



**CONTENTS**

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 19:	
Methods which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter: report of the Collective Measures Committee ( <i>concluded</i> ) .....	285

**Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).**

**AGENDA ITEM 19**

**Methods which might be used to maintain and strengthen international peace and security in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter: report of the Collective Measures Committee (A/2713, A/C.1/L.104) (*concluded*)**

1. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said that his delegation considered the problem of collective security the most important one currently facing the world. The maintenance of international peace and security constituted the primary function of the United Nations, yet that question was mainly dealt with outside the Organization. He would have liked to see the matter given the same lengthy discussion as had been given to disarmament, noting that the two questions were interconnected. If nations did not feel secure, they could not disarm. Iraq, like other countries, thought primarily of security. The Security Council had pitifully failed to carry out its functions in that respect. The General Assembly, from the time it had adopted the "Uniting for peace" resolution (resolution 377 (U)), had been discussing the importance of united action against aggression and had been formulating principles, but it had carried out no measures to provide for collective security.

2. Such measures were left to individual Members to find outside the United Nations, particularly through regional arrangements. Mr. Al-Jamali cited various developments in regional arrangements but noted that, although those arrangements were in accordance with Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter, they were not linked with the United Nations. Was it not time to ask that they should all be brought under one unified command, to act under the decisions of the Security Council or the resolutions of the General Assembly? Was it not also time to activate the Security Council and to implement the articles of the Charter which provided that armed forces should be made available to the Council? That, of course, depended upon the great Powers and on their willingness to disarm ideologically.

3. The optimism engendered by the USSR move on disarmament had been greatly offset by that country's

attitude on collective measures. Mr. Al-Jamali had expected another USSR move to strengthen collective measures and revitalize the Security Council, but it had merely urged the dissolution of the Collective Measures Committee and, contrary to its own advice, had delved into the past.

4. Mr. Al-Jamali wished to see the Collective Measures Committee explore further the material possibilities for collective action and he hoped that its functions would in future be more active than meditative in nature. The Committee should be given wider scope for action and greater responsibility. It should go deeper into the ability of States to contribute to collective measures. Some States, such as Iraq, were unable to do anything beyond their frontiers and would need help against aggression from any quarter. Iraq had pledged itself to defence against all aggression and had joined others in that pledge. It had also pledged itself to join in collective United Nations action, subject to its constitutional procedures.

5. The Iraqi delegation welcomed the report of the Collective Measures Committee (A/2713) and the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.104), but hoped that the Committee's work would become more practical. The paramount problem was security, which could only be achieved if the cold war was ended, if there was real ideological disarmament, and if adequate armed forces were placed at the disposal of the United Nations to prevent aggression. Until the Security Council resumed its normal functions, the General Assembly must be watchful and the Collective Measures Committee must stand by to guide it in the function of maintaining world peace.

6. Mr. RAMADAN (Egypt) paid a tribute to the work of the Collective Measures Committee and to its past and present Chairmen. Egypt had always been strongly attached to the cause of peace and the principles of the Charter, and it attached particular importance to the work of that committee. It had freed itself of all that had limited its sovereignty for more than sixty years, and it declared itself ready to contribute to the cause of peace in the Middle East. Together with other Arab States, Egypt had signed a collective security pact against aggression, concluded under Article 52 of the Charter. It considered that it could best contribute to the cause of peace by channelling its efforts in that way.

7. The Egyptian delegation interpreted the first principle on collective measures set out in the current report to mean that each Member State was entirely free to decide on the methods and circumstances of its participation in collective measures, so that such participation might be in accordance with its domestic laws and constitutional processes, as well as within its capacity.

8. The Egyptian delegation was pleased to see in the second principle the provision that aid should be

given to States which were not militarily prepared, in order to enable them to fulfil their obligations under the Charter. Such aid should also be given in order to remedy existing inequalities in armaments which might encourage aggression. In that connexion, Mr. Ramadan recalled that his delegation had submitted an amendment (A/C.1/581) at the fifth session providing that military equipment be sent to vulnerable parts of the world. The amendment had not been adopted, but the Egyptian delegation wished to stress the need for such a measure, particularly since the report emphasized that aspect of the matter.

9. It was possible to interpret the second principle as meaning that it was applicable only in cases of actual aggression. The Egyptian delegation thought it would be preferable to draft the principle in such a way as to allow States to act upon it immediately, if they considered it necessary. The role of the General Assembly should not be confined to expecting; it was indispensable to start at once so as to prevent and discourage any possible aggression by correcting the current imbalance. The main function of the United Nations should be to prevent, rather than await, aggression.

10. In the opinion of the Egyptian delegation, States which were willing to undertake military preparations for the strengthening of collective security should not also be asked to assume the financial responsibilities involved in such preparations if their national finances were likely to suffer gravely in consequence. In that connexion, Mr. Ramadan welcomed the United States representative's statement (704th meeting) that the United States would not stint its support.

11. He was also pleased to note the emphasis, in the report of the Collective Measures Committee, on regional arrangements, which were stabilizing factors in the world. Egypt's position in that respect was clear; its policy was based on the strengthening of the collective security pact among the Arab States, which brought together countries belonging to the same geographical region and linked by many ties.

12. Mr. KISELYOV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) had already stated his delegation's opposition to the work of the so-called Collective Measures Committee, an attitude which had been confirmed by that committee's third report. The Committee had been set up in violation of the Charter and, instead of helping to establish peace and security, it had helped to frustrate effective measures to that end.

13. The third report said that the Collective Measures Committee had not undertaken any new studies and did not expect to undertake any further studies. Mr. Kiselyov agreed with the representative of Canada (703th meeting) that the report was merely a compilation and repetition of General Assembly resolutions. Even the United States Press admitted that there had been no change and the report itself showed that the Committee was wholly unjustified and senseless. The authors of the report, however, considered the further existence of the Committee necessary as serving a useful purpose in the maintenance and strengthening of the system of collective security. A number of Member States had done their best to galvanize the Committee into further activity, with certain ends in mind, and in that connexion Mr. Kiselyov referred to the working paper submitted to the Committee by the United States and the Philippines (A/AC.43/L.5/

Rev.1). The report reproduced almost verbatim the principles of that paper, thereby showing who ran the Committee and showing also that the Committee's work had no connexion with the maintenance of international peace and security.

14. The statement that an attempt had been made to analyse the lesson of Korea was an interesting admission. Certain States which had suffered defeat in Korea had put the Committee to work to find more effective means of constraining the United Nations to take part in collective measures. Thus, for the United States representative on the Collective Measures Committee, the lesson consisted in the fact that only a few States had participated in the United States war in Korea and that in the operations it had proved impossible to share the burdens equitably. The United States representative had also said that his Government was carefully considering the question of encouraging wider contributions in the event of United Nations collective action in the future, thereby admitting that it was interested only in involving as many countries as possible in implementing its schemes.

15. The Collective Measures Committee had played an unsavoury role in that respect. It had stimulated the arms race in which certain members of the North Atlantic bloc were engaged and had fostered the growth of armed forces and armaments. It was clear that the United States, with the assistance of that committee, wanted other States to maintain large armies in existence. Such armies were a heavy burden on the peoples, and such a policy intensified the armaments race and international tension. From the various measures contemplated, it was clear that a total use of the capacities of States was envisaged for so-called collective security, which in that context meant a new war.

16. It was impossible to support the existence of a committee designed to further those objectives. The work of the Collective Measures Committee was at variance not only with the maintenance of international peace and security, but also with the fundamental Purposes and Principles of the Charter. A number of States were acting in flagrant violation and disregard of the Charter, as was indicated by the fact that they were prepared to vest responsibility for collective measures in the General Assembly. In that connexion, Mr. Kiselyov quoted the provisions of Articles 24, 39, 41 and 42 and Article 43, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which made it clear that the Security Council alone was empowered to decide on such measures. There was no provision in the Charter which could in any way lead to the inference that the right to adopt coercive measures for the maintenance of peace and security also belonged to the General Assembly. On the contrary, Article 11 emphasized that any question requiring action by the Organization should be referred to the Council.

17. It was thus abundantly clear that there were no political, juridical or moral grounds for the existence of the Collective Measures Committee. Mr. Kiselyov could not agree that that committee served the cause of strengthening international peace and security; nor could he agree with the joint draft resolution, which was designed to lead to further violations of the Charter. The First Committee should listen to those who wanted genuine collective security, not collective aggression.

18. Mr. SHUKAIRI (Syria), noting that the discussion of collective security followed the discussion of disarmament, expressed the view that both should be examined in the same atmosphere of objectivity. He did not propose to bring the past into the discussions and would deal only with matters of principle, since his country's views had been adequately stated by the representative of Egypt.

19. Mr. Shukairi quoted the provisions of the "Uniting for peace" resolution (resolution 377 (U)), which had established the Collective Measures Committee. He noted that they were only a restatement and reaffirmation of the major purposes of the United Nations, which, as stated in the Charter, were, first, the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; secondly, the suppression of acts of aggression; and thirdly, the settlement of international disputes in accordance with the principles of justice and international law. The Collective Measures Committee had in the main focused its attention on the second of those aims, thereby tackling the negative side of international peace, while the positive aspect remained unexplored. The Syrian delegation considered it its duty to suggest to that committee that, in the study of collective measures, priority should be given to prevention, rather than suppression, of breaches of the peace.

20. The examination of methods and procedures to repel aggression and to assist the victim was imperative, but before mobilizing collective measures to those ends aggression must be well defined. Aggression was not always obvious; sometimes it was not aggression at all, but mere self-defence. Aggression was not legalized by the lapse of time. An invasion did not become legitimate sovereignty after a few years, or even after a few generations. Aggression must be defined in a body of law and rules before collective measures could be taken into consideration, since otherwise one might find oneself fighting in the ranks of aggression. It was not difficult to stigmatize a given situation as the work of aggressors or rebels, but it must not be forgotten that there were rebels of all types, some of whom had fought for freedom.

21. In connexion with regional security, Mr. Shukairi declared that the Arab League had a duty to maintain the security of the area. That objective had been promoted by the security pact, ratified by the Arab States two years previously, which was of a binding character and had created organs to co-ordinate plans for defence. The Arab States were confident that their collective efforts would bring security and stability to their region, and were determined to repel aggression, from whatever quarter. Weakness, whether economic or military, was an invitation to aggression, and it was therefore their duty to achieve strength, but without violating their sovereignty and independence.

22. As for the arguments concerning a conflict between the Charter and the work of the Collective Measures Committee, the Syrian delegation had given them careful consideration. The issue was a complex one. The Committee had not, so far, made recommendations in final shape or form, and its work was a process of exploration. When recommendations were made in such form, the issue could be resolved. The Syrian delegation requested the continuance of the Collective Measures Committee.

23. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) said that his Government and people always appreciated any effort designed to further collective measures in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the Charter. They were aware, because of the small size of their country, of the need to make available as quickly as possible the forces required to combat aggression. Smaller, weaker countries, and particularly those with small populations and great natural wealth, always incurred the risk of tempting those who were willing to subordinate their policies to greed. Bolivia had therefore always welcomed the strengthening of regional organizations such as the Organization of American States.

24. Without wishing to criticize the report of the Collective Measures Committee, Mr. Quiroga Galdo expressed his regret concerning the absence from the report of any reference to reparations for damage inflicted by an aggressor. He trusted that that point would be considered in the future, considering it as a logical consequence of collective measures.

25. In conclusion, he congratulated the Collective Measures Committee and its Chairman on their work.

26. Mr. LEME (Brazil) said that Article 1 of the Charter, together with General Assembly resolutions 377 (V), 503 (VI) and 703 (VIII), provided the framework for a system of collective security; the principles set out in the report of the Collective Measures Committee filled in the details. But a long road had yet to be travelled. It had taken the American nations many years to arrive at the point where they could conclude the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro, but the difficulties confronting the United Nations were even greater than those which had had to be overcome in establishing the regional system.

27. The principles laid down in the working paper of the United States and the Philippines (A/AC.43/L.5/Rev.1) which were set forth in the report were important, particularly those to the effect that the sharing of the burdens and sacrifices must be fair and that as many States as possible must contribute. The report properly recognized differences in the ability of States to contribute; the contribution of each must be gauged according to its resources and needs. Once a contribution had been offered by a State under its constitutional processes, it was obvious that that State was the sole judge as to the timing and nature of its contribution. The action of regional organizations for collective defence also entered into the framework of the United Nations collective security system; the United Nations, in its turn, must take all appropriate steps to ensure the effectiveness of such action.

28. Mr. DU PLESSIS (Union of South Africa) said that the joint draft resolution acknowledged the usefulness of the examination of ways and means of strengthening the collective security system of the United Nations. His delegation fully endorsed that acknowledgment, and considered that the principles which the Committee had set out in its third report (A/2713) provided a significant contribution to the main objective. Quite properly, those principles took into consideration such essential aspects of the question as the constitutional processes of States, their capacities and their primary obligations in collective defence of a regional nature. The report also placed emphasis on regional arrangements or agencies which, it said, constituted an important part in collective security.

29. The principles embodied in the report, while not committing Member States to any programme of action, would serve as a guide in the event of aggression; action must naturally be adapted to the individual circumstances of each case. The delegation of the Union of South Africa supported the continuance in being of the Collective Measures Committee, which should pursue whatever studies it might deem desirable, and hoped that it would include all Member States in a programme and a system of collective security as provided for by the Charter.

30. In conclusion, Mr. du Plessis wished to reiterate his Government's earlier assurances that, bearing in mind its existing commitments and the resources at its disposal, it would be prepared to give careful consideration to any request from the United Nations for active co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security and in collective action against aggression, if and when any such occasion should unfortunately arise.

31. Mr. MENON (India) recalled that his delegation, ever since the fifth session, had abstained from participation in the debate on this item. That abstention was not a proclamation of lack of interest in the matter; it was the consequence of the belief that collective measures, in order to be effective and consistent with the purposes of the Charter, had to be collective and not merely sectional. It was for that reason that the Indian delegation had abstained from voting in 1950 on resolution 377 (V) creating the Collective Measures Committee. Moreover, the Government of India had hoped that, with the lapse of time, a new attitude would be brought to bear upon that problem, and that the real purposes of the United Nations would gain precedence over the idea of preventing aggression by warlike measures or by punishment.

32. The view of the Government of India, particularly at the present moment, was that it was inopportune to stress the military aspects of the United Nations at a time when all the peoples of the world were longing for peace. Moreover, if and when the United Nations unfortunately had to take collective action of a military character, or of a punitive character, the fact of aggression must first be decided upon by the Security Council in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter. Thus, only when aggression was determined by the Security Council would the question of collective measures to suppress that aggression arise. The Indian Government could not support any position whereby a decision on a threat to the peace or breach of the peace was left to any other body than the Security Council; whenever a decision was taken under Article 39 of the Charter, Articles 41 and 42 provided for subsequent action.

33. The Indian delegation was unable to subscribe to the views of the representative of Turkey, who had said (704th meeting) that the premium for ensuring peace and security had to be paid not only in money, but also in lives. Such an approach to the problem of peace contradicted the principles of the United Nations and the Charter. Nor could India agree with the representative of the United States that collective security and disarmament were opposite sides of the same coin. On the other hand, India agreed in part with the representative of the United Kingdom, who had said (704th meeting) that there was no need, at the present time, for the Collective Measures Committee to pursue further studies. Mr. Menon considered that there was need for the Committee to pursue its studies in the fields of conciliation and peaceful negotiations, as prescribed in the Charter. The Indian delegation also found itself in agreement with the approach taken by the representatives of Greece, Yugoslavia and Mexico (704th meeting).

34. India did not question the motives or the intentions of the sponsors of the joint draft resolution (A/C.1/L.104), but it believed that in existing circumstances, and especially in view of the slight lowering of world tensions and the results achieved in the direction of ending wars and initiating more negotiations and conferences, the United Nations should now turn its attention more constructively towards peace measures, and thus rally international public opinion to its main purpose, namely, the establishment of peace and conciliation.

35. In that connexion, Mr. Menon wished to recall to the Committee the approach taken by the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, in an address before the Indian Parliament, in which he had suggested that collective security could be brought about only by resolving world tension and developing a pattern of collective peace. The Indian delegation wished, therefore, to place before the Committee the alternative of collective peace to collective measures and would, accordingly, abstain from voting on the joint draft resolution.

36. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted jointly by Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, France, Mexico, the Philippines, Turkey, the United Kingdom, the United States and Venezuela (A/C.1/L.104).

*The draft resolution was adopted by 50 votes to 5, with 2 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.