dismember Pakistan and weaken it. Indian reaction has attempted by all means to create a situation of tension in East Pakistan in order to use it as a pretext for aggression. Along with aggressive activities and encouragement of separatist elements in East Pakistan, Indian reaction has undertaken an escalating series of acts of armed provocation on the Pakistan frontiers. Large numbers of armed forces have been concentrated there and, as is well known, in recent days they have launched a large-scale armed attack against Pakistan.

111. The fuss that the Indian Government is making about the right of self-defence in the face of so-called attacks on the part of Pakistan is just so many empty words which can deceive no one, however naive. History teaches us that all aggressors, when they attack other States, have always come out with such excuses. This becomes even clearer if we remember that similarly absurd claims were voiced by India at the time of its aggression against Pakistan in 1965.

It is obvious that the Indian Government could not have risked such a dangerous step—dangerous even for the interests of the Indian people—if it had not been incited by the Soviet social imperialists and did not enjoy their powerful support.

112. This aggression cannot be dissociated from the whole imperialistic policy pursued by the two great Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, in Asia.

113. The Soviet Government for a long time has given powerful support to Indian reaction and its expansionist designs. It has helped it in all possible ways, by providing it with the most advanced armaments and encouraging it in its actions against Pakistan.

114. In August 1971 the Soviet Union and India signed the so-called Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation, which was acclaimed as a so-called "instrument for the defence of peace in Asia and the world". In fact, time has shown that this is an aggressive treaty aimed against the peace-loving countries of Asia, and primarily against the People's Republic of China and Pakistan.

115. The Albanian people resolutely condemn the armed aggression of the Indian Government against Pakistan. We condemn the warmongering policy of the imperialist Powers, a policy which seriously threatens peace and security in Asia and the world. The results of the notorious Soviet-American collusion become clearer every day to the peoples of the world.

116. The Albanian delegation cannot pass over in silence the demagogic attitude of the United States, which, on the one hand, issues appeals for peace and humanism with regard to this question while, on the other hand, it has for years now been pursuing its imperialist aggression in Viet-Nam and other countries of Indo-China.

117. The propaganda of the Soviet revisionists is shot through with cynicism when they talk against the aggression in the Middle East and in favour of a world disarmament conference, while at the same time they support the armed aggression of India against a sovereign State!

118. The situation in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent is serious. The United Nations should not remain passive. On the contrary, the United Nations should raise its voice to stay the hand of the aggressor. Dilatory and ineffective actions can only widen the aggression. In condemning this aggression, Member States are defending not only the interests of peace but also their own sovereign interests, because the imperialists may one day weave against other free and independent States the same kind of plot as that of which they have now made Pakistan the victim. Member States devoted to freedom and national independence must call a halt to imperialist intervention in the internal affairs of sovereign countries and peoples. The Albanian delegation, concerting its efforts with those of other peace-loving Member States, will give its support to any draft resolution which is in keeping with the interests of the sovereign rights of the people of Pakistan and the defence of peace and security in Asia and throughout the world.

119. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): This is indeed not a time for long speeches and detailed analyses, but at the very outset I must point out that the Yugoslav delegation is deeply concerned over the most recent developments of the crisis on the Indian subcontinent, especially because of the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. At the same time we regret that the Security Council was not able to act effectively in the direction of the restoration of peace in that area. This crisis has obviously involved the entire Organization of the United Nations, including a number of countries which have close and friendly relations with both India and Pakistan.

120. The President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Josip Broz Tito, immediately after the outbreak of the armed conflict, addressed messages both to the Prime Minister of India and to the President of Pakistan, expressing grave concern at the danger of the widening of the armed conflict, with unforeseeable consequences for the two countries and for peace in that area and elsewhere. President Tito expressed the conviction of the Yugoslav Government that everything should be done to end such a development, and that the problems, no matter how difficult, should be solved through peaceful means. It was stressed in the messages that Yugoslavia has always believed that every delay in finding a political solution could only cause an escalation of the crisis. Such a solution must take into account the wishes of the people concerned and ensure the return of millions of refugees to their homeland.

121. My delegation has on a number of occasions during this session of the General Assembly indicated the true causes of the crisis on the Indian subcontinent and the emergence of millions of refugees—people who have become refugees primarily because of a political situation in East Pakistan and the armed suppression by the Pakistan authorities of the elected representatives of the people of East Pakistan and the great majority of the people who support them. Indeed, it is not a time to make any accusations and allegations, but we want to stress that we must now look to the real causes and responsibilities for such a development, which, unfortunately, has assumed, with its consequences, the proportions of an international crisis.

122. The exodus of millions of refugees and the situation in East Pakistan have created great problems and has caused material damage to India. It has also created a situation of insecurity on the border with India. At the same time we wish to observe that all of us together, as States Members of the United Nations, also bear our share of responsibility for insufficient engagement and commitment in defining and ascertaining the real causes of the crisis, and for failing to take effective measures to overcome them in time. Here I have especially in mind the passive attitude and *immobilisme* of the Security Council when it received the memorandum of the Secretary-General of 20 July, in which the Secretary-General pointed out that the developments on the Indian subcontinent constituted a danger to peace in that area.

123. Since we are faced with an armed conflict of wide dimensions, we must act with a sense of urgency in order to solve the problem of all the basic causes of the crisis. In so doing we must proceed from the basic principles of the

Charter: those principles which pertain to the renunciation of the use of force in international relations and to respect for the political independence and territorial integrity of each State, as well as to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the realization of the right to self-determination. This equally entails an obligation on the part of States to resolve international disputes by peaceful means.

124. In spite of the present dimensions of the armed conflict, we still believe that there exists a possibility, provided that we realistically perceive all the complexities of the causes and consequences of the crisis, for a peaceful settlement. In our opinion, the General Assembly should channel its efforts in that direction. That presupposes the rejection of every unilateral approach to one or another of the causes of the crisis.

125. In the existing situation three elements are, in the opinion of my delegation, vital. First, there must be an immediate cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities between the parties concerned. In saying that we have in mind the cessation of all the hostilities—hostilities between the Indian and Pakistani armed forces and between the Pakistani armed forces and the civilian population. Secondly, the withdrawal of all foreign troops to their own territories also constitute a vital element for the cessation of the armed conflict and the solution of the crisis by peaceful means and methods. Thirdly, at the same time effective measures should be taken immediately to solve the crisis in East Pakistan in co-operation with the elected representatives there. This, however, depends primarily upon the Government of Pakistan.

126. Furthermore, it is essential to create the political and other conditions for the free, peaceful and secure return of the refugees to their homes.

127. Those three elements should, in the opinion of the Yugoslav delegation, constitute the basis for a workable and action-oriented resolution of the General Assembly. We think that, on those lines, some improvements could be introduced into the operative part of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, which could stress, in a more balanced manner, the need for an early political solution and, with that, the uprooting of the causes of the conflict. My delegation is confident that, through concerted efforts and with patience and tolerance without any exclusiveness, it will be possible to find a generally acceptable platform, enabling us to find a realistic and just way out of the present crisis. Unless we make such an approach, we shall probably be faced with a more difficult situation of an intensified conflict and graver consequences directly affecting the situation on the subcontinent and elsewhere in the world.

128. We firmly believe that the fundamental principles upon which a solution should be sought are clear. They are enshrined in the Charter, in the Declaration on friendly relations⁵ and in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)].

⁵ Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations (resolution 2625 (XXV)).

129. By strictly adhering to these principles we States Members of the United Nations, especially the two Member States directly involved in the conflict, would best fulfil our obligations, contribute to the restoration of peace and carry out the basic mission of the United Nations.

130. Mr. BITSIOS (Greece) (*interpretation from French*): It is doubly painful for me to speak on the matter which has been referred by the Security Council to the General Assembly. It is so, because, on the one hand, it has been found that the Security Council was unable suitably to fulfil the duties entrusted to it by the Charter, and, on the other, because we realize the difference which exists at critical moments between speeches and political reality. I must voice the fear that, if we do not act immediately, these two elements will combine and thus lead to the increased scepticism regarding the United Nations which already is felt by our peoples. Therefore, the decision of the General Assembly on the question before us will be of great importance since it provides us with a chance—perhaps the last chance—to act in accordance with the directives of the Charter.

131. The position of my Government is dictated by two basic facts. First, the matter is an urgent one in that every hour there are new victims and every day that passes increases the political obstacles to a lasting settlement. Secondly, although our resolution can only be couched in the form of a recommendation, its moral weight will be undisputed and be further increased if we manage to adopt a text that is both objective and impartial.

132. I do not wish at this juncture to go into the historical background of East Pakistan, but I must mention the fact that everyone has known for months that tension was increasing inside the country. We all saw the every-greater influx of refugees to India. We were all aware of the delicate position of the Government of India. It was clear that this problem, though principally internal in character, had already created increasing international repercussions. To the economic pressure already felt by India because of the presence of millions of refugees was now added the political tension inevitably engendered by events of that nature. To the absence of effective action within Pakistan for a political solution was now added the reluctance of the international community in the United Nations to encourage a peaceful settlement.

133. Thus, a conflict principally internal in character overflowed the frontiers of one country and spilled over to have a direct effect on the economic life of a neighbour. From then onwards it was useless to deny that the problem had changed in nature and had become an international matter. Therefore, that aspect cannot be overlooked by the General Assembly in the decisions to be adopted.

134. A political solution—and by political I mean peaceful—to the problem of East Pakistan must, we feel, be urged in any resolution to be adopted. But that is one point of the matter—a very important part I know, but not the only one. A second fact is a cease-fire and a withdrawal of the armed forces facing one another. These are principles which Greece, ever true to the Charter, has always invoked and at all times supported.

135. Moreover, we need hardly say that no substantive negotiations can take place during a hot war. The United Nations has always acted in accordance with that fact and should be consistent and act accordingly now. The draft resolution submitted by Argentina and others reflects to a very large extent the points that I have just raised. We regret, nevertheless, that operative paragraph 2 has not been worded as clearly as has the fourth preambular paragraph.

136. We hope that the peoples of the subcontinent will be able to act in a way that will lead to pacification for years. India's attachment to the Charter and its wisdom have made it one of the most respected Members of our Organization. And Pakistan cannot fail to recognize that a political problem of grave importance now cries out for a peaceful and equitable solution.

137. As the representative of France pertinently put it yesterday in the Security Council at its 1608th meeting, that body is still seized of the problem. Consequently it would be reasonable to expect that any resolution adopted by the Assembly by way of recommendation might serve to inspire the Council, and particularly its permanent members, in any future action and that it will be duly weighed not only by the two Governments concerned but by the Security Council as well in the performance of the duties entrusted to it by the Charter.

138. Mr. TOUKAN (Jordan): It is a most unhappy duty to have to speak on an occasion as tragic and potentially as catastrophic as this occasion. A full-fledged war is being waged unabated between two major countries of the Asian continent with which my country has maintained the closest bonds of friendship and fraternity. The tragedy is heightened by the fact that the combatants have for ages shared a common destiny and, one would have thought and hoped, a common salvation.

139. But that is precisely why my delegation feels so profoundly concerned, so deeply troubled, by the frightful turn of events between India and Pakistan.

140. However, when a house is on fire, one's first, natural and instinctive thought is to extinguish the fire before all else. It is irrelevant to our purpose now to waste time on ascertaining the cause of the fire or on apportioning blame.

141. My delegation unreservedly supports any motion which aims at stopping the horrible blood-letting. The immediate and effective implementation of a cease-fire, together with a simultaneous withdrawal by the armed forces of India and Pakistan from each other's territories, should be the overriding, indeed the sole, consideration in our emergency deliberations under the "Uniting for peace" resolution [*resolution 377 (V)*]. The withdrawal of foreign forces is required by the principle of territorial integrity of every State. Regardless of the merits and origin of the present conflict, there can be no justification for the armed intervention of one State in the territory of another.

142. The United Nations recognizes, and must therefore respect and defend, the territorial integrity of Pakistan as a State Member of this Organization. The constitutional structure and the nature of relationship among the constituent parts of any State is a matter for its own people to decide, and is in any event an internal question.

143. When a cease-fire and complete mutual withdrawal have been achieved, we can turn to the most compelling of the problems which have contributed to the dangerous situation we face today. Above all, the inalienable right of the East Pakistani refugees to return to their homes must be ensured without any delay by appropriate and prompt arrangements.

144. But before all else, a cease-fire must be worked out and withdrawal of forces ensured without delay. It would be a sad day in the history of the United Nations if it failed to bring this about, or if it were to engage in an exchange of words when the lives of people and the integrity of sovereign States face the mortal danger which they do from the bullet, the shell and the rocket.

145. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia): First of all may I be permitted to express, on behalf of the delegation of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, our gratification over the fact that we have again seen the Secretary-General, U Thant, in our midst today. We wish him the best of health and a full recovery.

146. We are following with profound concern the situation which has developed in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent in consequence of the serious political crisis in East Pakistan, which, later on, spread into the Indo-Pakistani conflict. The Security Council, which considered this issue on 4, 5 and 6 December, unfortunately failed to reach any decision pertaining to this matter. Speaking today in the plenary General Assembly we should like briefly to explain our position concerning this issue.

147. In our opinion, when considering such a grave problem, the General Assembly must proceed from its roots, from the principal cause which led to the aggravation of tension and ultimately to the employment of the armed forces of India and Pakistan. The General Assembly should assess this situation as objectively as possible. My country has maintained and developed friendly relations with both India and Pakistan. It is our conviction, which has been borne out by the developments since the beginning of this year, that the present situation on the Indo-Pakistani subcontinent resulted from the political crisis in East Pakistan, which unfortunately was not resolved by political means. On the contrary, force has been applied against the population of East Pakistan and against its political leaders who, in the elections held at the end of 1970, gained a convincing victory. As a result of those events, thousands of people were killed and about 10 million East Pakistani citizens were forced to flee their country to the adjacent parts of India, in fear for their lives.

148. This massive exodus created grave economic problems for the Government of India, as well as a grave issue of a political nature. In spite of solemn declarations on the part of Pakistani leaders, Pakistan did not in fact take any measures which might have remedied that situation and brought about a political settlement in East Pakistan. Instead, the Pakistani leaders continued the military build-up against India, which further aggravated the already dangerous situation.

149. These facts constitute, in our view, an objective reality which the General Assembly should keep in mind

when considering this question. Any resolution which does not take into account these realities will be one-sided and therefore, in our view, cannot create the necessary conditions for a peaceful settlement of the present conflict. It is our considered opinion that any resolution following that objective has to proceed from an inseparable interdependence of the cease-fire and the cessation of military activities with a political settlement in East Pakistan, a settlement which would give immediate recognition of the will of the East Pakistani population as expressed in the election of December 1970.

150. We express our sincere hope that the General Assembly will be in a position to find a reasonable and just solution which would alleviate the present grave situation in the subcontinent.

151. Mr. SEN (India): We are glad to welcome the Secretary-General to the Assembly again, and the ovation he received is a measure of the affection and respect in which we hold him personally.

152. The gravity and importance of the situation which the General Assembly is discussing today is manifest from the manner of our discussion. It is not often that the procedures under which we meet today are employed. In keeping with the importance of the subject and its implications, our discussion should be full and comprehensive and take everything into account before the Assembly takes a decision.

153. I emphasize the vital need to take all factors into account. It is precisely because this was not done that the General Assembly is faced with this situation which has been developing for many months. The world was aware of it but, except for India, which received the refugees fleeing from terror and oppression, no decisive action was visible. As it developed, some of its aspects grew to such dimensions that they could no longer be ignored. But the belated recognition by the world community did not and will not solve the problem unless and until all the aspects are considered simultaneously and comprehensively.

154. Over the last nine months India has made repeated attempts to inform international opinion. We did this through extensive bilateral contacts at the highest possible level, and in such international forums as were available within and outside the United Nations. International opinion was also informed by the press, by diplomatic channels and by reports of many international organizations, but most of those reports were not made public.

155. As is now well known, the present situation began in what was then East Pakistan on the night of 25 March 1971. As early as 30 March I gave a note to the Secretary-General and requested him to circulate it to all the Members of the United Nations. I should like to remind Members of that note and, with permission, I shall read parts of it.

"Since November 1969, when the President of Pakistan announced that the elections would take place in Pakistan in the latter part of 1970 through which transfer of power to the elected representatives of the people of Pakistan would be effected, the Government and the

people of India, who have always entertained the friendliest feelings for the people of Pakistan, had hoped that a democratic evolution in that country would follow its natural course.

"Consequently, India hoped that after the announcement of the results of the elections in December 1970, the elected representatives of Pakistan would have evolved a constitution reflecting the urges of the vast majority of the people in that country. In the words of the Prime Minister of India, 'We had welcomed this not because we wanted interference in another country's affairs, but because they are values for which we have always spoken'."

156. Many representatives here will remember that India has perhaps been one of the most active countries to take part in a large number of civilized documents and instruments that we have adopted. We are proud of our participation, but we do think that all these instruments, all these principles, all these codes of morality, must be taken together and not be torn piecemeal to serve the temporary purpose of this country or that. I continue with my quotation:

"The Government and the people of India had entertained the belief that a democratic and stable Pakistan would co-operate with her neighbours, and particularly India, in a new attempt to bring about peace and stability in South Asia.

"Events since 25/26 March, however, have taken a different and tragic turn. Instead of the peaceful evolution that India and the world were anticipating, there is now a bloody conflict. The political talks between the concerned parties in Pakistan failed. The elected Nations Assembly did not meet. Meanwhile, regular units of the Pakistan army were ordered to take massive action against East Pakistanis in order to 'crush' their movement. New martial orders were issued, total censorship and curfew were imposed.

"...

"The magnitude of the loss of life and property in such armed action is self-evident. We are concerned that in these circumstances the international community can and should take suitable action. The scale of human sufferings is such that it ceases to be a matter of the domestic concern of Pakistan alone."

I should like to read that sentence again:

"The scale of human sufferings is such that it ceases to be a matter of the domestic concern of Pakistan alone. No country in the world can remain unconcerned in a fast-moving situation where thousands of lives are being lost."

When I wrote that letter it was "thousands of lives"; since then it has been hundreds of thousands; the general estimate in the press is 1 to 2 million.

"Inaction and silence in the face of this human tragedy could be interpreted by all those who suffer as helplessness, if not indifference, of the outside world.

"While the Government of India have acted with great restraint and scrupulously avoided any interference in this tragic affair of Pakistan, the reaction of the people of India to the massive killing of unarmed people by military force has been both intense and sustained. The Government of India cannot but take notice of this reaction, particularly as reports of increasing repression by the Pakistani armed forces continue to pour in. There is intense sorrow and shock and horror at the reign of terror that has been let loose. The common bonds of race, religion, culture, history and geography of the people of East Pakistan with the neighbouring Indian State of West Bengal contribute powerfully to the feelings of the Indian people.

"In these circumstances, the Government of India believe that unless maximum restraint is exercised by the armed forces of Pakistan, and international opinion gives sympathy and support for the people of East Pakistan, tension in the subcontinent is bound to increase."

157. On 23 April I informed the Secretary-General of the massive influx of refugees who had started coming into India as a result of these tragic developments.

158. In May, India raised this question at the 669th meeting of the Social Committee of the Economic and Social Council. In June we brought this to the Council itself.⁶ In subsequent months we tried to discuss it whenever we could in the General Assembly. Meanwhile we raised it in many international forums outside the United Nations, such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The reaction even of humanitarian concern was halting. When it was expressed, it confined itself to sympathy for the suffering of the refugees, but there was reluctance to look at the events which had caused the suffering and to seek any solution for its consequences beyond the provision of refugee relief.

159. The Secretary-General issued an appeal for the refugees on 19 May 1971. Other implications and consequences of the problem were also recognized by the Secretary-General in his memorandum of 20 July 1971 to the President of the Security Council. But even then, Member Governments were reluctant to analyse and accept the root-cause—which had, however, been widely recognized unofficially in various ways.

160. Before I come to the basic cause, I should like to provide a little background. The geographical, cultural and ethnic peculiarities of East Pakistan are well known. East Pakistan comprises not only the major part of the population of the whole of Pakistan, but it produces the bulk of Pakistan's foreign exchange and export earnings. Those who compare the East Pakistan problem with that of Biafra should remember this particular difference: that not only is there a distance of 1,000 miles between East and West Pakistan, but the majority of the people of Pakistan live in East Pakistan; and, therefore, there can be no question of the secession of the majority from the minority. Nor was it originally a secessionist movement; it was a movement for autonomy. It was turned into a movement for indepen-

⁶ See *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifty-first Session, 1781st meeting, para. 87.*

dence and secession by the military crackdown on the night of 25 March.

161. For 23 years there had existed and developed in what was then East Pakistan and is now Bangladesh a demand for autonomy, inspired by continued economic exploitation and political domination and discrimination by West Pakistan. Some delegations dismiss these things, saying, "Some mistakes are made in all countries", and so on. But these are not mistakes made casually; they are sustained and continued mistakes which lead to tragic consequences. This demand for equality was always rejected, and when it was finally expressed in an overwhelming manner through the elections of December 1970, an attempt was made to suppress it with the utmost brutality amounting to genocide. This is a central fact which is still ignored by many Governments. This is apart from the humanitarian concern for the plight of the refugees and the belated recognition of the tensions which have been growing as a result of the influx. It has, of course, been recognized by international public opinion and press. It was expressed succinctly by the resolution adopted by the Latin American Parliament in Caracas on 27 August 1971. I shall not read the entire text of that resolution, but it is a very moving one. The reason why I shall not read it is that it would take a little time and I should again be accused of filibustering, which is a peculiarly American political tactic; we are not familiar with it in India.

162. Had the United Nations recognized these facts earlier it would have been able to influence the developments of the present crisis, but the concepts of domestic jurisdiction, non-interference in internal matters, and territorial integrity, were successfully advanced to inhibit this. These concepts are indeed of fundamental importance, but it is not sufficiently realized that the savage repression applied by the Pakistan Army against the people of Bangladesh was of such magnitude, so genocidal, and so designed to annihilate a people that it was beyond the scope of normal standards of reasoning and judgement.

163. The movement for autonomy was transformed overnight into a movement for national liberation. Fifty thousand regular soldiers and policemen defected. They were joined by another 150,000 people who had obtained arms in Pakistan at the time of the military crackdown. So there was already a corps of 150,000 armed men when the military crackdown took place. This is not my statement; it is a statement made by the Ambassador of Pakistan in Washington. This is the corps which was the basis of all Mukti Bahini activities. They were joined by a massive defection of diplomats, ministers, civil servants, bank clerks, persons from every walk of life you can think of. So those who talk about interference in Pakistan's affairs engineered and prompted by India right from the beginning might do well to consider these facts also.

164. In turn that brutality fired and stimulated an increasingly large popular resistance. Each and every army action of reprisal against the civilian population produced new fighters for the freedom of Bangladesh. The truth of the matter is that where there is oppression there is bound to be resistance; when oppression is total, resistance is also total. Thus the theory that India worked for the dismemberment of Pakistan is both false and misleading. Pakistan

broke itself up on the night of 25 March this year. We realized that fact and had to adjust ourselves to the new reality. We hoped that Pakistan would also adjust itself by peaceful means, but it paid no heed to these means and continued its military suppression.

165. Not only did 10 million refugees come to us as a result—and they still continue to come—but our security was also threatened, our social and economic fabric endangered and international tension increased. There was hardly any response from the international community, which seemed paralysed and did not take any action to prevent the massive extinction of human rights and genocide.

166. But we could not ignore what was happening next door to us and its effect on our national integrity. Thus, what had started as an internal matter of Pakistan became an internal matter of India, although the events in East Pakistan should have been the concern of the international community. A grave civil aggression took place against India. None the less, in spite of these difficulties, in spite of our slow and gradual realization of the indifference of the outside world and the determination of the Pakistani army to continue to hold 75 million persons by force of arms—in spite of all those things, we still hoped that a peaceful solution would be found which would meet the wishes of Bangladesh.

167. However, it had also become increasingly clear for many months that the military Government of Pakistan had also come to realize that it could not hold 75 million persons by force and that, therefore, the only possibility open to it was to involve India in a military conflict so that the world's attention would be diverted from what was happening in East Pakistan and so that a face-saving escape might be provided.

168. After the military Government of Pakistan had come to that conclusion—which, I repeat, was that it could not hold 75 million persons by force of arms—the only question was how military action against India was to be brought about and when. Preparations were made, threats were issued and a "Crush India" campaign was launched.

169. We reacted and warned of the consequences. But Pakistan paid no heed. Pakistan then started shelling our villages, and we retaliated. Then the Pakistan air force attacked our cities and military airfields in an Israeli-type attack by air. By sheer luck we had been forewarned about that attack and were able to disperse our aircraft.

170. And once again when the realization came that even armed aggression against India would not succeed, United Nations help was invoked. But, of course, that is a realization one does not like to declare publicly, and it is therefore no wonder that Pakistan did not call for a Security Council emergency meeting.

171. Pakistan has consistently accused India of interference and involvement in the situation which has led to the establishment of Bangladesh. I must clearly point out the stage at which we became affected and involved. The demands for autonomy repeatedly expressed, the demands for the granting of official status to the Bengali language,

the demands to end economic exploitation and political discrimination were not of India's making. The elections of December 1970 and their overwhelming results were not of India's making. The armed resistance of the people of Bangladesh to the brutal military action of the Pakistan Government was not of India's making. The flight of 10 million refugees was not of India's making.

172. We were deeply concerned by what had been happening on our doorstep since 25 March. It was a movement for national liberation which was rapidly intensifying, with continued military suppression and without any attempt at a political solution. Moreover, it had caused the civilian invasion of refugees into India. On 24 May 1971 Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi said in Parliament:

"These 23 years and more we have never tried to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan, even though they have not exercised similar restraint. And even now we do not seek to interfere in any way. But what has actually happened? What was claimed to be an internal problem of Pakistan has also become an internal problem of India. We are therefore entitled to ask Pakistan to desist immediately from all actions which it is taking in the name of domestic jurisdiction and which vitally affect the peace and well-being of millions of its own citizens. Pakistan cannot be allowed to seek a solution of its political or other problems at the expense of India and on Indian soil. Has Pakistan the right to compel at bayonet point not hundreds, not thousands, not hundreds of thousands, but millions of its citizens to flee from their homes? For us it is an intolerable situation. Not only India but every country has to consider its interests. I think I am expressing the sentiments of this august House and of her people when I raise my voice against the wanton destruction of peace, good-neighbourliness and the elementary principles of humanity by the insensate action of the military rulers of Pakistan. They are threatening the peace and stability of the vast segment of humanity represented by India."

173. The intolerable situation to which our Prime Minister referred has continued and the threat to our stability and security has continued and increased. On every occasion when we have brought it to the notice of the world, Pakistan has replied to us by accusing us of dismembering it. But it was in fact Pakistan which was dismembering itself all these months. When the People's Republic of Bangladesh was proclaimed on 17 April, its Prime Minister said that Pakistan was dead and buried under a mountain of corpses, the persons murdered by the Pakistan army.

174. Late last week Mr. Bhutto, the West Pakistan leader, himself confessed that old Pakistan is dead. The Secretary-General referred in a memorandum to the conflict between the principles of territorial integrity of States and of self-determination. It was Pakistan which engineered this terrible conflict by its own actions in what was once its own territory. As a result a new nation has been born in our subcontinent.

175. We now come to more recent developments. When Pakistan found it could not impose its military solution in Bangladesh, it sought to create a confrontation with India in the desperate hope that a campaign against India would

somehow restore its defunct status. The military suppression in Bangladesh was deliberately spilled over across Indian borders, and when India reacted quite sharply Pakistan launched an all-out attack against India's western borders a thousand miles away from Bangladesh.

176. That attack, which is now partly documented by the reports of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan circulated by the Secretary-General, took place on 3 December. India, which had been suffering under an intolerable strain aggravated further by military provocations for the last nine months, had once again to react. This time we were determined that these intolerable burdens should be decisively removed.

177. It is not only a question of removing these burdens; it is also necessary for us to take into account the present and future realities. The genocide being committed in Bangladesh is a reality. The struggle of Bangladesh against this genocide is a reality. The existence of Bangladesh is a reality. No recommendations for solving the present crisis can be effective if they ignore or side-step or postpone these realities, and the Governments which do so not only do not contribute to a solution but also go against the forces of history. Bangladesh is there. It is the eighth most populous country in the world. Its only goal, as its Prime Minister has said, is to rebuild a new nation from the ashes and carnage left behind by the occupation army of Pakistan.

178. I quote the Prime Minister of Bangladesh from his statement made on 17 April:

"We now appeal to the nations of the world for recognition and assistance—both material and moral—in our struggle. Every day it is delayed a thousand lives are lost and more of Bangladesh's vital assets are destroyed. In the name of humanity act now and earn our undying friendship."

179. The Security Council in its meetings over the last three days wished to work towards a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities and withdrawal. These are all urgent objectives, but they must be complete and not one-sided. The hostilities are taking place not only between the armies of India and Pakistan but also between the Pakistan army and the Mukti Bahini of Bangladesh. No cease-fire could be realistic or effective if it did not take into account the Mukti Bahini. No withdrawal of forces could be effective or realistic if it did not cover the occupation forces of Pakistan in Bangladesh.

180. It is impossible to hide from these facts behind concepts which no longer apply to the situation. In our view, the only practical solution for putting out all hostilities is for the Pakistan troops to withdraw from Bangladesh and to work for the cease-fire and withdrawal in the west. The situation would have been quite different if West Pakistan had any hope of holding onto Bangladesh against the wishes of 75 million people. What has been taking place in East Pakistan during the past 25 years amounts to nothing but internal colonialism. Like the people of the United States of America nearly two centuries ago, the people of Bangladesh pronounced and asserted the right to a separate existence as a separate

nation. Nor will they forget what the policy, over the years, of arming, funding and defending the military dictatorship of West Pakistan has meant to them in terms of blood and tears, in terms of death and devastation.

181. The Security Council addressed itself to these matters, but it could not bring itself to see them fully. It could not make up its mind to hear the representative of Bangladesh. Without hearing him and so taking into account the wishes of 75 million people, how could it come to an effective decision? This was one of the reasons for the inaction of the Security Council so far. The General Assembly has no veto, but that does not absolve it from being realistic or considering this grave and grievous problem in all its aspects. Hasty action and nervous measures, however well intentioned, will further complicate an already complex problem.

182. It is very difficult for the people of Bangladesh to understand the international concern when they are finally about to throw off the foreign yoke, when not a leaf moved when they were being butchered and killed and raped and burned. What a travesty of truth it is to suggest that the refugees who are running away from these systematic and calculated horrors were being used by us for political purposes. What are these purposes? And how do the refugees help in serving these purposes? I do not wish to repeat all the other points which were discussed in the Security Council and some of which were again referred to by some of the delegations in our discussions today in the Assembly. I cannot help feeling that some of the chagrin against India is perhaps due to the fact that all that we have been saying would come to pass has indeed happened. But this is not credit to India. We live in the area and should know what goes on there.

183. The question is what should be done now. Simultaneously, together with the cessation of hostilities and withdrawal of the Pakistani occupation army from Bangladesh, the leader of Bangladesh, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, must be released from the Pakistani prison where he has been languishing since 25 March; and the leaders of Pakistan must initiate with him a peaceful recognition of Bangladesh. These peaceful means are still possible. And yet it is not too late, perhaps, even for this Assembly, to recommend these steps to the Government of Pakistan.

184. As everyone knows, India recognized the People's Republic of Bangladesh two days ago. If reports are to be believed, yet another State has recognized it, and I am sure more will follow. But irrespective of the speed and rate of such recognition, the fact remains that in so far as the implementation of any resolution of the Assembly is concerned, nothing can be done unless it is acceptable to the Government of Bangladesh. I would request the Assembly not to overlook this central fact.

185. Much has been said about India's attitude to various proposals and offers made in the past. I shall not go into that part of the history. Those who care to find out what the truth is will have no difficulty. I would, however, like to thank all those voluntary organizations and private individuals who have shown such a remarkable selflessness and sensitivity in helping us to look after the refugees. They do not necessarily come from any rich country; they do not

necessarily come from any poor country; they come from all over the world, from all longitudes and all latitudes, and we are infinitely grateful to all these individuals and all these organizations, as indeed we are much grateful to all those Governments who have helped us in looking after the refugees.

186. In conclusion, I should simply say that the problem the Assembly is facing is one of the adoption of a resolution. What India is facing is the problem of decent survival and the danger of annihilation of proud and friendly neighbours. We shall face this mortal problem with all that we are worth.

187. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): The Japanese Government and people are distressed to see that two brotherly nations, India and Pakistan, are now engaged in a fratricidal struggle which is causing immeasurable sufferings to their people. Japan, as an Asian country and as a close friend of both countries, is seriously concerned with this deteriorating situation on the subcontinent as it is bound to affect the peace and security of Asia and of the world at large. Earlier, Mr. Sato, the Prime Minister of Japan, sent messages to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan expressing the views of the Japanese Government to the effect that, firstly, the problem of East Pakistan should be solved by Pakistan itself; secondly, the United Nations must take appropriate measures to alleviate the sufferings of the refugees and also to ease the tension in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent; and, thirdly, that the return of the refugees be related to the normalization of the situation in East Pakistan. It was hoped that the early political solution of the East Pakistan situation would be effected.

188. When the situation became aggravated, the Japanese Government followed up its appeal by supporting the placing of the matter before the Security Council. We regret that in spite of all efforts the draft resolution which was sponsored by eight non-permanent members of the Security Council⁷ and, in our view, well balanced in its content, failed to be adopted by the Council because of a lack of unanimity of the permanent members.

189. Together with a number of other representatives, we submitted to the General Assembly draft resolution A/L.647. This draft resolution, as has been explained by the representative of Argentina, is essentially identical in its content with the draft resolution which failed to be adopted by the Security Council. This draft resolution calls for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of armed forces. It also appeals for the creation of conditions essential for the voluntary return of the East Pakistan refugees to their homes. It calls for the full co-operation of all States with the Secretary-General in offering assistance to the refugees. Moreover, in the preamble it expresses the conviction that an early political solution would be necessary for the restoration of normal conditions and for the return of refugees. We believe that this draft resolution contains essential elements which are needed at this juncture. It is balanced, impartial and practical. The draft resolution further requests the Secretary-General to keep

⁷ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*, document S/10423.

the General Assembly and the Security Council promptly and currently informed on the implementation of the resolution. Therefore, in case of necessity, the Security Council can be urgently seized of the question and will be in a position to consider the implementation of the resolution.

190. Many delegations have spoken in this forum to the effect that this is not the time for speech but for action. Even while we are discussing in this hall, hundreds and thousands of innocent people are dying and suffering in an undeclared fratricidal war. The people of the world are watching us and hoping that we will take effective steps to stop the bloodshed. We sincerely hope that the draft resolution will commend itself to the overwhelming majority of Members assembled in this hall and will be adopted.

191. I am authorized to report that Yemen is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

192. Mr. ROMAN (Nicaragua) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On 4 December 1971, Nicaragua signed the letter addressed to the President of the Security Council, together with the delegations of Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, Italy, Japan, Somalia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America requesting the immediate and urgent convening of a meeting of the Security Council to consider the deteriorating situation which had led to a bloody war between India and Pakistan.⁸

193. In its first statement, at the 1606th meeting of the Security Council on the same day, the delegation of Nicaragua stated that it had signed this letter because of the humanitarian feeling in its country and the particular feelings and friendly relations which link it and its people with the peoples of both India and Pakistan, and stated that it hoped that these two great countries, which make up the Indian subcontinent, would be able to come to a settlement and to accept peaceful mediation which the United Nations might offer them so as to avoid a bloody, brutal war which could lead, never to any victory, but simply to suffering and misery for both India and Pakistan as well as distress and suffering for the rest of mankind.

194. The delegation of Nicaragua similarly sponsored a draft resolution together with Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, Italy, Japan, Sierra Leone and Somalia⁹ which was vetoed by a permanent member of the Security Council. We also sponsored another draft resolution,¹⁰ which was withdrawn since it too would have been vetoed in the same way. Finally, as a last measure, bearing in mind the failure of the Security Council—I repeat, bearing in mind the failure of the Security Council—where the non-permanent members are, as it were, just courtesy members without any conclusive vote in a club of five great Powers, we sponsored draft resolution A/L.647 and the request referring the tragic situation to the General Assembly, stating that if it was not resolved immediately it would result only in suffering and distress and further complications for those already involved in the conflict and even for those of us

who are far away from it. That is why we are concerned over the destiny of the United Nations. If we cannot resolve this problem in a definitive way it will be a disgrace in the eyes of humanity, making the Organization nothing but “a white elephant” or, as Ezra Pound said, “just a bureaucratic lump of sugar”.

195. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): We would like to set on record the pleasure of our delegation at the restoration to health of the Secretary-General and to offer every best wish for his return to perfect health.

196. Uruguay, an essentially peace-loving country, categorically supports the draft resolution sponsored by Argentina and other States. It is a draft resolution which first appeals to the parties to bring about a cease-fire and a withdrawal of forces and then urges the intensification of efforts to establish the necessary conditions for the voluntary return of the Pakistan refugees to their homes.

197. In the view of my delegation, this is not a matter of making a prior examination of the claims of the parties at issue, nor of the causes of the conflict. Nor are we called upon now to search for long-term solutions which would require the working out with due care and thought of measures to that end. Nor is it urgent to decide who is to be held responsible. Still less is it necessary to examine the entire system of security of the United Nations and to consider its failures and remedies to them. All this can be done after we adopt the urgent and immediate measures which the circumstances imperatively require. In the view of my delegation, the urgent thing in the present circumstances is directly and immediately to try to safeguard human lives which, as the Charter says, are threatened by “the scourge of war”. What is required as a first measure, as a primary, prior measure—almost as an elementary measure—is a cease-fire and also an immediate effort to remedy the distressing situation of the refugees.

198. By adopting those measures provided for in the draft resolution under consideration and by doing so as soon as possible, the representatives in this Assembly would be proving that those countries on whose behalf we act are inspired by the firm intention to comply wholly and fully with the obligation to ensure peace, an obligation solemnly contracted by the Member States.

199. The purpose of my delegation was not to make a long speech, which would to some extent delay the Assembly's final pronouncement, but simply and purely to express aloud our strong desire to contribute to the approval of the draft resolution which would help to restore peace to a vast sector of mankind which now suffers the distresses and miseries of war. This intention has been fulfilled by the few words which I have spoken.

200. Finally, I take pleasure in announcing that the Republics of Ecuador and Panama have become sponsors of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

201. Mr. EKLO (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly has before it a most serious matter for which, unfortunately, no adequate solution has been found by the Security Council. I refer to the bloody confrontation of

⁸ *Ibid.*, document S/10411.

⁹ *Ibid.*, document S/10433.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, document S/10425.

two neighbours: India and Pakistan. My delegation does not wish to enter into the substance of the problem of the war which is raging nor refer here to the causes which brought it about. It, nevertheless, wishes to echo what other delegations have said and that is that the sacred principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of third countries has once again been violated. All the countries of the world, without any exception, have their own national problems. These problems are of different types and are due to various causes. If they are not racial, they are economic, political or of other types. But is it necessary then for foreign Powers, here and there, to dictate the lines of conduct to be followed? Is it necessary then for foreign Powers to go and tidy up another State? On what basis?

202. If we are to speak of self-determination in our respective States, we might be surprised to see some States multiplied by 4 or by 10 because of their varied internal problems, and our Organization, which has 131 members today, might have more than 600 members tomorrow as a result of this splitting up of States. Consequently, why do we wish for a division of Pakistan? Pakistan is a sovereign State; it is free to settle its own affairs as it sees fit. Our duty is to assist it to maintain its national unity within the framework of respect for the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

203. The problem of the Pakistani refugees is essentially a political problem. Had the third world not been despoiled, had Pakistan handled its own resources, it would never have come to this. My country, Togo, which bravely said "No" to the secession of Katanga and "No" to the secession of Biafra, reaffirms that position today.

204. In the interest of world peace and in the spirit of the Charter, States of the international community must respect the territorial integrity of other States. They must also refrain from interfering in the affairs of other States. This is why my delegation supports the draft resolution submitted by Argentina and other sponsors to put an end to an already murderous struggle that has claimed so many victims and caused such atrocious sufferings to the innocent, a draft resolution which calls for an immediate withdrawal of all Indian and Pakistani troops to their respective frontiers.

205. It is a blessing to heal wounds and to feed refugees, it is true. But it is a far greater blessing to stop the hand that torments and wounds.

206. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland): Allow me to express briefly my delegation's gratification at seeing our distinguished Secretary-General U Thant back at his post. We warmly welcome his return.

207. The standpoint of the Polish People's Republic on the problem now being discussed is best described in a statement of the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, Comrade Edward Gierek, made yesterday at the Sixth Congress of the Party. I quote from an unofficial translation:

"In view of our feelings of deep sympathy towards both India and Pakistan, we are distressed by the new armed conflict in the Indian subcontinent. Many times, we have

expressed our concern over the situation which developed after the December 1970 elections in East Pakistan, forcing 10 million people to leave their homeland and to seek refuge in the territory of India, placing a great responsibility and economic burden on that country. Inevitably, this was bound to lead to dangerous social and political tensions in that region. We continue to be convinced that only a political settlement in East Pakistan which meets the aspirations and the will of the population of that country and brings about the return of the refugees could lead to the cessation of the present tragic bloodshed, to the end of the conflict that causes an increase in international tension."

208. To this standpoint we have consistently adhered, from the beginning of the crisis, during its tragic development in East Pakistan, throughout our long debates in the Security Council. To this standpoint we continue to adhere.

209. There is not and there cannot be any difference of opinion as to the fact that the situation which we are now discussing is essentially rooted in East Pakistan. It is essentially a crisis born out of an attempt at counteracting by military and repressive means the expression of the political will of the people. It grew into a military confrontation opposing Pakistani armed forces to the population of East Pakistan. It grew into a civil war.

210. It was possible to take appropriate political steps in order to overcome this dangerous development. It was possible for the Pakistani Government to heed the appeals, to take into consideration the views expressed by many Governments, motivated by their good relations with Pakistan as well as concern over the situation.

211. Unfortunately, the situation was allowed to go on deteriorating. Ten million refugees flooded the border region of India, creating for that country a problem which for any country in the world would be an almost unbearable economic and social strain, and which, as was recalled in the Security Council, had no precedent in history in regard to its scale, intensity and rapidity.

212. Simultaneously, military actions were being extended to the immediate vicinity of the Indian frontier and across the frontiers. Is that not a situation which could not but provoke in India a legitimate feeling of a threat to its security? I do not think anybody can challenge that.

213. In our very sincere opinion these are the root-causes of the problem we are considering. This is what we should deal with as a first priority if we want to arrive at a solution which would be reasonable, realistic and lasting. That is what is called for, and not a course of action which from the very start has bypassed the crux of the matter, the grave internal crisis in East Pakistan, and which deals only with the external consequences of that crisis rather than with its root-cause. If we want to arrive at a solution, as we are sure we do, we have to consider the problem in all its ramifications and complexity. We cannot treat the component parts of this situation separately. We cannot disregard or minimize the sources of the conflict, the sources of the situation, and concentrate on its external manifestations, however much we regret the bloodshed and however much we sympathize with the sufferings of the people involved.

214. That is what we have been trying to expound in the Security Council. That was the reason for our support of the draft resolution submitted in the Security Council by the delegation of the Soviet Union and also the reason for which we support the Soviet draft resolution contained in document A/L.648. The gist of both is: immediate cease-fire and cessation of all hostilities, simultaneously with the acceptance by the Pakistani Government and with its implementation of the principle that immediate recognition be given—and I quote from the text of the draft resolution—"to the will of the East Pakistan population as expressed in the elections of December 1970".

215. We submit that this is the way in which the Security Council could have dealt with the matter and the way in which the right decision could already have been taken. This is the way in which the General Assembly can pronounce itself in the interests of a necessary, realistic and lasting solution.

216. These are the reasons which will guide my delegation when we come to the vote.

217. The PRESIDENT: There are still 18 speakers inscribed for this item. It is possible that the voting may take place late tonight. If not, the Assembly will resume its consideration of the item at 10.30 a.m. tomorrow. I shall now adjourn the meeting.

218. The representative of Tunisia wishes to speak on a point of order.

219. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): We have spent the whole day talking. At the beginning of the previous meeting I suggested that we stay in the hall until a decision was taken. I should like to make this a formal proposal. I would also request you, Mr. President, by virtue of the powers conferred on you, to close the list of speakers. The situation is serious; it is grave; it is abnormal. We must take a very special approach to it. I think that we have responsibilities which we must exercise. The world is watching us. The future of the United Nations is at stake. Peace in the world is at stake.

220. The PRESIDENT: I give the floor to the representative of Yemen on a point of order.

221. Mr. GEGHMAN (Yemen): I wish to support the suggestion put forward formally by the representative of Tunisia regarding the continuation of the meeting. I am sure that all the delegations realize that we cannot afford to adjourn while war is going on and God knows what suffering and destruction are going on with the passing of every minute. In addition to supporting that suggestion, and in order to complement it, I should like also to suggest that we should not adjourn until a decision is reached.

222. The delegation of Yemen was on the list of speakers. My delegation would prefer to act rather than speak, and consequently I will withdraw the name of Yemen from the list of speakers, so that we can hasten our work and reach a decision.

223. The PRESIDENT: If there is no objection, we shall continue our deliberations and I shall now close the list of speakers.

224. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with your recommendation at this morning's meeting, Mr. President, I shall try to be concise in my statement on the position of my delegation with regard to the distressing and painful problem which has been of the utmost concern to the international community in the last few days.

225. Our relations with India and Pakistan have always been, and remain, excellent, and that is why the conflict between those two friendly countries which, moreover, belong to the same region as our own, affects us profoundly, as indeed we are affected by the fate of the millions of refugees who have fallen innocent victims to a struggle whose cause they may not even understand.

226. Like many delegations here, we believe very sincerely that nothing can be settled by violence alone, by force of arms alone; arms have more than had their say. We are indeed convinced that the present conflict, if we do not do something, may easily and rapidly degenerate into a confrontation which would far transcend the regional framework and, in the final analysis, benefit no Power—great, small or medium-sized.

227. That is why we, for our part, urgently appeal to the two parties, India and Pakistan, to agree to a cease-fire, thus putting an end to a situation whose continuation can only damage the security of our region and hence endanger international peace.

228. A cease-fire should, within the primary respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter, necessarily be followed by the acceptance of a withdrawal of troops to their respective frontiers, which would make possible the gradual normalization of the situation in the area and a resumption of relations of confidence between the two nations, between two countries and two peoples which history and geography have decreed shall be neighbours, wed to the same destiny.

229. We have no intention here and now, in these circumstances, of trying to indict anyone or of trying to determine who was responsible for starting the conflict.

230. We are all aware of what has been happening in the area for more than nine months. Unfortunately, we are only too aware of the sufferings endured by 10 million refugees, and also of the heavy burden—the almost intolerable burden if it is to be sustained for very long—which India has had to bear, and will no doubt have to continue to bear. We are only too well aware that we have no right to interfere in the internal affairs of a Member State. But, at the same time, we think that it is urgent and necessary, by appropriate political means, to restore normal conditions of peace and security in Bengal, and for this purpose we must concede that the principle of self-determination, in this particular case and in the present context, can have only the sense freely given it by the peoples concerned. In our view, any restrictive interpretation of that principle, one way or another, can only make more complex an already delicate situation, one which is already heartbreaking, and thus jeopardize international security and endanger the lives of millions of human beings.

231. I would like to be properly understood. What we have just said is to be understood within the context of a political solution which, at some time or other, will have to be found for this situation, and the sooner the better. Such a solution can only be found by bearing constantly in mind the fundamental principles of the Charter and also taking into full and objective account the whole series of events which preceded the outbreak of the conflict—a conflict which might perhaps have been avoided by sending, while there was still time, observers whose mission would have been purely humanitarian and would have had no political significance.

232. However that may be, and pending a practicable and satisfactory solution in political and humanitarian terms with the co-operation of the Governments concerned and of the interested parties, my delegation associates itself fully with the opinion that it is an urgent matter to make sure that the cease-fire become effective as soon as possible and that it be followed by a withdrawal of troops to their respective positions and by efforts to create all the political and other necessary conditions conducive to the return of the refugees to a normal life.

233. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand): New Zealand, like other countries, has been saddened and dismayed by the outbreak of fighting between India and Pakistan. My Government deeply regrets the actions taken by the armed forces of the two countries in the last few days and the announcement by both sides that a state of war exists between them. These developments make what was already a tragic situation an even greater calamity.

234. It would be less than honest to pretend that what has happened was totally unexpected. The possibility of large-scale warfare has been inherent in the grim sequence of events that has unfolded in recent months, in the growing dimensions of the refugee problem, in the extent of guerrilla warfare in East Pakistan and in the mounting tension between India and Pakistan. My delegation pointed out at the Third Committee's 1877th meeting on 18 November that security conditions in East Pakistan had deteriorated and that there was a serious danger of war between India and Pakistan. I also pointed out that war would not solve the problem but would only increase the human suffering in East Pakistan, and spread it to other areas.

235. People in New Zealand have from the outset been deeply distressed at the suffering and loss of life caused by the crisis in East Pakistan. It is the human aspect of the situation that has commanded our special concern, but we have also been conscious throughout of the dangers that the situation holds for the peace and security of South Asia, and we have felt from the beginning that the United Nations has an important part to play in helping to deal with this problem.

236. In several international contexts New Zealand has taken action to direct the attention of the international community towards the problem and to get it to face up to its responsibilities. We took the initiative in the Economic and Social Council in promoting discussion of steps necessary to relieve the suffering of the refugees and of the people of East Pakistan. More recently New Zealand joined

with the Netherlands and Sweden in sponsoring in the Third Committee a draft resolution [*A/C.3/L.1885*] designed to emphasize the human dimensions of the refugee problem and the need for sustained international effort to deal with it. The sponsors proposed that the Assembly should appeal to the Governments of Pakistan and of India to take the steps that were clearly required of each of them to bring about conditions in which the refugees would return to their homes. Unfortunately that part of our proposal was unacceptable to some other members, and the resolution as finally adopted by the General Assembly yesterday [*resolution 2790 A (XXVI)*], falls a good deal short of what we had originally proposed. Even in its final form it did, however, contain elements which could have provided the basis for useful action by the Security Council, had the Council been willing to take up the question before the point of full-scale hostilities was reached, as the Secretary-General several times prompted it to do.

237. My Government has been deeply disappointed at the failure of the Security Council to come to grips with this problem and to fulfil its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security. It seems to us that certain of the great Powers have very little to be proud of in their response to a situation which is not only a great human tragedy but is likely to have serious and lasting consequences for the stability of South Asia and perhaps other areas. We hope that the great Powers will, however belatedly, see the need to exercise the influence which lies at their command and which seems alone capable of bringing a halt to the fighting.

238. Once war has broken out the first and most urgent responsibility of the United Nations is to bring it to an end. New Zealand will support any proposal which offers a reasonable prospect of achieving this goal. And we are pleased to note that the sponsors of the draft resolution before us in document *A/L.647/Rev.1*, have drawn upon the Third Committee resolution that New Zealand sponsored in preparing their draft. At the same time it must be recognized that there can be no lasting peace in the subcontinent until the problem that has given rise to this conflict is solved. And as I pointed out in the Third Committee during the debate on the refugee question, the heart of the problem is the desire of the people of East Pakistan for greater control of their own affairs. My Government has for some time believed that a solution can be found only through negotiations between the Government of Pakistan and those who were freely elected by the people of East Pakistan as their representatives.

239. As I said earlier, it is the human aspect of the crisis that has commanded New Zealand's special concern and we believe that it should be the concern of the United Nations as a whole. Any action taken by the General Assembly should, we believe, be directed not only towards bringing about a cessation of hostilities but also towards removing the deeper causes of the untold suffering that has arisen from the crisis in East Pakistan. Ending the fighting must come first, but any peace will be fragile and of short duration unless it enables the Bengali people to realize their aspirations.

240. Mr. SALIM (United Republic of Tanzania): These are very trying moments and we speak here with a very heavy

heart. For the Government and people of Tanzania in particular the war that has engulfed the Indian subcontinent is a matter of the greatest sadness and concern, for we have historically maintained the most cordial and friendly ties with both nations. We share with them not only commercial and economic ties, but cultural ties as well as ties of human and brotherly understanding. The war, therefore, has deeply affected our people. We feel the sufferings and devastation that have been created as our own.

241. The debate which started this morning on the war which has been going on between India and Pakistan is a matter of deep regret for us: regret because we believe the Security Council, which has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should never have failed to take appropriate measures. I shall not recount what has occurred in the Security Council. That has already been eloquently explained by my colleagues the Ambassadors of Argentina and Somalia this morning. However, those of us who have followed the proceedings of the Security Council in its consideration of this vital issue cannot fail to be disappointed, if not disillusioned. The security of small States depends among other things upon the effective discharge by the Security Council of its responsibilities at all times and wherever threats to international peace and security occur. It is, therefore, the sincere hope of my delegation that the entire membership of our Organization, particularly the small States, will undertake a serious analysis of the impotence of the Security Council in such vital matters.

242. My delegation whole-heartedly agrees with the prevailing view that this is no time for statements; it is a time for immediate action. In this regard we are grateful to the delegation of Argentina for taking the initiative to present a draft resolution which in our view meets the immediate requirements of the situation. We believe that the draft resolution, which is sponsored by 30 States, contains the essential elements and since it clearly conforms to the provisions of our Charter and our previous decisions and practices, cannot fail to invoke the support of our Organization.

243. It is clear that we cannot oppose an immediate cease-fire nor, for that matter, disagree with the call for the discontinuance of armed hostilities. That is not inconsistent with this Organization's solemn undertaking for the peaceful settlement of disputes between Member States. We are equally in favour of the vital call for an immediate withdrawal to internationally recognized frontiers. Indeed, none of us can afford to compromise on the respect for the territorial integrity of each State. All of us, on one occasion or another, either in the General Assembly or in other forums, have stressed the inviolability of this important principle in the conduct of international relations. For the principles involved in these two elements—the call for a cease-fire and for withdrawal—put to the test the very purposes and principles of the United Nations. We cannot condone the occupation of territories no matter how trying and difficult the circumstances may be. We cannot allow a state of war to rage, with thousands of lives being lost, and at the same time have any right to claim that this Organization stands for the preservation of peace and international security.

244. We find the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of Argentina and others satisfactory because it does address itself to one other essential element in this tragedy. We believe that the creation of a climate, in accordance with the principles of the Charter conducive to the voluntary return of the East Pakistan refugees to their homeland to be indispensable in an over-all solution to this problem. We do not in any way underestimate the complexity of the problem, but we are firmly of the opinion that the scrupulous observance of the Charter provisions and the many decisions and declarations which the General Assembly has adopted is the only way to ensure peace and security, not only in that region, but in the world.

245. In the light of the background of our ties with India and Pakistan, it is very difficult for the Tanzanian delegation to participate in this debate. It is difficult, because under normal circumstances we would prefer not to engage in a public debate, but to utilize all possible avenues for persuasion and conciliation. But, then, these are not normal circumstances. We have a full-fledged war going on, the repercussions and ramifications of which affect the international community as a whole. For what is at stake here is not just the threat to international peace and security that the Indo-Pakistan conflict surely poses, although that is fundamental; what is also at stake is the whole concept of international order as defended and supported by us all. The failure of the Security Council to live up to its responsibilities gives all the more reason for this Assembly to raise its voice. For the Assembly to remain silent or immobilized as the Council was would mean, I submit, that the hopes and expectations mankind has placed in our Organization would be shattered beyond redemption.

246. Mr. KHATRI (Nepal): As a small country surrounded by infinitely bigger and more powerful neighbours, and incapable either of defending itself alone from external attack or of imposing our will on others—however right that will may be, politically or morally—by means of the use or threat of force, Nepal can do nothing except base the whole premise of its national policy on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations. When we undertook to accept the obligations of the Charter and joined the United Nations, we did more than just give up the use or threat of force as an instrument of our policy; we also tried to secure ourselves from the use or threat of force by others. We came to the United Nations with a total trust in its collective security system. More than many other Member States we need this system, and since we depend so much upon the United Nations for our very survival, we cannot afford to be equivocal in our understanding and interpretation of the Charter principles. In our judgement those Charter principles, among other things, are: sovereign equality of States, respect for the territorial integrity of States, non-use of force or the threat of force against other States, and non-interference in the affairs of other States.

247. In this light, my delegation welcomes the consideration by the General Assembly of the present item concerning the deteriorating situation which has led to the current large-scale armed clashes between India and Pakistan, after the inconclusive consideration of the item by the Security Council. The capacity of the United Nations to deal with situations such as this which threaten international peace

and security should be preserved intact at all times and at any cost.

248. So far as the delegation of Nepal is concerned, it is clear that as a matter of basic principle we cannot remain indifferent to proposals seeking to put an end to all hostilities and effect the withdrawal of forces, as a necessary first step. At the same time it must also be understood that the end of the current fighting alone does not solve the problems which led to the fighting. After all, we all know that the fighting started only in recent days whereas the world community has remained seized of those problems for many months now. Moreover, the situation as it obtains in East Pakistan at present has vastly compounded the difficulties we are in.

249. In those circumstances the General Assembly, in its wisdom and in pursuance of its ultimate responsibility for the preservation of international peace and security, should take the necessary measures which stand a reasonable chance of being implemented. Those measures should be designed to put an end to the armed conflict and at the same time create not only the physical condition but the political will on the part of the parties concerned, which is required for the solution of the basic problem.

250. Mr. ZAKARIA (Malaysia): On behalf of my delegation I should like first of all to express our joy and satisfaction at seeing our esteemed Secretary-General restored to good health and back in his office.

251. All of us are acutely conscious of the grave responsibility which the General Assembly has been called upon to undertake as a result of the incapacity of the Security Council to exercise its primary duty of maintaining international peace and security in regard to the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. All of us without exception must feel deeply concerned over the continuation of hostilities on the Indian subcontinent. This concern arises not only from the tragic loss of life and property and the immense suffering inflicted on the people of both India and Pakistan, in particular the innocent civilian population, it arises also from the fact that the conflict and its continuation pose a serious and immediate threat to the peace and stability of Asia, and indeed of the whole world. To us, in Malaysia, the conflict is all the more agonizing because it involves two countries, India and Pakistan, with which we share not only a common, general, geographical region, that of South and South-East Asia, but also the closest bonds of friendship.

252. It is in the spirit of friendship with both countries and in an endeavour to bring the hostilities to a halt that my Prime Minister has sent an urgent appeal to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi of India and President Yahya Khan of Pakistan for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the peaceful resolution of their conflict.

253. It is the earnest hope of my delegation that where the Security Council has failed to exercise its responsibility, the General Assembly will act expeditiously to bring about the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of all forces to within their national boundaries, so that the two parties to the conflict can resolve their problem by peaceful means and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

254. We are all conscious of the complex problems which have given rise to the present open armed hostilities, but this is no time to go into these causes or to apportion blame to one or the other party to the conflict. While hostilities are raging and the situation is deteriorating rapidly by the hour, the central and immediate task of the United Nations must be to bring about the cessation of fighting and the withdrawal of troops so that the parties to the conflict can resolve their dispute by peaceful means. It is also the fervent hope of my delegation that urgent efforts will be intensified in order to bring about speedily, and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, conditions for the voluntary return of East Pakistan refugees, whose influx in the millions into India has imposed such an intolerable burden and strain on that country.

255. For all the reasons that I have briefly set out, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.I, sponsored by Argentina and other delegations.

256. May I conclude by expressing my sincerest hope that the adoption of this draft resolution will facilitate the immediate restoration of peace in the strife-torn Indian subcontinent and the eventual and peaceful settlement of the dispute in all its aspects, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

257. Mr. DÍAZ-CASANUEVA (Chile) (*interpretation from Spanish*): A menacing situation has existed for several months and has transformed itself into a war—mainly, because the various Member States, despite certain efforts, have responded neither rapidly nor adequately to the exhortations of the Secretary-General.

258. My Government and, more specifically, President Allende, have always stressed their concern over the serious problem facing India by the influx of millions of Pakistan refugees. President Allende, in a letter of 23 June 1971, thanked U Thant for the efforts undertaken in this connexion by the United Nations and referred to the concern caused by the magnitude of this problem. We had always considered the matter from a humanitarian standpoint, although as complex a situation as this must, we know, possess other elements.

259. Despite the frustration experienced in the Security Council at its meetings, we witnessed a detailed consideration of the matter and a desire to come to the source of the conflict. Our delegation believes that urgent measures should be adopted in order to put an end to the conflict now raging and to help the two countries for which we feel respect and friendship. We regret that the Security Council, the organ eminently competent to consider such problems, was unable to devise a just and balanced formula unanimously acceptable to its members. It would perhaps be too much to ask for unanimity, but it was the only way the United Nations could exercise both legal and moral influence over the parties to the conflict.

260. It is useless to call for a cease-fire if, at the same time, we do not contemplate a more positive measure to implement the cessation of fighting instead of a mere formalistic appeal destined to remain unheeded. In our opinion, the most positive measure would be to adopt a

draft resolution based upon the principles which we are all called upon to respect, principles binding in themselves and valid both individually and in the relation existing among all of them: cease-fire, withdrawal of troops, protection of human rights, the adoption of immediate measures aiming at resolving the political problem in the zone involved in order to ensure the return of the refugees, non-interference, self-determination, territorial integrity, and the active presence of the United Nations, together with the other principles considered as fundamental to international peace and security.

261. My delegation believes that the draft resolutions which have been submitted in this connexion [*A/L.647/Rev.1* and *A/L.648*] could be the subject of improvement. My delegation hopes that the Assembly will adopt a single resolution—hopefully on the basis of a consensus. This is the only way in which we can make a just and logical contribution to ending a war which has brought about death and ruin to the brotherly nations of the third world and the only way to create conditions for a realistic and lasting peace.

262. Mr. PATRÍCIO (Portugal): The delegation of Portugal feels called upon by a sense of duty to make a statement on the question that is at present being discussed by the General Assembly, namely, the situation resulting from the hostilities initiated by the Indian Union against the Republic of Pakistan. Today is the fifth day since these two countries found themselves in a state of virtual war, with all the horrors and sufferings for the local populations that such a situation entails.

263. We in Portugal are not strangers to this sort of chauvinistic conduct on the part of this powerful neighbour of Pakistan, involving the use of naked and massive armed forces in order forcibly to obtain the annexation of a part of our national territory. It is exactly 10 years since Portugal also was subjected to such a traumatic experience as Pakistan is today being subjected to in the Hindustan peninsula. It is not our desire to make capital for propaganda purposes out of the tragic situation that obtains there today. But a restatement of facts and principles will certainly be in order.

264. It would appear that, despite the untold misery and suffering which it had to undergo only some 35 years ago, the world community is unwilling to learn from the mistakes that punctuated the now historical road of agony along which a few small countries of Europe were led at that time through the use of armed force as an instrument for the solution of disputes between nations. It will have to be admitted that the techniques employed then are the same as those employed now. However, this time they are more studied, more calculated, more deliberate. But the goal is the same: territorial expansion and rounding off of geographical limits through the instrumentality of sheer armed might directed to the subjugation of smaller countries that lie in ambition's path. The methods, too, are the same now as they were then. First an intensive barrage of propaganda, then the creation of fifth columns through insidious campaigns alleging persecution of minorities that are in the end to serve as the unsuspecting instruments of the powerful aggressor in the justification of his plans. After that follows the never-ending chain of victims as they

are sent to their doom, while an unsuspecting world remains indifferent and impassive.

265. Ever since the setting up in 1947 of the two dominions of Pakistan and the Indian Union, which were to inherit political power in the Hindustan peninsula from the United Kingdom, the world has been witnessing one instance after another of the use of force by the more powerful of the two, the Indian Union, in the solution of disputes with the neighbouring small territories, which were expressly left out of the territorial limits of that country by the United Kingdom. One after another, small and defenceless States whose people and rulers had refused to toe the line at the dictate of New Delhi were reduced to subjugation by Indian armed forces in that Government's drive to achieve a rounding off of its geographical limits. In 1947 there was the case of Junagadh, a Moslem native State that had opted to join Pakistan. In 1948 it was the turn of the State of Hyderabad to fall in like fashion under the heel of the Indian army. Then it was the case of Kashmir. And in 1961 we ourselves were victimized by the same expansionist process in Goa.

266. On that occasion as in the present instance, the Security Council met after prolonged delays, and somewhat reluctantly, to consider the situation. And it is very strange that the circumstances attending the meeting of the Security Council in both cases should be so similar. For in both cases the Council's action was paralysed because of the negative vote of a single permanent member, cast in order to gain time to favour India's military success until further action by the United Nations became useless. But it is worth recalling before this Assembly the ominous implications of this course of conduct.

267. Concerning the Indian Union's expansionist programme through the use of armed force, my delegation would like to stress that this should be a warning to all the small and weak neighbours of the Indian Union. They are next in line. And here I am not expressing a personal view or a personal feeling. I shall quote from the Ceylonese paper the *Ceylon Daily News* of 19 December 1961:

"And countries like ours, neighbours of the vast Indian subcontinent, will inevitably feel a stirring of disquiet since her powerful and swiftly developing neighbour has chosen to use arms to end an argument."

From another Ceylonese newspaper, the *Ceylon Observer*, of 18 December 1961:

"The use of force by India is particularly disturbing for smaller nations that are neighbours of India. It creates a fear among India's neighbours that are far weaker than she is that similar military action may be used against them when the patience of India's leaders is exhausted that such problems as those affecting Indian minorities have not been settled."

268. Even at this late hour the delegation of Portugal would like to emphasize the following points that are beyond dispute:

269. The use of threat of force in international relations is expressly barred by Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United

Nations Charter. The only exception to this injunction is the requirement of the right of self-defence as provided in Article 51 of that document. As a natural consequence of this Charter provision, it follows that any territory that is occupied or annexed through the use of armed force by any Member State must be vacated unconditionally, leaving the resolution of any disputes to the relevant provisions of the Charter governing their pacific settlement. That is the law as agreed upon by all Members and as expressly laid down.

270. When we ignore the law or when we seek to amend it through one-sided action, as we have witnessed in the last few days, we are actually destroying it. That is what is happening to the Charter principles, which are applied only when it suits the interests of the strong and those that have the good fortune to be their friends.

271. And yet it is curious how those very principles of the Charter, as laid down in the above-cited Article, were loudly proclaimed in the course of the fifth emergency special session of the General Assembly, convened on 17 June 1967 to discuss the Middle East question, by those very powerful Member States which are today denying its validity, or at least are rendering it nugatory through blocking action. On that occasion the opinion was advanced with great emphasis that military aggression cannot be tolerated as a method of achieving the political solution of conflicts and that the aggressor should not be allowed to keep the fruits of military victory, even though justice may be on the aggressor's side as to the merits of the problem under discussion or as to the basis invoked for war operations.

272. Addressing the General Assembly on that occasion, on 21 June, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs of India, Mr. Chagla—also a well-known jurist—reiterated the same view and underlined that, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, it is not permissible for any country to start a war merely because it claims to be threatened, nor is it permissible that the aggressor should retain the fruits of aggression, nor is it acceptable that an armed conflict should establish legal titles, settle territorial disputes or constitute a basis for border adjustments. The Indian Minister added:

"We adhere to our belief that the cease-fire itself cannot be considered complete as long as an alien armed force occupies large areas of land belonging to its neighbours . . .".¹¹

273. This double standard must be abandoned if international relations are not once again within the period of half a century to lead us to a morass of destruction and war involving all of mankind.

274. The path of expansionism by armed force must be abandoned; restitution of territory gained by force must be made; and disputes must be resolved through recourse to the only sensible methods provided by the United Nations Charter for their pacific settlement.

275. It is with this conviction that the delegation of Portugal will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

276. Mr. SIKIVOU (Fiji): My delegation agrees this is the time for action and not for making speeches or apportioning blame. We therefore fully support those who have asked for prompt action by the General Assembly. We wish to express the most profound sadness of the Government and people of Fiji that India and Pakistan, with both of whom we have and enjoy close and friendly relations, are now engaged in war, and that the people in these two countries who have suffered so much are continuing to be killed or suffer untold miseries. It is extremely sad that the voice of Mahatma Gandhi, which advocated non-violence and which once used to be respected over the length and breadth of the Indian peninsula, is now stilled and ignored. It is tragic that in India and Pakistan, as in all developing countries where there is such a vital need for deployment of funds on development and combating poverty, their resources are being devoted to military purposes, with the tragic consequences of open warfare.

277. As you know, we have in Fiji a large Indian population whose origin is in the subcontinent and whose traditions and culture they proudly inherit and embrace, Hindus and Moslems alike, while living happily and harmoniously with other peoples in our country.

278. We also deeply regret that, in spite of the fact that the war was raging and lives were being lost and increasing and indescribable miseries mounted, the Security Council was unable to take positive action; this despite untiring and serious attempts by members of the Security Council imbued with compassion and goodwill. My delegation wishes it noted that it fully appreciates the reasons and principles underlying the position of those who could not support the two draft resolutions which gained majority votes in the Security Council. But what my delegation and my Government, and indeed the overwhelming majority of us, wished and looked to the Security Council for was a call for the cessation of hostilities. We wanted the loss of lives stopped and the untold miseries war causes minimized. And this done, details of a satisfactory political settlement could then be worked out. But no positive action was taken because of big-Power politics. We looked up to them but they took no action, and to this hour, the United Nations remain ineffective. Therefore, if the Security Council cannot act, then it is incumbent on the General Assembly to act, even if only to pass a resolution. It would definitely be better than the inaction of the Security Council. Our delegation will, therefore, gladly support draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, which, of the two draft resolutions before us, better accommodates our position.

279. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The best form of co-operation that any delegation can provide at this juncture is brevity. Therefore, I shall not deal with the substance of the matter, nor review its background, nor try to sketch out solutions. I merely wish to support a draft resolution such as that in document A/L.647/Rev.1 which is designed to bring about an immediate cease-fire, the withdrawal of the belligerents to their own frontiers, and the intensification of efforts to bring about the voluntary return of the refugees to their homes.

280. These are provisions that flow from the Articles of the Charter and the Declaration on the Strengthening of

¹¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1530th meeting, para. 152.

International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], adopted scarcely a year ago.

281. But, at the same time, the draft resolution is geared to a peaceful settlement of the dispute which now signifies only desolation, death and suffering to the subcontinent of Asia. For that reason, my delegation has become a sponsor of the draft resolution which originated with the Argentine delegation.

282. I should like to emphasize that it is an inescapable duty of the General Assembly, which represents the moral conscience of the world, to comply with the duties and responsibilities that on this occasion, as on many other occasions in the past history of this Organization, the Security Council has failed to carry out.

283. If power politics makes the Security Council what a few minutes ago was called a private club, with five permanent members and 11 occasional guests, then the General Assembly is under the urgent duty of enforcing compliance with the provisions of the Charter, enshrining the last hopes of mankind, which had hoped that a final end had been put to the scourge of war and to the threat or use of force.

284. My delegation has always held that decisions of the General Assembly that are based on principles of the Charter, or that develop those principles, are as binding as are the principles on which they are based; and therefore are not merely suggestions that may or may not be complied with. That is why my delegation hopes that there will be full compliance with any decision which the General Assembly may take on this memorable and historic night.

285. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): This is the second time in a decade that the world has had to watch the millions of inhabitants of the Indian subcontinent subjected to what the preamble of the Charter calls "the scourge of war". For several months we have all watched with apprehension and growing concern the deterioration in relations between India and Pakistan stemming from the situation in East Pakistan. The tragedy has developed in a way which seemed inevitable and inevitably to have rendered fruitless all efforts to prevent it. Of course, such efforts have been made. There have been bilateral approaches and appeals by many Governments, including my own, to the President of Pakistan and to the Prime Minister of India. There have been the humanitarian efforts undertaken mainly through the United Nations and to which many countries, including my own, have contributed in order to relieve distress and cure some of the manifestations of the problem. There have been the reports of the Secretary-General.

286. But none of these was able to prevent the outbreak of hostilities which occurred at the end of last week. Once that had happened, it was clear that the Security Council had to be seized of the situation. My delegation joined with a number of others in the Security Council in requesting an urgent meeting to consider the deteriorating situation which had led to armed clashes between India and Pakistan. Since then the Security Council has been trying, unsuccessfully, to take action. In that forum, which is the one expressly created by the United Nations Charter to bear

primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the object of my Government has been to try to find if there were some way to stop the fighting and which might lead to a sane and just solution.

287. The reasons for which the Security Council has so far been unable to act are known to all. My delegation cannot but deplore them, but we have to face the situation as it is. I said in the Security Council yesterday, at its 1608th meeting, that with the dissensions we had heard in the Council still fresh in our minds I did not see how a discussion in the General Assembly would be likely to change matters or immediately to overcome the limitations imposed by the nature of the international situation itself.

288. I am afraid that the course of the debate today has shown that this is still regrettably true. We now have two draft resolutions before us. One has been formally introduced and one so far only distributed, but together they reflect the wide range of opinion in the United Nations. Individually they demonstrate, as did the very similar draft resolutions that were presented in the Security Council, how much progress has yet to be made before there is the necessary basis for agreed action. Showing as this debate has done how deeply important sections of opinion among us are divided, we do not think that the passage of either draft resolution would really contribute to a settlement—and that is what counts.

289. But this is not a counsel of despair; the Security Council cannot give up. The acknowledgement in both draft resolutions of the Council's continuing role is a welcome recognition of this fact. It would indeed be desperate to admit that the Security Council was incapable of any action or that every effort should not still be made there to pursue a peaceful solution, the end of bloodshed and the promotion of reconciliation and peace. The situation is constantly changing and at no point must we relax our efforts to deal with it. Opportunities may yet open up and we have not yet exhausted all possibilities that are open to the Security Council.

290. The view of my delegation is that the Security Council is still the main forum through which, perhaps by means of bilateral consultations inside and outside, we should explore possibilities to try to overcome the difficulties, halt the fighting and find peaceful solutions to the desperately complicated issues which gave rise to the outbreak of war.

Mr. Bitsios (Greece), Vice-President, took the Chair.

291. Mr. HAMAT (Chad) (*interpretation from French*): It is with anxiety and some pessimism that my delegation followed the developments in the Indian subcontinent, for never in the course of our history has a conflict assumed such great and tragic proportions in so short a time as that which is now before our Assembly.

292. The *raison d'être* of our Organization, I remind you, is to seek international peace and if necessary to impose it. Consequently, I find it hard to understand the position taken by certain great Powers which some while ago—which we still recall—showed the will and the courage to win a war, not against another nation, but against arbitrariness

and injustice, thus winning the admiration of the peoples of our world.

293. Our unpleasant surprise is all the greater because, while the fighting goes on with everything that it means in terms of death and suffering, lengthy hours of debate in the Security Council have left the painful impression that it is those same Powers who because of the important role which they play in the world—bearing, as they do, the main responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security—are now abdicating that responsibility.

294. While knowing that not all the parties to the dispute are equal in strength, some seem to prefer a solution by means of force.

295. Knowing what the consequences of a blind and unreasonable application of the principle of self-determination may be, my Government, which has said "No" to Katanga and "No" to Biafra, cannot say "Yes" to what is now being asked of Pakistan, namely the disintegration of the territorial and national unity of that country.

296. In order to guarantee international peace and security, our Organization must be able to assure the weak that justice and respect for the law exist and are upheld. Respect for the national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of each and every State is guaranteed by our Charter as well as non-interference in the domestic affairs of States. If our Organization is unable to ensure respect for these basic principles, how can it justify the confidence and faith placed in it by the peoples of the world? Then there would be nothing left for us, the small countries, but to brace ourselves for aggression, which would be justified by its acceptance by the great Powers.

297. To my delegation, the problem which has been before us for four days now is a problem of domestic policy and as such can find a solution only within the framework of Pakistan's domestic policies. It is therefore for that Government to take care of its ills without any external interference, far less military support.

298. Confronted in the Indian subcontinent with a situation that exists and threatens world peace and persuaded of the soundness of the principle to which we are attached, that of non-interference in domestic affairs of a country which is a Member of our Organization, our delegation has decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1 because we believe that this is the least contribution that every State here represented owes itself to make in support of international peace and security.

299. Mr. HEARN (Canada): The Canadian delegation will vote for draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1 for two basic reasons: because this draft resolution calls unequivocally for a cease-fire in the hostilities between India and Pakistan, which have added immeasurably to the suffering of the people in the subcontinent, and because of the humanitarian appeal which the draft resolution makes on behalf of the refugees. Nevertheless, my delegation regrets that in its anxiety to underline the urgent need for a cessation of hostilities the Assembly has had so little time to exploit its full potential for influencing all the countries concerned in the direction of a peaceful settlement of their differences.

300. We favour the recommendation which, in addition to calling for a cease-fire, presses the Security Council to play the role assigned to it by the Charter, to restore peace. We believe, however, that in order to be genuinely effective, the call for a cease-fire should be accompanied by specific United Nations arrangements to supervise it. We also believe that the Security Council should be in a position to address itself to the underlying political issues.

301. Because of our concern with this aspect of the matter we are particularly cognizant of the provisions envisaged in the third paragraph of the preamble, which recognizes the need to deal appropriately at a subsequent stage, within the framework of the Charter, with the issues which have given rise to the hostilities. We would likewise underline that operative paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 both offer an opportunity and impose a responsibility on the United Nations to look beyond the immediate emergency. We can redeem our failures hitherto in only one way: by deploying the institutional and human resources of the United Nations not only for the installation of an uneasy armed truce and the saving of lives, but for the creation of a durable peace.

302. Mr. RYDBECK (Sweden): The views of the Swedish Government regarding the tragic developments in the Indian subcontinent were expressed yesterday in a public statement by the Swedish Foreign Minister. The statement reads as follows:

"With dismay the whole world is following the tragic drama which now unfolds on the Indian subcontinent. Two States with a total population of over half a billion people are involved in fighting and bloodshed. No one knows what will be the outcome of this fight. Great Power interests are affected by the conflict, which thus risks to be widened.

"We all know the background of the war. A flood of refugees with few parallels in world history has, during the last six months, fled from terror in East Pakistan and crossed the border into the most impoverished and over-populated part of India. The millions of refugees have become an intolerable burden upon India. India has carried this burden with enormous human and financial efforts, which have evoked the admiration and respect of the world. But, as time has passed, the burden has become too heavy.

"Simultaneously, a military escalation has been taking place on both sides of the Indo-Pakistan border. When India now, by resort to arms, tries to change the situation radically, this is to be deeply deplored. The Charter of the United Nations forbids the use of force except in self-defence. No other purpose can justify the use of military force by States. The Swedish Government firmly opposes such methods wherever they may occur.

"The Security Council, as is its duty, did take up the conflict. Two draft resolutions appealing to the parties for a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops behind their respective borders had been vetoed by the Soviet Union. The Swedish Government regrets that the Council has not been able to achieve unanimity in this serious situation. The first duty of the Security Council must be to see to it that the acts of war which have started are brought to an

end. The question has finally been brought to the General Assembly where the call for an immediate cease-fire can now be expected to receive an overwhelming majority of the Member States.

"But a cease-fire does naturally not solve the underlying problems, even if it is a precondition for a solution. A solution must be founded upon the expressed will of the people of East Pakistan. In this context a constructive contribution on the part of the United Nations must be possible: after a cease-fire the United Nations must contribute to the creation of such conditions that the refugees can return to their homes. An end to the military conflict must also be the point of departure for substantially increased humanitarian efforts."

303. I want to add that Sweden will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, in the conviction that the United Nations has a solemn obligation to make every effort towards finding solutions to this tragic conflict.

304. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) (*interpretation from French*): At this moment of deep concern and anguish for the international community as a whole, the presence among us today of the Secretary-General is a source of hope and comfort. Indeed, the efforts of the Secretary-General to promote peace continued even during his illness. We are sure that they will be redoubled and perhaps will help to relieve the terrible sufferings that have afflicted the peoples living in the areas devastated by the Indo-Pakistani war.

305. I shall be brief because, as a good many of my colleagues have quite rightly said, we should talk less but act and act quickly. If the Security Council was unfortunately unable to find a solution to the serious dispute that sets against each other two countries which only yesterday were friends, I trust that the General Assembly will be able to be effective, resolute and clear. Two countries of Asia, whom all things should bind together, are engaged in a murderous conflict that may be fraught with serious consequences for international peace and security. This dispute concerns Mauritania as well, because it sets against one another two countries whose contributions to the third world have constantly been noteworthy; we think that it is of concern to international solidarity and to the commonality of destiny which unites all of the developing countries.

306. Thus, I should like to point out that the head of the State of Mauritania, on behalf of my country and of the Organization of African Unity, expressed her concern to the Governments of India and Pakistan and appealed to them to ensure that the difficulties now besetting relations between the two countries would be ended by peaceful means. We are convinced that all problems can find their appropriate solution if, on both sides, there is a real will for understanding and *entente*.

307. We can appreciate the complex nature of the problems and the difficulties that confront the Indian Government, because of the mass influx of refugees into its territory. But we abide by the principles of the Charter, and it seems to us dangerous to condone the idea that one State, regardless of its reasons, can interfere in the domestic affairs of another State.

308. Our support of the Charter and a conscious awareness of the vulnerability of the smaller nations, prompts us to be prudent and to refuse to permit anything likely to dismember a sovereign and independent State.

309. Having regard to what I have just said, and because draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1 meets some of our concerns, my delegation is prepared to vote in favour of it.

310. Mr. CHIAO (China) (*translated from Chinese*): India and Pakistan are both close neighbours of China. The Chinese Government and people are seriously concerned over the armed conflict between India and Pakistan. The Chinese delegation would like to make a few remarks on this question.

311. First, the Indian Government is an outright aggressor.

312. Our colleagues here all know well how the war between India and Pakistan was started. The Indian Government has been saying again and again that it was the question of the East Pakistan refugees that had put it in a position in which it had no alternative but to send troops to invade Pakistan. This is indeed absurd to the extreme. The Indian ruling circles had also some time ago forcibly coerced several tens of thousands of the inhabitants of China's Tibet into going into India and set up a so-called government in exile headed by the Chinese traitor, the Dalai Lama. To agree that the Indian Government is justified in using the so-called refugee question as a pretext for invading Pakistan is tantamount to agreeing that the Indian Government will be justified in using the question of the so-called "Tibetan refugees" as a pretext for invading China. Is that kind of pretext not utterly ridiculous?

313. Supported by a certain big Power, the Indian Government has become most arrogant and unbridled. It openly claims that, since Pakistan is a neighbour of India, the existence of Pakistan troops in East Pakistan constitutes in itself a threat to India. This is sheer Fascist nonsense. India is also a neighbour of China. Does the existence of Indian troops in India then constitute a threat to China?

314. Indian ruling circles claim that India is a country that loves democracy, freedom and peace. This can only deceive or hoodwink those who are not familiar with the facts. In the world today, only in India can one find several tens of millions of untouchables. Among the new independent countries in Asia and Africa, only India has a "protectorate". Almost all the neighbours of India have been bullied by it at one time or another. What kind of democracy is this? What kind of freedom is this? And what kind of peace is this?

315. India's expansionism has a long history. In his book *The Discovery of India*,¹² Nehru openly proclaimed that the south Asian subcontinent and the Indian Ocean are in the sphere of influence of India. For years the Indian ruling circles have never given up their ambitious attempt to become a "super-Power" or a "semi-super-Power". Their present aggression against Pakistan is the inevitable outcome of the implementation of such an expansionist policy.

¹² Jawaharlal Nehru, *The Discovery of India* (New York, the John Day Company, 1946).

316. Secondly, the Soviet Government is the boss behind the Indian aggressors.

317. The Indian expansionists usually do not have much guts. Why have they become so flagrant now? The reason is that a super-Power, Soviet social-imperialism, is backing them up. As I said earlier, the so-called Soviet-Indian Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation is in effect a treaty of military alliance. Since the conclusion of that treaty, the Indian Government has become all the more flagrant, carrying out subversion and aggression against Pakistan without any scruples. On 5 December TASS published a statement which is full of the smell of gunpowder. It clamours that the tension between India and Pakistan has threatened the so-called interests of the security of the Soviet Union and that it cannot remain indifferent. This is blackmail and is a menace to China as well as all the neighbouring countries of India and Pakistan. I ask the Soviet representative, "What exactly are you planning to do? You might as well tell us here."

318. In the Security Council meetings of 4, 5 and 6 December the Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, and the Indian representative, echoing each other, insisted on imposing the representatives of the so-called "Bangladesh" on the Security Council. The Soviet representative unreasonably vetoed two draft resolutions which were supported by the majority of the Council's members. He unwarrantedly assailed at will all those representatives who differed with him. He openly declared that he would veto all draft resolutions other than his own. This is indeed arrogant and crude to the extreme. I can hardly find the proper words to describe his behaviour.

319. It is not at all surprising that the Soviet leading clique is giving such naked support to the Indian aggressors. Ever since the Soviet leading clique betrayed Marxism-Leninism and embarked on the road of revisionism, it has been pursuing a policy of social-imperialism. It has carried out everywhere aggression, subversion and interference against other countries and tries to control them. In 1968 it flagrantly sent troops to invade and occupy Czechoslovakia. This year it went so far as to attempt overtly to subvert the legal Government of an African country. The facts are well known to many of our colleagues here. Let me put it bluntly. Making use of the ambition of the Indian expansionists, the Soviet leading clique is supporting India's armed aggression against Pakistan for the purpose of further controlling India and, as the next step, controlling the whole of the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent and the Indian Ocean in order to contend with another super-Power for world hegemony.

320. Thirdly, the United Nations should not repeat the mistakes of the League of Nations.

321. The current Indo-Pakistan situation cannot but remind us of the situation during the 1930s. In 1931 the Japanese militarists unleashed a war of aggression against China by invading and occupying our four north-eastern provinces and set up a so-called "Manchukuo". The German and Italian Fascists closely co-operated with them by giving "recognition" to that puppet régime. The League of Nations, which was then under the control of Great Britain, France and other Powers, did not distinguish between right

and wrong, between the aggressor and the victim of aggression and, therefore, became helpless and permitted Japan to have its own way in its aggression against China. This was, in effect, an encouragement to aggression. It was in these circumstances that Japan further expanded its war of aggression against China, the Italian Fascists unleashed their war of aggression against Ethiopia and Hitler's Germany annexed one European country after another. In the end, that led to the outbreak of the Second World War, and the League of Nations collapsed thereafter.

322. The lessons of history merit attention. The United Nations is now facing a situation similar to that of the 1930s. The flames of the war of aggression against Pakistan launched by India are spreading, menacing the peace of Asia and the world. The United Nations must overcome the obstructions by the Soviet Union and speedily adopt measures to hold back this dangerous situation. First of all, it must draw a clear line of distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression, strongly condemn the aggressor and give firm support to the victim of aggression.

323. The United Nations should not take an ambiguous stand; still less should it abet and shield the aggressor. Under the manipulation of the one or two super-Powers, the United Nations has in the past made quite a few mistakes in this respect, in contravention of the will of the majority of Member States. The United Nations must learn from the lessons of history and must in no way embark on the old path of the League of Nations.

324. Fourthly, China maintains that the United Nations should, first, strongly condemn India's aggression against Pakistan and thoroughly expose the shameless support given by the Soviet social-imperialists to the Indian aggressors; secondly, call upon all countries to support the Pakistan Government and people in their just struggle against Indian aggression; thirdly, call upon the Indian Government to withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Pakistan territory the armed forces and armed personnel sent by it and call upon the Pakistan Government to withdraw the armed forces which it has sent into Indian territory for counter-attack; fourthly, call upon both India and Pakistan to cease fire immediately on the basis of the withdrawal of the armed forces of each side from the territory of the other; fifthly, recommend that the armed forces of the two sides withdraw respectively from the border between India and Pakistan and disengage from each other so as to create conditions for a peaceful settlement of the disputes between India and Pakistan.

325. Fundamentally speaking, the dispute between India and Pakistan is a legacy of British imperialist rule in the Indian subcontinent. The Chinese Government has consistently held that the new independent countries of Africa and Asia should resolve their disputes in a friendly way, through consultation on an equal basis. They must not be taken in by the imperialists. That remains our stand today. Should the Indian Government obdurately cling to its course, it will only eat the bitter fruits of its own making. If the Soviet Government acts in the same fashion, it will come to no good end either.

326. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): The question of the tension which exists on the

Indian subcontinent is now before the Assembly. To express an opinion and take a position it is undoubtedly absolutely necessary to make a thorough study of the main facts which serve as a background to the rapid developments of recent days in that part of the world.

327. After a long period of administration by decree, under the pressure of the popular masses and because of developments in the country, the Government of Pakistan was led to schedule elections in both East and West Pakistan for the end of December 1970, on the understanding that those elections would allow for a more specific expression of the popular will in Pakistan. The elections took place on 3 December. In both parts of Pakistan the various political parties took part. The Awami League, headed by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, received the unanimous support—and this must not be forgotten—of the people of East Pakistan. Of the 169 Members of Parliament that East Pakistan was entitled to elect, 167 were members of the Awami League.

328. The platform on which that party won the election included six main points, and it is essential that we know the contents of those points, if only in order to realize in summary form what it was that the people of East Pakistan wanted, and this is a matter of crucial importance in the debate. All these points related to one main claim made by the people of East Pakistan, a claim that could be expressed in a few words: political and economic autonomy within the framework of the Pakistani State; the implementation of social, economic and political reforms in Pakistan; and the adoption of a foreign policy of friendly relations with all countries, including Pakistan's closest neighbour, India. To that end, the programme provided for the withdrawal of Pakistan from aggressive military blocs, that is, from the South-East Asia Treaty Organization.

329. Following that resounding victory on the part of the Awami League, negotiations were instituted between the President of Pakistan, Yahya Khan, and leaders of the Awami League on the question of the future organization of the State, on the formation of a new Government whose Prime Minister was to be the leader of the Awami League, since it was his party that had not only won all but two of the seats in East Pakistan but had also won a comfortable majority in the Parliament as a whole. Mujibur Rahman, as a result of winning the election, is now in prison. Out of a total of 313 Members of Parliament, 167 does indeed constitute a majority, which should have made it possible to settle many matters of great importance.

330. According to information in the press, while negotiations were continuing, on the pretext of making all the necessary arrangements, the Pakistani leaders were making military preparations in order to undertake mass repression in East Pakistan to quell the movements that were arising and thus crush the aspirations of the people to attain the objectives set forth in the Awami League's programme. It was, of course, a game that was dangerous for the peace of the region—to try thus to settle accounts by force of arms when the whole population had expressed its views rather than to follow the path indicated by popular opinion.

331. It is unnecessary to dwell on the details of the military actions of the army of West Pakistan. It is reported

that in the course of a single night, 25/26 March 1971, several tens of thousands of victims were counted, including innocent men, women and children, massacred by the troops. For weeks and months, the tragedy of the East Pakistanis continued—and at a stepped-up rate.

332. These measures of repression gave rise to an unprecedented movement of population across international frontiers. Over 10 million refugees have crossed the frontiers of East Pakistan into India, creating enormous difficulties of a quite particular kind, on whose nature I shall not now expatiate but which no other country has ever had to suffer in the whole history of mankind. Thus, the events created by the repressions practised by the West Pakistani troops have had international repercussions of great gravity. We can only regret that this ferocious repression and the ensuing tremendous exodus of population have led to a confrontation between the two neighbouring brotherly countries of India and Pakistan and that they resulted in large-scale military operations.

333. Draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, submitted by Argentina, Burundi and many other sponsors, nevertheless calls on both the Government of Pakistan and that of India—which, because of the vast movements of population and other and inevitable consequences of the aggression unleashed against the people of East Pakistan, became the victim—to agree to a cease-fire and to withdraw their troops to within their respective frontiers.

334. Various principles have been mentioned by previous speakers. They took a very emotional tone, undoubtedly influenced by the tragic events which are at present taking place in the region in question. Mention has been made of the principles of the Charter, of the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs, of friendly relations between States, and of other principles and provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*]. However, certain delegations, including the delegation of China, have omitted even to call to mind the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and have not alluded to the right of every people to determine its own destiny as the people of East Pakistan did in their election.

335. We well understand the concern of the great majority of delegations that have taken the floor on the grave situation created in the Indian subcontinent, and their desire to see the United Nations contribute to a just solution to the question and to a cessation of hostilities. We share that concern and it is for that reason that we wish to go to the very heart of the present situation and not only limit ourselves to eliminating its destructive consequences. In the case of an ordinary conflict, one which has not been provoked by such serious events but which is nevertheless fraught with dire consequences for the international situation—I am speaking of domestic events, of course—the cessation of hostilities may be enough to lead to a *détente* and to create an atmosphere conducive to a settlement. A simple cease-fire between the two countries would suffice. However, the present case is of an importance that goes far beyond those of the ordinary type of international conflict. A cease-fire between the two countries is not sufficient. What is necessary in the present case is for the troops of West Pakistan to cease firing on the population of East

Pakistan. What we must try to do is to eradicate the deep causes that have led to the outbreak of hostilities between the two countries and not merely to eliminate its consequences.

336. As has been emphasized throughout the length of this abnormal situation, we must eliminate the causes of the situation caused by the ferocious repression visited on the East Pakistan population and their *élite*. It is only such a recommendation by the General Assembly which could have any effect on developments in the Indian subcontinent and make an effective contribution to solving the problems affecting millions of people in that unfortunate part of the world.

337. It is in view of these realities that my delegation will vote for the Soviet Union draft resolution [A/L.648]. We cannot support a draft resolution like that submitted by Argentina and Burundi and others [A/L.647/Rev.1] because it fails to take into account the deep-seated causes of the conflict. We want to cure the deep seated causes of the conflict and so shall vote for the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union.

338. Mr. ARIAS SCHREIBER (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): At a time when battles are being waged between the forces of two nations, I think there is no need to emphasize either the gravity of the existing situation or the urgency of seeking a formula that will put an end to it. Our action should be directed as soon as possible to avoiding an increase in the number of innocent victims of this serious and regrettable situation that has been brought about. And, accordingly, we should aim to bring about an immediate termination of hostilities between the two countries. Any delay in the adoption of this measure would be simply inhuman and would worsen the suffering and increase the loss of life, something which no one in good conscience could wish for.

339. However, the cease-fire in and of itself will not solve the conflict; it must be followed by a withdrawal of troops to their own territories, and the adoption of measures to lend assistance to the refugees to create the conditions that will allow for them to return to their homes voluntarily.

340. To cope with the effects and ignore the causes is a half-measure which will not take us very far. We believe it is essential to have a broader understanding in order to eradicate the origins of the conflict on the basis of the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

341. Draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1 is an adequate response to the first of the objectives that I have suggested, namely, the achievement of an immediate cease-fire, and it also provides for the adoption of measures at a subsequent stage to deal with the questions that have led to the outbreak of hostilities. My delegation believes that on this latter point the draft resolution is inadequate but at a time when immediate action is needed we must start with what is most urgent, which is the cessation of hostilities between the two States and, with that concern in mind we shall vote in favour of the aforesaid draft resolution. We should however like to state specifically for the record that it is necessary that the procedure that it outlines must be followed by the adoption of appropriate measures to ensure

a permanent settlement of the dispute in the interest not only of an understanding between two countries which enjoy our full esteem and respect, but also in the interests of security, peace, and the well-being of their respective peoples, which today have been subjected to such a tragic ordeal.

342. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has to take the floor in more than one capacity. There can scarcely be any more difficult task than to seek reconciliation between brothers who maintain rigid and irreducible positions. There is no better illustration of a true devotion to India and Pakistan, to their Ambassadors, Mr. Sen and Mr. Shahi, than our wholehearted resolve to intervene, for the sole purpose of putting an end to the murderous cross-fire.

343. The United Nations has a duty, over and above all, to safeguard its effectiveness. In the Security Council I was impelled to recount the reasons why the hostilities should immediately be halted. We broached the problem from the humanitarian, political and economic standpoints. Today we shall confine ourselves to the nature and the scope of the role that falls to the General Assembly in this context.

344. To be sure, our Organization is not able to work miracles. Meanwhile, if we are not able to work miracles, in conformity with the legitimate aspirations of the human race—aspirations which, after all, are a tribute to this Organization—we must at least prove to the human race our deep concern, provided that concern is given practical expression in our immediate determination to provide a solution that will satisfy the great and the intimate hopes of peoples.

345. The General Assembly is fully empowered not only to strengthen the principles of the Charter but also to overcome the bouts of pessimism and defeatism engendered by the weakness of the Security Council, despite valiant efforts it has made to remedy a situation that is both complex and dismaying.

346. Peace—that is the prime concern of my delegation. It may, perhaps, be superfluous to reaffirm that we are fully conscious of the fact that that sacrosanct objective is better obtained by joining our efforts and resources than by recourse to a direct confrontation.

347. Nevertheless, it does not seem to us timely to pass judgement, still less to hurl accusations at one or another party to the conflict, or to support one side to the detriment of the other. The essential role of the United Nations is both to save and reaffirm the sacred principles which are at stake in this tragic crisis. Fortunately for us all, those principles are frequently stipulated and abundantly mentioned in all our various resolutions, declarations and statements; they are none other than those to which we have adhered by signing the United Nations Charter. They are: first, the sacred principle of sovereignty, free from all outside interference; second, the principle that there shall be no recourse to war so long as peaceful negotiations are still possible; third, the principle that all peoples have the right to the full enjoyment of freedom without any constraint or fear.

348. The United Nations is an Organization which is bound to practice to the highest degree the principles of a peace which my Government would objectively and most pertinently call a "neutral and impartial peace". But peace is not static; it is a dynamic entity, which cannot be safeguarded today only to be sacrificed tomorrow. Accordingly, we must be ever vigilant to preserve peace every day of our lives.

349. It is not this Assembly's business to replace the Security Council, and we must not regard the fact that the General Assembly has taken up this question as a delegation of powers from the Security Council. If the Assembly should also fail, my delegation would strongly support the right of the Security Council to resume its duties. Nevertheless, if both bodies should fail to find a solution to these most grave problems, it seems to us that the Secretary-General should, in his turn, step in.

350. The important thing for us is not the procedural, technical or institutional nature of the body which is called upon to act. The man in the street cares little for such technical niceties. When, however, the United Nations is called upon, it is on the contrary called upon as an organic whole.

351. It is in that spirit that we have to take a decision this evening. My delegation will support draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, whose principles we have advocated since the beginning of the Security Council debate on this problem.

352. I am happy to announce that I have been asked by the representative of Paraguay and by the other sponsors of the draft in question to announce that Paraguay will become a sponsor of the said draft resolution.

353. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): Since the beginning of these tragic events, that is to say, ever since March, the attitude of the French Government has been inspired by a single concern: to ensure the restoration of peace, to promote a political solution which, with the consent of the peoples concerned, could and can be the only guarantee of a lasting peace and, in the interim, to make its contribution to the international effort to relieve the sufferings of millions of human beings. This concern is shared by all. Many voices have been raised to express this in the Security Council, in the General Assembly and all over the world. But the drama took on a dizzy pace and resulted in an armed conflict between two friendly countries. It is all the more our strict duty urgently to seek a realistic and effective solution. This required the Security Council to take measures. The Charter intends it; events demand it. For what purpose would it serve to ignore the role that this or that Power, a member of the Security Council, can and must play in order to establish and guarantee peace?

354. That is why the French delegation devoted all its efforts to the negotiations that were carried out tirelessly in the Security Council. We did not resign ourselves to the failure of the Council, a failure for which people will agree we are not responsible. But there are some, whose feelings we understand and whose impatience we share, who turned to the Assembly. An appeal will be made. It will express the feeling of profound horror, of profound injustice, aroused

by this tragedy, as well as the Assembly's will for peace. But will not be unanimous. It will not fulfil that wish for consensus which was movingly expressed by the representative of Chile a few moments ago, and we doubt that it can increase the chances for an immediate cessation of hostilities.

355. The draft resolutions before us [A/L.647/Rev.1 and A/L.648], in fact, reflect the division which had already appeared in the Council. If the Assembly confirms this division, how can we hope that the Council can heed its appeal? And, above all, how can we believe that an end will be put to the hostilities?

356. Our abstention will express this apprehension, but it will testify at the same time to our determination to continue to seek in the Council the only concerted measures that can really restore peace. What has prevented the Council so far from succeeding are the requirements and the exclusions, with each one saying he asked the minimum while demanding the maximum. It seems to us that the draft resolutions submitted thus far have been made obsolete by the events and now we fear that in the war zones, wherever they are, the peoples will undergo not only the violence of combat but will also suffer the fear of unpardonable reprisals.

357. The only realistic measure, before all else and without prejudice to what may be decided subsequently, would be to obtain the cessation of hostilities—of all hostilities. That is why we support the appeal of our Secretary-General who, with his usual lucidity and humanitarian approach, has understood what can and should be done immediately, so that at least these humanitarian measures will command unanimity and be adopted without delay.

358. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): First of all I should like to express the deep sense of satisfaction my delegation experienced at seeing the Secretary-General in his rightful place in this Assembly this afternoon. We express the hope for his speedy recovery so that he will be able to accompany us in the debates in the Assembly, as is his custom.

359. Since I have referred to the Secretary-General, I should like to quote here a few paragraphs from the report which he submitted to the Security Council on 3 December 1971 in document S/10410,¹³ and I should like to do this for two reasons: first, because it seems to me only fair that the records of the General Assembly should reflect the fact that U Thant entirely fulfilled his duties from the very outset with respect to the facts of this tragedy that has brought us together today; secondly, because the account given by U Thant in his report includes many facts which can be extremely useful for a better understanding of the origins of the question which we are considering and thus give us an accurate and impartial perspective regarding them.

360. In the first paragraph of the report which I have mentioned, the Secretary-General, after referring to the

¹³ See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1971*.

events taking place along the frontier of East Pakistan and in other areas of the subcontinent, expressed "his conviction that this situation constitutes a threat to the maintenance of international peace and security" [*S/10410, para. 1*]. He then reviewed briefly the principal measures that he had already taken. We read in this report:

"The Secretary-General has kept the President of the Security Council informed of these efforts under the broad terms of Article 99 of the United Nations Charter which provides that 'The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security'. The Secretary-General feels that an initiative on this matter in the Council can best be taken by the parties themselves or by the members of the Council." [*Ibid.*]

361. Further on U Thant recalled that:

"On 20 July 1971"—not last week, but on 20 July—"the Secretary-General submitted the following memorandum to the President of the Security Council:

"For some months now the members of the Security Council, and many other members of the United Nations, have been deeply preoccupied with developments in East Pakistan and the adjacent Indian states and their consequences, or possible consequences. I myself expressed my concern over the situation to President Yahya Khan shortly after the events of March 1971 and have been in continuous touch with the Governments of Pakistan and India, both through their Permanent Representatives at the United Nations and through other contacts.'" [*Ibid., para. 3*]

362. After dealing with other aspects of the question and the reports that he had made to the Economic and Social Council on the situation, U Thant went on to state:

"As the weeks have passed since last March, I have become increasingly uneasy and apprehensive at the steady deterioration of the situation in the region in almost all its aspects.'" [*Ibid.*]

Further on he states:

"The conflict between the principles of the territorial integrity of States and of self-determination has often before in history given rise to fratricidal strife and has provoked in recent years highly emotional reactions in the international community. In the present case there is an additional element of danger, for the crisis is unfolding in the context of the long-standing and unresolved differences between India and Pakistan—differences which gave rise to open warfare only six years ago.... The situation on the borders of East Pakistan is particularly disturbing. Border clashes, clandestine raids and acts of sabotage appear to be becoming more frequent..." [*Ibid.*]

363. U Thant also made reference in his report to the fact that on 20 October, the Secretary-General, having in mind the possible usefulness of comprehensive discussions with the heads of the Governments of India and Pakistan on all

the aspects of this problem "addressed identical messages to the Prime Minister of India and the President of Pakistan" [*ibid., para. 5*]. In those messages the Secretary-General stated, *inter alia*:

"Recent developments have only served to increase my anxiety that this situation"—that is, the situation which he described in his memorandum of 20 July sent to the President of the Security Council—"could all too easily give rise to open hostilities which would not only be disastrous to the two countries principally concerned, but might also constitute a major threat to the wider peace....

"...

"In this potentially very dangerous situation, I feel that it is my duty as Secretary-General to do all that I can to assist the Governments immediately concerned in avoiding any development which might lead to disaster. I wish you to know, therefore, that my good offices are entirely at your disposal if you believe that they could be helpful at any time." [*Ibid.*]

Mr. Malik (Indonesia) resumed the Chair.

364. Careful analysis of this report allows us to come to a conclusion concerning where and to what extent there is blame to be affixed in this situation. But I do not think that this is the time to try to define the share of blame to be borne by each party, nor that which devolves upon the Security Council and, in particular, its permanent members, who bear the major share of responsibility for the maintenance of international security, since they are the ones who have greatest rights—I repeat, the responsibility that falls upon the two parties or on the permanent members of the Security Council.

365. What is essential, in our opinion, at this juncture is to comply strictly and fully with the obligations imposed on us by the Charter, which all Members of the United Nations have undertaken to carry out in good faith in accordance with the provisions of Article 2 of the Charter. Among those provisions, which are the most relevant and which call for immediate application in the present case? It seems to us that there can be no hesitation in replying: nothing less than the provisions of Article 1 of the Charter, which defines the first of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, those which, as was rightly stated at the San Francisco Conference, we may say constitute in practice the justification for the very existence of this Organization and the very keystone of this Organization and the very keystone of its effectiveness.

366. What is the primary purpose of our Organization? In one word it comes down to maintaining international peace and security and, to that end, to taking effective measures to prevent and remove threats to the peace and to bring about, by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. In the sequence of acts, the first is the taking of measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and the second is the bringing about of an agreement by peaceful means and in

accordance with the principles of justice and international law. The reason for this sequence was very well explained at San Francisco when one of the representatives, who was one of the most outstanding participants in the work of Commission I, stated the following:

"It is our view that this Security Council which we are establishing will have two very important functions. There will be many other functions in addition, but on this matter of the future peace of the world, there will be two very important functions. These might be characterized somewhat as being the functions of a policeman and the functions of a jury. . . . It is our view that the people of the world wish to establish a Security Council, that is, a policeman who will say, when anyone starts to fight, 'stop fighting'. Period. And then it will say, when anyone is all ready to begin to fight, 'You must not fight'. Period. That is the function of a policeman, and it must be just that short and that abrupt; that is, unless at that place we add any more, then we would say 'Stop fighting unless you claim international law is on your side'. That would lead to a weakening and a confusion in our interpretation.

"...

"And then we proceed with the very important functions that might be called the functions of a jury, that is, those functions in this Charter under which any seven members of the Security Council may invite any parties to a dispute to come before it. . . . Then as you proceed in that process of finding the facts, you reach the points of decision of a jury."¹⁴

That was the theory that was incorporated in the Charter.

367. In the report of the relevant Committee 1 of Commission I, this lucid exposition was made, which in my opinion applies very well to the problem that we have before us now. The report of Committee 1 states:

"Peace is threatened by disputes or situations that may lead to a breach of the peace. A breach of the peace may ensue. That is how situations of that nature arise. At a first stage, the Organization should insist and take measures that states do not threaten or cause a breach of the peace."¹⁵

368. May I be allowed to add, in passing, that this first stage was the one that began with the presentation of the memorandum of the Secretary-General of 20 July to the President of the Security Council. It is really a pity that the Council was not able correctly to interpret that memorandum.

369. I shall continue to quote from the report of Committee 1 of Commission I:

"If they do, the Organization should, at a second stage, promptly stop any breach of the peace or remove it. After that it can proceed to find a just adjustment or settlement of the dispute or situation."¹⁶

¹⁴ Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, I/6 (vol. VI, pp. 29-30).

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I/1/34 (vol. VI, p. 394).

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

370. My delegation has studied this problem very carefully, and at the same time attempted to be as objective as possible—and this is all the easier for us because Mexico maintains excellent and very cordial relations with the two parties directly involved in the dispute. As a result of this study, we have come to the conclusion that, of the two draft resolutions that we have before us, the one that is most consistent with what my delegation and the rest of us adopted at San Francisco, and which was incorporated in the United Nations Charter, is draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

371. In the operative part of that text, we have, first of all, the pressing appeal to the parties to bring about an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of their armed forces to their own side of the borders forthwith.

372. Then the text goes on to urge, in equally strong terms "that efforts be intensified in order to bring about, speedily and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, conditions necessary for the voluntary return of the East Pakistan refugees to their homes".

373. This appeal is interpreted by my delegation in the light of the two paragraphs of the preamble of the text which recognize "the need to deal appropriately at a subsequent stage, within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, with the issues which have given rise to the hostilities", and the conviction, "that an early political solution would be necessary for the restoration of conditions of normalcy in the area of conflict and for the return of the refugees to their homes".

374. Accordingly, and with the hope that the adoption of this draft resolution may help not only to bring about an immediate cessation of hostilities, but also a speedy settlement of the dispute which gave rise to these hostilities, a speedy settlement in accordance with the provisions of Article 1 of the Charter, and in accordance with justice and international law, my delegation, will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

375. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): After a prolonged and heated discussion in the Security Council, the question of the tragic events in East Pakistan, which has grown into a military conflict between two large States in the region, India and Pakistan, and which has now become an international problem, has now come before the General Assembly for consideration.

376. We know for a fact that the consideration of this question was transferred to the General Assembly on the initiative and at the prompting of those who seek to close their eyes to the reality in the Indian subcontinent, to side-step a true assessment of the situation which has developed there, and to oppose in every way they can the removal of the main cause of the conflict, namely the serious political crisis in East Pakistan.

377. The question of the voting in the Council has been raised here. How did the voting proceed? Unrealistic draft resolutions were introduced which did not take into account the real situation in East Pakistan that was the

cause of this conflict, and which indeed closed their eyes to that reality. Accordingly, the USSR twice voted against such draft resolutions. The United Kingdom and France abstained in the vote on those drafts. Consequently, three permanent members of the Security Council did not support those unrealistic draft resolutions. Who did support them? The United States, which first of all submitted its own draft, which was favourable to its own plans in that region, and China actively supported these draft resolutions. Such was the picture of the voting. But only China voted against the Soviet draft resolution in the Security Council, and obviously just because it was a Soviet draft.

378. This is reminiscent of the worst days of the "cold war", when the representatives of the imperialist Powers rejected even the best Soviet proposals without reading them. This is how the representative of China acted and obviously how he intends to act now with regard to the Soviet proposals.

379. The passionate speeches of the United States representative and the no less passionate speeches of the Chinese representative, both in the Council and here in the General Assembly, concerning the sufferings of people in the Indian subcontinent, have obliged the Soviet delegation to draw attention to one simple fact. If what they have said about the sufferings and tragedy being endured by the population in the area of military operations on the Indian subcontinent were to be applied in full or even in part, including an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops, to the situation in Indo-China, where human suffering is a million times greater, then peace would come to Indo-China. Yet neither of them mentioned Indo-China.

380. Indeed, the Chinese representative, both in the Council and here, referred to almost all past history, and failed to mention only the imperialist aggression in Indo-China. Under the present circumstances, no such thing exists in the Chinese vocabulary. These are the facts. This is "revolutionary spirit" for you. Not a word about Indo-China. Obviously, the United States and the Chinese representatives share the view that there is no suffering and no death among the people there.

381. Yesterday, at the 1608th meeting of the Security Council, we were informed as to who initiated and inspired the transfer of this question from the Council to the Assembly. It was a United States initiative. The United States had prepared a "strategic plan" to transfer this question from the Council to the Assembly, and that plan was actively supported by the Chinese delegation in the Council. Thus, in this area, too, a duet has been struck up and continues. This should be food for thought for one of the speakers here, who for many years has repeated like a parrot, in a voice not his own, the slanders of the social traitors against the peace-loving Leninist policies of the Soviet Union.

382. The USSR delegation would like to state right at the outset its firm conviction that the Security Council has by no means exhausted its possibilities of settling this question. It could find an effective solution to this complex and acute situation which has arisen in the Indian subcontinent. Precisely for this reason the Soviet delegation, while not voting against the transfer of the question to the Assembly,

nevertheless stated quite specifically that such a course could result only in delaying the adoption of concrete measures which might have a beneficial effect on the dangerous development of events in the area.

383. The reason why the Council was unable to reach an agreed decision on the problem has become perfectly clear. It is that two great Powers, because of their political orientation, ideological concepts and military and political obligations, have shown themselves unable to rise above their narrow, self-seeking goals and attitudes. They have tried with all their might to divert the Council's attention from the political reality which has emerged in the Indian subcontinent as a result of the generally known events in East Pakistan and the military action subsequently undertaken by Pakistan against its neighbour, India.

384. To judge by the statement of the Portuguese representative from this rostrum today, such an approach on the part of these two great Powers has delighted the Portuguese colonialists, those executioners and oppressors of the African peoples of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea (Bissau). When questions relating to Portuguese aggression are discussed in the Security Council, that representative does not show up at the meetings, but here, taking advantage of the fact that the approach of two permanent members of the Security Council to the situation in the Indian subcontinent is to the liking of the Portuguese colonialists, he has delivered from this rostrum a fiery speech which you have all heard.

385. However, the discussion in the Council left no doubt that, unless the real circumstances which have arisen in the Indian subcontinent are taken into account, the United Nations will be unable to take rapid and effective steps to put an end to the military conflict, normalize the situation in that region and reach a political settlement in East Pakistan.

386. The position taken and consistently maintained by the Soviet Union from the earliest days when this problem first arose was set out perfectly clearly in the statement by the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, at Warsaw on 7 December. He said:

"Like all partisans of peace and of freedom for the peoples, we learned with great distress of the military conflict that has recently broken out between two neighbouring States of Asia, and of the events which gave rise to that conflict—the bloody suppression of the fundamental rights and the clearly expressed will of the population of East Pakistan, the tragedy of 10 million refugees . . .".

Later in the same statement, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said:

"The Soviet Union resolutely supports an end to the bloodshed, a peaceful political settlement of the problems which have arisen with due regard for the legal rights of the peoples and no interference of any kind from outside forces, and the creation of conditions for a stable and just peace in the region".

The Chinese representative, however, closes his eyes to this bloody suppression of the fundamental rights and the

clearly expressed will of the people of East Pakistan, and slanders my country with the assertion that the Soviet Union is imposing its will in parts of Asia and Africa.

387. But we do not kiss the boots of bloody executioners. That is the difference between the policy of the USSR and the policy of the social traitors.

388. At this stage of the discussion of this question in the United Nations, scarcely anyone can have any doubt that the main cause of the conflict in the Indian subcontinent is the bloody repression and terror conducted by the military authorities against the population of East Pakistan. The representative of Pakistan in the Security Council acknowledged the existence of a serious political crisis in East Pakistan. This crisis has now gone far beyond the borders of East Pakistan, has become an international problem, and has given rise to serious international consequences and complications. To pretend that the struggle of the peoples of East Pakistan against terror and acts of violence is the result of some kind of "intrigues and plotting" by India with the help of the Soviet Union is, to say the least, frivolous. It is laughable to spread such a legend which is intended for small children and great fools. All this can only divert the Assembly from the essence of the question, and make matters a great deal worse. The real point at issue is that the bloody repression of the 75 million people of East Pakistan by the Pakistan authorities has led to the death of many thousands of peaceful people, and has caused almost 10 million others to flee to a neighbouring country, India, in order to save their lives. This is a great human tragedy, an event unprecedented in history. To close our eyes to this reality is to encourage and cover up bloody terror and violence.

389. The course of events is well known. It has been described here in detail, and I will not dwell on it. One hundred and sixty-seven deputies, elected by the will of the people, were deprived of the right to participate in the work of Parliament, and the majority party which they represented was prevented from forming a government. Under various pretexts, the Pakistan authorities prevented the representatives of that party from participating in the government. Moreover, the leader of the party, M. Rahman, was arrested on a charge of State treason, no more and no less, and is threatened with reprisals.

390. The Soviet Union has adopted and maintains a strictly consistent position. In April this year, the Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Comrade M. V. Podgorny, sent a special message to the President of Pakistan, Yahya Khan, urgently appealing to him "to take urgent measures to halt the bloodshed and the repression of the population of East Pakistan and to switch to methods of peaceful political settlement". "We are convinced," the message said, "that this would be in the interests of all the people of Pakistan and the cause of maintaining peace in the area."

391. The continuation of repressive measures and bloodshed has complicated the situation. It is now clear to everyone that, if the Government of Pakistan had heeded the wise counsels and appeals of many heads of State or Government of Member countries of the United Nations, there would now be no need to discuss this matter in the United Nations.

392. The Pakistan authorities, finding themselves in a difficult position and trying to find a way out, launched an attack on the neighbouring country of India. Their purpose was obvious: to distract attention from the real cause of the strained situation, to hide their powerlessness and to try and solve the crisis by other means. By initiating military action, they were counting on transforming the problem of East Pakistan from an internal into an international problem and attempting to solve it through the intervention of the great Powers and the United Nations.

393. The discussion in the Security Council fully confirmed this view. There can be no doubt that, without the decisive, rapid and effective removal of the main cause of the conflict in the Indian subcontinent, neither the Council nor the Assembly will be able to arrive at a proper solution.

394. In their statements, representatives have quite rightly indicated the necessity and importance of a cease-fire between India and Pakistan. In so doing, however, some of them—and not a few—have, either by accident or deliberately, overlooked another related problem, that of the need for the immediate removal of the main cause of the conflict. This would in fact mean for the population of East Pakistan only a cease-fire between the Indian and Pakistan armed forces, and the Pakistan troops in East Pakistan, their hands left free, would virtually be given the right to continue the terror and bloody reprisals against the population of East Pakistan.

395. It is perfectly clear that what is basic and essential is precisely the elimination of this main source and cause of the conflict. The question of a cease-fire must therefore be closely, inseparably and organically linked with a demand to the Government of Pakistan to put an immediate end to the bloodshed, and to recognize unreservedly and without delay the will of the people of East Pakistan, as expressed in the elections of December 1970, to which many delegations here have already referred. These two questions are closely interrelated. This means that only the people of East Pakistan, through their elected representatives, can decide their future. No one must deny the rights and full authority of the representatives elected by the people.

396. The General Assembly cannot and must not close its eyes to this political reality which has arisen in the region and attempt to solve only one part of the problem by calling for a cease-fire and a cessation of hostilities while paying no attention to, and providing for no measures to remove, the main source and real cause of the conflict, which has become an armed confrontation, as is now clear to everybody, and a serious international problem. If the General Assembly, without taking this reality into account, were to embark on a one-sided course which, at first sight, might appear more attractive, this would not only not help to solve the problem and bring the conflict to a rapid end, but might even complicate the attainment of a cease-fire and an end to the bloodshed in the area.

397. It was precisely with this serious political reality in the Indian subcontinent in mind that the Soviet delegation introduced for consideration by the General Assembly draft resolution A/L.648. I shall not describe its contents, since representatives are already aware of them. The essence of our proposals is that there should be, simultaneously and

inseparably, a cease-fire, an end to bloodshed and hostilities, and a peaceful settlement of the problem in East Pakistan on the basis of respect for the lawful rights and interests of its people. Our approach to the problem under consideration could lead not only to a cease-fire but also to the cessation of bloodshed throughout the area, and an end to the bloody repressions and the untold suffering of the people of East Pakistan.

398. In the Security Council, the delegation of the USSR firmly upheld this just approach to a solution of the problem. It equally decisively and firmly presses for such a solution in the General Assembly.

399. In conclusion, I should like to say a few words on the latest anti-Soviet statement by the Chinese representative. The Members of the United Nations are becoming increasingly convinced that China needed a forum in the United Nations, in the Assembly and other organs, not to promote co-operation among States and peoples with a view to strengthening peace, security, disarmament, the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism, and so on. It is using this forum as a platform for the malicious anti-Soviet slanders and anti-sovietism of the Chinese social traitors and schismatics. Day after day they use the organs of the United Nations for this ungrateful, sordid, and above all completely useless purpose. The same old mendacious phrases, the same kind of falsifications of history, flagrant juggling with historical facts, arbitrary listing of past events and biased interpretations of them, and all of this without rhyme or reason. Day after day, in speech after speech, they repeat the term "social imperialism". But, gentlemen, to accuse the Soviet Union of Social imperialism makes as much sense as to speak of fried ice.

400. Really, representatives are beginning to get tired of this. They watch in amazement the performance put on for them by the Chinese representative, both here and in other United Nations organs. Moreover, the Chinese representative here has repeated, almost literally word for word, everything said by another representative in the Security Council. The only part of what was said in the Council which he did not repeat here was that in China war criminals are not brought to judgement, but are made librarians, as was the case with Pu Yi.

401. But, anyway, if the Chinese representatives like to act out such shows from the rostra of United Nations organs, let them continue to do so. The vast majority of representatives are already beginning to get tired of it, and are becoming bored. But the representatives of imperialist circles both within and outside the United Nations derive great entertainment and delight from such shows.

402. I must also draw attention to one additional circumstance. All the malice and hatred of the social traitors is concentrated on the Soviet Union. But this is understandable. Our policy is just and peace-loving. We are developing our friendship with all peoples and, as far as we can, are rendering great political, economic and moral assistance to peoples struggling for national liberation and for the strengthening of economic independence in young countries. At the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, an important and constructive programme was laid down for the Soviet Union's campaign

for peace and friendship among peoples. All this infuriates the social traitors. For this reason, they slander us. About imperialism, on the other hand, they are completely silent. Indeed, in many cases they have mutual contacts, joint action and a common position. They slander the friendship between India and the Soviet Union. We are proud of that friendship, and treasure it. That was Lenin's dream. We are making that dream a reality, in order that there should be real, sincere, fraternal friendship and co-operation between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the people of India. The Chinese social traitors attempt to represent this as an intention on the part of the Soviet Union to take over the whole of the Indian subcontinent and the whole of the Indian Ocean. But who will believe these fairy tales? Moreover, gentlemen, you who represent the non-aligned countries, the countries of the third world, does not this concept of Peking's that friendship means control and domination make you somewhat wary? If a stronger country is friendly with a weaker country, this means that the stronger must necessarily control and dominate. Does not this reflect China's true ideas and intentions? Behind the catchword of friendship with all States, especially with the non-aligned countries and with small and medium-size nations, it conceals its desire to subject them to its influence, its control and its domination. This should put us on our guard, and I think many of those sitting here should think seriously about it.

403. The Soviet Union has never threatened anyone, nor does it do so now. The statement made from this rostrum today to the effect that the Soviet Union is threatening China is a fabrication and a falsehood. The Soviet Union does not stir up and cultivate a war psychosis against China. We extend to China and its people the hand of friendship and co-operation. It is China that in recent times has done everything in its power to stir up a war psychosis and hatred against the Soviet Union. Why, then, do they transfer the blame from a sick head to a healthy one? In order to conceal their real intentions. This is the only explanation.

404. Finally, the Chinese representative asks what the USSR is planning, what it intends to do. In order not to take up the time of my fellow delegates, I shall simply advise him to read the documentation of the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in which he will find, confirmed by the Congress, a programme for peace, the strengthening of international security, the development of friendship with all peoples of the world and the liberation of those peoples still suffering under the yoke of racism and colonialism. That is our programme, and those are our plans.

405. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It is most deplorable that this Assembly is witnessing a marathon of invective and incrimination between two major Member States of Asia. It is deplorable because such exchanges of vilification between China and the Soviet Union are exacerbating friendly relations as they are spelled out in the United Nations Charter—friendly relations which we sorely need at this critical moment. I submit that by this time we know by heart what the representatives of those two Powers have been saying. For Heaven's sake, spare us. Look at the question before us and do not beset us with your own problems. We appreciate that you have differences; there

are no two States nowadays in the world that do not have certain differences. But we have had enough. We know that you are at loggerheads on many an issue, but we cannot take these exchanges anymore, because they will solve nothing and, unfortunately, they will inadvertently put you at a point of no return and then, indeed, international peace and security will be threatened.

406. I appeal again to all the major parties involved in the conflict—without naming them—to take into account that if the fighting continues millions upon millions in the Asian subcontinent will perish, not necessarily by military operations but more so by famine and exposure, and other millions will survive in misery and curse the day on which they were born. I appeal to my Indian friend, brother and colleague, Ambassador Sen, not to forget the teachings of Mahatma Gandhi, which were based on non-violence, inspired as he was by the life of an Indian king—none other than Asoka, who, after he had won innumerable battles and conquered many lands over 2,000 years ago, was finally saddened by the untold sufferings and tribulations of the victims of war and vowed never again to resort to force and renounced war for the remainder of his life.

407. I also invoke in this Assembly the teachings of the Chinese poet and sage Lao-tze, who lived about 25 centuries ago. Lao-tze abjured the role of soldier, which he considered to be an instrument of destruction, and sang of peace and concord among peoples. Lao-tze, the poet of all times, sang of peace and extolled the peace-makers. And what he wrote in poetry could not be matched by the prose of the United Nations Charter, which was written with the hope that it might “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war . . .”.

408. And I should like to recall to the memory of my Russian friend Ambassador Malik the epic with which Tolstoy enriched world literature, his novel *War and Peace*.

409. And let us not forget the prophets. Jesus, when asked: “What is God?”, replied in Aramaic in two words, which, translated into English, read: “God is love”. And the prophet Mohammed Sala Allah Alyihi Wa Salam, articulating the divine message, proclaimed in the first chapter of the Holy Koran the words “In the name of God the Merciful and the Compassionate . . .”. God is described by 99 epithets in the Holy Book of Islam. But the emphasis was not on God the Powerful, the Omnipotent, the Great, the Stupendous; it was “In the name of God the Merciful”. And as if that was not enough, the affirmation came by the second word “Compassionate”.

410. And what are we doing here? Bickering and altercation about alleged rights and wrongs, about presumed justice and rationalized justice as if we were a tribunal, as if we held the scales of justice in our hands—self-righteous each one of us, thinking that we have a monopoly on wisdom. But we forget how frail and weak we are, even as representatives—for after all we are human.

411. Have we forgotten what Alexander Pope translated from the Latin: “To err is human, to forgive divine”? There is no forgiveness in what we witnessed here. “To err is human” but to forgive is divine. You are bickering and altercation without benefiting from the lessons of history or

from the tragic experience of recent times on the Asian continent and especially in that region. Korea is still fresh in our mind—four years of misery. Is Viet-Nam not enough? It is continuing also in Cambodia; war, all over Asia and the Middle East—and now you want to fan the flames of war in the subcontinent, set brother against brother in the name of freedom. What a crime in the name of freedom. War. Kill. Just because certain Powers are self-righteous, “holier than thou”, infallible. But no one is infallible. Who are you here? In 30 years you will all be in the ditch, and you strut, each one of you, as if you were a rooster on his dunghill. Crowing like a rooster, each one of us here, including myself. And with what result? Millions perish. “We should do this, we should not do that. No, there should be a word there, and this does not please the other party. But the comma is wrong.” What a shame. What a puerile endeavour of an international community of 131 States. While the people of the world are watching us and are losing faith in us, we bicker and altercation.

412. I should like to sound a grave warning. It is within the realm of possibility that the present conflict may easily fan the flames of religious intolerance. Such intolerance is not dead, as we are witnessing even in Europe in certain places—I do not want to name the countries involved lest I digress and embarrass the susceptibilities of Member States. Religious intolerance is not dead yet. What if 600 million Moslems are inflamed by what is going on in the subcontinent? This is quite possible, and let me tell my Indian friends that they have a population of 60 million Moslems inside their borders. Far be it from me to say that we should have religious intolerance in the world, but it exists. Have you thought of that implication: not setting one nation against another nation, but one religion against another? This is within the realm of possibility.

413. I still think that the great Chinese people, as represented by a Government that has worked miracles in development, whether economic or social, should have some rapport with the Soviet Union and should talk with it, instead of bickering and altercation, one of them calling the other “traitor”. I have lived long enough to see this. I never thought I would hear such language between two Communist States. “What have we left?” ask the capitalists. “What will you call us if you call each other traitors and revisionists?” All these semantics should be denounced because they get us nowhere.

414. I appeal to the Soviet Union, which has shown much political sagacity during the last decade in the international policies of States, to do the same as I would expect China, a great Asian country, to do. Let us prevail on them not to add fuel to the fire, not to trade any more insults, but to come forward with something constructive, forgetting their differences—freezing them, as I mentioned in the Security Council—for the time being, and treat this question from its humanitarian aspect, thinking of the millions upon millions who will perish by war and attrition.

415. I submit that the Security Council should remain seized of this question—I am in agreement with Ambassador Malik of the Soviet Union—and that the Security Council should not only remain seized of it, but should resume its efforts, not necessarily in the Council chamber but *in camera*, hoping that a breakthrough will be reached in that

impasse and that in the end Chinese, Soviet, Indian and Pakistani wisdom will prevail.

416. Mr. DUGERSUREN (Mongolia) (*translated from Russian*): The Mongolian delegation fully shares the justified concern expressed here by all representatives who have spoken on the tragic situation in the Indian subcontinent. Many of those who have spoken here have indicated the true causes of the crisis which has arisen. We agree with the view that this crisis did not begin yesterday or the day before. If we look a little more closely, we find that the crisis has its roots in the pernicious heritage left on the subcontinent by the former colonial Powers, a heritage which has plagued that part of the world for many years already, and has now erupted with renewed force in East Pakistan.

417. As you all know, the situation in the eastern part of Pakistan since the general elections in December 1970 has been tense and explosive. The Governments of many countries, and also many national and international organizations, attempted until the last moment to draw the attention of the Government of Pakistan to the danger inherent in the course of action it has adopted, which, in violation of the basic rights of the people of East Pakistan, was aimed at completely annulling the results of the general elections and at flouting the lawful rights of the vast majority of the population of the country for the sake of short-sighted political considerations. However, the Pakistan authorities not only failed to heed the appeal of the world community, but embarked on a dangerous course of violence and the use of armed force against the peaceful inhabitants of East Pakistan. One result of this action, among others, was an unprecedented flow of refugees from that area to the neighbouring territory of India, leading in turn to a new and serious complication in the already strained relations between the two countries.

418. It is a well-known fact that the Government of India, for its part, did everything in its power to settle the question by peaceful means on the basis of justice and respect for the lawful rights of the people of East Pakistan. Nevertheless, the situation on the subcontinent continued to deteriorate further, and we are now witnesses to the sad fact that these two sister countries are in a state of armed confrontation. During the past two or three days the Security Council of the United Nations has been discussing the problem of the Indian subcontinent. However, through the fault of those who clearly do not wish to see the real causes of the crisis and are unwilling to take into account in their approach to the question the lawfully expressed will of the 75 million people of East Pakistan, the Council was unable to take any effective decision, but confined itself to transferring the question to the General Assembly for consideration.

419. We do not know how justified and desirable that decision was. We still have doubts in that respect.

420. Apart from everything else, we must regret the fact that the representatives of a number of countries feel it necessary to adopt a superficial decision, one which goes only half-way to solving the problem, without any deep or serious study of the real causes of the crisis. The representatives of certain Powers which bear a particular responsi-

bility for the maintenance of peace and security in the world are attempting to use the tragic events in the Indian subcontinent for their own mercenary purposes which have nothing in common with the real long-term interests of peace, freedom and progress for the peoples in that area.

421. In our delegation's view, the General Assembly should on this serious occasion make a profound and serious study of the causes of the crisis, and should adopt the most reasonable decision taking into account the real situation. Our delegation will support those proposals which aim at a really radical and far-reaching solution to the problem on the basis of justice and humanity, taking full account of the real situation in the area.

422. We are in favour of the immediate restoration of peace in the subcontinent, but the peace we advocate is one based on justice to the peoples of East Pakistan and on the recognition of their lawful rights and aspirations.

423. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation indeed rejoices at seeing the Secretary-General in his accustomed seat in this hall. Ever since the inception of this crisis—from 25 March—I have had occasion to remain in close touch with U Thant, and no one knows more than I how much he has contributed in trying to avert this great tragedy which has overtaken the peoples of India and Pakistan. I mean no disparagement of the other organs of the United Nations when I say that the Secretary-General, who heads the Secretariat, which is a principle organ of the United Nations, has single-handedly and with the assistance of his devoted colleagues and collaborators, done more than all the other four organs combined to try to avert this tragedy and to spur efforts for the humanitarian relief of the millions who have become its victims.

424. For its part, the Pakistan delegation finds it entirely appropriate that the opening substantive statements in this debate have been made by Member States other than the two parties directly concerned.

425. We find it appropriate because we believe that, although the war which has occasioned this debate is between India and Pakistan, the issue that has been joined is between the Charter of the United Nations and the forces that would destroy it. The issue that the Assembly has to face is whether the principles of the territorial integrity of Member States and of the non-use of force in international relations are to be regarded as the corner-stones of the Charter or not. The issue is whether these principles are absolute and unconditional, or whether they can be qualified and compromised.

426. Looked at in this perspective, the issue involves not only Pakistan but every Member State that wishes to guard a peaceful world order. It involves all who cherish freedom from the fear of aggression. Today it is Pakistan whose territorial integrity has been violated; tomorrow it may be any of you. Today it is Pakistan which is fighting outside armed interference; tomorrow the challenge may have to be taken up by any other Member State. Today, it is Pakistan which invokes the principle that international disputes, whatever their cause, origin or magnitude, have to be settled without recourse to force; tomorrow, some other Member State may have to make the same appeal.

427. Pakistan therefore is not asking for any partisan support from the Assembly. Our case is vindicated if the principles of the Charter are respected. We lose if those principles are set aside or compromised.

428. Pakistan is one fourth India's size. Its two parts are separated by the whole breadth of northern India. Pakistan has been grieved and torn and rent by a domestic crisis. It may have, as a people, mishandled that crisis. Nevertheless, Pakistan prizes its personality and regards its dignity and its honour as more precious than its life. Pakistan may be small compared to India but it values its freedom and unity no less than India values its own. Pakistan has therefore resolutely taken up the challenge flung at it by India. Whatever be the outcome of the debates in the General Assembly or the Security Council, Pakistan will not falter or fail. But Pakistan wants every other nation—every other nation that is smaller than its neighbour—to understand that Pakistan is fighting a battle which, in the final analysis, is not only its own.

429. There are three aspects of the question which are of immediate relevance to the decision of the General Assembly.

430. The first is the fact of the invasion of Pakistan territory by India. This began on 21 November and my delegation has adduced in the Security Council detailed evidence of this aggression. The fact of aggression is admitted by India.

431. The second is India's armed interference in Pakistan's internal affairs. This has consisted chiefly of creating an irregular army from the persons displaced from East Pakistan and making it operate from Indian bases and encouraging armed incursions into the territory of Pakistan. Again, this is admitted by India.

432. The third is India's avowed goal—avowed publicly—of breaking up the integrity of Pakistan and promoting a separatist East Pakistan under the name of Bangladesh which would be subservient to India and thus raise India to the status of a dominant Power in the South Asian region. The Indo-Soviet Treaty of 9 August 1971 has been a crucial factor in India's choosing war as the instrument for achieving this end.

433. For each of these three causative factors of the present situation in the subcontinent, India, of course, advances a justification.

434. The plea regarding invasion is that Pakistan had been planning a war with India to divert attention from its domestic discord. Sometimes the argument is varied, and it is alleged that Pakistan turned on India out of frustration at its inability to organize its polity. Was Pakistan, in reality, planning a war? If so, why would it have initiated or accepted every proposal—every conceivable means—by which the situation would have been defused and hostilities averted?

435. First, Pakistan sought the good offices of the Security Council in August. India blocked the move.

436. Second, Pakistan accepted the proposal for a pull-back of Indian and Pakistani armed forces from the borders to peace-time stations. India rejected it.

437. Third, Pakistan proposed that the two sides withdraw their armed forces at least to agreed safe distances to meet India's contention that its lines of communication were longer. Again the Indian answer was "No".

438. Fourth, Pakistan accepted the good offices of the Secretary-General as soon as these were offered in October. India's refusal was couched in terms of such lofty disdain that it puzzled the Secretary-General.

439. Fifth, Pakistan also asked for United Nations observers to be stationed on both sides of the border to safeguard against violations. India rejected this proposal as well.

440. Sixth, on 29 November Pakistan signified that it would be willing to accept these observers on its own side of the East Pakistan border to obviate a threat to peace resulting from India's invasion which had commenced on 21 November.

441. I must also mention here that on 20 November the President of Pakistan extended the hand of friendship to India. What was the response? India launched its aggression on East Pakistan the very next day.

442. Let me now turn to India's justification for the armed incursions into East Pakistan from Indian sanctuaries with Indian arms, equipment and directions for the past several months. The justification given is that India had a moral duty to extend maximum support to the so-called liberation forces. We are accustomed, by now, to India's self-righteousness. But what about India's moral and legal duty under the Charter, solemnly reaffirmed in so many declarations of the General Assembly, to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorism in another State?

443. The third causative factor of the present situation relates to India's sponsorship of the so-called Bangladesh. But what is this Bangladesh? The same correspondent whom the Indian representative is so fond of quoting has this to say in a report filed from Calcutta yesterday and appearing in *The New York Times* of today:

"Until now, their government of Bangla Desh has been an all-Indian show—functioning on Indian soil, following Indian advice and in general being dependent on India for its official existence."

Further on the report says:

"Some diplomatic observers think the Bangla Desh government will not actually move into East Pakistan until Indian troops have taken the entire country."

The dispatch adds:

"The Indians, to insure their objective of having a friendly nation on their eastern border"—and we all know what big Powers mean by friendly nations on their borders—"have tried to guide the Bangla Desh leadership into paths acceptable to New Delhi. For example, an advisory committee was attached to the government that included pro-Moscow leftist parties, which won not a single seat in last year's pivotal elections. . . ."

"The inclusion of the leftists was a concession to the Soviet Union, which has been India's staunchest supporter throughout this crisis."

444. Thus, India's design is clear. It is to impose the so-called Bangladesh on the people of East Pakistan by the bayonets of an Indian army of occupation. This is the kind of government which India calls upon the international community to recognize.

445. We have been told that Pakistan must respect the will of the population of East Pakistan. Did the people of East Pakistan opt for submission to such a régime in those elections? Can anyone assert that the people of East Pakistan—who are the most politically conscious part of our nation and have a long history of struggle against upper caste Hindu domination—wished for the reimposition of that same domination?

446. To respect the will of the people of East Pakistan imposes on us the obligation to resist with all the forces at our command the attempt to convert East Pakistan into an Indian protectorate.

447. Let me make it clear that the issue involved here is not that of self-determination. Pakistan yields to none in espousing this principle. But the electorate of East Pakistan voted for autonomy in last year's elections, not for secession. This is conceded by India itself when it says that the goal of the Awami League was autonomy, not independence. Secondly, as the Secretary-General so clearly stated at a press conference in Accra on 9 January 1970:

"Regarding the second question of self-determination I think this concept is not properly understood in many parts of the world. Self-determination of peoples does not imply self-determination of a section of a population of a particular Member State. If the principle of self-determination is applied to 10 different areas of a Member State, or five different areas of a Member State, or 20 different areas of a Member State, then I am afraid there will be no end to the problems.

"What is relevant for the consideration of the United Nations is the simple basic principles of the Charter.

"When a State applies to be a Member of the United Nations, and when the United Nations accepts that Member, then the implication is that the rest of the membership of the United Nations recognizes the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of this particular Member State".

448. While the issue has been clouded by unprecedented Indian propaganda and by the world press which, unfortunately, cannot forget—it has long memories of Moslem-Christian wars and crusades and cannot deal objectively with certain countries of the world—the fact is beyond challenge that it was India which, by its interventionist role, caused and aggravated Pakistan's internal crisis and then used that crisis as a pretext for unleashing aggression against Pakistan. The Indian representative, in trying to deny the facts, used the name of Mr. Bhutto, the leader of the largest political party in West Pakistan, the other day and alleged that in his book, *The Great Tragedy*, Mr. Bhutto had said

"not a word" about India's complicity in attempts to break up Pakistan. Let me read from Mr. Bhutto's book:

"India's hostile attitude, although expected, has been unbecoming in the extreme. She has blatantly interfered on the side of the secessionists. She has openly supported the forces seeking to destroy Pakistan. The Prime Minister of India waxed eloquent in support of the secessionists in the Lok Sabha, and declared that the problems of East Pakistan could not be regarded as the internal affair of Pakistan. Both Houses of Parliament unanimously passed a resolution in support of the aspirations of the secessionists. West Bengal has been turned into a springboard for Indian infiltrators to penetrate East Pakistan. It has also been turned into a haven for the insurgents. The Border Security Forces of India have been sent in civilian clothes to East Pakistan. Large quantities of arms and ammunition have been supplied to the rebels. Indian forces have actively aided the rebels on the borders particularly in Sylhet, Khulna and Jessore. The Indian Navy harassed Pakistan's merchant ships and even attempted to blockade the Bay of Bengal. Funds for the secessionists are being collected throughout India. The State Legislatures are whipping up Indian public opinion in support of the secessionists.

"India's actions cannot be passed off as spontaneous demonstrations of support for an independent Bangla Desh. The conspiracy is as old as Partition"—of the subcontinent into India and Pakistan in 1947—"and since the Agartala Conspiracy Case it has been considerably intensified. India always had a covetous eye on East Bengal, as a first step in destroying Pakistan."¹⁷

449. The General Assembly is aware of the circumstances under which this situation of war between India and Pakistan has been brought to its consideration. The Security Council was reduced to complete impotence by the arbitrary use of the veto by one permanent member, which is in military alliance with the aggressor State, and which never ceases to claim to be the paragon of non-alignment. The Pakistan delegation is confident that this body, representing the will of 132 sovereign and equal nations, will take a decision on the basis of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, whose unconditional validity seems now to be cast into doubt by those who have been the loudest in proclaiming their contribution to the strengthening of international security.

450. There are now two draft resolutions before the General Assembly. These are contained in documents A/L.647/Rev.1 and A/L.648. From the debate in the Security Council and from today's debate in the General Assembly it is quite clear that an overwhelming majority of the Members of this world Organization would favour only that draft resolution which, without doing violence to any of the principles of the Charter and as a minimum first step, seeks an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of forces. That is draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

451. But while the imperatives of the situation require a condemnation of the aggression and the provision of a

¹⁷ Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, *The Great Tragedy* (Karachi, Vision Publications, Ltd., 1971), p. 54.

mechanism to ensure that there is no repetition of attacks by armed forces or other armed personnel against the territory of Pakistan or, for that matter, the territory of India, and inasmuch as these provisions are not included in draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, my delegation considers it to be suffering from a serious deficiency. My Government had proposed the introduction of United Nations observers on both sides of the India-Pakistan border, a measure which would have provided adequate assurance in regard to the question of the implementation of any decision that the United Nations might adopt. It will be recalled that when Pakistan welcomed the good offices of the Secretary-General, which could be utilized to defuse the situation between India and Pakistan, we had pointed out what were the basic minimum conditions for achieving that result. Nevertheless, as draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, despite its inadequacies, gives expression to the collective will of a large number of Member States, Pakistan has taken note of this collective will of the international community.

452. As for the draft resolution sponsored by the delegation of the Soviet Union [A/L.648], I had occasion to comment on it last night at the 1608th meeting of the Security Council when an identical draft had been submitted. I therefore do not need to dwell on it. But I must repeat that by linking the cease-fire with what it calls a political settlement in East Pakistan, the draft resolution wants the Government of Pakistan to negotiate with the secessionists under the duress of the presence of the Indian occupation forces on Pakistan soil. The Soviet draft resolution provides for no cease-fire; it provides for no withdrawal; it in effect implies the continuation of the Indian war of aggression until Pakistan submits to dismemberment.

453. The Soviet draft resolution would have Pakistan sign away its national integrity. Needless to say, no self-respecting State can ever countenance such a proposal.

454. At this moment of trial for Pakistan and its people, when death and destruction are being rained on our civilian population, in both the western and eastern parts of our country, when its valiant armed forces are fighting against heavy military odds, when suffering is our companion, and tears and blood our portion, the people of Pakistan, of East and West, are driven by one will: to confront the aggressor with all their strength of spirit and to flinch from no sacrifice in defending the nation's unity, freedom and honour.

455. Mr. TAYLOR-KAMARA (Sierra Leone): At this very moment, as we continue to discuss the India-Pakistan conflict, the war continues to escalate in that subcontinent and lives are being lost and property damaged. Resources, whether human or material, which could have gone into nation-building, are being depleted and exhausted in un-economic warfare.

456. My President and Government are deeply perturbed over the disaster that is taking place in South Asia. We have excellent ties and relations with both countries and we are members of the Commonwealth through our background and community of interests. We, therefore, would not want to see good friends of ours engaged in a devastating war of such proportions. We had hoped that both parties would

have heeded our appeals to end their fighting and take whatever problems or grievances they had to the conference table. To our regret, however, this has not been possible. The heat of temper has been allowed to prevail and good sense has been thrown to the winds. It is with grave concern that my delegation witnesses this ugly situation.

457. In our capacity as President of the Security Council for the current month, we have done what we could to tackle the problem in the hope that the Security Council, which, according to the Charter, has been invested with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, would find ways and means to solve this serious and deteriorating situation.

458. The Council's efforts over the past three days have severely bogged down. Instead of making progress and advancing its work with a view to arriving at the normally accepted solution of bringing pressure to bear on both parties, we see the work of the Council deadlocked as a result of the intransigence of both parties and the backing and support which we believe they receive from their friendly major Powers. Notwithstanding the seriousness of the situation of which the Council was seized, and the duty and responsibility of the great Powers to assist in ending it, the will of the Council was frustrated by great-Power veto.

459. Two draft resolutions put to the vote commanded more than the required majority. Both of them, if adopted, would certainly have advanced our task by calling for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of the armed forces of the combatants within their own territorial confines. It would have brought about an end to the untold suffering and deprivations that still continue to plague that subcontinent.

460. The failure of the Council to bring a solution to this problem has once again drawn attention to the crisis of confidence which surrounds this organ. It leaves the burning impression that no matter how world opinion is shaped around a problem, as long as it affects great-Power interest, it is incapable of solution.

461. My delegation, in conjunction with several others has sponsored, both in the Security Council and in this august Assembly, draft resolutions which, in our considered opinion are designed to help advance the cause of peace and tranquillity in the India-Pakistan subcontinent. We trust that our efforts, based on the "Uniting for peace" resolution [resolution 377 (V)], will prove a blessing and help save thousands of lives that might otherwise be lost.

462. Let it not be said that the General Assembly, like the Security Council, is incapable of positive action when action is most needed. Let not this United Nations be condemned by posterity for failing to live up to its Charter responsibilities.

463. Finally, I wish to announce, on behalf of the sponsors, that the delegation of Zaire has also become a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

464. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

465. Mr. SEN (India): I have listened with great attention to the various comments made in this important debate. Without going into a detailed analysis, I think it is fair to say that four trends of thought against India have emerged: one led by the United States of America, one by Portugal, one by China and one by Pakistan. Now, what is there in common among all these four countries? The United States is a great democracy; Portugal is a great Fascist State; China we know nothing about; Pakistan is full of animosity against India.

466. The representative of the United States said: "You gentlemen of the United Nations, put out the flame. Let us stop worrying about the blame". But before he said that he had already put the blame squarely on India. That is his privilege. Those who care for facts either about the subcontinent or elsewhere will know how United States policies are formed and how they are executed. I shall leave it at that.

467. As for Portugal, a most fantastic Fascist, colonialist territory has the gumption to come here to the United Nations and stand on this rostrum and defend Goa—a little pimple on the face of India which would have been wiped out a long, long time ago. We tolerated it through 14 years of peaceful negotiations. Nothing happened. We took it. We are proud to have taken it. I hope all of my African and Arab friends would support that action; indeed, they did, and we are most grateful to them for so doing. We have nothing to be ashamed of.

468. And it is extraordinary: the great revolutionary State of China, the beacon-light of our future, still tolerates Macau. I leave you to draw your own lesson from this.

469. The representative of Pakistan was quite right. I was quite touched by his moving speech about the break-up of his country. If I were in his position I would be equally moved. No one, no human being, no man with any decency can feel anything but extreme sadness, extreme worry that his country has broken up. But the question is not whether we feel sorry. Of course we must feel sorry, but we have to face the fact that it has broken up. Nothing on earth can stop it. It has happened. Whether it was a succession of faults that brought it about, whether it was the wisdom, or lack of it, of the leaders—whatever may have been the reasons, it has broken up. This is a fact which we have to face today and this is why I have come to comment on the draft resolutions before us.

470. The first draft resolution, moved with extremely good intentions, with extreme goodwill and with great sensitivity for this Organization, by Argentina and others [*A/L.647/Rev.1*], to our mind is unrealistic, irrelevant and, may I say, even dangerous. It is unrealistic because there is not one kind of battle that is going on in the subcontinent; there are two kinds of battle that are going on. There is a battle between Indian soldiers and Pakistani soldiers brought about by Pakistani aggression, and a battle between the Mukti Bahini and Pakistan soldiers brought about by Pakistani repression. What this draft resolution tends to do is to stop one kind of battle and leave the repression part, the resistance part alone. This obviously will not work. All men of goodwill, all countries represented in this hall, would want all hostilities to cease, all violence to cease.

And we do not need any lessons about what Mahatma Gandhi did and what Jawaharlal Nehru did, and how we have failed our idols and their ideals. We do not need any lessons on that. We have never been foolish enough to believe all of us are like our greatest men. We only hope that with our efforts and through trial and error we shall contribute to their ideals. We never feel that we have reached those ideals; we try for them.

471. Therefore, you are trying to put a damper on one conflict while encouraging the other—the other one which is much worse, namely the conflict of the soldiers of a country repressing the civilian population, destroying their villages, killing their men, women and children, raping their women, and taking part in the most sadistic orgy ever known in human history. If that is the result you want to achieve, go ahead and do it. I do not for a moment deny that your intentions are pure, your goodwill is above suspicion; but if this is the use to which the United Nations is to be put, you will wreck the United Nations. You cannot expect the delegation of India, which has sought faithfully for so many years to uphold all the principles we believe we should uphold, to be a party to that. We shall therefore be obliged to vote against it.

472. Apart from that, there is our peculiar position in the sense that we have to look after these people, these refugees from oppression, from terror, from incredible brutalities. Do you think we could now turn around and say to them: "We have now accepted a cease-fire because it will allow Pakistan's army to continue with their brutalities. We, being a faithful Member of the United Nations, could not do a thing for you when you were being butchered, raped and looted. But today, now at last you are on the threshold of some self-respect, some decent existence, we shall see that you are back again to the game of being looted, raped, burned and killed." We cannot be a party to that, let there be no doubt about that.

473. I was extremely gratified, in this context, by the statements made by the representatives of the United Kingdom and France. They represent great Powers. We have many difficulties with those Powers, but I hope that neither India nor its representatives have ever lacked the courage to pay tribute when and to whom it is due. These distinguished representatives of great Powers have seen the problem, have seen its complications, have seen its tragedies, and I would like to believe that their store of knowledge is much greater than that of many of us. If they have shown that wisdom, let us not decide on an action that would only mean bringing about—with the greatest of good intentions—a situation where the United Nations will not be in the vanguard of all the good values our civilization stands for, but will instead become an object of ridicule and may indeed even itself break up.

474. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Czechoslovakia to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

475. Mr. ČERNÍK (Czechoslovakia): We have heard the statement of the representative of the People's Republic of China, which contained, among other things, some unwarranted remarks concerning my country. I therefore consider it necessary to exercise my right of reply on behalf of the Czechoslovak delegation.

476. Permit me to reject most resolutely those remarks concerning my country as an inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of a State Member of this Organization. Such attempts to revive slanderous campaigns in the United Nations are to be condemned. There is no doubt that they do not contribute to the strengthening of constructive co-operation and the creation of the favourable atmosphere so necessary for resolving a problem so grave as the one we are considering at this time.

477. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Pakistan to speak in exercise of his right of reply.

478. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): The Indian representative has pronounced a death sentence on Pakistan's unity. Let me tell him that there is a higher court of appeal. That court is the collective will of the nations of the world that bear fidelity to the United Nations Charter and its principles and are here assembled.

479. Let me say one word more. It is not India's threats or its might but the faith and spirit of the people of Pakistan that will prevail.

480. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on the two draft resolutions before us.

481. Mr. DAVIN (Gabon) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of my delegation I am pleased to be able to express the satisfaction we felt on seeing the Secretary-General, U Thant, return to take his place in the Assembly hall. We wish him a complete recovery so that he may long continue to hold his high post.

482. My delegation has decided to support the two draft resolutions before us [A/L.647/Rev.1 and A/L.648]. We shall vote in favour of the two texts, and in so doing my delegation means to express its desire to make a maximum contribution to the search for and the implementation of appropriate measures to put an end to the very serious situation in the Indian subcontinent.

483. So long as war rages causing thousands of deaths and bringing immeasurable suffering in its wake, the primary task of the United Nations is to interpose itself between the belligerents to stop the bloody confrontations. It is therefore not a question of splitting up into two camps, differing on matters of principle and semantics, when all here are aware of the urgent and overriding necessity of stopping the fighting.

484. In asking that every effort be made speedily to create the conditions necessary for the return of the refugees to their homes, it seems to us that the authors of the draft resolutions want to see an end put to the deep-rooted causes underlying the tragic events ravaging the subcontinent, which constitutes a grave and serious threat to international peace and security.

485. It is from this standpoint and on the basis of these considerations that my delegation has analysed the two draft resolutions and decided to support them. Draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1, by calling upon the Indian and Pakistani Governments to cease-fire and to withdraw

behind their respective frontiers, meets with our complete support. But it seems to us that in calling only for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops without laying sufficient stress on the restoration of a climate and a political framework likely to encourage the refugees to return to their homes, the draft resolution tends to eliminate only the consequences and effects without dealing with the causes that led to them.

486. Draft resolution A/L.648, on the other hand, although not fully agreeable to us in some of its terms, seems to us to take more into consideration the need to reach a political settlement in accordance with the will of the peoples concerned. It therefore comes to grips with the causes better than draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1. That is why we feel it is our duty to support it also.

487. As is apparent, the two texts, far from being contradictory, complement each other and constitute a whole. That is why my delegation will cast these two affirmative votes. Had the two texts been combined in one I am convinced we should have had a text that would have met with almost unanimous support.

488. It is regrettable that, when confronted with such serious and tragic developments, when the whole world has its eyes fixed on our Organization, we have been unable to silence our differences and divergencies of view in order to devote ourselves to our primary duty, which is above all to bar the road to war in order to spare millions of innocent victims and maintain international peace and security.

489. Mr. BAHOLLI (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked to speak in order briefly to explain its vote on draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1. We should have preferred a text that would have clearly indicated those responsible for the aggression, but in view of the situation created, and particularly out of solidarity with the just cause of Pakistan, the victim of the aggression, our delegation will support the draft resolution as a whole. However, I should like to emphasize that our affirmative vote does not mean that we approve of the eighth preambular paragraph containing a reference to General Assembly resolution 377 A (V).

490. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with rule 93 of the rules of procedure, I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory

Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda.

Against: Bhutan, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, India, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Afghanistan, Chile, Denmark, France, Malawi, Nepal, Oman, Senegal, Singapore.

Draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1 was adopted by 104 votes to 11, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2793 (XXVI)).

491. The PRESIDENT: In view of the action just taken by the General Assembly, I assume that it is the wish of the Assembly not to vote on draft resolution A/L.648.

It was so decided.

492. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

493. Mr. ANDERSEN (Denmark): Denmark abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/L.647/Rev.1. Let me emphasize that our voting certainly does not detract in the least from our full adherence to the principle that the use of force cannot be accepted as a means of solving any problem. We agree, therefore, that all military activities and violent acts of any kind should be brought to an end. Equally, we certainly agree that all States should co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in rendering assistance to and relieving the distress of the refugees.

494. We do find, however, that the resolution now adopted by this Assembly does not deal with the basic political problems in a manner which fully takes into account the complexity of these problems.

495. Finally, I should like to state that we have taken note of the attitude of those members of the Security Council who have not yet committed themselves on any text, and we have not wished to associate ourselves with a text that could hamper future constructive efforts by those Powers.

496. Mr. HUANG (China) (*translated from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Argentina and other countries. However, the Chinese delegation must state that this draft has failed to draw a line of distinction between the aggressor and the victim of aggression and has failed to condemn the aggressor and to voice support for the victim of aggression. It is, therefore, highly unsatisfactory.

497. Secondly, the third paragraph of the preamble mentions "the need to deal appropriately at a subsequent

stage, within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, with the issues which have given rise to the hostilities", and the fourth paragraph of the preamble expresses the conviction "that an early political solution would be necessary for the restoration of conditions of normalcy in the area of conflict and for the return of the refugees to their homes".

498. In view of the obstinate positions of certain representatives—especially the Soviet Union and Indian representatives—to insist upon interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan, the Chinese delegation states the following: at no time and under no conditions should the above clauses in any way be distorted as a pretext for United Nations interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan.

499. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): My country's relations with India have always been those of closest bonds of friendship and brotherly solidarity. India has all along been the object of our profound esteem and admiration for the moral background of its people and for its devotion to noble causes.

500. However, our dedication to the Charter and the principles and purposes of the United Nations for an international legal order and peace in the world is at the very centre of the policy of Cyprus on all subjects and on all problems. From the very day we joined the United Nations our stand on all questions has always been one of strict adherence to the principles of the Charter and support of the development and the strengthening of the United Nations as an instrument of peace and progress in the world.

501. We are, therefore, fundamentally against the use of force and war in all cases and for whatever causes. We firmly believe that war can solve no problem but merely aggravate the situation, with incalculable repercussions.

502. No war in our time can be brought to a successful or any conclusion. If a war is started, it is the duty of the United Nations and its Members under the Charter to intervene in order to bring an immediate stop to it.

503. At the present juncture, we fully realize that India has been under the gravest of provocations as a consequence of the tragic sequence of events in East Pakistan and the suppression of human rights in that country. With millions of refugees fleeing to India, the economic and social problems resulting from the constant influx of those refugees led to a situation of such dimensions of growing anomaly that it should have been arrested by a political solution and by the concerted action of the international community through the United Nations.

504. Regrettably, nothing has been done in that direction and all of a sudden we have been faced with an open war involving increasing loss of life, destruction and untold human suffering.

505. Although the resolution which has just been adopted is not sufficiently balanced, since it does not provide for a political solution and the restoration of conditions of normalcy in the area in the operative part as it does in the fourth preambular paragraph, we nevertheless considered it

our paramount duty under the Charter to vote in favour of a draft resolution calling for a cease-fire and the cessation of hostilities in that area.

506. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): I have already indicated earlier that the draft resolution just adopted by the General Assembly by such an overwhelming majority was full of defects. I indicated specifically what were the defects of that draft resolution, and it is not necessary for me to repeat what I stated then.

507. At the same time—and although my delegation had no instructions from the Government of Pakistan—out of deference to the overwhelming will of the general membership of this Assembly we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

508. It is necessary for me to emphasize that, in construing the provisions of the resolution just adopted, my delegation reads the third and fourth preambular paragraphs together as a whole, and we would emphasize that any efforts made by the General Assembly of the United Nations “to deal . . . at a subsequent stage . . . with the issues which have given rise to hostilities” and the expression of views about “. . . an early political solution [being] necessary for the restoration of conditions of normalcy in the area” must be construed within the framework of the Charter of the United Nations, meaning thereby that all such attempts by the General Assembly or the international community must be within the principle of the territorial integrity of Pakistan and no attempt should be made to disrupt the national unity of Pakistan either partially or totally.

509. It is in that sense that we understand the third and fourth preambular paragraphs of the resolution just adopted, and we would further emphasize that the meaning of paragraph 2 of the resolution, which states:

“*Urges* that efforts be intensified in order to bring about, speedily and in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, conditions necessary for the voluntary return of the East Pakistan refugees to their homes”,

is also very clear, namely, that the “conditions necessary for the voluntary return” must be consistent with the territorial integrity and national unity of Pakistan, and any attempt to construe that paragraph as meaning a demand on the Government of Pakistan to negotiate with secessionist elements will be rejected by my Government.

510. It is with that understanding that we voted for this draft resolution, although we had no instructions from the Government of Pakistan.

511. Furthermore, may I express the deepest gratitude of the delegation of Pakistan for this overwhelming historic vote. It is the first occasion when the general membership of the United Nations decided to be seized of the situation when the Security Council had been prevented from acting by the veto of a permanent member of the Security Council. In that sense this Assembly has risen to great historic heights, which does credit to the United Nations, retrieves its honour and revives the hopes of the people of the world in this Organization.

The meeting rose at 11.20 p.m.