



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security ( <i>continued</i> )	1

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

**AGENDA ITEM 103**

**The strengthening of international security (*continued*)  
(A/7654, A/C.1/L.468)**

1. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, my delegation shares the profound sorrow expressed by you and other speakers at the untimely death of that outstanding statesman, Mr. Ali Shermarke, President of Somalia. It requests the Somali delegation to convey its deepest sympathy and sincere condolences to the Somali people and to the family of the deceased.

2. Mr. Chairman, permit me now to express my delegation's satisfaction at your election. Being aware of your qualities—the impartiality, tact, and erudition of the experienced diplomat—we find it difficult to heed your appeal. Your demonstration of these qualities at this early but highly responsible stage of the Committee's work is one more reason for not heeding it, but rather for sincerely congratulating you on your election and wishing you every success in your complex and responsible mission. My congratulations and wishes of success are also addressed to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur.

3. The Committee is discussing the important and urgent item entitled "The strengthening of international security". We believe that the draft Appeal to All States of the World [A/C.1/L.468], submitted by the USSR Government to the General Assembly for consideration at its twenty-fourth session, contains a clear statement of the crux of the problem and sets forth proposals which are entirely in line with the struggle of peoples for international peace and security, national independence and social progress.

4. We are convinced that the consideration and adoption of such an appeal would be a timely measure, and one badly needed to normalize the world situation, strengthen co-operation among all States and solve problems of vital interest to the world's peoples. This document lays down principles guided by which, I believe, we can find our way in the political maze, correctly evaluate international events and, on that basis, intensify our joint efforts to solve those vital problems with which we are all deeply concerned.

5. Mankind has entered upon the last third of the twentieth century. New features are discernible in world development. They include the rapid growth, in breadth and in depth, of the scientific-technical revolution and the consequent accumulation and perfection of nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction, and the progress of the national liberation movement in many countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which have now reached the stage of consolidating their political independence and building up an independent national economy; and the increasing clamour of the popular masses everywhere against war and for peace, social rights, democratic freedoms and a healthier economic situation. The changes taking place are plain to see. It is therefore urgently necessary to define the tasks facing the United Nations on the eve of its twenty-fifth anniversary, to outline a programme of action and to identify the main links in the chain of international problems which demand priority attention. Various considerations of this order were advanced in the general debate by the representatives of African, Asian, Latin American and European countries, including the socialist countries. Frankly, the ideas for a programme of action set forth by the various speakers were very different; but that is not surprising. The reason we work in the United Nations is precisely in order, despite our different and frequently diametrically opposite political views, to seek ways of maintaining international peace and security.

6. However, we cannot but be alarmed by a tendency manifested in a number of speeches at this session—possibly more strongly than ever before. It consists in an attempt to prove that the world has changed so much that it no longer needs the United Nations in the form in which it was established a quarter of a century ago, and that the Charter must therefore be revised. Thus, both in the general debate and in this Committee, the Brazilian delegation, calling for a prompt revision of the Charter, declared: "The Charter is a document that signalled the close of a war. . . it is incumbent upon us to make of it a document signalling the beginning of an enduring peace" [1755th plenary meeting, *para. 41*].

7. The world has certainly changed in the last 25 years. All the changes, however, have confirmed and reaffirmed the timeliness and validity of the principles on which the United Nations has been founded. It is precisely because these principles are valid that the United Nations was able to do its share towards preventing another world war for over two decades. When we are told today that for a quarter of a century we have been living under a Charter which merely signalled the close of a war, while the Charter that would signal the beginning of an enduring peace has yet to be written, we cannot but disagree. Those who laid

the foundations of the United Nations were looking to the future, not to the past, and were thinking not simply of the close of the Second World War, but above all of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

8. The difficulties encountered by the United Nations stem not from its Charter, but from the imperialist policy of certain States which is contrary to the Charter and seeks to undermine it. In the present circumstances, attempts to revise the fundamental principles of United Nations activity may precipitate a crisis with unforeseeable consequences for the United Nations. No, the way to peace, to enhancing the role and authority of the United Nations, lies elsewhere. That way is for all Members of the United Nations, in strict observance of the letter and spirit of the Charter, to make fresh efforts to achieve the purpose for which the Organization was created—to ensure international peace and security.

9. I would also remind the Committee that the Declaration signed in Moscow in October 1943 by the Foreign Ministers of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and China, stressed “the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States . . .”<sup>1</sup>

10. It will be remembered that when the United Nations was being established, the Allies were even considering a proposal to name the future organization the International Security Organization. Although another name was later agreed upon, the Charter of the United Nations and the structure and powers of its organs leave no doubt that its principal activity is to be the strengthening of international security.

11. If we all agree that the world has undergone great changes since 1945, when the United Nations Charter was adopted, we cannot but agree also that the problem of preventing war and maintaining security is no less acute today than when the Charter was signed. Consequently, the timeliness and validity of the principles of our Organization should be reaffirmed today with even greater force, as many delegations have emphasized in the general debate.

12. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland remarked that it would be a mistake if we were to begin our work of improvement—as some orators had proposed—by changing the principles on which the United Nations was founded and altering the legislative procedure [1767th plenary meeting, para. 88]. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Burma said: “A renewed determination by all nations to practice more consistently the principles enshrined in the Charter” is required [1766th plenary meeting, para. 48]. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of Uruguay remarked: “. . . we trust in the instruments offered to us by the present Charter of the United Nations” [1759th plenary meeting, para. 10].

13. The attention of the United Nations must thus be focused on the strengthening of international security. We

must, in strict observance of the Charter, undertake a fresh collective effort, fresh initiatives and fresh action. That is the crux of the problem we are discussing today, and that is the essence of the proposals submitted by the USSR Government.

14. What specific form are these fresh initiatives and fresh action to take?

15. To begin with, we must put an end to acts which represent a direct threat to peace and security and never allow them to occur again. Foremost in this connexion is the question of the presence of foreign troops in territories occupied as a result of action by the armed forces of some States against other States and peoples defending the independence they have won as a result of the collapse of the colonial system, and their territorial integrity. A situation in which foreign troops behave as masters in a territory which lawfully belongs to others is fraught with the danger of an outbreak of armed hostilities which could escalate so greatly that they would be difficult to put an end to. The policy of seizure and occupation of foreign territory must be eradicated. Then, and only then, will it be really possible to settle international conflicts.

16. I fully share the view of Mr. Pazhwak, the representative of Afghanistan, who rightly said in commenting on the conquest of foreign territories that: “. . . if this throwback to the Dark Ages is permitted an inch of compromise, then we shall plunge the world back into the days of Genghis Khan” [1770th plenary meeting, para. 26], and who added: “This Assembly should administer an unmistakable and decisive rebuff to such policies” [ibid./].

17. No attempt on our part to strengthen international security can be successful unless it includes measures for the prompt and final elimination of the shameful system of colonialism and nips in the bud any use of force to suppress national liberation movements. The colonial system, which arose as a result of piratical wars, has always been a cause of military hostilities and international tension.

18. The last remaining defenders of overt colonialism who are wreaking their will in southern Africa and elsewhere are insolently challenging not only national freedoms, but the peaceful coexistence of independent neighbouring States. In this year alone, the Security Council has already examined four times situations endangering peace and arising as a result of the use of force to suppress the popular liberation movement. This occurred on the eve of the tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV)], in which, *inter alia*, the General Assembly solemnly declared that all armed action and repressive measures directed against dependent peoples shall cease, in order that they may peacefully and freely exercise their right to complete independence.

19. These highly important provisions of the Declaration, as also the recommendations contained in other anti-colonial resolutions of the United Nations, have still not been implemented with regard to the more than 35 million inhabitants of dependent territories. As recently as 6 October last, Mr. Ahmadou Ahidjo, the President of

<sup>1</sup> Compilation of documents “The Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union during the Patriotic War”, volume I, p. 361 (State Publications of Political Literature, 1944).

Cameroon, in presenting the Manifesto on Southern Africa on behalf of the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity, said in the General Assembly:

“In Namibia as in the Territories under Portuguese domination, in Zimbabwe as in South Africa, we see the same insolent scorn for the resolutions of the United Nations concerning those Territories. It is now clear that this defiant attitude towards world opinion would not be possible without the support of certain powerful international interests, and indeed of some Governments . . .

“It is also clear that this attitude constitutes a veritable threat to peace and international security” [1780th plenary meeting, paras. 14 and 15].

20. Termination of this intolerable situation would be entirely in keeping with the provision contained in the USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World concerning the need to ensure without delay “the cessation of all measures of the suppression of the liberation movements of the peoples still under colonial rule and the granting of independence to all such peoples” [A/C.1/L.468, section II, para. 1].

21. The General Assembly is fully entitled to declare firmly that failure to observe this requirement will constitute a violation of the United Nations Charter and will be dealt with accordingly.

22. All the Charter provisions defining the responsibility of all States, both great and small, for the strengthening of security fully retain their force today. Highly important among them is the provision for the creation of viable systems of regional security. I would emphasize in this connexion that the Charter accepts the principle of co-ordinating global and regional action.

23. The Charter contains a number of provisions dealing directly with the activity of regional organizations. In addition to Chapter VIII, defining the relations between the United Nations on the one hand, and regional organizations and arrangements on the other, and recognizing the predominant role of the Security Council in such relations, the Charter encourages the solution of international disputes by “resort to regional agencies” [Article 33], supports the principle of collective self-defence, which is one of the elements of regional arrangement [Article 51], and provides for co-operation at the regional level on questions “relating to the Security Council’s military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security” [Article 47].

24. Adoption by the General Assembly at this session of the Appeal to All States of the World will, in our view, serve as a timely reminder of the need to observe the Charter, in particular by creating viable systems of regional security.

25. Broad segments of the world’s population and the Governments of many countries are now paying increasing attention to the strengthening of co-operation at the regional level. One example is afforded by the support received by the proposal of the countries members of the

Warsaw Pact to establish a system of collective security in Europe.

26. At this time, when the Ukrainian people is celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of its country’s liberation from the Nazi invaders, I should like once again to stress as vigorously as I can that this people, 47 million strong, is vitally concerned that the flames of a world conflagration should not break out in the European continent either today or in times to come. The events and developments which are now taking place in Europe and the efforts of a number of States (I would emphasize particularly the importance of the initiative being undertaken by the Government of Finland) allow us to hope that an all-European conference on questions of collective security and co-operation will be convened in the near future.

27. I have a few words to say on enhancing of the role of the Security Council. The Charter states clearly and unambiguously that the Members of the United Nations confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. For reasons we all know, the Security Council has been unable to make full use of the powers vested in it under the Charter. The Soviet Union’s proposal that the Security Council should make it a practice, as provided in the Charter, to convene meetings at the level of members of Government or other specially designated representatives in order to consider problems relating to the maintenance of security, including disarmament problems, strikes us as timely and fully justified. It will be remembered that Secretary-General U Thant at one time advanced similar ideas. The need to activate the Security Council and to broaden the range of questions it considers is explained by the lofty position it occupies in the system of United Nations organs and by the fact that its decisions are binding.

28. The recent practice of the Security Council itself confirms the timeliness of this proposal. There is a clear tendency in the Council’s resolutions and in the statements of its members and Members of the General Assembly to make a wide range of the Council’s decisions binding, as laid in Article 25 of the Charter, and to find means of ensuring compliance with its decisions. The repertory of the application of the Charter also shows that we have far from exhausted the possibilities of enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations, and the proposal before us on the further implementation of Article 28 of the Charter should mark an important step in that direction.

29. One of the timely and important tasks of the United Nations in strengthening international security is to make its peace-keeping operations more effective. Consequently, the work of the Special Committee of Thirty-Three<sup>2</sup> is of basic significance.

30. We are encouraged by the fact that the Special Committee, after lengthy debates, has found an approach which should result in the adoption of mutually acceptable decisions on United Nations peace-keeping operations strictly consonant with the Charter.

31. My delegation is gratified that the Special Committee has agreed to begin its study of the entire question by

<sup>2</sup> Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

examining a specific kind of operation, namely, the dispatch of military observers appointed or accepted by the Security Council to observe the implementation of the major decisions taken by the United Nations.

32. Obviously, the results achieved thus far are extremely modest and many differences of opinion still remain. However, positive elements are also clearly present. In this connexion, it would be fitting for the General Assembly at this session to invite the Special Committee to intensify its efforts with a view to the earliest possible completion of its useful work and submission of its proposals and recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

33. Obviously, progress in this area, too, will depend greatly on the readiness of Member States to maintain a spirit of practical and workmanlike discussion, based on adherence to the principles of the Charter and on the general need to strengthen international peace and security.

34. In proclaiming our fidelity to the Charter, we do not mean to say that it contains a full and adequate complement of rules for regulating international relations. Moreover, we are opposed to a dogmatic approach to the Charter's provisions, being fully aware that, if they are to be not mere dogma but guidelines for action, they should be constantly defined and developed. We accordingly believe that the General Assembly, in appealing to all States strictly to abide by the principles of the sovereignty, equality, and territorial inviolability of each State, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the right of all peoples freely to choose their social system, and to settle all disputes between them exclusively through peaceful means without the use or threat of force, must stress the need for the further development of a basis in international law to govern relations among States.

35. In this connexion, special interest attaches to the work of two organs closely involved with the problems of peace and security—the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States and the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression.

36. The Special Committee on Principles of International Law has been instructed by the General Assembly to draft legal rules governing friendly relations and co-operation among States.

37. Thanks to the persistent efforts of the delegations of socialist and developing countries, which have advocated the elaboration of such legal principles from the very first, this Special Committee was able to make substantial progress. Nevertheless, it has not yet completed the work assigned to it. In particular, it has been unable to formulate the most important principles concerned—the prohibition of the use of force and the principle of the equality and self-determination of peoples. It would seem that the formulation of these principles of international law is being delayed because certain elements prefer to have a free hand and are unwilling to be bound by specific provisions which might make it difficult for them to pursue their aggressive policy of suppressing the national liberation movement.

38. The same may be said with regard to the formulation of a generally acceptable definition of aggression. This question was first raised in the United Nations by the USSR delegation as long ago as 1950. The proposal that a definition of aggression should be drawn up received broad support from the majority of Member States. At its sixth session, in resolution 599 (VI), the General Assembly recognized that it was possible and desirable, with a view to ensuring international peace and security, to define aggression by reference to the elements which constituted it. At its twenty-second session, in resolution 2330 (XXII), it reaffirmed that there was a wide-spread conviction that a definition of aggression would have considerable importance for the maintenance of international peace and for the adoption of effective measures under the Charter for preventing acts of aggression.

39. The Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression has recently made some progress in that it has agreed on a number of the elements entering into a definition of aggression.

40. Nevertheless, the question of defining aggression has not yet been satisfactorily resolved. The same circles which have been delaying the formulation of principles of international law governing friendly relations among States have been directly or indirectly hindering the formulation of a definition of aggression.

41. There is thus a yawning gap in international law and international relations, a situation which is favourable only to aggressors. To bridge this gap would mean to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations, and primarily of the Security Council, in the discharge of its functions of strengthening the peace and preventing and arresting acts of aggression.

42. For these reasons, my delegation believes that the General Assembly should at the current session invite the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression and the Special Committee on Principles of Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States to intensify their efforts with a view to the earliest possible submission of their proposals and recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Security Council.

43. A number of the important points which are among the component elements of the USSR proposal appear as independent items on the agenda of the current session of the General Assembly. They will be considered in the appropriate Committees. Naturally, my delegation does not mean to minimize the importance of such consideration or of the decisions to be taken by those Committees. At the same time, it is aware that solution of the questions of decolonization, peace-keeping operations, definition of aggression, and formulation of the principles of friendly relations is taking a long time. Possibilities for accelerating this work must therefore be explored.

44. That is why my delegation believes that the First Committee, and then the General Assembly, by discussing these questions from the viewpoint of strengthening international security and by adopting the Appeal to All States of the World, will furnish a stimulus for a prompt and effective solution.

45. Consequently, from this standpoint as well—from the standpoint of bringing about optimal conditions for the solution of important questions facing the United Nations—the discussion and adoption of the USSR proposal will be of major import.

46. The questions of strengthening peace and international security and enhancing the role and authority of the United Nations were accorded primary attention in the recently completed general political debate. That is further proof of the highly responsible nature of the work of the First Committee, which in any event, being a committee on political and security questions, is bound to make an important contribution to United Nations activities in strengthening international security.

47. However, in the course of a serious, businesslike, and on the whole constructive discussion in this Committee of the vital and urgent question of international security, a sharply discordant note was sounded by the statement made yesterday by the Maltese representative. I would have thought that the representative of a small country should have been particularly interested in the strengthening of international security, since the primary purpose here is to safeguard the interests of the small countries which are the present or potential victims of imperialist aggressors. But he chose a different course. He saw fit to hurl slanderous accusations at the Soviet Union.

48. With regard to his theoretical and historical disquisitions on Leninism, the Maltese representative apparently has no inkling in how unenviable and ridiculous a position he placed himself by acting as a “defender” of Lenin’s principles, writings and pronouncements and contrasting them with the USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World.

49. There are a good many examples in history, including the history of the United Nations, when would-be commentators of Leninism—of a higher calibre, if I may say so, than Mr. Gauci—sought to outdo each other in criticizing the principles of Soviet policy. I would say to the Maltese representative, in the friendliest manner possible, that this was a thankless undertaking even in the days of the cold war.

50. Today one can hardly fail to see that such exercises in the theory of history are but a screen for slander and for attempts to poison the political atmosphere and sow doubt with regard to proposals which are genuinely conducive to the strengthening of international peace and security.

51. But those who, for lack of solid arguments, inject the filth of anti-Communist and anti-Soviet propaganda into this debate are making a miscalculation. I am convinced that no attempt to denigrate the USSR proposal, which deals with the vital matter of securing peace on earth and protecting the future of mankind, can possibly hinder a broad and fruitful discussion by the First Committee of the programme for strengthening international security proposed by the Soviet Union. It is time to stop regarding anything proposed by the Soviet Union with suspicion.

52. Naturally, we all realize that, as representatives of different countries, we are divided by differences of

principle. But we have, and can have, no more important task than to avert the threat of a world war. Consequently, we must all unremittingly seek ways and means to strengthen international peace and security. The draft Appeal to All States of the World which is now before us provides a good opportunity for reaching mutual understanding and agreement on cardinal principles and measures that would be conducive to a substantial improvement of the international situation.

53. Response by Governments to the Appeal and discussion by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session of the item entitled “Progress in the implementation by States of measures for the strengthening of international security” would help to mobilize forces in support of a durable peace, enhance the authority of the United Nations and strengthen international security.

54. Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom): Mr. Chairman, the other day you asked that compliments should not be addressed to you. I hope that you will accept it as the measure of my great respect for yourself and your colleagues on the Bureau if I now obey your instructions and say nothing more. But we are indeed most fortunate to be guided in our deliberations by such a splendid team.

55. Before I speak on the subject which is on the agenda, I should like to add to the expressions of sympathy which have been heard today the condolences of this delegation and of my Government upon the tragic death of the distinguished President of Somalia. It fell to the Government of my country for a number of years to work in the closest association with President Abdirashid Ali Shermarke. This was a most fruitful period which culminated so happily in Somalian independence. We remember him as a most outstanding man, a staunch nationalist and an ardent supporter of Islamic unity. On behalf of the British people, I should like to express our deep sympathy with his family and with the whole nation of Somalia.

56. We have before us a draft appeal to all States of the world submitted by the Soviet delegation [A/C.1/L.468]. We also have a most revealing speech which was made by the representative of the Soviet Union [1652nd meeting]. I am extremely grateful to the Soviet representative for having taken such trouble to explain the thoughts behind the Soviet appeal. We must now consider that appeal carefully in the light of his speech. The two hang inseparably together.

57. Now it seems to me that the key phrase in the speech is the one where the speaker said that “To strengthen the peace and to ensure peaceful living conditions is what is asked of us by the hundreds of millions who constitute the new post-war generation” [ibid., para. 8]. I am quite sure that we all agree with that. Indeed, it would be impossible to find anyone in this Committee who did not agree. I believe that all members of this Committee are fully aware of their responsibilities in this matter and of the disastrous consequences which will flow from any failure on our part to strengthen peace. The question, of course, is what we should do about it. The Soviet delegation has suggested that we should issue an appeal. This is quite a familiar idea. As the representative himself pointed out in his speech, the Soviet Union has been responsible for proposing a good

number of such appeals, declarations and resolutions in the past. It is certainly an idea that my delegation welcomes and will carefully consider.

58. Fortunately a great number of other things also are being done to forward the cause of peace and international understanding. The achievements of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament are for my Government achievements of tremendous importance. These are real steps, made on real matters towards real understandings. Also, the achievements of the regional organizations in settling long-standing disputes or in calming some sudden flare-up are equally real achievements which make it easier to live in our world today without anxiety. So, to speak plainly, the conclusion, for example, of the Treaty on the peaceful uses of outer space<sup>3</sup> or the nuclear test ban Treaty<sup>4</sup> has meant rather more to us than any declaration or appeal. And equally, what we most look for now is some indication that serious discussions on the limitation of strategic arms are about to begin. The conclusion of an agreement, coming from such talks, would be the greatest single step towards strengthening security and towards calming the fears of mankind that could possibly be taken. I should like to express this delegation's individual appeal for peace: it is that those concerned with strategic arms limitations talks should embark now on their heavy task without keeping us one day further in suspense.

59. However, from the point of view of this Organization there has been dissatisfaction expressed about one aspect of the progress which has so far been made towards disarmament and on regional co-operation and security. This complaint is that that progress has been made outside the United Nations, or on the edge of it or with the participation of only a very few Members or of only the most powerful. The doubts, fears and disappointments which this has raised were clearly expressed in the brilliant analysis which was given to us by the representative of Brazil last Monday afternoon [1653rd meeting]. It is impossible not to feel sympathy for his view. Nevertheless, my Government has always taken the line that it is inevitable and in the nature of things that those principally concerned or having the greatest responsibilities in a given situation may well have to consult together, in the first place, in order to contribute to our wider agreement. We do not mind much how an understanding is arrived at provided that it contributes to the lessening of dangerous tensions. We count ourselves lucky if something has been achieved. I think that this will continue to be so until such time as we all live under one world government, if indeed that is ever to be the case.

60. That being so, it has always been the policy of the British Government that general agreements and statements should be in line with the Charter and the policies of the United Nations, that they should reflect the wishes of the Members, that they should be submitted to those Members for serious and not just formal discussion and that they should finally become part of the whole theory and practice of our Organization. Bit by bit, we hope to escape

<sup>3</sup> Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies, see resolution 2222 (XXI).

<sup>4</sup> Treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow, 5 August 1963.

from a society based on force and to build up an international order based on co-operation. For this it is necessary that the United Nations should from time to time review the whole direction in which it is going, that it should lay down a general policy and indicate what it thinks the Members should be doing. That can quite well be achieved by some action in the General Assembly from time to time, such as an appeal, or a declaration or a resolution. It is for that reason that my delegation has taken most seriously the Soviet suggestion that we should consider an "appeal".

61. What I have been saying so far is simple and obvious enough and it leads to a perfectly simple and obvious conclusion. In order to fulfil the purpose of strengthening world security any appeal must have the following characteristics. First, it must accurately reflect all the causes of international tension and not be based on some arbitrary selection. Secondly, it must indicate all the main steps which need to be taken and not only those which suit a particular State or group of States. Thirdly, it must reflect the policies and views of our membership as a whole. Fourthly, it must reflect our Charter and extend its application in a way that is agreeable to all.

62. It is in the light of these criteria that I now propose to look at the provisions of the Soviet draft and draw attention to one or two of its provisions, some of which do not seem at first sight to match up to what is required.

63. I will start in a preambular way with the preamble, which as far as I can see should also include section I as well, since these two segments purport to give a resume of where we have got to in the last 25 years and what are the main factors uppermost in our minds today. I will not dwell on this part of the draft except to say that I wonder if it does not take a slightly negative and selective view and whether, as some other speakers have remarked, it does not look too much towards the distant past. I feel we might do more justice to the achievements for peace which are evident in many quarters of the globe.

64. The first passage which must command our strict attention is section II dealing with the withdrawal of troops. The sending of one's troops into the territory of another State against the wishes of its government and people is a gross violation of the Charter, an infringement of human rights and a threat to the general security of nations. I do not think there has ever been any dispute about that. But the Soviet draft tries to specify what troops may not be sent into the territory of other countries. It lists three kinds of troops which must be considered as aggressors, bullies, violators of the Charter. Well then, are we to assume that troops outside their own frontiers under any other circumstances than those listed in the Soviet draft are not required to withdraw? Have they a ticket to remain where they are or, worse still, to go into other countries in all similar circumstances which the Soviet draft exempts by its silence? We know that there are circumstances in which the troops of one country are freely and willingly invited into the territory of another for purposes of joint defence, and no one would wish to deprive recipient countries of the right to invite in their friends. Perhaps that is really what we ought to say in any appeal. But surely we should not legalize certain kinds of aggression

by a restricted, over-simplified list of what is forbidden. Let us look instead for something which binds everyone and to which everyone can agree.

65. Next we come to section III. This is surely of central importance because it lays down in general how countries should behave to one another. There is one point here which bothers my delegation, and I ask the following question: does this section apply only to relationships between States of differing social systems? It does not precisely say so, but then we have to go to the speech which was made in explanation by the representative of the Soviet Union in order to find an answer. And here we have the statement,

“It is hard to overestimate the beneficial consequences of an agreement on the legal principles of friendly relations and co-operation of States, in other words, the principles of peaceful coexistence.” [1652nd meeting, para. 57.]

66. So it seems that friendly relations are the same as peaceful coexistence. The representative of Poland went even further—he spoke of “friendly relations and co-operation among States, probably better known as the principle of peaceful coexistence” [1653rd meeting, para. 6]. Well, in my country friendly relations and co-operation are certainly not better known as peaceful coexistence, and this raises certain difficulties.

67. In speaking of peaceful coexistence we are dealing with a concept which is of the utmost importance to those who have evolved it and who hold it. I certainly do not intend to try to enter into a critique of it here or even to challenge its validity as far as it goes. In its own limited field it is something which my country also practises and greatly values. Nor do I propose once again to open a debate on the way in which it has been applied by certain countries in recent years. There are however two points that I would like to make.

68. First, may I again draw attention to the fact that the principle of peaceful coexistence is said to concern relations between States with different social systems. But this covers only a very small part of our international relations. There are barely a dozen States in the world with which we practise peaceful coexistence in the strict sense of that doctrine and a vastly greater number with which we practise friendly relations and co-operation. We do not wish to distinguish between the two. Any appeal to which we subscribe which speaks of security, peace, co-operation, and so on must be in such language and in such terms as to determine our relations with the whole international community. In our dealings with other countries we in the United Kingdom are not held in the grip of rigorous theories nor influenced by irrelevant distinctions. It is of no significance to the United Kingdom in seeking good relations whether the other party has a capitalist or a socialist society, whether it practises a Christian or Buddhist religion or whether it has a manufacturing economy or is a primary producer. We could not therefore accept any language which would appear to throw the slightest doubt upon this matter or change our equal commitment to establish good relations with, and treat alike, all members of the international community, irrespective of their nature, their character or their situation.

69. Secondly, certain doubts have been aroused in this context as to the nature of the Charter itself. In his speech the representative of the Soviet Union spoke of the need for the “specification and elaboration of its basic principles and provisions in keeping with the changing conditions and needs of inter-state relations”. He went on to say that the Charter had “fully retained its pertinence and significance as a political and legal instrument for regulating relations among States with different social systems” [1652nd meeting, para. 53].

70. Here again, I must say that the view of the United Kingdom would appear to be opposed to what has been suggested. As far as we are concerned, the Charter applies to all States and to the relationships between all States quite without regard to whether they belong to the same social system, different social systems or parallel social systems. Nor do we believe that the Charter has evolved or is evolving in this sense. The Charter, as some speakers have had occasion to note, is not an immutable law of nature fixed for all time. But at this stage of history, the principles of co-operation and international relationships enshrined in it are still certainly accepted by most Members. Evolution of the Charter consists in extending its application to new fields, such as the exploration of space and the exploitation of the sea-bed and so on. It consists in a wider and wider acceptance of international authority, in a gradual renunciation of the use of force, and so on. But I doubt if many of us here could accept that evolution has come to the Charter, in the sense which appears to be suggested in the speech of the Soviet representative, as a gradual watering down or withering away to become merely a regulator between two different groups of States, defined only by their social system and without regard to the aspirations and hopes of their constituent parts or the thousands of other relationships which make up our complex world.

71. It may, of course, be that the intention of all this has not been clearly understood by my delegation. No doubt the Soviet delegation will be able to give assurances. But if I may sum up our present fears, we feel that in any statements or conclusions of this Assembly we should be extremely careful to say exactly what we mean and not to be led into misconstructions of the Charter or into careless phrases which later could be used in support of abuses of that Charter. In spite of its readiness to join in any appeal for what is good and desirable, my Government could not agree to adopt wording which would purport to change overnight its whole attitude towards international relations and good behaviour throughout the international community.

72. I come now to section IV, which deals with regional security systems. I note that the draft says that such systems, “can promote the strengthening of international security”. In the opinion of my Government they are already doing so and we feel that this paragraph does not really do justice to the tremendous advances which have taken place in regional co-operation. We look for further progress in this direction. And as far as a conference on European security is concerned, the views of my Government are on record and well-known. We should welcome such a conference provided that those who have helped to ensure the security of Europe are all represented and provided that there is some indication that there is a

reasonable chance of a successful outcome. We should prefer, in this Committee, not to discuss language which would predetermine the membership, nature or outcome of such a conference.

73. Section V deals with the role and responsibilities of the Security Council and my delegation does not disagree with these as defined in the first paragraph of the section. We certainly have no objections to the holding of periodic meetings at the level of members of Governments as provided for in Article 28, paragraph 2 of the Charter. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the United Kingdom is already regularly represented in the Security Council by a member of Her Majesty's Government. The United Kingdom has in the past had occasion to suggest special meetings under Article 28, paragraph 2, although the suggestion did not in fact find favour with certain other members of the Council. We also endorsed the proposal when the Secretary-General again drew attention to it in his report for 1966-1967.<sup>5</sup> We continue to support it now. We consider that it is for the Security Council itself to decide on such occasions what matters to discuss and what action it may wish to take in accordance with its own constitution as laid down in the Charter. We cannot lay all that down in advance. May I add, however, that my delegation will give very careful thought to the extremely interesting reflections of the representative of Finland on the functioning of the Security Council [*1655th meeting*].

74. On section VI there is no need for me to comment. We all wish to hasten on with the tasks which are set out there and it is an encouraging sign that after more than a decade of total inactivity we have recently been able to start serious discussion on the general principles governing the Organization's peace-keeping activities. My delegation very much hopes that we shall continue to make progress.

75. Section VII, however, raises a difficulty which will have escaped no one's attention. Under the guise of the need for universality it raises a question which has unfortunately for a long time bedevilled our councils. I do not intend to discuss the rights and wrongs of this problem here and I very much hope that we shall not have to do so while trying to reach agreement on an appeal for co-operation and mutual understanding. The dispute would seem to be totally out of context and to be at war with the ultimate purposes of an appeal of this kind.

76. Coming to the end of the draft I have been struck by the sense of something missing. There is nothing at all to say that we should be getting on with our work on disarmament. I started by saying that this seemed to my delegation to be one of the most important things that any of us could be doing to avert war. There was also much stress laid on disarmament in the speech of the representative of the Soviet Union. It is therefore doubly surprising that no mention should have been made of it in the operative part of his draft. I suggest that we should remedy this in any conclusions to which we may finally come.

77. Nor is anything said about economic development and social advance, to which, as was clear from what was said in

<sup>5</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1.*

the general debate, almost all Member States attach great importance. I make no further points on the text of the draft appeal, but I should say that I have certain other reservations about the wording.

78. In conclusion I have only to say that the more one thinks about the question of international peace and security, the more obvious it is that the United Nations has no more important task and that it should be foremost in our minds. My delegation believes that all our activities should tend in this direction and all national efforts should be subordinated to it. An appeal to the international community could possibly help to make sure that we all head in the same direction and that we all work towards a common plan for maintaining peace. But, although the draft which we have before us deals with many aspects of the problem, it does not deal with them all nor does it always, in our opinion, provide right solutions. Sometimes it seems to lead us into dangerous pronouncements which in no way reflect the views of many Members. If we are to make an appeal it must be right and it must be acceptable to all; for if it is not acceptable to all it will certainly not be heeded. Reflecting on the present draft, I feel that it leaves us with a very long way to go and I wonder quite by what means we shall get there. Other delegations may have some suggestions on this, and we have heard some already. My Government will certainly be willing to help in the search for a satisfactory solution to this overwhelmingly important issue, which the Soviet Government has rightly raised.

79. Mr. PILAVACHI (Greece): Mr. Chairman, may I, at the outset of my intervention, express to you the gratification of the Greek delegation at your unanimous election to the high office you are holding. We also offer our congratulations to the distinguished Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, who have also been elected by acclamation to the Bureau of the First Committee.

80. Before I proceed with my statement I wish to extend to the representative of Somalia the sincerest condolences of the Greek delegation for the tragic loss suffered by the Republic of Somalia. The Greek delegation subscribes to the moving tributes paid by the representatives this morning to the memory of the respected President of the Republic of Somalia.

81. The item on our agenda is the most serious subject facing our Organization. The question for peace is a primary and permanent preoccupation for all peoples and countries in the world. Moreover, in the Charter the maintenance of international peace and security precedes all other purposes of the United Nations. The inscription of this subject on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly offers to all Member States the opportunity to make their contribution, from their particular point of vantage to a discussion affecting the future of mankind.

82. Peace and security are matters of concern for all States, large, medium-sized and small. The fact that a discussion on peace and security was initiated by one of the two super-Powers, with responsibilities commensurate to the immense strength they command, emphasizes the seriousness of the problem.

83. No country in our nuclear and space era feels secure, not even those possessing the monopoly of nuclear weapons

and means of delivery of such weapons. Smaller countries are deeply concerned. They are not only afraid of death and destruction if war breaks out, but they are concerned for their independence which can be safeguarded only if international security, guaranteed by the world Organization, effective and impartial, prevails. It seems perhaps Utopian, but it is a fact that small countries, whether or not they belong to systems of alliances, have pinned their hopes on the United Nations. Therefore, any plan dealing with the subject of the preservation of international peace and security, can only be based upon a strong United Nations, rendered effective and capable of dealing with any menace or threat to peace.

84. As Secretary-General U Thant pointed out a few years ago, and I am quoting from one of his speeches delivered in 1964:

“When we talk of strengthening the United Nations, it is not from a point of view of seeking new power or greater glory, of empire-building by attempting to extend the influence and authority of the Organization. We speak of strengthening the United Nations because this is an urgent necessity if the Organization and its Members are not to be crushed by the great and actual responsibilities and challenges which our times have put upon them. What becomes more apparent with each successive international crisis, whether in the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, or the growing economic imbalance of the world, to name only a few, is the very large discrepancy between the aims and responsibilities of the United Nations and what the peoples of the world, through the General Assembly and the Security Council, call upon it to do about them, on the one hand, and the meagreness of the Organization’s resources, its authority and its support, both material and political, on the other. In this existing situation the strengthening of the United Nations is not just a theoretical idealistic aim—it is a vital practical necessity.”<sup>6</sup>

85. The Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, mentioned the immense losses sustained by Europe and other continents during the last century as a result of devastating, futile and bloody wars. Greece has the unfortunate distinction of being one of the European countries with losses well out of proportion in relation to its population and size. It is also appropriate to recall that Greece was neutral at the beginning of both world wars. However, without the slightest provocation on its part, Greece was attacked and dragged into both conflagrations, and its territories were occupied. Thus, apart from the losses which she suffered in human beings and material wealth, Greece’s development was retarded and the traumas of war and devastation have not yet totally disappeared.

86. Greece is a firm believer in the United Nations. It supports the peaceful solution of all conflicts and peaceful change under the aegis of the United Nations. Greece was among the first to accept United Nations bodies for investigation and observation during the difficult period of hostilities in its territory between 1946 and 1949. Greece is

a strong supporter of United Nations peace-keeping operations—a novel enterprise in the maintenance of peace.

87. My country regrets that peace-keeping operations have encountered, and are still facing, serious financial difficulties. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report of September last,<sup>7</sup> in paragraphs 9 to 14, mentions these difficulties and expresses his deep concern about the reluctance of certain Members to contribute to the solution of this extremely serious problem facing the United Nations.

88. The United Nations has been fortunate in having at its helm three prominent Secretaries-General. One of them, Dag Hammarskjöld, gave his life in the accomplishment of his duties for the cause of peace.

89. The role of the Secretary-General should not be minimized. He is, of course, the chief administrator of our Organization; but in the spirit, if not in the letter, of the Charter, he is more than that. He is an observer, and from his impartial and objective position he can follow world trends and developments, foresee burgeoning problems, draw the attention of Member States to dangers resulting from a perilous course, offer, if need be, his valuable counsel or even his mediation, and act as an organizer and coordinator in the implementation of decisions or recommendations of the competent bodies of the United Nations for the safeguarding of peace.

90. May I quote an excerpt from a statement made by our Secretary-General in 1966:

“To be candid, I feel that I have found it increasingly difficult to function as Secretary-General in the manner in which I wish to function, and secondly, I do not subscribe to the view that the Secretary-General should be just a chief administrative officer, or, in other words, that the Secretary-General should be a glorified clerk. I do not accept this concept of the Secretary-General. As I have said repeatedly on previous occasions, besides the functions of administration, the Secretary-General must take the necessary initiatives in the political and diplomatic fields. These political and diplomatic initiatives, in my view, are an essential part of the functions of the Secretary-General.”<sup>8</sup>

91. In another speech, also in 1966, the Secretary-General described his office as that of “Moderator”, the term “Moderator” being more apt to describe the type of work he is expected to perform. Such a mission of the Secretary-General does not interfere with or run counter to the role assigned by the Charter to the Security Council and the special responsibilities placed upon its permanent members.

92. The deficiencies of the Security Council are well known. The abuse of the veto and the double veto and the lack of unanimity in the Security Council led to the “Uniting for peace” resolution [377(V)] adopted by the General Assembly in November 1950. Recently, in the

<sup>6</sup> Excerpt from *The strengthening of the United Nations*, a speech by the Secretary-General delivered at the University of Denver, Colorado, on 3 April 1964.

<sup>7</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

<sup>8</sup> Statement by the Secretary-General at a press conference at United Nations Headquarters on 19 September 1966.

Security Council, the practice evolved of arriving at unanimous decisions; but once the resolutions are adopted, no action follows to implement them. Thus, inaction has succeeded the former condition of paralysis that prevailed. It is clear that any plan for strengthening the United Nations should aim at finding means by which the Security Council would become more effective.

93. As mentioned before, my country is devoted to the peaceful solutions of conflicts according to the precepts of international law and the principles of the Charter. We favour peaceful change in those areas where progress towards self-determination and independence, on the basis of the provisions of the Charter, has not followed the same pace as that in other areas which have already attained statehood.

94. The United Nations cannot have two heads, like Janus or Hermes, one facing towards the road to peace and orderly and peaceful change, and the other looking towards violence and bloodshed. The road to peaceful change may be slow. It is, however, safer and the only one that the United Nations, as an Organization devoted to peace, can follow.

95. Looking at this problem from another angle, it should also be noted that the United Nations, in order to deal effectively with serious problems affecting peace and security, is in need of clearly defined terms. When the parties concerned differ on definitions of vital terms, such as the terms "aggression" or "intervention", or when such terms are given a different interpretation by the parties concerned the effectiveness of the United Nations is weakened or paralysed.

96. It is also clear that any recommendations leading to a more orderly regional organization of the world will be futile if no progress is made previously in clearing the road and removing the causes which brought about the division of certain areas of the world into what are known as "blocs". Blocs are the result and not the cause of the division of the world into such groupings.

*Mr. Kolo (Nigeria), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.*

97. My country has constantly followed a basic line in its foreign policy, namely, to cultivate good and friendly relations with all countries, especially with its Balkan neighbours, independently of social régimes, provided that there is mutual respect and avoidance of intervention in the internal affairs of each other.

98. Finally, it should be borne in mind that international peace and security will be illusory, whatever rules or decisions we adopt, without total and complete disarmament under strict international control. Up to now only peripheral subjects of disarmament or non-armament have been tackled. It is rather strange that international agreement has been reached on standards for the sterilization of space craft designed for landing on the moon or Mars where, so far as we know, human beings do not exist, while the arsenals of our planet are still stocked with deadly weapons of total destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological. It is time that priorities and targets be fixed leading to early and serious discussions for attaining agreements on

total and complete disarmament under effective international control and safeguards.

99. The quest for peace is as old as the world. The symbols of peace, the dove and the olive leaf, date from the time of Noah, the beginning of creation. Peace has many definitions. An eminent statesman, international lawyer and diplomat, the late Nicolas Politis, described peace in the following simple terms and I quote him in the original French: "*La paix c'est un état d'âme*", "peace is a condition of the mind or soul". Let us hope that our discussions on strengthening international peace and security, which will be a continuing process, will be pursued in such a spirit.

100. Mr. CREMIN (Ireland): Despite his appeal at our first meeting, I cannot refrain from congratulating the Chairman on behalf of the delegation of Ireland on his election to the important office of Chairman of the First Committee.

101. I wish also to express our congratulations on their election to the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, and to the Rapporteur. We also extend a welcome to Mr. Chacko of the Secretariat in his new post as Committee Secretary.

102. I should add, on a more sober note, that the Irish delegation is deeply grieved by the tragic death of President Shermarke of Somalia. We express our sincere condolences to the Somali delegation.

103. My delegation has read with care and attention document A/C.1/L.468 containing the text of the explanatory memorandum and the draft appeal in connexion with the item we are discussing. In requesting that the item be included in the agenda of the current session of the Assembly, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union described it as an urgent and important matter [A/7654]. We share this view. The matter is important because the maintenance of international peace and security is the primary purpose of the United Nations. And no detailed analysis is needed to show that in the present very unsettled international situation urgent and strenuous efforts are required to achieve that purpose.

104. Historically, as we all know, and as the Charter itself testifies, it was the searing experience of two world wars and the determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which led the founding Members, in the name of their peoples, to establish the United Nations.

105. Quite soon a quarter of a century will have passed since the Organization was established. And in those 25 years weapons, first heard of at the close of the Second World War, have been developed to such a stage and in such profusion that a new world war would be no longer merely horrible for our peoples but would be catastrophic for our planet. It is a threat which has cast an ever-growing shadow over relations between nations and over the whole human race.

106. So far that threat has been contained. But if disaster has been avoided, the divisions and rivalries between States and groups of States give us no cause for complacency. Many of our peoples have suffered in local wars or conflicts which, though they are smaller in scope, are tragic in

consequences for those involved and contain within them the seed of dangerous escalation. In those years since the United Nations was established people have suffered, and still suffer, from oppression, injustice, and a denial of those human rights which our Charter affirms. And experience shows that the oppression of a people and the denial of their rights will evoke in time a surge to freedom, and an insistence on equality of treatment, which may find expression in violence.

107. My delegation therefore holds that the state of the world in these opening weeks of the twenty-fourth session—a world disturbed, with many of its peoples oppressed—is such that it is indeed timely, and not only for historical reasons connected with the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Charter, to consider measures to strengthen international security.

108. As you know, the Government of Ireland is firmly committed to full observance of the purposes and principles of the Charter. This basic position of ours has found frequent expression here, and most recently in the address to the Assembly, on 26 September last, by the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Hillery, when he stated:

“... I should like to reiterate the strong commitment of my Government to the objectives and purposes of the Charter. That commitment has consistently informed our policies and attitudes within the United Nations. It will continue to do so and our aim will continue to be to promote the vigour and efficacy of the Organization.”  
[1768th plenary meeting, para. 51.]

109. It is thus our policy to support all measures which we believe would ensure the efficacy of the United Nations and promote the purposes of the Charter. It is in this spirit that my delegation has examined the “Appeal” attached to the letter of Foreign Minister Gromyko of 19 September. There are certain aspects of the appeal about the wisdom of which my delegation has some doubts. But at the same time it contains elements which we feel would correspond to our basic policy as regards the United Nations; and if such an appeal is to issue from the Assembly, it is these elements which we should like to see stressed.

110. In the first place, we note that the proposals are based on observance of the principle that all disputes between States must be settled without the threat or use of force. We see in this aspect of the proposals a reaffirmation of Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter, and it is, we feel, a reaffirmation which would be very appropriate on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations.

111. A second aspect of the draft proposals which we regard as constructive and useful is the stress laid on securing full respect for the provisions and a fuller use of the mechanisms of the Charter. None of us would, I am sure, deny that the Charter has imperfections. But although capable of improvement, a strict implementation of its terms would undoubtedly bring about a much better, and less anxious, world than that in which we live today. And here we note the suggestion in Section V, paragraph 2, of document A/C.1/L.468 for greater recourse to Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter. On this point, as the representative of Finland and also the representative of the

United Kingdom have noted, we are reminded that, in the Introduction to his annual report submitted on 19 September 1967,<sup>9</sup> the Secretary-General recalled earlier efforts to give effect to that provision and urged that those efforts should be renewed. My delegation agrees that this matter should now receive active attention.

112. Another matter which we find stressed in the draft proposals, and which we believe must form the basis of any attempt to strengthen international security, is a clear recognition of the rights of all peoples to national independence, freedom from colonial rule and preservation of their territorial integrity: these are rights which are explicitly prescribed in the Charter.

113. My delegation believes that international order—like the domestic order in any State—can be secured only on a basis of justice; and experience has shown that division of peoples or fragmentation of territories is a poor basis for stability and peace, either nationally or internationally. We find for our part that these principles are well set out in the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples incorporated in resolution 1514 (XV) adopted by the General Assembly on 14 December 1960. The Irish delegation welcomed and supported that Declaration, and we believe that the principles it recognized must be the basis for our efforts here to find means to strengthen international security.

114. My delegation has also noted the reference in the draft appeal, and in the statements made by the Soviet delegation, both in the General Assembly on 19 September [1756th plenary meeting] and in this Committee on 10 October [1652nd meeting], to regional security systems, and the proposal that these systems should come within the scope of Chapter VIII of the Charter. We realize of course that the conditions required for establishing such systems may vary from region to region. I may say, however, that in so far as concerns the proposal for a European security conference, my Government made known some months ago that, as a European country and a Member of the United Nations, Ireland would welcome all effective measures to reduce tensions and promote security and co-operation among European States, founded on respect for national self-determination and on non-intervention. We pointed out at the same time that, so as not to raise false hopes and risk a failure which could do more harm than good, it would be essential that a European security conference be carefully prepared, and that the premises underlying convocation of a conference should not contain any features that would make it difficult to bring it about, citing in this connexion the fundamental aim of our own people to see national unity restored.

115. These are matters which my delegation believes to be basic to the problem of strengthening international security—full use of the potentialities of the United Nations, peaceful settlement of disputes, the clear recognition of the principles of national independence, self-determination and territorial integrity. We recognize, however, that agreement on the details of a text will require careful consideration in this Committee. My delegation hopes that the deliberations

<sup>9</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A.*

of the Committee will result in measures that will effectively contribute to international peace and security, and so serve to invigorate the United Nations.

116. Mr. COLEMAN (United States of America): In order to facilitate our work, involving as it does a full agenda of important items, and out of his innate modesty, the Chairman, requested that compliments should not be addressed to the Chair. In this as in all other matters, the United States delegation will co-operate with the Chairman. Our esteem and respect for him and other members of the Bureau will be conveyed in another manner.

117. "To maintain international peace and security" is the first purpose of the United Nations, in fact enunciated in Article 1 of the Charter. This purpose, of course, transcends the particular national interests of any Member, or groups of Members, and permeates the work of the United Nations. It is the standard against which we must judge—and future generations will judge—the time we spend, the speeches we make, the paper we generate, the resolutions we debate and those we adopt, and the subsidiary organs which have been created as the result of resolutions of the United Nations.

118. The United States would be happy, if the General Assembly felt it would serve a meaningful purpose, to join with other members in recalling the purposes and principles of the Charter and by a simple declaration reaffirm them, and reaffirm our commitment to and faith in the Charter's provisions. Such an exercise, however, would not only be an act of supererogation, but one which would not advance any of the aims of the United Nations. What the United States could not do would be to associate itself with an effort to rewrite or reinterpret, by hasty Assembly resolutions, certain fundamental provisions of the Charter in a way which would tend to cast doubt on the Charter as it now stands.

119. The United States delegation feels that real work addressed to specific problems is what is called for, rather than generalized resolutions, exhortations, or declarations of purpose, in whatever form they may be clothed. Even less does it call for declarations designed to recast Charter principles in the mold of the philosophy of one or a few Members rather than all 126 Members of the United Nations. For example, each and every one of the United Nations Members is directly concerned with—and derives essential guarantees from—the Charter; they cannot permit it to be redefined, even by implication, either as condoning spheres of influence or as applying only to relationships between States of different social systems.

120. But even Assembly declarations of unquestionable fidelity to the Charter have little to contribute to the fundamental job which the United Nations was created to do: maintaining the peace, and removing the causes of future wars, large and small. A few days ago President Nixon reminded us that "Good words are not a substitute for hard deeds, and noble rhetoric is no guarantee of noble results". The United States delegation would like, therefore, to touch briefly on only some of the elements which must go to make up any serious effort to come to grips with the problem of the growing precariousness of peace in the world.

121. The first requisite is a frank examination of attitudes towards the United Nations Charter itself. The Charter is neither perfect nor immutable. But there are few problems of peace and security which would not readily yield to the simple expedient of universal good faith and respect for the Charter in just the terms in which it is at present written. And thus none of us should be—and I am sure that none of this sophisticated audience is—under any illusion that any failure of the system of collective security envisaged in the Charter is due to defects in the drafting of the Charter or insufficient clarity in the statement of its fundamental principles. The very first principle makes clear that the Charter applies equally to all Member States, large, medium or small, and thus it is the guide for the conduct of relations between States, whether they have identical, similar or different social, economic and political systems. In plain language, this means: independence, territorial integrity, the freedom from intervention, and the absolute equality and responsibility of all States, large or small, in the international community. On the other hand, it does not sanction the hegemony of certain nations over others, the right of the strong to dominate the less strong, or any doctrine of limited or partial sovereignty, equality of independence.

122. If the Charter requires amendment, the mechanism for doing so is of course defined in the Charter itself and is a process involving all the Member States. But until that amendatory process is completed, the United States will continue to support the Charter in the terms in which it is presently written.

123. In that regard, I would like to assure the Committee that, while the United States supports the Charter concept that the Security Council has special responsibilities in the field of international security and in preventing or stopping aggression, we strongly believe that all Members of the United Nations have an important role in promoting and maintaining international peace and security. For example, the General Assembly has legitimate responsibilities under the Charter, particularly in the event of the failure or inability of the Security Council to exercise its responsibilities, in connexion with disputes which threaten international peace. Certainly the role of the Assembly must not be downgraded.

124. Similarly, the Secretary-General has a major role under the Charter in maintaining international peace and security.

125. One of the greatest contributions to international security, we believe, would be the elimination of the root causes of international tensions. For example, the Second United Nations Development Decade provides each of us with an opportunity to build on the progress already made toward freedom from want, hunger, disease, and inequality of opportunity, including that inequality which results not from bad or malicious motives but simply from the lack of technological efficiency.

126. Another example is the promotion of human rights and full respect for the basic political rights of man as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This would guarantee the rights of all people to freedom of expression, including the freedom of peaceful dissent—a

right which, I note in passing, is certainly considered by many in this country to be directly related to the search for peace, as many of you were able, I am sure, to observe yesterday. No one should be mistaken: the United States is dedicated to the proposition that free speech is one of the great traditions, that it is one of those qualities that will keep this an open society, and even make it more so. Therefore we welcome dissent and we welcome the opportunity to discuss, with those in the country and outside of it, those problems of peace and security which tend to plague all of mankind. Moreover, the tensions of international security are relieved by a free flow of the people and of information across international boundaries. We have still another example in the principles and decrees that have followed from the adoption of the resolution dealing with decolonization.<sup>10</sup>

127. The above items, along with others equally important such as peace-keeping, the definition of aggression, and friendly relations, to name only a few, are on the agenda of the twenty-fourth General Assembly session and are being dealt with in various Committees. We attach particular importance to the work of the United Nations Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and to the reinforcement of United Nations peace-keeping in regard to the despatch of both observers and forces to areas of conflict, which we hope will result from its continued efforts. In this connexion, however, we share the concern of the Secretary-General with regard to the continuing financial arrears of our Organization resulting from unpaid assessments for past peace-keeping, and urge that all Members contribute to the elimination of those arrears.

128. High on the list of our concerns are disarmament and arms control of both nuclear weapons and so-called conventional weapons, particularly of weapons being shipped into areas of high tension.

129. The bulk of the Assembly's agenda expresses the desires of humanity, the large States and the small. Assuring the quality of the environment, economic development, the elimination of racism, the rights of man, would respond to those desires and thus help eliminate or decrease the causes of international tensions and correspondingly increase international security. Almost the entire agenda represents an appeal from the whole world and shows that 126 nations are concerned about increasing international security and reducing causes of tension.

130. Thus we see that the many subjects about which we have been asked to make generalized declarations are, in fact, extremely serious, complex problems already being dealt with in a serious manner in the appropriate international forums which the General Assembly or other appropriate organs of the United Nations previously have decided are best suited to handle the particular problems. Colonialism and related matters are dealt with in the Committee of Twenty-Four,<sup>11</sup> the Trusteeship Council as well as the Fourth Committee of the Assembly. The Special Political Committee has a number of important items on its

agenda relating to international peace and security. Our Committee is urgently seized of important disarmament matters as well as of the question of the peaceful uses of the deep sea-bed and outer space. Furthermore, there are other conferences grappling with these thorny problems which do not lend themselves to simple formulations and phrase-making. The work going on in Geneva on disarmament, which this Committee will review, is an example. Because these items have been on the agenda since its inception, the Members have had time to do their homework and secure instructions from their foreign offices. And we note, and we are impressed by, the appeal of the representative of Mexico, made on behalf of 23 Latin American nations, that sufficient time be allocated in this Committee to disarmament and related subjects [*1651st meeting*].

131. Other speakers, as well as myself, have touched on some other subjects which the United States delegation considers essential—elements of international peace and security without which no lasting peace and security can be had. In those cases also it will be noted that there are appropriate bodies of the General Assembly or other organizations in which that work is already in hand. The United States delegation would like to re-emphasize that the various committees and councils and conferences that have been charged with dealing with those problems are the proper venue in which each of the problems can most effectively be solved.

132. During the short time remaining until 16 December 1969, which, as you know, is the adjournment day of the General Assembly, the United States delegation intends to assert its efforts to have meaningful debates, resolutions and conclusions, on the items of real significance, which will result in deeds, not in words or rhetoric, noble or otherwise. I am sure that all Governments will wish to reflect carefully on the views expressed during this session concerning the maintenance and promotion of peace and security. The national policy of the United States is to support measures designed to strengthen peace and tranquillity in the world and permit man to develop to his full potential. My Government is convinced that the United Nations is a vital instrument in moving toward that goal. As you know, each one of the Presidents of this country beginning with President Truman and including President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, President Johnson and President Nixon, has accepted the privilege and opportunity of appearing before this body and has indicated that the foreign policy and the basic policy of the United States has, as one of its foundations, the conviction that this Organization must continue and must become even more effective, and that it is one of the vital organizations of the world that will aid all of us to enjoy peace and security.

133. We believe that the devotion of all Governments represented here to the maintenance of international peace and security will be best demonstrated in hard deeds and noble results achieved while dealing concretely with each of the many aspects of this subject which various delegations here have mentioned. The United States delegation will devote its best efforts to working on the specific tasks before us and urges other delegations to do so as well, in the spirit of international co-operation called for by the Charter.

<sup>10</sup> Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, resolution 1514 (XV).

<sup>11</sup> Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

134. The CHAIRMAN: The representative of Malta has asked for the floor in order to exercise the right of reply.

135. Mr. PARDO (Malta): Speaking as a representative of a small but still sovereign country that has a very deep and sincere interest in strengthening international security, I was saddened by the assertion of the representative of the Ukrainian SSR that my delegation has indulged in slanderous fabrications in this debate.

136. We have consistently attempted to leave slander and vituperation to others, and indeed to deal exclusively in facts, facts as accurate as humanly possible. If we did indulge in slander, we are prepared to apologize publicly. But before doing so, I would appreciate a precise and exact indication of any slander, that is, of any serious inaccuracy of fact, into which my delegation may have inadvertently fallen. Should this precise indication not be provided, I must assume that the representative of the Ukrainian SSR had a *lapsus linguae*, and that the contents of the statement of my delegation were basically correct.

137. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Ukrainian SSR in exercise of the right of reply.

138. Mr. BELOKOLOS (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): My delegation always

bears in mind and is in sympathy with the interests of small nations and States. But the Maltese representative's remarks today make me feel that the Maltese representative had a reason for rising from the sea-bed to take part in the discussion of our earthly affairs. It seems that he would like to drown the question of security in an ocean of words borrowed from polluted sources. This sets us on our guard, as we doubt that in making such statements Mr. Pardo is motivated only, as the little dog was in Krylov's fable "The Elephant and the Little Dog", by the desire to be known as a great fighter without actually fighting.

139. I would emphasize once again that my delegation accords the greatest attention to small nations and States. But we shall not allow anyone to falsify Marxist-Leninist doctrine and shall vigorously repel any assaults on it. On the other hand, we are always prepared to take part in a constructive discussion.

140. The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to remind representatives that, in accordance with the decision already taken by the Committee, the list of speakers in the general debate on this item will be closed at 12 noon tomorrow, 17 October.

*The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.*