

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS



UN LIBRARY

TWENTY-SIXTH YEAR

JAN 29 1975

1614th

MEETING: 14/15 DECEMBER 1971

UN/SA COLLECTION

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1614)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in the India/ Pakistan subcontinent	1

(141P.)

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

183

SIXTEEN HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH MEETING

Held in New York on Tuesday, 14 December 1971, at 3 p.m.
and resumed on Wednesday, 15 December 1971, at 12.10 p.m.

President: Mr. I. B. TAYLOR-KAMARA (Sierra Leone).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Argentina, Belgium, Burundi, China, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/1614)

1. Adoption of the agenda.
2. Letter dated 12 December 1971 from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/10444).

Adoption of the agenda

1. The PRESIDENT: The provisional agenda for the present meeting is before the Council in document S/Agenda/1614. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the agenda is adopted.
2. I call upon the representative of Somalia on a point of order.
3. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I raise a point of order in connexion with the question under debate. So far, although we have been debating the situation on the Indian subcontinent—or the India-Pakistan subcontinent—this has not been reflected in the agenda. For instance, on 4 December [1606th meeting], we had the item inscribed as "Letter dated 4 December 1971 from the Permanent Representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Burundi . . ." and so on [S/10411]. On 5 December [1607th meeting] we had that same letter on the agenda, together with the report of the Secretary-General [S/10410 and Add.1], and another report by the Secretary-General [S/10412]. On 12 December [1611th meeting] we had the item again, but this time it was related to a letter dated 12 December from the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the President of the Security Council [S/10444].
4. I think it would be convenient for our debate if we could now try to reach agreement on a title for this question; and since every one of us has referred to "the situation in the Indian subcontinent" or "the situation in the India-Pakistan subcontinent" we should now give this title to our debate.

5. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I consider that the observations just made by the representative of Somalia are relevant. This is the same question that we have been discussing for a number of meetings of the Council. Of course, new documents come in as the debate proceeds, but I believe it would be a good thing to have a general title such as that suggested by the representative of Somalia. Of course we could consider whether some other title would be better, but I think the idea is an excellent one and should be accepted.

6. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I agree with the suggestion made by the representative of Somalia, supported by the representative of France; and if we are to use a title in our agenda my proposal is that it should be "The situation in the subcontinent of India and Pakistan".

7. The PRESIDENT: May I ask the representative of Somalia whether he has any particular suggestion as regards the title or qualification of the agenda?

8. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I would suggest that the question be entitled: "The situation in the India/Pakistan subcontinent".

9. The PRESIDENT: As there is no further suggestion or comment on this, I shall regard the present suggestion as accepted.¹

The agenda, as amended, was adopted.

The situation in the India/Pakistan subcontinent

10. The PRESIDENT: The Council will now resume its consideration of the item on the agenda.
11. I now call on the representative of the United Kingdom on a point of order.
12. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Before we deal with the formal procedure might I make a suggestion. As all members of the Council will know, we have before us a draft resolution by the Italian and Japanese delegations [S/10451], but there is also a draft resolution which is being worked on by my French colleague and myself. Intensive consultations are going on at the present time and I do not see that they will necessarily be completed by this evening. So, might I suggest that we adjourn until tomorrow.

¹ The amended provisional agenda was circulated under the symbol S/Agenda/1614/Rev.1.

row so that we can pursue our consultations and we do not, therefore, as it were, waste the time of the Council in purely formal matters.

13. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): In principle I agree that consultations should go on. However, the time of the resumption of the Security Council must be as early as possible. Therefore, I do not agree that we should defer our meeting until tomorrow. I suggest that after we have some results from our consultations we should resume our meeting. If we have to fix a time then make it tonight at 7 p.m.—not later than that time.

14. We must consider the gravity of the situation in that subcontinent. We must bear in mind that many cities are now under the devastation of gunfire. Masses of people are being slaughtered, are being sacrificed, and therefore we must keep that in mind. We have to have a conception of time: We have also to bear the responsibility that we have towards them, towards the people of the world, and we have to proceed with our consultations in a serious way. The meeting must be resumed as soon as possible.

15. The PRESIDENT: May I know from the representative of China what he means when he talks about the resumption—we have resumed the meeting—but is it his suggestion that we should rise now for a while, go for further consultations and then come back again? I have the impression that the representative of China is asking us to resume the meeting. We have already resumed our meeting. Is he suggesting that we should have a short adjournment within which we can hold further consultations, because when we are meeting it becomes difficult to hold further consultations? Is he asking for an adjournment for a specific period to hold further consultations and then for a resumption of the meeting?

16. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): If I remember correctly, the representative of the United Kingdom made a statement that consultations are being held at the present time and he also proposed that the meeting should be resumed tomorrow—that is his proposal. I wonder whether that understanding is correct? Can the representative of the United Kingdom clarify this point for us?

17. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Yes, I did propose an adjournment until tomorrow because, with great respect, our consultations are being continued very urgently but I really very much doubt that they will be able to be completed this evening because there are a number of extremely difficult points at issue. Representatives will have to get instructions from their home Governments and I believe it is very important that as far as the next resolution that this Council tries to pass is concerned, we should be able to achieve unanimity, or be able to pass a resolution, and therefore it is very important that we should do our work; an extra delay of an hour or two, or even eight hours, would be worth while, to avoid further disagreement.

18. Mr. KALAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to say that we are all aware of the situation, but we are all also aware of the need to continue

consultations, to continue efforts to reach a solution of the question. I wanted to say that my delegation is also engaged in drafting a text for submission to the Council. We too have broached consultations with other delegations. In the circumstances we believe that the proposal made by the representative of the United Kingdom would help to advance these consultations and perhaps enable us to come to our next meeting with texts that can be discussed advisedly.

19. Mr. KOSCIUSKO-MORIZET (France) (*interpretation from French*): I wanted to speak a moment ago. Perhaps it is not so appropriate right now, but I wanted to say that I fully share the concern expressed by our colleague from China. To be sure we are all very anxious to move ahead swiftly and all delegations here are working very hard at this present time, but a premature meeting might not yield the expected results. I therefore think we should be as flexible as possible. We could suspend the present meeting. I do not think we could reasonably meet before this evening, perhaps not even before tomorrow. However, if after our consultations it seemed feasible to have a meeting this evening, then the President could immediately convene the Council. Thus I do not think it is necessary now to schedule a time either for this evening or tomorrow. We could say that we are suspending the meeting and then the President could convene the Council again as soon as possible, as suggested by the representative of China. It could be this evening or at the latest tomorrow morning.

20. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation fully shares the concern expressed by the representative of China. We believe that the Council must act, and act very soon, to try to resolve the tragic crisis in the Asian subcontinent. Nevertheless, at the present stage of our work it is necessary to pursue consultations, not only among all members of the Council but also between the two parties most directly concerned in this clash, India and Pakistan. I think we need time for these consultations to yield fruitful results. Experience has shown that when the Council adjourns its meeting for a few hours, guided by the very noble desire to conclude its work as soon as possible, the results are not always the best because an exhaustive consideration of the matter cannot take place in a very short period of time; moreover, a short interval does not make it possible to receive instructions I would therefore appeal to the representative of China and tell him that I share his views, but I appeal to him not to oppose the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom. I think we can make very good use of the few remaining hours of today then perhaps at a meeting tomorrow we might be able to reach the solution which is required. The hours which remain today—and they are not so many, I might say parenthetically—will have to be devoted to the intensified consultations that are necessary. For this reason my delegation does not believe that we should have a debate on this matter here and now. Therefore, I support the suggestion made by the representative of the United Kingdom that we should have a meeting tomorrow morning and that we devote the rest of today to these very necessary consultations.

21. Mr. TOMEH (Syrian Arab Republic): I should like to support the very pertinent suggestion, or proposal, that was

put forward by the representative of France. It seems to be a very practical one because it would not close the door to the possibility of having a meeting tonight, should the consultations now being conducted reach a result which would warrant a meeting of the Council tonight. In case such a result is not reached, then a meeting of the Council would be held tomorrow. The important thing is that this proposal does not close the door to a possible meeting tonight. Thus it is a very happy compromise between the proposals that have been put before the Council. I therefore formally support the proposal of the representative of France.

22. Mr. BENNETT (United States of America): I should merely like to speak of the urgency of the situation. You will recall that this Council decided last evening, after considerable debate, to adjourn until 3 o'clock this afternoon to enable consultations to take place. My delegation is grateful for the fact that those consultations are going on and a great deal of dedicated work is being put into the question of finding a solution and a draft resolution on which we can all agree. However, while we are consulting, let me remind the Council, if I may use an American phrase, that there is "a war going on". People are dying, there is shooting and bombing and innocent women and children are being killed along with the soldiers and other civilians while we consult. My delegation is prepared to sit here now or to rise to enable further consultations and to meet again as soon as possible, whether it is this evening or tomorrow, but we feel that there is urgency in the situation and we would be prepared to come as soon as others can, after the consultations. We would hope that that could be as early as this evening.

23. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): We share, as we have often said, the concern and the impatience once again expressed here by the representative of China and by other representatives. We also feel that we should set about our work without delay in order to find a solution to the problem which is of concern to us. I also propose with the representative of France that we should continue our consultations and perhaps meet this evening, if we can reach concrete results.

24. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): The representative of Argentina remarked that there are only a few hours left of our working day in New York, but a few hours for those poor victims of aerial bombardment and shelling is a lifetime of misery. For this reason, my delegation, naturally, is not entirely happy about having to postpone this problem day after day without any kind of constructive proposal coming out to justify such postponements.

25. If the representatives of France and the United Kingdom—who, after all, have still to make plain their position or whatever proposal they may have—can indicate to us that they share a sense of optimism about coming to the Council tomorrow with a formula, the Council certainly would be justified in agreeing to the adjournment, but if they cannot promise us any prospect of a settlement or solution and we find tomorrow that we go on with the same old procedure of postponing again for 24 hours, we would be abdicating our responsibilities. If we do adjourn, might I suggest that perhaps the representatives of India or

Pakistan be invited to take the floor in case they have something to impart to us?

26. Mr. NAKAGAWA (Japan): My delegation shares the anxiety expressed by the Chinese delegation and also some other delegations about the urgency of the problem. Although we understand the need for time to engage in consultations, I think we can tentatively schedule a meeting for, say, 9 o'clock this evening in view of the urgency of this matter, with the delegations doing their best to arrive at some understanding by that time. Of course, if there is no prospect of an early solution of the matter when we meet, then we can adjourn again until tomorrow morning. But anyway, I think the Council should try as hard as possible to meet in view of the urgency of the matter.

27. Mr. VINCI (Italy): I do not think I have to reiterate the sense of urgency with which our delegation has always viewed this very serious problem. We have been acting on that basis all the time and, therefore, we share completely the feelings of anxiety which have been expressed by so many speakers, beginning with the representative of China.

28. My feeling is that we should not now establish any hour when we meet. I think the best thing is that we go on with our consultations which, as far as my delegation is concerned, have been very serious and important negotiations. We are deeply involved in those negotiations, and I am sure that the delegations of the United Kingdom and France are equally involved in very serious negotiations. If we can succeed in a few hours, all the better. I think the best proposal was made by the representative of France; it leaves you free, Mr. President, to convene the meeting at the earliest possible moment. If it can be in two hours, all the better. We could meet at any time provided that we know you are empowered to convene the meeting as soon as you know there is something we can do.

29. The PRESIDENT: A proposal was put forward that this meeting of the Council be adjourned and that the Council reconvene either at short notice or, at the latest, tomorrow morning, the time in between being utilized for further consultations. We have heard short statements from members of the Council. Unless there are further statements to be made, I propose to adjourn the meeting for three hours, to meet again at 8 o'clock tonight.

30. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): We are all showing concern about the matter under consideration, we all realize the urgency of the question and there appears to be complete agreement among us.

31. The second point on which, in my opinion, there is unanimity is the necessity and the desirability of continuing consultations. Here again there would seem to be no opposition. We all agree with this.

32. The third point on which a general approach seems to be crystallizing concerns the interrelationship between consultations and the time of convening a Council meeting. If we succeed in reaching positive results in the process of consultations in an hour, the meeting could be convened in an hour's time; if we do so in three hours, the meeting

could be convened in three hours' time. That is to say that since we all recognize the interrelationship and interdependence between consultations and their consequences, between their results and the time at which the meeting should be convened, bearing in mind the proposal expressed by our distinguished French colleague and supported by our Italian colleague and a number of others, including the representative of Argentina, I think it would be most useful to agree on the following formula: appreciating the urgency and the importance of the question, manifesting our concern, recognizing the necessity and the desirability of continuing consultations and bearing in mind the interrelationship between consultations, their outcome and the time of the meeting, consultations should be continued; if we succeed in producing positive results from these consultations, the meeting should be convened at any time today. If we do not succeed in three hours, we might do so in four or five hours, by 9 o'clock, 10 o'clock, or 11. If we do not succeed today, the meeting should be convened not later than tomorrow morning.

33. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): My delegation will agree reluctantly to another adjournment of this Council. But before adjourning, I should like to make sure that neither of the parties to the conflict wishes to take the floor. That might be ascertained before we adjourn. If they wish to take the floor, we should allow it. If not, we can adjourn.

34. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation is always actively in favour of inviting to a meeting of the Council parties, delegations and even individual representatives whose statements may be of use, so that the Council may hear them. We have absolutely no objections to the proposal by the distinguished representative of Somalia that an invitation should be issued forthwith to the representative of India and the representative of Pakistan and that they should be given an opportunity to express their views. But this may have an effect on the time available for our consultations. If each of them speaks for an hour, that will take two hours. It is not impossible that after their statements someone will require to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and we shall in practical terms commence a meeting. In such a way our understanding on the continuation of consultations will be rendered invalid. Would that really be desirable?

35. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*translation from Chinese*): I support the proposal made by the representative of Somalia to invite the representatives of Pakistan and India to participate in our discussion. As for the consultation, perhaps, Mr. President, you could set a time limit on statements by the representatives of Pakistan and India.

36. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation believes that silence can also contribute to expediting proceedings. Therefore, in view of the extreme gravity of the situation, we decided to remain silent, in the hope that a settlement would be reached as soon as possible. It now appears that matters are not proceeding as we would have desired, and so, in the light of the various proposals which have been put forward, I do not think we can say that there is any unanimity. Hence it might be useful, Sir, if in exercising your authority as

President, you were to rule one way or the other. My delegation does not like to discuss procedural matters and it is willing to go along with any ruling, as long as it is the ruling of the Council. In summary, then, Mr. President, we would be extremely grateful if you were to rule on the alternatives that have been proposed.

37. Mr. KULAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, I should like to put a very simple question with regard to this matter: Do the representatives of India and Pakistan want to speak at this afternoon's meeting? If they have not requested the floor I think it would be natural to conclude that they do not intend to speak this afternoon. If you do not have the names of India and Pakistan on your list of speakers, and if the representatives of those countries do not ask for the floor, I think it would be logical to conclude that they do not intend to take the floor at this particular meeting.

38. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): I do not know, Mr. President, whether you want to answer the Polish representative's question as to whether or not they are inscribed. Have they been?

39. The PRESIDENT: They have not yet been inscribed.

40. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): In that case, Mr. President, under rule 33 of our provisional rules of procedure, may I put forward a formal motion to suspend the meeting until such time as you are satisfied that consultations have proceeded to such a degree that we are able to reach agreement and can have a fruitful meeting.

41. The PRESIDENT: I have considered the various proposals made, and I am of the opinion that the meeting should be adjourned and that the Council should reconvene tonight. If there is no objection to this suggestion I shall adjourn the meeting and allow reasonable time to re-convene the Council. But if I hear further objection, then I shall put the proposal for suspension to the vote, as suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom. I make this suggestion to allow for compromise, because some are asking for adjournment until tomorrow morning, while others are asking for suspension until tonight. I would prefer to have some flexibility and to notify representatives when it is time for a meeting tonight.

42. Mr. ORTIZ DE ROZAS (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): What would happen if this evening we were to find that the consultations—which are very difficult because positions are still very far apart—had not achieved positive results? I do not think there is much point in tentatively scheduling a meeting for this evening. With all due respect, Mr. President, I would say that it seems to be, if not the unanimous opinion, at least the majority view in the Council, that we should not set a time for the next meeting, that we should leave things up to the consultations. If the consultations yield positive results, then, of course, all members of the Council will be most anxious to meet. But let us not set a time for an evening meeting, because we do not yet know whether the consultations will yield fruitful results between now and then. If unfortunately this evening the consultations yield nothing concrete, then it is obvious that we shall have to meet tomorrow

morning. Therefore, although my delegation would in principle prefer to meet tomorrow morning at 10.30, we believe that the French proposal is the most appropriate.

43. The PRESIDENT: There appears to be some misunderstanding of what I have stated. I had earlier proposed to suspend the meeting for three hours, but after hearing statements from members my proposal now is that the meeting be adjourned, to be re-convened tonight, without our setting any time, it being understood that, in the interim, if this proposal is agreed to, we would continue consultations and that, sooner or later, we would know when to re-convene the meeting.

44. Mr. FARAH (Somalia): I did not see any justification for the representative of the United Kingdom to move for a suspension of this meeting for the purpose of proceeding with consultations. If members are going to hold consultations, naturally they are going to consult with the two main parties to the conflict. Now, if either of those two parties wishes to take the floor at this stage, of course, such consultations would be of no avail. What I am asking you, Mr. President, is to ascertain from those two parties whether they wish to speak. If not, then let us adjourn. But, surely, this very elementary right cannot be abrogated or refused for the purpose of consultation.

45. The PRESIDENT: Under rule 33 of the provisional rules of procedure I cannot prevent the representative of the United Kingdom from invoking that procedure, but I might again appeal to all members, for the purposes of compromise, that we agree to suspend the meeting and re-convene tonight as soon as notice is given by me. I promise that I shall be taking part in the consultations and that, sooner or later, we will know at what specific time we are to re-convene. If it becomes apparent that no agreement has been reached, I will still re-convene the meeting with a view to adjourning until tomorrow morning, if that is agreeable.

46. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): I made a formal proposal under rule 33. Perhaps the easiest thing would be for the Council to vote on it straight away; it should be decided without debate.

47. The PRESIDENT: I would request the representative of the United Kingdom formally to repeat his proposal so that I may take it as a motion under rule 33.

48. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom): Mr. President, I propose that the meeting be suspended for the purpose of consultations, to be reconvened by you at such time as you are satisfied that sufficient progress has been made in the process of consultations so that agreement is likely to be reached.

49. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now vote on the motion made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Argentina, Belgium, France, Italy, Japan, Nicaragua, Poland, Syrian Arab Republic, Union of Soviet

Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against: None.

Abstentions: Burundi, China, Sierra Leone, Somalia.

The motion was adopted by 11 votes to none, with 4 abstentions.

The meeting was suspended at 4.55 p.m.; it was resumed on Wednesday, 15 December, at 12.10 p.m.

50. The PRESIDENT: The resumed 1614th meeting of the Security Council is called to order. This meeting of the Security Council was suspended yesterday afternoon for the purpose of consultations following the adoption of a motion to that effect made by the representative of the United Kingdom.

51. Members of the Council will recall that the agenda for this meeting was modified before its adoption yesterday afternoon, and the formulation of the agenda now under consideration is to be found in document S/Agenda/1614/Rev.1.

52. The Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

53. Members of the Council will recall that at a previous meeting [1606th meeting] the Council had decided to invite the representatives of India and Pakistan to participate, without the right to vote, in the debate on the problem currently under discussion in the Council. In accordance with that decision, and with the consent of the Council, I would invite the representatives of India and Pakistan to take their seats at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Swaran Singh (India) and Mr. Z. A. Bhutto (Pakistan) took places at the Council table.

54. The PRESIDENT: The Council had also decided at a previous meeting [1607th meeting] to extend invitations to the representatives of Tunisia and Saudi Arabia to participate in the debate, without the right to vote. Accordingly, and with the consent of the Council, I invite those representatives to take the places reserved for them in the Council chamber, with the understanding that they will be invited to take places at the Council table when it is their turn to address the Council.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. R. Driss (Tunisia) and Mr. J. M. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia) took the places reserved for them in the Council chamber.

55. The PRESIDENT: We are meeting again this morning to resume our discussion of the item relating to the deteriorating situation on the India-Pakistan subcontinent. The Council has already held some seven meetings on this question, during the course of which it has considered a dozen draft resolutions. Some of those drafts were not pressed to the vote, but others, which were pressed to the vote, failed to be adopted. Only one draft resolution was

adopted [resolution 303 (1971)]: it was a procedural draft transmitting the matter to the General Assembly, and the General Assembly thereupon, on 7 December, adopted resolution 2793 (XXVI). In response to that resolution we have received replies from Pakistan and India. Pakistan's reply is contained in document S/10440; India's reply is contained in document S/10445.

56. Meanwhile, the situation on the subcontinent is deteriorating, and innocent lives are being lost. I would therefore appeal to the Security Council, which under the Charter has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to come to a decision. It has already taken considerable time, while the situation demands urgent action by the Council. I would, therefore, reiterate my appeal for a positive decision by the Council as soon as possible—I would hope at this meeting.

57. I call now on the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Pakistan, who wishes to make an urgent statement. At this time he is the only speaker whose name is inscribed on my list.

58. Mr. BHUTTO (Pakistan): We have met here today at a grave moment in the history of my country, and I would request the Council kindly to forbear with me and to hear the truth, the bitter truth. I know the United Nations. I know the Security Council. I have participated here in the past. The time has come when, as far as Pakistan is concerned, we shall have to speak the truth, whether members of the Council like it or not. We were hoping that the Security Council, mindful of its responsibilities for the maintenance of world peace and justice, would have acted according to principle and brought an end to a naked, brutal aggression against my people. For this reason I left my country. I was needed by the people of Pakistan, and when I was leaving Pakistan I was in a divided mind whether to go to the Security Council to represent the cause of my country, to represent the cause of a people that had been subjected to aggression, or to remain with my people, by their side, while they were being subjected to attack and violence. However, I felt that it was imperative for me to come here and to seek justice from the Security Council. But I must say, whether the members like it or not, that the Security Council has denied my country that justice. From the moment I arrived we have been caught by dilatory tactics.

59. It will be recalled that when the Indian Foreign Minister spoke and I spoke after him I said that filibustering was taking place. That was my immediate observation. The Security Council, I am afraid, has excelled in the art of filibustering, not only on substance but also on procedural matters. With some cynicism I watched yesterday a full hour of the Security Council's time wasted on whether the members of the Council would be ready to meet at 9.30 a.m. or whether bed and breakfast required that they should meet at 11 a.m.

60. The representative of Somalia referred to the population of East Pakistan as 56 million, but later on he corrected himself to say that the population of Bengal—of Muslim Bengal—was 76 million. If he had waited for a few more days he need not have corrected himself because

millions are dying, and it would have come to 56 million if the Council had kept on filibustering and discussing whether it should meet today or tomorrow or the day after tomorrow—whether the lines of communication between New York and Moscow and Peking and other capitals would permit the members to obtain new instructions. Thus we could have gone on and on. That is why I requested you, Mr. President, to convene a meeting of the Security Council immediately, and I am thankful to you for having convened this meeting, because precious time is being lost. My countrymen, my people, are dying. So I think I can facilitate your efforts if I speak now. Perhaps this will be my last speech in the Security Council. So please bear with me, because I have some home truths to tell the Security Council. The world must know. My people must know. I have not come here to accept abject surrender. If the Security Council wants me to be a party to the legalization of abject surrender, then I say that under no circumstances shall I be. Yesterday my 11-year-old son telephoned me from Karachi and said to me, "Do not come back with a document of surrender. We do not want to see you back in Pakistan if you come like that." I will not take back a document of surrender from the Security Council. I will not be a party to the legalization of aggression.

61. The Security Council has failed miserably, shamefully. "The Charter of the United Nations", "the San Francisco Conference", "international peace and justice"—these are the words we heard in our youth, and we were inspired by the concept of the United Nations, maintaining international peace and justice and security. President Woodrow Wilson said that he fought the First World War to end wars for all time. The League of Nations came into being, and then the United Nations after it. What has the United Nations done? I know of the farce and the fraud of the United Nations. They come here and say, "*Excellence, Excellence, comment allez-vous?*" and all that. "A very good speech—you have spoken very well, *très bien*." We have heard all these things. The United Nations resembles fashion houses in trying to hide ugly realities and draping ungainly figures in alluring apparel. The concealment of realities is common to both, the ugly realities cannot be hidden. You do not need a Secretary-General. You need a chief executioner.

62. Let us face the stark truth. I have got no stakes left for the moment. That is why I am speaking the truth from my heart. For four days we have been deliberating here. For four days the Security Council has procrastinated. Why? Because the object was for Dacca to fall. That was the object. It was quite clear to me from the beginning. So what if Dacca falls? Cities and countries have fallen before. They have come under foreign occupation. China was under foreign occupation for years. Other countries have been under foreign occupation. France was under foreign occupation. Western Europe was under foreign occupation. So what if Dacca falls? So what if the whole of East Pakistan falls? So what if the whole of West Pakistan falls? So what if our State is obliterated? We will build a new Pakistan. We will build a better Pakistan. We will build a greater Pakistan.

63. The Security Council has acted short-sightedly by acquiescing in these dilatory tactics. You have reached a

point when we shall say, "Do what you like." If this point had not been reached we could have made a commitment. We could have said, "All right, we are prepared to do some things." Now why should we? You want us to be silenced by guns. Why should we say that we shall agree to anything? Now you decide what you like. Your decision will not be binding on us. You can decide what you like. If you had left us a margin of hope, we might have been a party to some settlement.

64. But the Indians are so short-sighted. Mr. President, you referred to the "distinguished" Foreign Minister of India. If he can be the Foreign Minister of India I could have been the Prime Minister of united India. But I would much rather be a janitor in a free country. I am proud to belong to a free country, even if it is sought to obliterate it. How is he distinguished, when his hands are full of blood, when his heart is full of venom? But you know they did not have vision. The partition of India took place because they did not have vision. Now also they are lacking in vision. They talk about their ancient civilization and the mystique of India and all that. But they do not have vision at all. If I had been in his place, I should have acted differently. I extended a hand of friendship to him the other day. He should have seen what I meant. I am not talking as a puppet. I am talking as the authentic leader of the people of West Pakistan, who elected me at the polls in a more impressive victory than the victory that Mujibur Rahman received in East Pakistan, and he should have taken cognizance of that. But he did not take cognizance of it. We could have opened a new page, a new chapter in our relations.

65. As I said, if the French and the Germans can come to terms, why cannot India and Pakistan come to terms? If the Turks and the Greeks can still talk sensibly as civilized people over Cyprus, why cannot India and Pakistan do likewise? If the Soviet Union and the United States can open a new page in their history, if China and the United States can open a new page in their history, why can we not usher in a new era in our relations? We could have done so. But as was said about the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, the military victory of Israel made it more difficult for Israel and the Arabs to reach a settlement. If you want to subjugate Pakistan militarily, you will find it more difficult to bring peace. I say that the choice for us is either to accept living in the same subcontinent co-operating for peace and progress, or to be implacable enemies of each other for ever.

66. The Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union does not like my reference to the Roman Empire. I do not know what objection he has to it, unless he sees some similarity between his empire and the Roman Empire. I do not really see why he had any objection to that. But I shall again refer to the Roman Empire, and I hope that the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union will have no objection to it, because we want to have good relations with the Soviet Union and we want to open a new chapter with the Soviet Union because we are neighbours. I go back to the Roman Empire and I say what Cato said to the Romans, "Carthage must be destroyed." If India thinks that it is going to subjugate Pakistan, Eastern Pakistan as well as Western Pakistan—because we are one people, we are

one State—then we shall say, "Carthage must be destroyed." We shall tell our children and they will tell their children that Carthage must be destroyed.

67. So please, Mr. President and members of the Security Council, realize the implications. The Pakistan nation is a brave nation. One of the greatest British generals said that the best infantry fighters in the world are the Pakistanis. We will fight. We will fight for a thousand years, if it comes to that. So do not go by momentary military victories. Stalingrad was overwhelmed. Leningrad was besieged for a thousand days. People who want to be free and who want to maintain their personality will fight and will continue to fight for principles.

68. We were told about the realities, to accept the realities. What are the realities? Realities keep changing, Mr. Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union. The reality was that the Nazi forces were outside the gates of Moscow. But you fought valiantly, you fought bravely and the world saluted the Soviet Union for having resisted the realities which it was sought to impose on it. The reality was that China was under the occupation of Japan, that Manchuria was taken—half of China. That was the reality. Since the Opium War, China has seen reality. The reality for France was that it was under occupation. But there were great men like President de Gaulle who left France and they fought across the seas. Ethiopia was under Fascist domination. But the Ethiopians fought. The Emperor of Ethiopia left his country and sought asylum in Britain. Ethiopia is free today. The realities that matter are those that are not a temporary phenomenon, which are rooted in historic principles. The principle is that Pakistan is an independent sovereign State, which came into being because of the volition of its people. That is the basic reality which has existed for 24 years. Pakistan would not have been dismembered like this if it had not been attacked by another country. This is not an internal movement. We have been subjected to attack by a militarily powerful neighbour. Who says that the new reality arose out of free will? Had there been the exercise of free will, India would not have attacked Pakistan; India would not have invaded my country to impose its will backed by a handful of secessionists. If India talks about the will of the people of East Pakistan and claims that it had to attack Pakistan in order to impose the will of the people of East Pakistan, then what has it done about Kashmir? East Pakistan is an integral part of Pakistan. Kashmir is a disputed territory. Why does India then not permit it to exercise its will?

69. But yesterday I saw how the Security Council was pandering to India. Even the great Powers are pandering to India, saying to us "Do not misunderstand", "Would you please let us know", "Would you please answer the following questions", "I am not insisting on those questions, but if you do not mind". India is intoxicated today with its military successes. In 1967 I told the present Permanent Representative of India that we wanted to have good relations. I am not speaking from a position of weakness. I told him in 1967 that we wanted good relations between the two countries—but based on principles, based on justice, based on equity, not based on exploitation and domination, because relations on the basis of exploitation and domination cannot be a lasting solution. What we want

is a lasting, a permanent solution. I did not say this just today; I said that in 1967 to their Permanent Representative, who was then the High Commissioner of India to Pakistan. I told that to the Foreign Minister of India when we were negotiating on Kashmir: "Let us settle this problem on the basis of equity and justice, so that we can live as good neighbours." And I add today: we can still live as good neighbours, as friends. Do not wipe out that possibility by military conquest and military power.

70. This has been the worst form of aggression, of naked aggression. Even Poland was not invaded by Germany in this fashion. Even in that case there were some pretences, some excuses that were made. Here the excuse was, "We have refugees, so we must invade another country." We said, "We are prepared to take those refugees back." If we had said, "We are not prepared to take them back", then you could have said, "Well, you will be sunk."

71. India's population rises by 13 million a year. The number of refugees was alleged to be 9 million, 10 million; according to our estimate, there were 5 million. But that is not important, figures are not important. The point is that we were prepared to take them back. If India's population can expand by 13 million a year, then with all the aid and assistance that India was getting for the refugees, it could have held on for a short period until the civilian Government came into Pakistan to negotiate the return of the refugees. I told the United States Ambassador in Pakistan that once a civilian government came into being in Pakistan, I was prepared to go to the refugee camps myself to talk to them. But they pre-empted it all, because the refugee problem was used as a pretext to dismember my country. The refugee problem was used as a pretext, an ugly, crude pretext, a shameful pretext to invade my country, to invade East Pakistan.

72. The great Powers will forgive me. I have addressed them in this moment of anguish, and they should understand. The great Powers, or the super-Powers—the super-duper-Powers, the razzling-dazzling Powers—the super-Powers have imposed their super-will for the moment. But I am thankful to the people and the Government of the United States, among the super-Powers, for the position it has taken. The people of the United States to some extent have been misled by massive Indian propaganda. While we had no paraphernalia of popular administration and government in Pakistan, there was a political vacuum. The Indians took advantage of that political vacuum and they spread out fast to project their point of view. As a result, American public opinion, and public opinion in Great Britain and France and other countries, was influenced. Unfortunately, nothing was said of the massacres that took place between 1 March and 25 March.

73. No doubt there were mistakes on our side. I said yesterday that mistakes were made, and that the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union said that I had admitted mistakes. Well, that is not a sign of weakness, is it? Do we not all make mistakes? Are India and the Soviet Union the only two countries that have never made mistakes? I have made mistakes personally. But mistakes do not mean that my country must be destroyed, that my country must be dismembered. That is not the consequence of mistakes of

government. Which Government does not make mistakes? But if some Government has made a mistake, does it follow that the country itself must be dismembered, obliterated? Is that going to be the conclusion of the Security Council, if it legalizes Indian aggression on the soil of Pakistan?

74. So you will see now: this is not the end of the road; this is the beginning of the road; this is not the end of the chapter; a new chapter has begun, a new page has been written in international relations. This is gunboat diplomacy in its worst form. It makes the Hitlerite aggression pale into insignificance, because Hitlerite aggression was not accepted by the world. If the world is going to endorse this aggression, it will mean a new and most unfortunate chapter in international relations. A new chapter may have begun in India and Pakistan, but please do not start a new, dreadful, chapter in international relations. For us, it is a hand-to-hand, day-to-day, minute-to-minute fight. But do not do that to the rest of the world. Please do not permit this kind of naked, shameful, barbaric aggression to hold sway.

75. In the old days great warriors swept over the world—Genghis Khan, Subutai Khan, Alexander, Caesar, coming down to the great Napoleon. But this is worse, this is much worse than all that was done by the great conquerors of the world in the past. If the United Nations becomes a party to this kind of conquest, it will be much worse than all that has been done in the past. You will be turning the medium-sized and the small countries into the harlots of the world. You cannot do that. It is against civilized concepts, it is against all the rules of civilization and of international morality and justice.

76. The United States Government was criticized for supporting the position of Pakistan. What crime has the United States Government committed? It has taken the position identical to that of the whole world on the India-Pakistan conflict. That position was supported by 105 countries—it was 104 officially, but it was really 105 because one representative did not know how to press the right button. That was the voice of the world. It was an international referendum. You talk about the election of 1970. Well, I am proud of the election of 1970 because my party emerged as the strongest party in West Pakistan. But here was an international election, and India flouted it. With such an attitude towards international opinion, how can India pretend to be sensitive to a national election in another country? The same India that refuses to hold a referendum in Kashmir?

77. The Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union talked about realities. Mr. Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union, look at this reality. I know that you are the leader of a great country. You behave like one. The way you throw out your chest, the way you thump the table, you do not talk like Comrade Malik; you talk like Tsar Malik. I am glad you are smiling, because I am not; my heart is bleeding. We want to be friends, but this is not the way to be friends when my country is decimated, it is sought to destroy it, to wipe it out.

78. And why should China and the United States be criticized when the whole world is for Pakistan? You

know that we have won a great political victory. We might have suffered a military defeat, but a political victory is more important than a military defeat because political victory is permanent, while military defeat is temporary. The United States Government has acted according to its great traditions by supporting Pakistan, and I will go before the people of the United States before I return home and tell them the truth. The United States has stood by the traditions of Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, right down to Roosevelt and Wilson, by supporting Pakistan as an independent State, its national integrity and its national unity. What wrong and crime has the United States committed? Why is the Indian delegation so annoyed with the United States? The Indian delegation is annoyed with it—can you imagine that? If it had not been for the massive food assistance that the United States gave to India, India would have had starvation; its millions would have died. What hope will India give to the people of East Pakistan? What picture of hope is it going to give when its own people in West Bengal sleep in the streets, where there is terrible poverty, where there is terrible injustice and exploitation, when the parliamentary rule in West Bengal has been superseded by presidential rule? Is India going to do better for East Pakistan, Muslim Bengal, than it has done for West Bengal? The people of West Bengal sleep in the streets of Calcutta. The people of West Bengal are the poorest. India goes hat in hand to the United States for 6 million tons of food. If they are going to impose presidential rule in West Bengal, in their Bengal, how can they do any better in my Bengal? They will not. And time will show that they will not.

79. So the United States has taken a correct and moral position. Thomas Jefferson once said: "I have sworn eternal hostility against any form of tyranny practised over the mind of man." This is a vast form of tyranny practised over the mind of man and over the body of man. So the United States has adhered to its tradition. And if some misguided Senators were here, some young, misguided Senators who have been overtaken by Indian propaganda—and if the Permanent Representative of the United States were not from Texas—I would have told those young Senators that I am setting up the headquarters for a republic of Texas and making the former President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, the chief of that republic, in order to spread the cult of Bangla Desh everywhere. Why can Texas not be free? Let there be a republic of Texas. I did not buy Bengal as Alaska was bought by the United States. We did not pay money to get our territory. We did not pay dollars to acquire territory. The people of the United States should appreciate the position taken by their Government. Muslim Bengal was a part of Pakistan of its free will, not through money. We did not buy it as Alaska was purchased. Why do the people of the United States not see that?

80. We are beholden and thankful to the great People's Republic of China. We shall always remain thankful for the position it has taken. It has taken a position based on principles of justice. And I thank the third world for having supported a just cause, a right cause.

81. Now in the Security Council we have been frustrated by a veto. Let us build a monument to the veto, a big monument to the veto. Let us build a monument to the

impotence and incapacity of the Security Council and the General Assembly. As you sow, so shall you reap. Remember that Biblical saying. Today it is Pakistan. We are the guinea pigs today. But there will be other guinea pigs and you will see what happens. You will see how the chain of events unfolds itself. You want us to lick the dust. We are not going to lick the dust.

82. Britain and France have abstained in order to play a role. I said the other day, with all due respect to those two great Powers, that they have really exhausted their position in trying to play a role, because now the only role they can play is to accept a shameful fait accompli. Britain and France abstained, and that abstention has cost us dearly. Gallic logic and Anglo-Saxon experience, whatever it is, have cost us dearly. If Britain and France had put their powerful weight behind the international community rather than sitting on the fence, the issue might have been different. There is no such animal as a neutral animal. You take positions. In that respect we admire the Soviet Union; it took a position, a wrong position, but it took a position. You have to take a position on these matters. You have to either be on the side of justice or on the side of injustice; you have to be either on the side of the aggressor or of the victim. There is no third road. It is a black and white situation in these matters; there is no grey involved. You are either for right or you are for wrong; you are either for justice or for injustice; you are either for aggression or for the victim. If the United Kingdom and France had earlier on put their full weight behind the verdict of the international community, I think that we would not have reached this position. But Great Britain and France want to come back into the subcontinent, as Clive and Dupleix, in a different role, the role of peacemaker. They want a foot here and they want a foot there. I know that British interests in East Pakistan required this kind of opportunistic role because in East Pakistan they have their tea estates. They want the jute of East Pakistan. So that is why they sat on the fence. And I am most sorrowful for France because with France we had developed very good relations, extremely good relations. But they took this position. And now, today, neither Britain nor France can play a role because their resolution has been overtaken by events. There is a lot of goodwill for France in Pakistan, and they will not get the same goodwill in East Pakistan because in East Pakistan already the clock is now moving in another direction. Every day that the Indian army of occupation stays there it will be a grim reminder for Muslim Bengal that they are under Hindu occupation, and you will see the result of it. You will see how it will turn out.

83. Let them stay—why not? Let them stay, let them swagger around. If they want to take East Pakistan, let them stay as an army of occupation. They are an army of occupation; how can they be called liberators? They will stay, and they will see how the clock is going to move in a different direction.

84. Finally, I am not a rat. I have never ratted in my life. I have faced assassination attempts, I have faced imprisonments, I have always confronted a crisis. Today I am not ratting, but I am leaving your Security Council. I find it disgraceful to my person and to my country to remain here a moment longer than is necessary. I am not boycotting.

Impose any decision, have a treaty worse than the Treaty of Versailles, legalize aggression, legalize occupation, legalize everything that has been illegal up to 15 December 1971. I will not be a party to it. We will fight, we will go back and fight. My country beckons me. Why should I waste my time here in the Security Council? I will not be a party to the ignominious surrender of part of my country. You can take your Security Council. Here you are. I am going.

85. The PRESIDENT: I invite the representative of Tunisia to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

86. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): This is certainly a very moving moment. On a number of occasions, ever since 5 December, I have taken the floor both in the Security Council and in the General Assembly. On behalf of my Government I have stressed the gravity of the situation in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent. Like other delegates, I have issued urgent appeals for decisions to be adopted to put an end to hostilities, to human suffering, and I have appealed for a start on the process of withdrawal of occupying forces on both sides. Peace and respect for the territorial integrity of the countries involved are the necessary conditions for the settlement of disputes and regrettable situations arising from the complexity of problems and from the errors of men.

87. We have the greatest respect for the leaders of India; we recognize and appreciate the support given to us by India and Pakistan during the difficult hours of our fight for independence. Our great desire is to see them, countries which are friends and brothers, settling their disputes and reaching the necessary *modus vivendi* for those two countries.

88. We are sorry to see both of them making mistakes which have very serious consequences, and in particular the mistake of wishing to impose by force a settlement to a problem which is, in the final analysis, an internal one. Would India agree to have an army from any country occupy the state of Kerala or Assam if for political reasons, or reasons of security, the central Government of India were to decide to replace an elected government with an appointed government? Has this already happened? In any case, my Government is opposed to any intervention by a third party in the internal affairs of a State. This is contrary to the Charter.

89. Here I should like to read a communiqué which was published a few days ago by the Tunisian Government, after the meeting of the Council of Ministers:

"The Tunisian Council of Ministers has decided to support Pakistan in the legitimate defence of its territory and sovereignty. The Council deplores any foreign interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan. The Council hopes that a settlement of the conflict will be found as soon as possible in accordance with justice and the ideals of the international community."

90. On this occasion I wish to quote a statement just made by the Foreign Minister of Tunisia, endorsing the support of my country for Pakistan and regretting that Pakistani

leaders did not deal suitably with the problem of East Pakistan, which unfortunately has engendered a secessionist movement. In the same statement the Minister of Tunisia appealed to our friends, to the Soviets, the Chinese, the Americans, the French and the British, the permanent members of the Security Council, to assume their responsibilities.

91. The Tunisian position is in accordance with the Charter and in accordance with the General Assembly resolution of 7 December [2793 (XXVI)]. While we support Pakistan in the legitimate defence of its territory and sovereignty, we are not unaware of the fact that there is a regrettable situation which for India, which is a friend of ours and with whom we have always had the best of relations, caused great concern because of the influx of millions of refugees from East Pakistan. But this should never have given rise to military action which is contrary to the spirit and the letter of the Charter. Before using military force, even if one were convinced of being right, would it not have been better to use United Nations machinery to settle the disputes?

92. Unfortunately, we forget. We have now forgotten the fate of the refugees, human misery, suffering and frustration, mourning and desolation. War only increases mourning and destruction. How many victims and how many horrors have been committed in the name of liberation imposed by armed force? Who would therefore wish to recognize a Government that sets itself up under the bombing of occupation forces, which can be maintained only by the tanks of the occupier? Can we speak of democracy when the very right to life and peace is being contested?

93. My delegation, at the very beginning of our debate, on Sunday, 5 December [1607th meeting], in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter, proposed that the Council take a transitional decision, that is, that it order a cease-fire, and continue its discussions to reach a decision on the substance of the problem. When there is a conflict, when there is fighting, when there is war, the first duty of the international community is to order a cease-fire.

94. This proposal subsequently appeared in a draft resolution put forward by a number of Powers [S/10425] and then withdrawn. As no decision was reached on the first day, the situation worsened. I do not, however, seek to fix responsibility. The General Assembly voted by a majority of 104 votes in favour of a draft resolution, complete or partial implementation of which could have led to a cessation of hostilities and the beginning of the process of evacuation and of the peaceful settlement of the dispute. I wonder whether or not the proposal adopted by the General Assembly has since been communicated to the Security Council.

95. Now what are we waiting for? For all of East Pakistan to be occupied? For Bangla Desh to be proclaimed a new and independent State? For the Charter to be completely violated? And for a State Member of the United Nations to be dismembered? I seriously doubt that the Indian leaders really aim at this objective. I seriously doubt that the international community would like to be associated with

such an undertaking. I doubt whether the Members of the United Nations, great and small, wish to create precedents which will have very serious consequences. There may be indefinite discussions on this matter. To force the United Nations to reach a decision on this is to force it to condemn itself. That is impossible. Even if the problem were solved in the field, it would still remain pending for many years before our Organization which, whatever the circumstances, must refuse suicide. But is this really our problem, the one which requires the most urgent examination? Should we not rather study the deterioration of the situation between India and Pakistan? Must not the necessary steps be taken to put into effect the resolution which the General Assembly adopted, demonstrating its faithfulness to the principles of the Charter, by an overwhelming majority?

96. On behalf of a small country worried about the serious consequences the worsening situation in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent may have for the peace of the world, I should like to plead a lost cause, but a just one, the cause of peace, the cause of the Charter, the cause of the United Nations itself. I reiterate my appeal to one and all to heed the voice of reason. In my statement on 5 December I said that India and Pakistan are brothers, that we must help resolve their difficulties. Only in peace and mutual respect will they find the path of dialogue and understanding. May the voice of reason be heeded. This is but the expression of a wish. The facts are sad indeed. For 10 days now many meetings have taken place. There have been declared or hidden vetoes of the major Powers, obstructing the system. The non-permanent members of the Council are powerless. The Members of the Organization are perhaps irritated and frustrated, waiting for what is impossible while the irreparable is actually taking place in the field. Pakistan resists. India is getting bogged down in an adventure which will be added to its great concerns. The population of East

Pakistan, no matter what its views may be, is the victim of a fratricidal, implacable struggle and East Pakistan, part of a Member State of the United Nations, may become a powerless island. How much longer will it be able to ensure its stability? How will it be able to solve its problems? Will it sever the ties which linked it to West Pakistan ever since the creation of that two-winged State based on common ideals, and could its leaders refuse a helping hand which would inevitably be extended by a civilian régime that would be set up in West Pakistan?

97. We understand, of course, that the population of East Pakistan is anxious to have a régime which will ensure its freedom and prosperity and, if it is determined to exercise its democratic rights, no force can prevent it from doing so. But it must exercise its rights within the over-all framework of Pakistan which can, if it finds it necessary one day, accept widely varied formulae on State organization. Before the problem is settled between the Pakistanis themselves, it is inadmissible that foreign interference of any kind should lead us here in the United Nations to recognize *de facto* situations. Tunisia believes in the ideals of the Charter, in human rights, in the right of peoples to self-determination, and we will not fail to study the situation in accordance with these criteria, in the hope that Pakistan will be able to collect itself in order to settle these problems, and that India, demonstrating deep understanding of the interests of both the parties, will make its task easier by transcending the errors of the past. But more than ever before our primary duty, the duty of the Security Council, the duty of the United Nations, is to put an end to hostilities and the occupation, and to establish the necessary climate of peace for the settlement of complicated problems which exist in that area.

The meeting rose on Wednesday, 15 December, at 1.20 p.m.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.
