



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. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): For the last four or five years a malaise has progressively permeated the United Nations. Intransigent debates have given way to many innocuous statements. The abuse and vituperation which characterized most speeches on political issues during the period of Lake Success and the whole decade thereafter have to a large extent vanished like echoes of the past. Since the early 1960s statements have, with a few exceptions, tended to be quite mellow and frequently conciliatory. A new era has dawned upon us, the era of coexistence between the great Powers. Some of us old-timers were hopeful that international security had begun to loom over the horizon. But it was not too long before we realized that it was the balance of terror between nuclear Powers which was giving us a respite from the clash that could involve us in a global conflict. But laudable as the new policy of coexistence has been, it has not prevented the outbreak of wars in regions outside the territories of the great Powers.

2. However, two of the great Powers—strictly speaking, the two super Powers, if I may call them that—have been directly or indirectly involved in these local wars. That is sometimes quite ominous. It is as if those two Powers had been playing chess with the destinies of peoples—but not their own. And this has not necessarily been intentional; it may have been unwitting. The chess board is outside the countries of the great Powers. The game seems to be protracted and may push those great Powers into another world war which could easily bring about the extinction of mankind.

3. Hence, coexistence is not as calm as it may seem. On the contrary, deceptive currents underneath the illusory surface could cause a tidal wave which might without notice engulf us all. The signs of danger are no longer hidden. World tension is increasing. One of the great Powers, namely the Soviet Union, is alerting us to that portentous situation. We therefore should be thankful to the Soviet Union for having proposed the inscription of the

item under consideration in the form of an appeal for the strengthening of international security.

4. Some may take issue with the Soviet Union because the appeal it has submitted does not spell out any concrete measures to correct the errors committed in the aftermath of the Second World War. On the other hand, we gather from the statement of the United States representative that the present machinery of the United Nations, as it is being run today, is quite adequate to bring about international peace and security. While Mr. Malik, on behalf of his Government, has manifested concern about the future and is prodding us to strengthen the machinery for ensuring international security, our friend Mr. Coleman seems to be complacent—on the surface, at least—and to feel that there is no dire urgency for adopting extraordinary measures but that business should go on as usual within the present framework of the United Nations Charter. Be that as it may, we the representatives of small nations have no right to be smug about the world situation, which I dare say is worsening from day to day—and there is no assurance that it will not end in catastrophe.

5. Therefore, I should like to marshal the facts, not the facts of today but the historical facts, those of the last 50 years or so—facts that I have seen unfold in the aftermath of two world wars. As someone who has lived through both these global conflicts, I do so in the hope that I shall be able to bring out certain conclusions, or at least comparisons, which may throw sufficient light on the present situation with a view to averting trouble by learning from past mistakes.

6. I shall therefore give specific examples and avoid talking in generalities and platitudes. Nor shall I resort to the insinuations that have characterized many a statement before this Committee. We cannot afford to talk like professors of political science in seminars. We should grapple with the facts. In so doing we may perhaps jolt the peoples of the world into the consciousness that something new, a conceptual plan, should be devised lest we founder like the League of Nations before us.

7. Coexistence no longer implies the existence side by side of two or more Powers with different social systems. No doubt a radical transformation has been taking place during the last 10 years or so in the socio-economic structure of States, with the result that a resurgent brand of nationalism has become quite evident. However, that new brand of nationalism is dependent for its survival on co-operation amongst States irrespective of the political philosophy they have chosen to embrace. Many communists today look and behave somewhat like contented and enlightened capitalists; and conversely, capitalists in responsible positions

quite often act like harassed socialists endeavouring to satisfy the ever-increasing demands of disgruntled segments of the population.

8. Whereas the old nationalisms largely concerned themselves with clashing, narrow self-interests which sometimes lead to costly conflicts, the emphasis of the new brand of nationalism, nowadays, is on economic co-operation and the establishment of cultural exchanges between States.

9. However, the ambition for wielding tremendous power has not abated nor has the yearning for national vainglory diminished. Nations big and small still pride themselves on their gross national income and their standard of living on the one hand, and the display of their prowess on the other hand. Nations are like individuals; they still yearn for wealth, power and glory. And, like individuals, nations vie with one another in seeking to increase their wealth, extend their power and bask in the sun of a glorious image of their country.

10. In his statement our colleague from Brazil lucidly epitomized for us the role power plays in international relations [*1653rd meeting*], and I must say his analysis contributed a great deal to our understanding of the present situation. Had it not been for the United Nations which is intended to regulate the wanton conduct of States—and that in the light of the Charter—and thereby give certain States a face-saving excuse to curb their excessive power, we would already have had a third world war.

11. Ironically, the balance of nuclear terror also contributed to self-restraint. But it would indeed be dangerous were we to depend on the balance of nuclear terror for maintaining universal peace. Constant terror leads to constant tension which in turn may erupt in violence. And there can be no safety in a world that is always living in fear. But before we had the balance of nuclear terror, we had since the sixteenth century been regulated in international affairs by the balance of power and spheres of influence. The epitome of that balance of power was manifest in the Congress of Vienna in 1815 when the protagonists of Europe in that era tried to find a formula by which to maintain the peace of a Europe that had suffered from many conflicts.

12. But the balance of power boomeranged. In 1848 there was revolution in Europe, and I do not have to remind my colleague from the United States that this country, the host country, gained a lot from that revolution of 1848 for there was an exodus of people that deemed themselves suppressed and they constituted the core from which this great country developed. Have we got rid of the balance of power? I submit that in our era, in the era of the United Nations, leaving aside the balance of nuclear terror, international conduct is still regulated by the policy of balance of power and spheres of influence.

13. We thought that the First World War had given us a tragedy which would have pumped some sense into the minds of responsible leaders all over the world. But we find that the leaders of the victorious Powers committed worse mistakes than they had at Versailles. In the 1920s I was a young man—I lived through that era of Versailles. And what did Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd George do? They

gerrymandered Europe arbitrarily without due regard to the right of self-determination of peoples and nations. They even created a town called Danzig on the Baltic which they connected by a corridor which was later known as the Polish corridor. They included certain German segments of the population in another State in central Europe and whilst they spoke of the self-determination of people, whose protagonist was the then President of the United States, Mr. Wilson, when they dismembered the Ottoman Empire secretly they forgot about the freedom and liberation that they had promised to those people. I have only to cite the Sykes-Picot-Sazonov Agreement—although in fairness to the Russian Sazonov, after the Revolution his name was dropped out of that Agreement—when the Russians, during the 1917 Revolution, handed over at the Brest-Litovsk Conference that paper which has created so much trouble in the Middle East.

14. I am talking specifically, not in abstract terms. Many of the territories of the Middle East were placed under mandates—which was colonialism in disguise—and in fairness to the Soviet people under the Revolution they proclaimed that all people should be liberated. No wonder the Soviet Union has made great incursions in the Middle East for it had had no colonial history in that area. But, I am not going to go into too many details because I would leave nothing to say in the Special Political Committee about Palestine. There is plenty to say, but I want to use the time profitably in developing my thesis before this Committee.

15. I just forgot to mention that the *raison d'être* of the First World War were slogans such as “To fight German militarism”—they having forgotten that France was the greatest military Power challenged by Germany and that Britain was the biggest naval Power. America had a few gunboats that it sent to Latin America at that time, but it depended on the British fleet for their safety. They had the Monroe Doctrine which they seem to have forgotten nowadays. They were isolationists. What were the slogans? “To fight German militarism”. In fact it was to fight German mercantilism that was making inroads into the markets not only of the Middle East but the whole of Asia, Africa and Latin America. That was the whole crux of the First World War, and people were driven to the battlefields like sheep driven to the slaughterhouse.

16. We have only to go to Verdun to see the thousands upon thousands buried there in a forest of tombstones. Self-determination was cast by the wayside. Germany was beleaguered. Children died because the Allies did not allow milk to be sent to the Germans. No wonder that when one suppresses a people it develops a psychosis. That psychosis in Germany produced Hitler. Versailles was responsible for Hitler. And we have not learnt much from the lessons of history. No sooner had the Treaty of Versailles been signed than the Allies fell apart—and I witnessed the rivalry of the French and the British in my own area, the Middle East. I shall draw the parallel when I come to the Second World War, because if we do not marshal the facts we shall learn nothing from history and we shall commit the same mistakes—and I am afraid we are committing the same mistakes nowadays.

17. It took 20 years for the Second World War to erupt: 1919 to 1939. The seeds of the Second World War were

sown by the victorious Allies, with the exception of Russia, which had its own revolution and civil war. No wonder that some of us see some portents that do not augur well for the future in the aftermath of the second world conflict. Even before the Charter saw the light in San Francisco, those who hoped to be victorious in the Second World War were partitioning countries and bisecting territories without due regard to the principle of self-determination. That was done in the name of international security.

18. To begin with, look at the map of Europe—we shall come later to Asia. What did the Allies do in Potsdam, in Yalta, in their conferences in Cairo and in other secret conclaves and caucuses? In Korea they drew a line which they called the 38th Parallel. Two years ago I spoke to a very good friend about that great blunder which had been made for the security of the great Powers. I asked him: "What right did they have to bisect a country? They indeed lacked the wisdom of Solomon." You remember that story in the Bible. Solomon asked the two claimants to cut the child in two—and he pumped sense into their heads.

19. I have been told by a number of my colleagues here that ideology is more important than ethnology. In other words, the same family, the same people should be divided on ideological grounds. Why was that done? For international security and establishing positions of power for those who arrogated to themselves the duty of maintaining world peace. One would think that these things had been decided before the United Nations Charter was written. What about Viet-Nam in 1954, when a country that was ethnologically the same was divided into two parts, which in the name of ideology were pitted as enemies one against the other.

20. Every Power sings the praises of its preserve. We are told that South Viet-Nam is a democratic country and North Viet-Nam is a dictatorial country. Conversely, we are told by the other party that there is a puppet Government in South Viet-Nam, and that North Viet-Nam represents a free socialist experiment in Asia. Whom are we going to believe? What is what? We know that the country has been divided into two parts: ethnology is not important; ideology transcends ethnology.

21. What happened to Germany? I do not know whether the people of East Germany and the people of West Germany are of different cultures. I visited Germany before the Second World War, in fact between the two world wars. The Germans were a well-knit people with a common culture, a common language and common traditions. But in the heat of victory what did the Allies do in the wake of the Second World War? They not only bisected Germany, but also garrisoned Berlin and divided it into four sections. I think that the mistakes of the Second World War were far more serious than those of the First World War which sowed the seeds of this last global conflict.

22. I come now to my area, the Middle East, which I have left to the last. The President of a great country, who himself was in San Francisco—I saw him and shook hands with him there—in 1947 cast to the four winds paragraph 2 of Article 1, which states:

"To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-

determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace."

23. Is there any "universal peace" with the Middle East festering as a result of the partition that was brought about because of the narrow national interest not only of a State but also of a person who wanted votes? Why did he not open the gates of the United States to the persecuted Jews, to harbour them? They were in need of care after they had suffered so much from Nazi Germany. I will not go into detail about this question because it is being discussed by the Security Council and in another Committee of the General Assembly.

24. As I said, our colleague from the Soviet Union, or rather his Government, is to be thanked for sensing that things are going from bad to worse. He did not want to frighten us at this stage, so Mr. Gromyko read that appeal. I took issue with him; I told him at that time that I would have liked to see some concrete measures included for rectifying the situation. I was given to understand that the appeal was a first step to see what the reaction of the United Nations would be to such an appeal. And what do we do here? Many of us come and do our homework and read dissertations in the General Assembly. I can assure you that if, God forbid, this United Nations breaks up, we shall be recruited overnight by the major universities of the world for the lucidity of our exposition in abstract terms of political theory. None of us here will be out of a job. We shall all be recruited as professors of political science in the institutes of higher learning. But we have not grappled with the situation. And I, being in my seventh decade, find it my duty to raise my voice, not addressing my colleagues who, most of them, are wearing the strait jacket of instructions, but trying to address, if I may, the world at large.

25. Look at the galleries. They used to be filled ten years ago. Nobody takes us seriously any more. They may be the leaven of the future, those young people sitting there in the galleries. I think the television services are more interested in devising more commercials with songs and the people are more interested in cosmetics and fads and fashions than in our work in the United Nations. That is deplorable, because if we do not heed the portents, if we do not read the handwriting on the wall, we shall dissolve like a grain of salt in a glass of water.

26. As has rightly been said, the question of strengthening international security is closely bound up with the internal state of affairs in every nation. The two world wars were instrumental in waking up peoples everywhere. As I said, the young no longer go by slogans. They are questioning the old fogies of my generation—and there are many of them—and threatening them all over the world. They will not be driven like sheep to the slaughterhouse any more. They are demonstrating all over the world. They want peace. It is their lives that they want to order. They do not want to have their lives moulded for them, to be sent out to wreak destruction and to have their lives nipped in the bud.

27. What should we do constructively? I said that we should have a conceptual plan rather than engage in an analysis of the situation without giving any remedy. Can there be any remedy? Can there be any solution? Well, we have an item called general disarmament; we have a treaty

which is in the process of being ratified, about non-proliferation of nuclear weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*]. But armament goes on at a pace much swifter than that of the slow progress that is being made in the field of disarmament. How can we bring about peace when there is so much distrust among nations big and small, in fairness to the super-Powers? I stated, a few years ago, several suggestions which I am going to elaborate now at greater length.

28. I think the United Nations should embark on a convention that will free anyone below the age of 35 from conscription. Armies, unless they are needed for self-defence, when everyone should fight to defend his homeland, should be drawn from men between the ages of 40 and 45. We would have no more war. Those people who wage wars, those between 40 and 55, why do they want only the young men to be sacrificed, when modern warfare is a pushbutton operation in which you hear very little about fighting by the infantry?

29. It is all a question nowadays of rockets, napalm and all kinds of lethal diabolical weapons that need not muscular strength but technology. I think that those people in the 40 to 55 age bracket would be more skilful in using technology with the background of experience they may have gathered. I assure the Committee that they will think twice before allowing themselves to be drafted to go to war. That is a bold statement I am making, but why not air it? Let the young people in every country clamour that, unless a war is for self-defence, they do not want to be sacrificed to serve the interest—enlightened or dark interest, or narrow interest—of their elders.

30. Another convention should be elaborated so that mothers may be polled about war. I am talking about mothers. I am sure that 95 per cent of mothers would not want to see their sons march into war, to kill and be killed. I must say that men have been bankrupt since the patriarchal days. It is men who have waged war throughout history, not women. Do not go by Catherine the Great and a few others. It was the men who probably sold her the idea of aggrandizement. And there was Elizabeth I. She had her Lord Essex and Sir Walter Raleigh, the pirates of those days. You see, they were pirates, just as there are pirates in our days. They just wrested the land from Spain, from the Conquistadors. We know about that.

31. Let us give the mothers a chance, by the instrumentality of a convention, to decide whether wars should be waged, unless of course—and always make this reservation—they are wars of legitimate self-defence. Why should we not, instead of submitting so many resolutions and items, elaborate a convention that would regulate the research of scientists who are enlisted in secret projects of lethal weapons, whereby they would take an oath that their discoveries would not be used for the destruction of man. What is wrong with that idea? I am trying to think aloud and see how we can enlist all the scientists engaged in research to rebel and disclose any secret weapon that is being made in order not just to kill men but to bring about genocide, to kill men wholesale.

32. That is my third point. We should not rely on the great Powers to be the policemen of the world. They will go

bankrupt if they do. They are self-sufficient, but they will go bankrupt. They are self-sufficient economically and financially, I daresay. The United States has a population that does not amount to more than about 6.5 per cent of the world population. I believe that the Soviet Union's population, also approximately, does not amount to more than 8.5 per cent. If they are going to continue to wield power and to have clients all over the world—whom, of course, they have to subsidize—they will go bankrupt. I know what I am speaking about from the financial point of view.

33. In 1945 the dollar was worth twice as much as it is worth today. It is eroding. So are the currencies of Western Europe, of the victorious Powers, so to speak. Who has the strongest economy? The Germans, the defeated Power. They were the victors economically. Can we not draw a lesson from past mistakes that it is really the victor nowadays who is defeated economically? We do not want the Soviet Union and the United States to continue to police the world, because I think that they make a bad job of it. They cannot afford it. I do not know about the ruble. I believe that our Soviet friends have a controlled economy and they seem to manage all right. But this is no way to divide the world into spheres of influence and to have clients.

34. That is not enough. Pending the devising of instruments by way of covenants or treaties or conventions, we could pave the way for familiarizing the whole world with the United Nations. Today, we have too many raucous national voices—I do not have to specify them—that disseminate their propaganda, their ideology, their way of life, claiming that they are superior to the way of life or ideology of another State. That is causing cleavages in the world.

35. Why not have the voice of the United Nations. Oh, you might say: We have a few language broadcasts, is that not enough? I submit that it is not enough. How can this be accomplished? This can be accomplished by utilizing an information satellite that would broadcast and televise the activities of the United Nations to the whole world. I have obtained some information about how this could be done. As the Committee knows, those engaged in outer space activities have the means to launch such a project for the United Nations.

36. We know that by the end of 1969 nearly 50 earth stations for transmitting and receiving signals to and from satellites will have been established the world over. The cost of an earth station is between \$3 million and \$4 million. Under the interim agreement INTELSAT—"SAT" is an abbreviation of satellite—which has no legal personality and is only a joint venture of Member States, is at present managed by COMSAT, an American commercial firm. The United States Government, with an investment quota of 53 per cent, holds the majority of votes and the veto power—again we come to the veto here—in the governing body of INTELSAT.

37. I heard that the Soviet Union was keenly interested in a joint venture with the United States for a satellite to broadcast news. Not the Voice of Moscow, nor the Voice of America, nor the BBC and Big Ben, nor some of our

raucous voices in Africa or the Middle East—they are just as raucous, although perhaps not as subtle as the propagandists of the West—but the voice of the United Nations. The activities of the United Nations should be broadcast to the whole world so as to involve the peoples of the world and commit them to the United Nations. What is wrong with that project?

38. Both the Soviet Union and the United States are spending billions on space projects. Can they not earmark \$3 million or \$4 million—and we pay our share, if we are assessed—so that we may have the voice of the United Nations? Managed by whom? By United Nations personnel with high qualities. We have had enough of propaganda.

39. The mass media of information today practice the three Ss. The correspondents are an honest crowd but beware of the owners and the editors behind them. The three Ss are the scissors, slanting the news and silence. It only pleases the mass media of information—the major ones amongst them—to print what suits them, and most of the news is unfit to print.

40. Is this all, Sir? I have taken a long time. I could take more time.

41. Our colleague from the Soviet Union did not show his concern. He has a very smiling, open face. But we are concerned—the small nations. Mr. Coleman from the United States has a legal mind; he need not be concerned. But what about us, the small nations? We are the people who are concerned. And, as I said, the checkerboard is our territories, and they are playing chess on it.

42. Following the old pattern of the League of Nations, what assurance do we have that, since the blunders have been compounded, we will not have a third world war by miscalculation? What assurance do we have that, while they are experimenting with gases and biological weapons, some scientist might not think of having some aerosol bottles filled with germs and take it upon himself to spray many countries and spray mankind—a misanthrope? You think misanthropes are only in Molière's play? There are many misanthropes. They might spray us with germs.

43. What is to prevent a pilot from going berserk and taking a few of those small, eggshaped bombs—hydrogen or nuclear or whatever you call them—and saying, "To hell with this world?" We have no assurance. We are playing with fire. We are playing with bombs. We are playing with germs.

44. And here we talk about what should be done and should not be done in resolutions, adding one word, subtracting another word, engaging in semantics, the game of language, which means different things to people who want them to mean one thing. Hence we finish up by meaning what we do not say and saying what we do not mean. This is our problem: saying what we do not mean and meaning what we do not say. The whole world should be involved in the United Nations, and the only way it can be involved is to broadcast the work of the United Nations by satellite, if possible.

45. The pressure of populations is getting greater in every country. People will not stand for our lackadaisical at-

titude. I have heard that it is said—and I must repeat it so that I may jolt my colleagues here—that diplomats of the United Nations are having a good time. It is true; we have a good time once in a while. They go to receptions, they dine on the best foods; and although the air in New York is polluted, it is filtered in this glass house, and their jobs are sinecures. That is what people are saying about us.

46. Many of us read dissertations here on how to solve our problems. Our politicians are far from being statesmen, and they send instructions based on the reports of many self-styled experts. I know who the self-styled experts are. I come from a region which has been seized with a problem for 45 years, and people from a distance of 7,000 or 3,000 miles tell us what we should do in our area—self-styled experts.

47. In conclusion, I must say that we small countries can play an effective role. We can become the catalytic agents for bringing about world peace. I was heartened when I read the statement of my colleague from Finland offering Helsinki as headquarters for a conference about European security. I was heartened when I passed through Vienna this year to see how some United Nations agencies are functioning there. It gave me hope when I passed through Geneva last summer to know how effective a small country can be in mending the broken currencies of victorious countries—the Swiss banks bolstering those currencies. You know them, without my naming them.

48. Small countries can play a great role. Such small countries as Ceylon and Nepal in Asia, like Cyprus and Lebanon in our area, they can involve themselves and play a great role as catalysts for bringing about world peace. I am not going into the details of racism and of the few enclaves of colonialism that remain in Africa; these will be dealt with in good time.

49. I think countries like Austria, like Switzerland, like Finland, like Cambodia for that matter, like Ceylon, like Nepal, like Lebanon, like Cyprus can play major roles in becoming catalysts for world peace, and that we small Powers should not abdicate our future to the policy of the balance of power or the balance of nuclear terror, which seems to preserve the peace on a very shaky foundation.

50. In conclusion I should like to say that we should co-operate with our colleague from the Soviet Union to see whether—using the suggestions that have been made here, especially by my colleague from Barbados and by others—we can abridge the appeal which I think is a little too long; whether we can make it a little more cohesive; what we can do to prepare the way for future action after we present it to our respective Governments. We must see how we can involve the United States, the other great Power, in also taking a lead in devising ways and means for bringing about world peace. But above all we must see how we in the United Nations can familiarize the old and the young with our work so that after all we may be able to carry out projects that indeed would lead to world peace.

51. How can we finance such big projects for world peace? I have put forward in the Fifth Committee certain ideas on how to make the United Nations solvent. For, as many of you may know, this Organization is on the brink

of bankruptcy, and it should not always send an SOS to those who contribute the lion's share, because those big countries may at this stage of their historical development exact a high price for that which they contribute.

52. There should be a plan—and I would reiterate it here—of earmarking at least one quarter of 1 per cent of national defence budgets to the United Nations as a premium for ensuring world peace. I would say that there should be a revenue stamp for international trade, something like tuppence or two cents, which would not be a tax, but which should be affixed on invoices that reflect world trade between nations. We should make sure that committees would be formed in every country to solicit funds from individuals, not only from Governments, and this would mean involvement of the people in the United Nations. We should think aloud and see why it should not be feasible to ask those countries which are spending billions on outer space to earmark part of their budgets to a United Nations information satellite. Such revenues would amount to at least half a billion to a billion dollars on the conservative side. Then we can think of peace-keeping operations, but not before we have the butter with which to fry the eggs. We have an Arabic proverb which says that you cannot fry eggs in air.

53. We speak of peace-keeping operations; we have been seized of this subject for many years, getting nowhere because of our insolvency. It is that sense of commitment, that sense of involvement, that should grip all of us, not only here but outside the walls of the United Nations, with no limit, so that it may reach the people in big towns, small towns, villages and hamlets, and let them know that it may not yet be too late to save mankind from annihilation on this earth.

54. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, you have asked us to refrain from congratulating you; however, we should merely like to express our great satisfaction at seeing you preside over this Committee since we are among those in the General Assembly who had the agreeable privilege of supporting your nomination.

55. We also wish to congratulate Mr. Kolo of Nigeria and Mr. Barnett of Jamaica on their elections to their respective posts as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

56. My delegation welcomes the initiative taken by the USSR [A/7654], which has put forward for our very careful consideration and for examination and approval by the Governments of all States, whether Members or not of the United Nations, an appeal for the strengthening of international peace and security.

57. When we undertake the examination of such a problem, two considerations come to mind. First, we think of the spectre of the last world war, which cost mankind millions of lives, caused extensive damage and left visible traces, even after a quarter of a century, in many countries of Europe. The other consideration is that the two great Powers, together with other Powers, one of which is not a Member of the United Nations, now have means of destruction that could lead the world into a cataclysm.

58. And a paradox is that one of the interlocutors—after all we are all participants in this dialogue—a nuclear Power, which in addition represents more than a quarter of mankind, is arbitrarily excluded from these debates in which we seek to strengthen international peace and security. This great spokesman, the People's Republic of China, certainly inhabits our planet, which means that the subjects we discuss and the decisions we shall take are of as much concern to it as to us.

59. It is therefore normal that our instinct for self-preservation should cause us to think. We know that all peoples of the world aspire to peace. We also know that international security depends much more on Governments and their policies. Peace is inseparable from security and no continent can have an easy conscience when elsewhere insecurity permanently prevails.

60. That leads us to define the principal causes of the threat to international peace and security. My country's foreign policy is based on the principles of non-alignment.

61. Whereas in the past war was the exclusive concern of the strong, and it was confined to the limits of certain countries, today it concerns all of mankind. Since the last world conflict we can confidently affirm that mankind is in a permanent state of war. There are wars in Korea, in Viet-Nam, in Angola, in Mozambique, in Guinea (Bissau), and there is smouldering or open warfare in Latin America.

62. The problem which looms largest is not essentially that of safeguarding international peace and security but that of the total liberation of peoples fighting for their independence, no matter how limited these conflicts may be. Can international peace and security be strengthened when States Members of our Organization continue to support Portugal in its colonial wars, when numerous and varied forms of aid are provided to the fascist Government of South Africa, and when the people of Viet-Nam have, for a quarter of a century, been subjected to destruction unparalleled in the history of mankind?

63. Thus we have to recognize that there exists a permanent state of war which is in itself an implicit renunciation of the spirit of peace. Should we strengthen this relative peace and selective security and consider as threats only the prospect of a conflict between Powers possessing thermonuclear and biological and chemical weapons?

64. Thus international peace and security are not and cannot be objectives in themselves, the mystique of which could mobilize world public opinion. The strengthening of international peace and security not only requires the immediate cessation of the permanent state of war that has existed since the end of the last world conflict, but it also presupposes a whole body of achievements at the national and human level, safeguarding first of all and above all men's lives and then their right to a life worth living.

65. The strengthening of international peace and security would mean that peace was the condition *sine qua non* for the introduction of an era of justice in all fields and at all levels, justice that should be reflected in the real equality of all men in accordance with the principles of the Declaration

of Human Rights and the United Nations Charter within one nation and in all nations the world over, without distinction as to race or religion.

66. The maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security would enable all States, and in particular the small States, to develop freely amid the institutions that these peoples had chosen in complete freedom. Domestic interference, *diktats*, economic pressure and coups d'état engineered from afar for the needs of foreign causes, creating instability everywhere, imposing yesmen, puppets and lackeys of imperialism are part of a new strategy for the creation, maintenance and enlargement of the spheres of influence of certain Powers and are thus a source of insecurity for the harmonious development of young States. Any attempt to undermine the effective liberty of a State should be considered as an act of aggression endangering international peace and security. Such an act of aggression is not characterized by the nature or size of the means used, but by the fact that it alienates the life, rights and freedom of men or nations in their mutual relations, which thus necessarily becomes antagonistic.

67. International peace and security cannot be strengthened either unless the problem of world economic development is properly equated. The disparities and differences between poor countries and rich countries, between the so-called under-developed, insufficiently developed or developing countries and the technically developed countries are increasing day by day and the gap is becoming increasingly difficult to fill. If we are to strengthen international peace and security, we should act in such a way that the next United Nations Development Decade does not prove a second failure. To achieve this there must be greater universal solidarity, technical development must be harmonized and applied to the real needs of men, and justice must rest on a better foundation.

68. The strengthening of international peace and security must be founded on justice. The argument of force or the law of the jungle must not prevail in relations among nations. Military conquests and military occupation of any State by another State should not only be condemned, but should end immediately. Colonization, racial discrimination, international brigandage by the white minority in Rhodesia and by South Africa in Namibia are such shocking facts that we may well ask ourselves whether our Organization itself is not in the grip of a crisis. Our Charter, based on principles that were noble in their ideals, is becoming ever less workable, depending as it does upon the interpretation which each Member State wishes to place upon it. We say we all belong to the same religion, but we do not believe in the same God. The Security Council adopts fine resolutions but encounters obstacles which it sets itself as it proceeds along its course. In Commissions, in Committees, as in the General Assembly, the substance is sacrificed to the form, but basically within the framework of the Charter. It is therefore high time, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, to realize in all objectivity that if at Lake Success there were about 40 Member countries, today there are 126.

69. The framework has become too cramped even if the principles are good. This calls for a new evaluation and a

better adaptation of the Charter so that there may be more force and confidence in the resolutions and recommendations taken in the Security Council or the General Assembly. The strengthening of international peace and security depends on that.

70. In conclusion, may I quote the President of the Republic of Guinea, who, in defining our concept of the important problem of international peace and security, stated:

“We must not confuse peace, as it is defined by some, with the appearance of peace, when imperialistic aggression, openly or covertly is being manifested more and more in various regions of the world, when the greater portion of consumer goods is concentrated in the hands of a quarter of the world's population, and when the highest technological and scientific achievements of mankind are used for the manufacture of destructive weapons or for unjustifiable investment in prestige, when men are forced to fight to regain their freedom and their dignity which has been scorned, and when the world's resources are utilized without heed for the priority needs of those who produce them.

“Heretofore the maintenance of peace has been linked to the balance of forces and interests that the peoples of Europe and America have been attempting to set up between two conflicts. Apart from the precarious nature of that balance, the maintenance of peace in the world is characterized by a new form of confrontation of opposing forces, namely the cold war, or an attempted stabilization of those forces in a position of warlike watchfulness.

“This concept of international peace and security envisaged as a phase of the struggle for influence engaged in by the great States and which they impose *ipso facto* on other peoples should be denounced by all nations that wish to contribute something new in a new perspective.

“For the Republic of Guinea, peace is not an interlude between two wars; nor is it a compromise between divergent interests. It should, above all, be the result of the elimination of the fundamental causes of insecurity in the world. Thus it cannot be the concern of the great Powers alone, but should, on the contrary, require the active and enlightened participation of all peoples in the struggle that must be waged, not to help the dangerous strategy of the balance of forces, but rather in the true interests of all nations. While in the obvious interests of all nations, the Republic of Guinea unreservedly supports decisions which may be taken to promote a reduction in international tensions, it intends also resolutely to oppose any effort to set up a *status quo* which would maintain the inadmissible differences, discriminations and unjust inequalities existing in the living conditions of nations and in the relations established between countries”.

71. It is in that spirit that my delegation welcomes the appeal launched by the Soviet Union. This is a basic document and an important contribution towards restoring, stabilizing and strengthening international peace and security.

72. Mr. CHIMIDDORJ (Mongolia) (*translated from Russian*): Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to welcome you on

behalf of my delegation as well worthy to preside over our Committee. I congratulate you as the representative of a country with which the Mongolian People's Republic maintains good-neighbourly relations. I also congratulate the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

73. May it be a good omen for us all that the Committee has begun its work by discussing the highly important question of strengthening international peace and security.

74. The United Nations is on the threshold of the second quarter-century of its existence. We have reached a point where we can and must realistically, without overestimating or minimizing, analyse the stage that lies behind us and assess the activities of the United Nations in the light of the world situation today. As we all know, the founders of the United Nations, having in mind the sad experience of the League of Nations, which because of its inherent defects had been unable to prevent the fascist forces from precipitating the Second World War, set themselves a clear goal: to shape the United Nations into a universal security organization, capable of rapidly and resolutely arresting acts of aggression and breaches of the peace, and of preventing another military conflict on a world scale. This, and only this, is the primary task of the United Nations.

75. The yardstick, the criterion, which should be used to determine the effectiveness of the United Nations and evaluate its activity is the extent to which mankind is safe from the threat of war and to which general security is guaranteed. If we view United Nations activity over a quarter of a century from this angle, then, despite some achievements to its credit, we are forced to note with regret that we are still far from a world in which the peoples could peacefully, without a thought for the morrow, devote their creative labour and their energies to producing things of material and spiritual value and bringing about better living conditions.

76. The Secretary-General is quite right when he states in the Introduction to his annual report that "the world now stands at a most critical crossroads."¹ Indeed the world has not yet attained that stable peace to which the United Nations had aspired when they were being tossed in the maelstrom of the last war and were deeply aware of their responsibility both to the millions of victims who had laid down their lives to overcome fascism and to the generations to come. The principles of the United Nations Charter which should be the basis for relations and for peaceful and equal co-operation among States, and which indeed should govern international life as a whole, are not always observed. We still witness flagrant contravention and open violation of these principles by certain circles in whose interest it is to maintain international tensions and prevent the national and social liberation of peoples. They have caused the peoples to experience some anxious moments, in particular during the aggression against the People of Korea and revolutionary Cuba and numerous crises in the Taiwan Straits and central Europe. The continuing armed aggression against the Viet-Nameese people and the Arab States shows that situations fraught with danger for world peace and security still exist.

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, paragraph 41.

77. It is a matter of common knowledge that colonial domination has not yet been fully overthrown and that many peoples are still engaged in a bitter but just struggle for their national and social liberation. The arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, far from having stopped, continues apace, despite the efforts of the socialist and other peace-loving States to attain general and complete disarmament. Some countries are not only developing and stockpiling chemical and bacteriological weapons, but are beginning to consider the use of such monstrous methods of destruction and annihilation as man-produced floods and earthquakes. In the military establishments of States and aggressive blocs, men are coolly working out plans for waging world and local wars with and without the use of nuclear arms and other weapons of mass destruction.

78. The fact that the world situation is so acute and likely to deteriorate naturally alarms the peoples and makes it incumbent on all States, both those which are Members of the United Nations and those which for any reason are not represented here, to undertake a collective effort to strengthen international security.

79. In my delegation's view, in order to reach agreement on effective measures to strengthen security we must take certain preliminary steps to improve the situation. My delegation has two comments to make in this connexion.

80. To begin with, every effort must be made to extinguish the flames of war that are raging today, explore every possibility to reduce the tension in various parts of the world and eliminate the causes of the prevailing atmosphere of mistrust and friction among States.

81. Secondly, we must seek ways and means, in a spirit of mutual understanding and good will, to normalize relations among States with different social systems on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, with a view to developing economic, cultural, scientific and technical collaboration among them.

82. My delegation is convinced that, once this groundwork has been done, it will be much easier to attain agreement on the central problems of guaranteeing security and maintaining peace throughout the world.

83. The USSR proposal on the strengthening of international security which is now under discussion aims at the realization of a broad range of effective measures to ease world tensions and, in the last analysis, to avert the threat of another world war.

84. In his statement here on 10 October, Mr. Malik gave a detailed explanation of the Soviet Union's purposes and motives.

85. Many other speakers have emphasized the extreme timeliness, constructiveness and importance of the measures proposed in the USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World [A/7654].

86. That the present USSR initiative is fully consonant with the objectives of Mongolia's foreign policy and the vital interests of the Mongolian people can be clearly seen from the statement made by Mr. Toiva, our Minister for

Foreign Affairs, in the general debate in plenary session [1777th plenary meeting].

87. I shall therefore not comment on the draft Appeal [A/C.1/L.468] in any great detail.

88. My delegation, representing as it does the people of a small country which has had ample experience of the sincere and consistent desire for peace that lies at the heart of USSR foreign policy, based on great Lenin's principles of the sovereign equality of peoples, wishes to declare that it fully supports the new USSR proposal for the strengthening of international security, both the content and the form of which are fully consonant with the universal nature of the problems dealt with.

89. What does the Soviet Union propose that we should do to strengthen security? Merely reaffirm the purposes and principles of the United Nations, or take positive and practical action?

90. As anyone can readily convince himself by making an impartial analysis of the draft Appeal to All States of the World, the Soviet Union proposes that we not merely recall well-known principles—which in itself is worthwhile in the present circumstances, when some persons, under capitalist pressure, have developed short memories—but that we eliminate the consequences of those acts, past and present, which seek to defeat the purposes of the United Nations and contravene its resolutions and declarations. I do not think it is difficult to draw a distinction between the reaffirmation of principles and the constructive proposals of steps to be taken to improve the international climate and strengthen world security.

91. The USSR draft Appeal to All States of the World on the strengthening of international security mentions such specific measures as: the withdrawal of all foreign troops unlawfully occupying the territories of other States; the complete elimination of the colonial system; the creation of regional security systems; observance by all States of the generally recognized principles governing international relations, and their prompt codification; and acceleration of the work on a definition of aggression and on arriving at an understanding on United Nations peace-keeping operations.

92. Furthermore, the draft contains serious proposals for enhancing the role and effectiveness of a principal United Nations organ—the Security Council—and ensuring that its resolutions are carried out.

93. In this connexion, my delegation would draw attention to the fact that there is a gap in the membership of the Security Council owing to the absence of an authentic representative of China.

94. The USSR proposals deal with vital questions facing the United Nations and the world as a whole. They contain nothing that might contravene the letter and spirit of the Charter or threaten the interests of any State sincerely desirous of averting threats to peace and security. My delegation believes that no Government which observes the Charter and is prepared to apply the principles of the Charter in its international relations could find anything to object to in section VII of the draft Appeal. No United

Nations resolution is of value unless it is supported by practical action on the part of Member States and is translated into reality by all States. Recognition of the fact that the world is indivisible implies that United Nations activities to strengthen security must not be confined to its membership but must extend to all States without exception.

95. In connexion with the statements of some representatives who doubted the advisability of adopting the USSR proposals at the current session, I should like to put forward two interrelated general considerations involving matters of principle.

96. Firstly, as the representative of a small country which is not a member of any military bloc, I should like to emphasize that in a question of life and death, such as the question of war and peace, there can be no neutrality. The cause of peace permits no one to be passive or to bide his time. Neutrality with regard to military blocs, or to relations among States with different social systems, presupposes that all countries which regard themselves as neutral must make active efforts towards ensuring general security and reaching an understanding on the cardinal problems of our day. This cannot be otherwise, for in modern conditions no country can maintain neutrality unless general security has been assured, especially in those areas where opposing forces confront each other.

97. I should like to quote the following passage:

“The policy of neutrality in Finland is not interpreted as an attempt to remain on the sidelines in case of war. It presupposes increasing activity for peace. Thanks to its policy of neutrality, Finland also found the best possible solution for the problem of its own security. We understand, however, that peace in Europe and in the world is in the last analysis indivisible and that the fate of neutral countries hangs upon it”.

This was written by Mr. Ahti Kardalinen, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Finland, a country whose devotion to peace and good-neighbourly relations is known to all.

98. That is precisely our own understanding of the policy of neutrality in our time, when the security of all countries is interdependent and the fate of mankind is at stake.

99. Secondly, as the representative of a socialist country, I should like to refute an entirely unfounded but frequently repeated argument. Here in the United Nations and in the press of many countries there is frequent mention of disputes between the super-Powers, without any reference to the fundamental difference between the purposes and methods of their policies, which are diametrically opposed. Moreover, such mention is often accompanied by slander on the peace-loving policy of world socialism and justification of the imperialist policy of oppression and war.

100. I must emphasize that what matters in such cases is what the policy aims at, and whom it seeks to protect—the aggressor or the victims of aggression, who defend their national independence and territorial integrity, and peace and tranquillity on earth. This was eloquently brought out by Mr. Awadalla, the Prime Minister of the Sudan, when he

said in the general debate in plenary session: “We do not stand in the middle of the road, maintaining a position of neutrality between the imperialist camp and the socialist countries. There can be no such neutrality for us” [1761st plenary meeting, para. 7].

101. We are convinced that a correct appraisal of the policy and practical action of the Soviet Union and other socialist States which have been consistently defending peace, democracy, national independence and social progress, is an essential prerequisite for victory in the struggle to protect mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe, and to eliminate whatever may prevent the peoples from living in peace and prosperity. Unless a sharp line is drawn between the main directions of these two policies, the United Nations will find it difficult to achieve its main purpose—the maintenance of international security.

102. In the light of these considerations, my delegation strongly urges the General Assembly to approve the draft Appeal to All States of the World submitted by the Soviet Union, a country which is not only sincerely concerned with peace, but which has assumed a tremendous financial burden to ensure a better, and a peaceful, future for all peoples.

103. Our conviction that the measures for the strengthening of international security proposed by the USSR delegation must and can be put into effect has been strengthened by the constructive statement made in our Committee yesterday by the USSR representative, a statement imbued with the spirit of good will, understanding and co-operativeness [1660th meeting].

104. Mr. GARCIA ROBLES (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): On the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, and in circumstances alarming enough to lead the Secretary-General to begin the introduction to his annual report with the statement that “During the past twelve months, the deterioration of the international situation, which I noted in the introduction to the annual report last year, has continued”,² surely few items could be more appropriately examined than the one which appears on our agenda under the title of “The strengthening of international security”.

105. If our debates are to have any prospect of being fruitful, we feel that they should aim first and foremost at elucidating, by means of a sober and objective analysis, the causes of the insecurity which prevails throughout the world in many fields, since this would allow us to consider what might be the best remedy for the disease diagnosed.

106. Let me state at the outset that in my delegation’s opinion the world’s ills in this sphere cannot be blamed on the United Nations Charter, whatever defects and lacunae the Charter may have from a strictly technical or academic standpoint.

107. When the United Nations was set up, nearly two and a half decades ago, the Charter in its very first Article stipulated as a fundamental principle that the Organization

should “maintain international peace and security”—which obviously did not mean and could not mean arbitrary peace and security subject to the whim of force. While the expression “in conformity with the principles of justice and international law” did not follow immediately after that phrase as was proposed by so many delegations, including my own, but was inserted in the same paragraph following the reference to means of peaceful settlement, the Committee dealing with that matter at San Francisco made it abundantly clear in its report that “there was no intention to let this notion lose any of its weight or strength, as an over-ruling norm of the whole Charter”, and that all States represented at the Conference “affirmed that peace, real and durable, cannot be based on anything other than justice.”

108. The Charter next set forth in unequivocal terms a whole series of measures, headed by those it calls “effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace” to be used to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security based on justice. The Charter likewise took care to define clearly, immediately after the purposes of the Organization, the principles which the Members agree to apply to attain those purposes.

109. What are those principles which, as may be seen from the official records of the Conference, were solemnly declared on that occasion to be the supreme rules in the light of which the Organization and its Members were to discharge their duties and undertook to attain the common purposes and which, as was added with great insight and sound common sense, would in practice constitute the touchstone of the effectiveness of the Organization?

110. To recall those which are most relevant to the item under consideration, we need only look at the Preamble and Chapter I of the Charter or at any of the many reports of the United Nations committee which has been concerned with most of them since 1964: the principle of the sovereign equality of States, on which the Organization is based; the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force; the principle of non-intervention; the principle stipulating the peaceful settlement of disputes; the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples; the principle of obligatory co-operation among States, and between States and the Organization, in accordance with the principles of the Charter; and the principle on which ultimately the effectiveness of all the others depends, namely that States must fulfil in good faith the obligations they have assumed under the Charter.

111. If we examine in the light of these principles the evolution of international relations during the last two and a half decades, and particularly in the last few years, we are inevitably led to the conclusion that the uneasy peace and the shaky security in the world are due to the fact that we have not followed these principles of the Charter designed as the supreme code of international conduct for the Members of the United Nations. And if we delve a little deeper, we reach the further conclusion that even though perhaps there is no State that can take a holier-than-thou attitude and refuse to accept any blame for this flouting of principles, whether by commission or by omission, the

² *Ibid.*, para. 1.

primary responsibility for the present disturbing situation lies with the great Powers which in a greater or lesser measure have ignored the obligations imposed on them by the Charter and accepted by them when they signed and ratified it.

112. In particular, the principles of the sovereign equality of States, the prohibition of the threat or use of force, non-intervention, and the right of peoples to self-determination, have frequently been a dead letter as far as the permanent members of the Security Council are concerned, like their undertaking to contribute to the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security “with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources”, to quote Article 26 of the Charter.

113. It would be easy to produce any number of irrefutable concrete examples to prove what I have just said, but it would be out of place either in a debate like the present one, which should maintain a high level, or in a statement like the one I am making, designed solely, as I have said before, to try to get to the root of the disease we are seeking to cure. But I nevertheless do think it desirable to explain why we are convinced that the responsibility of the great Powers should be described as “primary responsibility”.

114. The reason is first that since their resources, both economic and military, are infinitely superior to those of most Members, so likewise is their capacity to act to maintain and consolidate international peace and security. As was explained on the eve of the San Francisco Conference by one of the draftsmen of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that were to serve as a basis for the wording of the Charter, the system that was to be embodied in the Charter places the direct responsibility for international security on the shoulders of the nations most capable of bearing it.

115. This is obviously the only possible justification for the privileged status granted under the Charter to the permanent members of the Security Council; and my country made this clear in 1945, as is shown in the records of the appropriate Committee of the Conference. We requested—I myself had the privilege of submitting the request—that the following statement be included in the record:

“The Mexican delegation, in voting for the text of the Article relating to composition of the Security Council as approved by its Committee I, wishes to point out that it does so because it considers this text to be an implicit application . . . of the juridical principle of correlation between powers and duties which safeguards the basic principle of equal rights of all States.

“The Mexican delegation interprets this Article as the granting of broader rights to those States therein named to hold permanent seats on the Security Council, principally for the reason that those are the States whose responsibility for the maintenance of peace . . . is greater in the international community’ . . .”.

116. The permanent members of the Security Council have used—and let us admit it, have at times abused—the

broader rights granted to them under the voting procedures of the Council itself and various other provisions of the Charter. But they have certainly not likewise measured up to their broader responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

117. This responsibility on the great Powers is also a primary responsibility in respect both of their failure to act and of such of their actions as have involved overt or covert violations—some very serious—of the principles of the Charter. This has had a sinister influence, since there are medium-sized and small States which have no doubt begun to wonder why they should not regard themselves as entitled to follow that example. In some cases apparently they have decided that they were so entitled, which is hardly surprising, since the action of the great Powers in international life has effects similar to those which in the days of absolute monarchy the accession of a dissolute sovereign to the throne had on the morale of the nation, carrying along with him first his court and later a large section of the populace; or similar to the effect it has on public security in a city when high-level police officers are implicated in crimes that they more than anyone should avoid.

118. In the light of what I have just said, we wonder whether the appeal submitted for approval by the General Assembly ought not to be directed specifically to the great Powers. That was the case, as will be recalled, with the appeal made by the Mexican delegation more than 20 years ago at the third session of the General Assembly and unanimously adopted on 3 November 1948, later becoming resolution 190 (III): “Appeal to the great Powers to renew their efforts to compose their differences and establish a lasting peace.” We are convinced that if those Powers took their obligations seriously and carried out faithfully their undertakings under the multilateral treaty known as the Charter, international security would automatically be strengthened and the system of organized collective action spelt out in detail in Chapters VI, VII and VIII of the Charter would take on a new lease of life. Nevertheless, we would have no objection, if it were found preferable, to any appeal of this kind being directed to all States provided that where appropriate it was expressly stated that it was directed in particular to the great Powers having permanent seats on the Security Council.

119. Another general comment I would like to make concerns the importance of emphasizing somewhere in the draft appeal the need to ensure that such exhortations as it contains do not remain a dead letter but generate appropriate action. This is one of the crucial points, since people are beginning to tire of fine phrases and fanciful promises. Let me illustrate what I have just said by citing a question to which my delegation—and I think the same is true of many other Latin American delegations—attaches particular importance.

120. For a number of years the nuclear Powers have emphasized that nuclear-weapon-free zones, established on the initiative of the States in any particular zone, should be encouraged and supported in the interests of strengthening peace and security, curbing the arms race, and preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The delegation submitting the draft appeal now under consideration has

gone further and stated that the responsibility for creating denuclearized zones may be assumed not only by groups of States covering entire continents or vast geographical regions but also by small groups of States and even by individual countries.

121. Nearly two years ago, on 5 December 1967, the General Assembly satisfactorily rounded off the discussions of the First Committee concerning the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, or Treaty of Tlatelolco,³—discussions which had abounded in expressions of the warmest praise for that instrument—by adopting without a single dissenting vote resolution 2286 (XXII) in which it was declared that the Treaty constituted “an event of historic significance in the efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to promote international peace and security”, and invited the Powers possessing nuclear weapons “to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty as soon as possible”. That invitation was to become the exhortation adopted by the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States held at Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968 and reiterated by the General Assembly itself on 20 December 1968 in resolution 2456 A, B, C and D (XXII), likewise adopted without a single negative vote.

122. However, despite these renewed exhortations; despite the fact that as a result of the Treaty there is today a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America comprising territories of over 5.5 million square kilometres with a population of approximately 100 million inhabitants—an area and population that will continue to grow as the number of States parties to the Treaty increases; despite the establishment on 2 September last at Mexico City of the Agency for Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, known by its Spanish acronym OPANAL, at a solemn ceremony honoured by the presence of the United Nations Secretary-General U Thant, who stated among other things that “in a world that all too often seems dark and foreboding, the Treaty of Tlatelolco will shine as a beacon light”, that “in the scope of its prohibitions and its control features” it exceeds the Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and that “the creation of the zone is in full accord with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter”; despite the fact that the obligations on the nuclear Powers under Additional Protocol II are nothing more in substance than the application to a concrete case of their general commitments under the United Nations Charter, since they are restricted to the undertaking to respect the “statute of denuclearization of Latin America in respect of warlike purposes” and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the Contracting Parties of the Treaty”; despite the fact that almost three years have now elapsed since both the Treaty and its Additional Protocols were declared open for signature on 14 February 1967; despite all this, I repeat, as of today Additional Protocol II has been signed by only two of the four nuclear Powers represented in the United Nations—the United Kingdom and the United States—and has still not been ratified by any of them.

123. This, it appears to us, is clear evidence to suggest that there is no need for a fresh appeal by the General Assembly

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-second Session, Annexes, agenda item 91 (A/C.1/946).

to demonstrate concretely the will to contribute to the strengthening of international security.

124. With respect to the draft text, [AC.1/468] formally submitted to the Committee by the representative of the Soviet Union on 10 October, my delegation would like for the time being to confine itself to three specific comments which incidentally coincide wholly or partly with those already made by representatives who have spoken ahead of me.

125. We consider that any document of this kind should give a suitably prominent place—and in our opinion this is not the case with the present text—to the fundamental principles that prohibit both the threat and the use of force in international relations and direct or indirect intervention, for whatever reason, in the internal or external affairs of another State.

126. We would make the same stipulation in regard to disarmament, which we believe should be treated in a sufficiently broad manner, emphasizing among other things the urgency of nuclear disarmament and chemical and microbiological disarmament, the importance of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones, and the necessity for the Powers possessing those terrible weapons of mass destruction to undertake to respect such zones in solemn international instruments having full legal binding force.

127. Finally, with regard to regional agencies or regional agreements we consider—and Mexico’s position in this matter has never wavered—that the following matters should be spelled out in unequivocal terms: the primacy of the United Nations in matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security; the need for compatibility between such agreements or agencies and the purposes and principles of the Organization; the fact that the application of enforcement measures under such agreements or agencies shall be subject to the provisions of Article 53 of the Charter, along with the activities for the peaceful settlement of local disputes referred to in Article 52, paragraph 4; and lastly, the fact that in the event of conflict of obligations as referred to in Article 103, the obligations imposed by the Charter shall prevail as stipulated in that Article. We feel, in fact, that regional agreements and agencies must never be used to revive the old practice of “spheres of influence”, in which the strong exercise hegemony at the expense of the weak.

128. In conclusion, I should like to say that my delegation shares the view already expressed here by various representatives that if any appeal on the strengthening of international security the General Assembly might see fit to adopt is to have any likelihood of success, it should be such as to command overwhelming or at least extremely broad support. To draft a text satisfying this requirement is without doubt an arduous, delicate and lengthy task. If then it were desirable that the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session should adopt such a text as a feature of the celebration of its anniversary, it seems to us that it would be appropriate to take the relevant procedural measures at once, including perhaps that of requesting the views of Governments on this question and entrusting the task of carrying out the indispensable preparatory work to a study group or working group or whatever we like to call it.

129. The task should of course be based on the United Nations Charter and should take thorough account of resolution 2131 (XX) on non-intervention and resolution 1514 (XV) on decolonization; of any views received from Governments; of the records of this Committee and of a whole series of documents which my delegation feels should include the reports of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, and the Committee on Disarmament—four organs to which, I might say, incidentally, Mexico has given unrestricted co-operation without interruption from the outset.

130. The year between now and the twenty-fifth session of the Assembly might also be used to prepare the ground and to facilitate the adoption of the appeal by deeds to prove that there is a genuine desire and determination to help to strengthen international security. World public opinion, which fortunately still retains confidence in the

United Nations, has nevertheless become somewhat sceptical and seems already to have adopted as its motto the admonition given by Maese Pedro, one of the characters in Cervantes' masterpiece, to the Knight of La Mancha: "*operibus credite, et non verbis*".

131. Eloquent proof of such a desire could easily be forthcoming in the disarmament field by putting a stop to the squandering of the \$200,000 million which it is estimated are spent every year for military purposes, and—in the field of economic and social development—by making an effective contribution to solving the problems which, as the Secretary-General said very pertinently, "affect the two thirds of humanity whose present levels of nutrition, housing, education and income make life on earth for them nothing more than a constant struggle for bare subsistence."⁴

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 83.