



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security (continued) . . | 1 |

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 103

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

1. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius): This being the first time that I have taken the floor in the United Nations since my arrival here exactly two months ago I hope you will forgive me, Sir, if I take the liberty of not fulfilling your desire that no compliments should be addressed to the chair. Your modesty is well known. My delegation is aware of your vast experience and understanding and feels proud to see a man of your calibre presiding over this Committee after your unanimous election. We are confident that you will discharge your very important duty to the satisfaction of all. We extend to you, and through you to the Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur, our sincere best wishes.

2. The delegation of Mauritius would like to express its deep shock at the murder of the President of Somalia, Dr. Abdelrashid Ali Shermarke. We wish to express here our sincere and heartfelt sympathy to the Government and people of Somalia and in particular to our colleague Mr. Abdulrahim Abby Farah.

3. The length of our statement will be relative to the size of Mauritius. However, with all the pretensions in the world, we hope it will not be less weighty than the statements of the delegations of the super-Powers.

4. At the outset, may I crave your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to make something very clear. References have constantly been made in this Assembly to "large States", "medium-sized States" and "small States". We shall soon be coming to "mini-States". I hope that the word "size" is not used as a synonym of the word "important"; if it is, perhaps we should sometime agree on the criteria of what goes to make a country important. Whatever our size, Mauritius remains an independent sovereign State—a socialist State in fact, in the sense that all the political parties of the island adhere to socialist principles. The people of Mauritius are fully aware of the different shades of socialism and they will choose the one that will suit their country best. Mauritius intends to shape her own destiny with a sense of integrity and duty to her people without

allowing any undue patronizing or interference in her internal affairs.

5. The delegation of Barbados has told us that a handful of determined men in a medium-sized yacht could represent a very real threat to the security of their country [1658th meeting]. This, indeed, is very true of Mauritius as well. Perhaps I should inform this Assembly that my delegation has no official information of any invasion of the island of St. Brandon, a dependency of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, 250 miles north of Mauritius, by "beautiful Russian blondes" for the purpose of subversive activities, as reported in a section of the Mauritius press, although it would seem to be true that the *Argus*, a Russian tug of 832 tons, 175 feet long, ran aground on the island's reef on 3 October.

6. My delegation is most grateful to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Mr. Gromyko, for having proposed on behalf of his great country the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the United Nations General Assembly of an item entitled "The strengthening of international security" [A/7654]. We have before us the draft appeal to all States of the world [A/C.1/L.468]. We confess that we were at first a little puzzled by it, perhaps through lack of experience, but the statement of our friend and colleague Mr. Malik, Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs [1652nd meeting], has cast much light on the Soviet Appeal. We congratulate the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for having taken the initiative to provoke a discussion on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations on a topic that, more than ever before, is occupying the minds of men.

7. It is not only what the draft appeal says that seems to matter, but also what it does not say. However, we do not in the least doubt the sincerity, the good faith and noble spirit in which the draft has been placed before this Assembly. We are pleased to note that so many views have already been expressed and the keen interest that the item has aroused. This is a very healthy sign and we hope that amendments, if any, will be easily agreed upon and that the Soviet draft will be finally accepted. Were it not primarily for the strengthening of international security, we would not have been here today. Indeed, it is the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

8. Mauritius is proud to be a Member State of the United Nations. We bow to its authority and competence, and we would expect all nations taking advantage of this forum to do so. We reiterate our pledge to be guided by the ideals and principles of its Charter. We are also very jealous of this Charter and would not wittingly allow it to be misused in any way nor amended by any other means than the ones

provided by the Charter itself, without at least raising our voice—there is so little else we can do.

9. We sincerely believe that the forum of the United Nations should be used purely for the advancement of the peace and progress of mankind as a whole and for international security, and not for propaganda or only for the furtherance of national interests. It is in that spirit that my delegation will operate, however modest our contribution can be. However, we feel a little embarrassed that our distant island with only 800,000 inhabitants should be participating in a discussion on international security at the United Nations while vast areas of the world, representing about one fourth of its population, are not present. Can we really achieve lasting peace by the ganging up of some and the freezing of others, by whatever tactics or for whatever reasons?

10. The wounds of the Second World War have healed. Is it not time that we should forgive and forget and start afresh? Should the allies of yesterday be the enemies of today? Have we not learned our lessons from history? Have not empires existed and disappeared? Have not civilizations come and gone? Have not military concepts and ideas withered away with no more than ephemeral success? Peace is not the concern of a small group nor of the nuclear Powers alone. Every single State has a right to be consulted.

11. Small, new, developing countries like Mauritius today feel helpless and frustrated. No one needs peace and security more than they. And yet we, the smaller States, have become nothing but pawns in a giant game of chess played by the nuclear Powers. We are constantly living under fear and duress. We are vulnerable politically, economically and socially. We are still being expected to sell our soul and mortgage our national integrity for a pittance towards our development. We are supposed to have attained independence with all its freedom of choice. Yet, however we choose, we are bound to incur the wrath of the other. To feed our people we have to walk on a tightrope. It sometimes looks to us as if we are expected to bargain with our one miserable vote at the United Nations at all times. Was that the spirit from which the United Nations Charter evolved?

12. We Mauritians are trying in our small way to set an example to mankind. No one can teach us anything about peaceful coexistence, friendly relations and co-operation. Flung out in the middle of the Indian Ocean by sheer accident of geography, we have a heterogeneous population consisting of people of European, African, Indian, Muslim and Chinese origin. The ethnic groups are there, but we are merging gradually into a nation. In fact, we can boast of being a laboratory of human relations, if not a mini-United Nations. We have always worked, played and lived together happily and peacefully, and the co-operation and friendly relations we enjoy in Mauritius and the united front we present to the world were, as all members of the Committee know, very well demonstrated when the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, came here accompanied by the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Mr. Gaetan Duval, as members of the Mauritius delegation.

13. And yet in the past we have constantly faced—and we still face—possible interference from outside which would aim to keep us divided and an easy prey of power-seekers. We depend almost entirely on the goodwill and understanding of all. So far we have been fortunate in that respect, and it is our earnest prayer that it will always be so.

14. If we have described the case of Mauritius, it has not been for the purpose of our own national interest. Our difficulties are also the difficulties of small and newly independent developing countries. The independence of small countries is being constantly interfered with and is not always fully recognized and respected. As long as one country interferes in the internal affairs of another country, there cannot be peace and security. There are many forms of aggression and interference being practised these days. It would not be a bad idea if, while seeking a definition of “aggression”, the meanings of “interference” and “internal affairs” were looked into. Is not interference in the internal affairs of a country, by whatever means, in itself some form of aggression? Nor can there be peace with justice as long as imperialist Powers continue to exploit their colonial Territories, or as long as the economic gap between the wealthier and the poorer States is not adequately bridged.

15. In that last respect the United Nations, through its various agencies and bodies, is playing a very constructive, positive and useful role. The hopes of the developing countries are pinned on the success of the Second United Nations Development Decade. That in itself will perhaps contribute much more to peace and security than any volumes of words spoken at this Assembly. The danger to international security is not one of direct conflict between the nuclear Powers, but, rather, the spark which the less developed countries can provide, however unintentionally, by looking up to one patron, so to speak, rather than to the other. Jealousy sets in, security is threatened, and confrontation begins.

16. We take the view that withdrawal of troops, to be effective, should be undertaken by all, unreservedly and from all occupied territories, because, according to the Charter, the United Nations alone has the authority to station troops in danger spots. That may be a very naive outlook, but is there any alternative if we are to put an immediate end to senseless killings? Disarmament remains the key to world peace. My delegation appeals to the great Powers of the world to meet more often so as to speed up the work of the Committee on Disarmament.

17. We have attempted to put across some of our views in a very simple manner. As a new nation our experience is limited and I may even have sounded very naive, but we do have a sincerity of purpose, and a sense of integrity, and we are willing to work for peace and the strengthening of international security in any manner that we can. We maintain no army in Mauritius nor do we manufacture offensive hardware. We are in a unique position since we belong proudly to several groups. Yet, as I said before, we feel almost helpless—certainly frustrated. The best we can do is to provide a corridor or build a bridge.

18. We hope that common sense will prevail and that some solutions will be found soon—and very soon—that will put an end to war for ever. If not, the nuclear Powers might as

well start renaming their ministries of defence and security ministries of murder. We pray that in 1970, the year of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, new windows will be opened to a world of peace and international security.

19. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Mauritius for his kind words about my colleagues on the Bureau and myself.

20. Mr. NOAMAN (Southern Yemen): Mr. Chairman, first of all, I should like to express the deepest condolences of the people of Southern Yemen and of its Government and delegation to the Somali delegation on the death of President Shermarke. May God bless him and may his soul rest in peace.

21. At the outset, Mr. Chairman, allow me to break one of your rulings by insisting on expressing the warmest congratulations of my delegation on your election as Chairman of the First Committee and the same to Ambassador Kolo of Nigeria and to our young and energetic Rapporteur, Mr. Barnett of Jamaica. Having broken your ruling on one occasion, I find myself obliged to abide *in toto* by your other ruling, that is, to be brief in the statement I am going to deliver before this Committee.

22. My delegation welcomes the Soviet initiative to inscribe on the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly the item entitled "The strengthening of international security" [A/7654]. A decade ago also, the Soviet Union made a significant contribution to world peace and security by taking the initiative on the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [resolution 1514 (XV)], which accelerated the process of decolonization in the world.

23. At a time when the security of the majority of nations in the world is threatened, at a time when the firing of guns in the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and Africa echoes and haunts us even in the very halls of the United Nations, it is astonishing to hear a representative of one of the super-Powers announce that the discussion of the strengthening of international peace and security is superfluous or a "supererogation", to quote the exact term used.

24. As one can conclude from the debates of the General Assembly of this session, as well as from those preceding it, States are becoming more and more concerned about their security. They are demanding and seeking more guarantees of their security. This is true of both the developing and the developed nations. Paradoxically enough, it is more true of developed and great Powers, which spend billions of dollars on security and defence arrangements.

25. The United States' repugnance to discussing international peace and security is but natural. In this manner the United States presumes it can conceal and hide its black record of numerous violations and breaches of the Charter. The first and foremost was its involvement in the internal affairs of the Korean peoples. Its most recent breaches of the Charter were the Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 against Cuba and its continuous interference to suppress the progressive nationalist régimes in Central and South America.

26. Its most spectacular violations are its barbaric war in Viet-Nam and its support of the neo-Nazi and Zionist gangs of Israel in displacing and uprooting the indigenous peoples of Palestine from their homeland. Its consent to and endorsement of the Israeli aggression against three Member States of the United Nations in 1967 is well known. This is exemplified by the recent deal and delivery of Phantom jets to Israel. Its collaboration with Israel was further indicated by President Nixon's statement in the General Assembly in September this year and his intention of changing the map of the Middle East in order to please Israel, without consulting the countries concerned and without the slightest regard for the will and wishes of the peoples of the region. That certainly is hypocrisy in which power, and power alone, has the upper hand.

27. A further and most recent contribution to international peace and security in the Middle East is the United States Supreme Court decision in the case of Afroyim versus Rusk in 1967. This decision, with the consent and explicit support of the United States Government, has approved citizens and nationals of the United States joining the armed forces of Israel to suppress the Palestine National Liberation Movement and to commit naked aggression against the neighbouring Arab States. Without doubt their role as advisers to the armed forces of Israel reminds one of the original role of United States advisers in South Viet-Nam and the eventual development of the situation into a full-fledged war of extermination against the Viet-Nameese peoples as a whole. That is the contribution of the United States to international peace and security. Any attempt to conceal it would be like trying to conceal sunlight with a sieve.

28. It is my delegation's view that a better way of handling international peace and security in the world is by making a fresh collective effort. I mean by reviewing the Charter of the United Nations with justice, equality of mankind, the outlawing of the use of force and universality of membership as basic constituents of the reviewed Charter. It is no secret that the United Nations and its Charter is Western in character and orientation. The views of the continents of Latin America, Africa and Asia are grossly unreflected in the Charter due to the fact that a majority of them were under colonial occupation and domination at the time of the San Francisco discussions.

29. The emerging countries of the third world are often faced with a dilemma when they encounter certain "norms" of international law that have been practised by the Western and colonial countries, despite the fact that these "norms" are basically inhuman and unjust. Also there are arbitrary "international" treaties and agreements which more often serve only the interests of Western countries without any regard paid to other parties either because they were formulated and imposed during the days of colonial piracy or because the other parties were not really in existence to speak for themselves and for their own interests. A codification of all international agreements and treaties based on equity and justice is most essential and would contribute a great deal to international peace and security.

30. My delegation shares the view of those delegations concerned with the urgent necessity of finding an accept-

able, but just, definition of aggression, of agreeing on the principles of friendly relations and co-operation among States and of arriving at an understanding on United Nations peace-keeping operations on the basis of strict observance of the spirit of the Charter. As to aggression, it is regrettable that a definition has not yet been reached. It seems that it will never come as long as the aggressions of the United States in Viet-Nam, of Israel in the Middle East and of South Africa in Namibia still persist with impunity.

31. The Security Council has been ineffective, and instead of solving problems it has opted to freeze them. This is due not only to the veto power enjoyed by the permanent members or to its water-down and meaningless resolutions designed to achieve unanimity, but most important of all, to the fact that the Security Council was crippled from its very inception. It was crippled because of the non-participation of one of the great Powers, namely, China. And I refer here, of course, to the People's Republic of China.

32. If the Security Council were to awaken this late, and to activate Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter, it would be advisable that the People's Republic of China be present, as suggested earlier by my colleague Ambassador Åström of Sweden [1654th meeting]. The absence of the People's Republic of China from the Security Council and from disarmament and nuclear conferences has in effect made such conferences void and meaningless. The Security Council has rarely referred to Chapters VI and VII of the Charter to implement its resolutions. It could hardly invoke Chapter VII of the Charter without the participation, consent and presence of the People's Republic of China. As the representative of Mauritius just stated a while ago, it is really embarrassing for the countries of the United Nations, not excluding Southern Yemen of course, to speak about peace and security in the world when about one fourth of the world's population is not represented in this forum.

33. In conclusion, allow me to state that we would have preferred that the title of the present item should read "The ensuring of international peace and security" because, as the representative of Iraq stated earlier, in our region, the Middle East, as well as in the southern part of Africa and in South-East Asia, peace and security are not even relatively present to be strengthened. Consequently, we would also have preferred paragraph 2 of section VII of document A/C.1/L.468 to read "Lack of progress in the implementation by states of measures for the strengthening of international security" instead of "Progress in the implementation by States of measures for the strengthening of international security", as it now reads.

34. We are all aware that Europe is no longer a sensitive thermometer with which to measure world tension and thereby security. The powder-keg has already shifted to the Middle East and the southern part of Africa. That must be crystal clear in our minds, lest we realize it too late. My delegation would prefer a total review of the Charter of the United Nations based on justice, equity, illegitimacy of the use of force, and universality of membership without discrimination against mini-States or other States.

35. Before concluding, I should like to emphasize that we earnestly hope that a just definition of aggression will soon

be reached. It is also imperative that such a definition should take into consideration the important point made by Ambassador Manuel Maurtua of Peru in his statement on Monday, 20 October, in this Committee [1658th meeting] that killing by hunger, economic exploitation and injustice are also forms of aggression.

36. At a later stage my delegation will address itself in more detail to the Soviet draft appeal which appears in document A/C.1/L.468. At this juncture let me say that we unreservedly support section II of the document "the cessation of all measures for the suppression of the liberation movements of the peoples still under colonial rule and the granting of independence to all such peoples", as well as the paragraph on "the withdrawal of troops from 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".

37. The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Ismail Noaman for the compliments he has addressed to the Bureau.

38. Mr. RABETAFIKA (Madagascar) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, I hope that you will allow my delegation to express to you its pleasure at working in this Committee under your guidance. My delegation has always admired the qualities which distinguish you, your concise and clear approach to our work, your consideration and courtesy and your keen reasoning. We therefore face our work at this session in a spirit of confidence.

39. We are also happy to see at your side Mr. Kolo and Mr. Barnett, and extend to them our warm congratulations on their election.

40. It would be inconceivable for a representative of a developing country, like my own, which wishes to achieve on an international level nothing more than the friendship and understanding of all those concerned in helping it to develop, not to participate in this debate. I should like to recall what was stated by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands during the general debate:

"There is a close link between questions of peace and security, and the economic and social situation in developing countries and regions; or, one might say, conversely, when economic and social development in large areas of the world are lagging, peace and security are in danger to the detriment of all." [1773rd plenary meeting, para. 62.]

41. The strengthening of security does indeed affect man's destiny, and we would be the last to oppose the strengthening of the authority of the United Nations for the purpose of preserving peace and security. We are happy to see that an initiative has been taken so that we may hold a serious and, if necessary, detailed discussion on the question of international security. But how much happier we would have been if a collective security system on the political level could have been combined with a collective security system on the economic level.

42. In the views that my delegation will present we shall be guided mainly by resolution 2131 (XX) concerning the

principle of non-intervention based on Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter. I would remind the Committee that at the nineteenth session of the Assembly, my country requested¹ the inclusion in the agenda of an item entitled: "Observance by Member States of the principles relating to the sovereignty of States, their territorial integrity, non-interference in their domestic affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the condemnation of subversive activities".

43. That shows the importance that we attach to co-operation among States, regardless of their social and political systems, provided that such co-operation is not considered exclusive or made contingent upon restrictions which do not respect either the sovereignty of States or the freedom of choice of peoples.

44. Similarly, we feel that the Charter, until such time as it may be revised, if the circumstances demand it, and in view of the many difficulties arising in relations among States, still provides us with a useful framework if all of us accept its provisions and in particular the purposes set forth in its Article I. It would be of no use to change something which we have not yet had the possibility of fully putting into practice, or to interpret a document certain parts of which we have consciously or unconsciously overlooked. We believe that the Charter is an entity and if there is to be an order of priority it should conform with the spirit of those who have undertaken the solemn obligation of respecting it. A formal order of priority would hardly conceal the hesitations and reservations we might have about any given part of the Charter.

45. With respect to the principle of withdrawing troops from foreign territories, my delegation has already on several occasions expressed its support of that principle. This is not a dogmatic position, but the result of our recognition of the inadmissibility of any action which would jeopardize the territorial integrity or political independence of any State.

46. We disapprove of force used in a manner incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations. However, so long as an effective security system is not accepted by all, due account will have to be taken of the sovereignty of States and of certain juridical situations freely accepted. The Charter must, as has been said so often, find universal acceptance, and we cannot agree to a restrictive enumeration without reducing the confidence which has been placed in our Organization.

47. As regards self-determination, it is our wish that that principle should be applied everywhere and in all circumstances. It should not be subject to any ideological interpretation.

48. Madagascar is a member of two of the three Committees mentioned in the Soviet draft [A/C.1/L.468], namely 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.

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Nineteenth Session, Annexes*, annex No. 2, document A/5757 and Add.1.

49. We attach very great importance to the development of friendly relations and co-operation among States. We feel that such relations, with a clearly accepted basis and accepted by all, not in accordance with some special concept but in accordance with the Charter, would better serve the cause of international peace and security than a situation in which, while not openly speaking of mistrust, each party endeavours to consolidate temporary advantages and maintain a *status quo* which has been outdistanced by present-day thinking. It might seem natural that in today's world we might try to measure everything in terms of power, but the smaller States cannot accept that such relations might, even secretly, exist. We consider that the best exercise of power is to recognize equality and mutual respect.

50. With regard to regional systems of collective security, our delegation would like to recall that it was among the first to welcome the presentation at the twentieth session of the General Assembly of a resolution bearing the title "Actions on the regional level with a view to improving good neighbourly relations among European States having different social and political systems" [*resolution 2129 (XX)*]. World security may, according to circumstances, depend on the security of one special continent and with respect to Europe we would be very happy if, putting aside the feelings of acrimony, the sources of tension could be eliminated. We do not, however, overlook the fact that there can be no regional security without a realistic approach to the problem of world security and that is why the African States have asked, through the Lusaka Manifesto,² that the great Powers assist them in safeguarding the peace and security of that part of the world. This request may be made in another appeal, for we feel that in Africa too we need co-operation and coexistence. In any case any initiative concerning security, regional or otherwise, should, in our opinion, be examined with care, and undue haste in this area can, in the event of a setback, only aggravate feelings or exacerbate disagreements.

51. With respect to the maintenance of security and peace, a special role has been conferred on the Security Council by the Charter. There can be no question of our changing this; we admit this all the more readily since we recognize the responsibility of the permanent members of the Council. But this does not mean that the small Powers should abandon their prerogatives or that we should trust the great Powers in all matters concerning international security. Special responsibility does not mean exclusive responsibility, and if the application of Article 28 of the Charter can improve the international situation then we shall gladly support reactivating it, provided that that does not lead to an arbitrary classification of problems or conflicts.

52. We hope too that such a reactivation of the Security Council will not diminish the useful contribution made by the various Committees and organs of the United Nations to the maintenance of peace and security.

53. Such were the preliminary views my delegation wished to present at this stage in our debate. They do not claim to be original but are presented in a spirit of complete

² *Ibid.*, *Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 106, document A/7754.

sincerity and objectivity. And since we want such an appeal to be heard by all, we would have preferred Member States to be given the opportunity to devote further study to the many proposals and suggestions made in the course of this debate. We would have preferred also that any element of controversy, whether of form or substance, could have been eliminated from this appeal through serious consultations. Finally we would have liked the appeal to be complete, for we cannot dissociate the question of international security from all development or disarmament, which we need if we are to be free of feelings of insecurity when we have to face situations which we are far from being able to control effectively.

54. In conclusion I should like to quote the statement made by our Foreign Minister at the 1774th meeting of the General Assembly:

“My country affirms its devotion to the principles drafted in exceptional circumstances that have now become historical, but we also look resolutely to the future and we advocate an increasingly broader framework in which to place a new concept of relations between nations and peoples, in accord with the present needs as well as the very nature of man, without narrow nationalism, without ideological extremism and without power politics.

“My delegation is ready to lend its full support so that the ideals and objectives which I have mentioned could be attained and so that the United Nations could become an effective instrument in creating conditions favourable to peace, to the prevention of war and the promotion of the economic and social well-being of mankind.” [1774th plenary meeting, paras. 87 and 88.]

55. Mr. TSURUOKA (Japan): Sir, when the election of the Chairmen of the Main Committees took place at the outset of the current session of the General Assembly, I had the honour and privilege of seconding your nomination to the post of Chairman of the First Committee. I stated at that time that your long experience in many different aspects of the work of the United Nations and your devotion to the ideals and purposes of the Organization would enable us to accomplish successfully the tasks assigned to the Committee. While taking the floor in this Committee on behalf of the delegation of Japan for the first time, I should like to congratulate you on your unanimous election to this very important post, and on your exemplary chairmanship since then in this Committee—a chairmanship which, in the brief period that has passed since your election, has confirmed what I stated on that occasion.

56. I should like, at the same time, to extend my heartfelt congratulations to Mr. Kolo of Nigeria and to Mr. Barnett of Jamaica on their respective elections to the posts of Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur of this Committee. I am sure that the assumption of those posts by these two diplomats of high distinction will contribute immensely to the fruitful work of the Committee.

57. We have before us a proposal put forward by the Soviet delegation concerning “The strengthening of international security”. This is certainly a topic which by its very

nature is bound to arouse the most active interest of all Member States. The question of international security is important, not simply from the viewpoint of the security of this or that individual national State, but also from the viewpoint of the general interest of the international community as a whole in the establishment of a peaceful world. Thus my delegation welcomes the initiative taken by the delegation of the USSR in this respect, inasmuch as it serves as a timely reminder of the importance of the question of international security in the present-day world.

58. Now, before addressing myself to the specific question of how to achieve the strengthening of international security, I should like to dwell somewhat upon the more general question, namely, what should be the nature of our deliberation on this item and what is the significance of such deliberation to the problem at issue. It hardly needs recalling that the maintenance of international peace and security is the foremost of the fundamental purposes of the United Nations, and that in order to attain this basic purpose of the Organization all Member States are expected to co-operate as best they can on the basis of mutual respect and confidence. All this may sound trite and obvious. Nevertheless, in the view of my delegation, if we are to give real and serious thought to the question of how best we could strengthen international security, it is of cardinal importance that at the very outset of our discussion we should be clear about this as our point of departure.

59. In other words, the point of departure should be the Charter of the United Nations, and more specifically, the will and the determination of all the Members of the Organization to abide by the fundamental principles of the Charter as set out in Article 2 of the Charter. What is required of us, then, is not so much the proliferation of words as the will and the determination to carry out these solemn obligations assumed by all of us under the Charter. The malaise of the present-day world is certainly due not to the fact that there is any lack in the amount of appeals and resolutions on paper, but to the fact that there is an unfortunate gap between what States have solemnly agreed to abide by and what States, at least some of them, do in practice. Surely, under such circumstances, the remedy should not be sought merely in flooding the world with further appeals. Beautiful words will be reduced to nothing unless they are accompanied by the resolute will to translate them into action. It is pertinent to recall in this context that as recently as last year all of us witnessed, with just indignation and deep sorrow, the sacred principles of the Charter being trampled upon so mercilessly and so flagrantly.

60. These remarks are naturally introductory in character, but none the less essential, in our view, to any attempt to strengthen international security. It is advisable to keep this point constantly in mind, because we might otherwise fall into the pit of deceiving ourselves and mistaking beautiful words on paper for a real achievement. With these preliminary remarks I should like to turn now to some of the specific points involved in our search for ways and means to strengthen international security.

61. The first point that my delegation would like to emphasize is that in any attempt designed to strengthen

international security, be it a declaration or an appeal, it is essential to reaffirm the objectives and the principles of the United Nations. Above all, we should start by reaffirming, as an essential minimum, the obligation of all Member States to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, to settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, and to observe scrupulously the principle of non-intervention in the domestic matters of other nations.

62. It might also be added in this context that, in our reaffirmation of these objectives and principles, their universal character should be made clear beyond any possible doubt. They are applicable, as sacred obligations under the Charter, to all the Member States, without any exception whatsoever. Geographical propinquity, similarity of social systems, mutual relations of a special character—all these and other factors that may exist between particular States or within groups of States should not find a special place in our formulation.

63. Once we are agreed on this point, it will then be necessary, as part of our common struggle for peace, to take up a wide range of problems, some of which may go even beyond the direct realm of security in the narrow sense of the word. Indeed, it is in this same spirit that the Foreign Minister of Japan, Mr. Kiichi Aichi, emphasized in his speech in the general debate on 19 September of this year the necessity for uniting the efforts of all of us in what he described as our “common struggle for peace”, not simply efforts to maintain or to restore peace and security in the contemporary world, but creative efforts to explore the way, and open the road, to everlasting peace. More specifically, he said:

“... the struggle for peace consists in efforts to respond to the expectations of all peoples of the world for the future peace-keeping ability of this international Organization, by enhancing the effectiveness of the functions of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace. The struggle for peace means to strive towards general and complete disarmament, through concrete disarmament measures. And the struggle for peace is to eliminate frustration, which is the fundamental cause of social insecurity, by raising the living standards of the peoples of the world. Furthermore, it is extremely important to remove the distrust existing among nations and races, or between different political systems based on different ideologies, by bringing about an easing of world tensions, and promoting mutual friendship and understanding among nations.” [1756th plenary meeting, para. 11.]

64. With regard to the Soviet proposal for the strengthening of international security, the delegation of Japan takes it to mean that the Soviet Union also purports to make a genuine and serious contribution in our joint struggle for peace in the spirit I have just referred to. If that is the case, what is imperative in the view of my delegation is to have an objective and balanced examination of the question, taking into account all the factors that are relevant to the maintenance and the strengthening of international peace and security. It would be very unfortunate if any concrete

formulation of this important problem were to be presented in a form which falls short of an impartial and balanced statement of the matter. This is nothing more than a word of caution, and my delegation hopes that it will prove to be a solicitude without substance.

65. A third important factor to be recognized for the effective carrying out of the struggle for peace by the United Nations is the role played by the major Powers. Thus, resolute and concrete initiatives as well as realistic and flexible approaches towards the strengthening of international security will have to come from the major Powers, conscious of their responsibilities for the establishment of peace. This would be particularly true in the field of United Nations peace-keeping activities and disarmament.

66. It is our belief that in order to maintain world peace the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations should be further strengthened. The extent to which they can be developed depends entirely on the amount of effort that can be made by each Member State, but the immense responsibility of the major Powers can hardly be exaggerated. They are expected, positively, to assume a major role in the maintenance of peace in general, not to mention their obligation to refrain from the use of military force as a means of solving international disputes.

67. The same could be said of disarmament. Disarmament is one of the essential measures required to cut through the vicious cycle of the expansion of armaments and the acceleration of tensions. Accordingly, if, while strengthening security systems under the United Nations, we succeed in gradually scaling down the armaments of countries, subject to effective verification and without affecting the balance between them, we will, in practical terms, be able to alleviate world tensions and lessen the danger of war. And it is quite clear that in all this the key to the solution of the problem of disarmament lies principally with the major Powers.

68. In the view of my delegation, the ideal of permanent peace can come true only when general and complete disarmament has been achieved. Regrettably, of course, the reality is that we cannot achieve that goal at once. Therefore, the only way left is to adopt successively, step by step, partial disarmament measures, as such measures become feasible. Nonetheless, it is to be stressed that we should hold firmly to the principle that those successive disarmament measures should be carried out with the full co-operation of the major Powers, while at the same time using sufficient care and wisdom so that the balance of armaments may be maintained in order to ensure the security of all countries.

69. Further, a fourth important factor to which we should give our full attention in our search for the ways to strengthen international security is the promotion of economic and social development. A victory will not be won in the struggle for peace unless the advancement of the welfare of all mankind is achieved. In other words, the promotion of economic and social development is the prerequisite for political stability and the foundation for the active construction of peace. In this connexion, it would become necessary to re-examine comprehensively

the activities of the United Nations not only in the political and peace-keeping fields but also in the field of economic and social development. It is hoped that this aspect of the problem, which is nothing else than the other side of the same coin, international security, will not be overlooked but will be given the due attention that it deserves.

70. What I have stated above concerns, in a way, what we could and should do for the strengthening of international security on the basis of the existing Charter of the United Nations and by means of strict observance of the Charter. I am convinced, however, that it would be even more important in the strengthening of international security to take a forward-looking attitude toward the question of making the United Nations Charter itself more effective.

71. International security is not a static concept. It is bound to change with time, with circumstances. The question of international security, both within the United Nations and without, can be dealt with properly only within the context of the changes that have occurred in the world. How, then, can the Organization, whose primary role lies in the maintenance of international peace and security, remain static? Indeed, it cannot afford to be static if we are serious in our attempt to strengthen international security. In this connexion, perhaps I may be permitted to quote once again from the statement of our Foreign Minister, Mr. Kiichi Aichi, made only a few weeks ago from the rostrum of the General Assembly. He said:

“... it may be highly useful to reflect upon the areas where the United Nations has failed, during these twenty-five years, to achieve what was originally expected of it, to define the future direction which it should follow and, at the same time, to review the Charter of the United Nations for the purpose of ensuring the more effective functioning of the Organization. The purposes and principles of the United Nations as set out in the Charter remain quite appropriate as to the norms of action for Member States, despite the passage of these twenty-five years. Nevertheless, the world situation has evolved in a way different in many respects from what the Charter anticipated at its inception. Therefore, we must take full account of this reality when we search for the best way to achieve realization of the ideals represented by the establishment of the United Nations.” [Ibid., *para. 31.*]

72. The proposal of the Soviet Union refers to the role of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. The importance of the Security Council as an organ endowed with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security is certainly great. However, because its importance is so great, there is all the greater reason why my delegation feels that we should see to it that the organ, in its composition, in its outlook, in its achievement, be up to the task it is expected to perform.

73. It would be idle to speak of the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security while keeping one's eyes closed to the changes that have taken place in the past 25 years in the world situation as well as in the United Nations, and to the very real problems that the Security Council faces at

present. In this context, Foreign Minister Aichi had this to say:

“I consider that the basic structure of the Security Council, in which the super-Powers occupy the central positions and assume major responsibilities for the maintenance of peace, is realistic. Nevertheless, we are far from satisfied with the performance of the Security Council in the past, and we all know that there are many problems still to be solved in this regard.

“In the light of realities of the international situations since the establishment of the United Nations, various questions may be examined in order to make more effective the functioning of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Among these might be enumerated such questions as whether the composition of the Security Council and its method of voting should remain the same as originally established or whether the powers of the General Assembly should be enlarged and should be expressly provided for in the Charter.

“I believe that, in order to make the Security Council most effective, it would be desirable, in view of its importance, that it be an organ composed of Member States which ... are in a position to render the most effective contributions to the maintenance of international peace and security and also are truly representative of various regions of the world.” [Ibid., *paras. 33-35.*]

74. In the limited time available, I have tried to go over the whole field of international security, depicting some of the salient points of relevance for comment. The brief sketch that I have tried to give on this question of strengthening international security will, I hope, be sufficient to reveal the magnitude and the complexity of the problems involved. This leads my delegation to suggest that it will be highly advisable for us to devote our full and mature reflection to this all-important and highly complex problem before we come to any hasty conclusion. Naturally, this does not mean that we should be deterred or discouraged from the worthy efforts that we should be making in the cause of strengthening international security. On the contrary, we should be prepared to do all we can to conquer whatever obstacles may lie ahead of us, if the strengthening of international security is to be fully realized. In this common effort of ours my country will certainly be ready to co-operate.

75. The CHAIRMAN: My colleagues on the Bureau and myself are grateful to the representative of Japan for his kind words about us, which reflect his generosity of spirit.

76. Mr. ZELLEKE (Ethiopia): Mr. Chairman, I should like to seize the early opportunity of my first intervention in the Committee to extend to you the compliments of my delegation on your election to the Chairmanship of this Committee. I also wish to tender my heartfelt congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur upon their elections. For our part, we wish to assure you of our sincere co-operation.

77. Since my country attaches the utmost importance to the question of the strengthening of international security, I wish to express briefly some general observations on the

matter under discussion. In this connexion, I wish to recall, first of all, that my country, a victim of the lack of collective security during the last days of the League of Nations, had ceaselessly strived in that organization for the establishment of an effective system of collective security. Thereafter, since the inception of the United Nations, of which we are a founding Member, my country has not spared any effort in seeking a system that would guarantee once and for all a permanent peace. I am sure that the record of the United Nations has taken due account of Ethiopia's modest contribution in the fulfilment of the principles of the Charter, particularly with regard to the maintenance of peace and security. We have always considered that conditions of security can be promoted if Members of the United Nations agree to live by the principles of the Charter.

78. In our view, the problem of peace and security is connected with the problems of disarmament, decolonization, respect for human rights and economic and social development. We feel that breaches of peace and international security are not phenomena erupting by themselves. We think, rather, that their causes are to be found in the inherent conditions of injustice and inequity that still prevail very much in the world today.

79. We in Africa are very much aware to what extent those conditions prevail on our continent and elsewhere. What disturbs us most is the terrible outcome that may result, both in our continent and elsewhere, if the actual situation of violence and intolerance is allowed to continue. Hence, we welcome any step, however small, that may help in promoting conditions that would enhance a sense of security and that would also contribute in tangible ways to the system of international security.

80. At this juncture I should like to address myself to the documents now before us [*A/7654 and A/C.1/L.468*], and in this connexion I should like to present the compliments of my delegation to the Government of the USSR for the most noble and opportune initiative that it has taken in bringing to the consideration of the Assembly such an important and urgent question. My delegation finds much to be commended in the appeal submitted by the Soviet Union and we agree with its purport. If we have any reservation about the document it is not because of the fact that we have any disagreement with any of the principles contained in it, but because we think that the document does not go far enough in being specific. Moreover, as has been pointed out in the Committee, many of the principles and the recommendations contained in it have already been enunciated many times in one form or another in this and other forums of the United Nations. We are afraid that, however sincere our intentions, principles formulated in too general and vague a manner might be inadequate to meet the actual problems of our time, as well as the challenges of the future. Even more serious, unless such declarations were to lead to an immediate amelioration of the necessary conditions of peace, it might lead to a discrepancy between intentions and deeds, and might contribute to a further loss of faith in the efficacy of the United Nations.

81. To say that, however, should not mean that we should retrench ourselves behind the existing *status quo* and be satisfied with the *modus operandi* that we have created,

without looking for new ways to promote conditions that would favourably operate for the maintenance of peace and international security. The general dissatisfaction expressed in this connexion in the general debate, about the performance of the United Nations should supply enough evidence that definite improvement is necessary.

82. I can only recall in this respect the great responsibility that has been entrusted to this Organization, a responsibility accepted willingly and with enthusiasm, with a clear understanding of the moral, historical and material implications of that responsibility, by those who founded the United Nations and by those who joined it later. In the face of that historic responsibility we cannot keep on avoiding the real issues with oratorical euphemisms, declarations, appeals and resolutions the significance of which amounts to no more than a gesture of goodwill. We have had almost a quarter of a century to ponder and toil over the problem of promoting international security, and it must be admitted that we have not succeeded. The time has come for making an effective contribution with a call for tangible commitments on the part of all Members of the United Nations.

83. In the final analysis it will be the sincerity of our purposes and the concrete measures that we adopt and fulfil for the maintenance of peace and security that will make the United Nations worthy of the principles of its Charter, worthy of the hopes that humanity has reposed in it. That is why we would have liked to see in the document more tangible ideas providing the necessary aspects by which international security could be strengthened and lasting peace achieved. We would have liked to see how decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly could be implemented. We would have also liked to see the big Powers, on whose shoulders the ultimate responsibility of peace rests, make commitments, within such a declaration, to undertake real measures of nuclear disarmament.

84. If an improvement of the existing conditions of peace is thus to be envisaged, my delegation feels that positive and effective measures will have to be adopted and implemented with a view to realizing the desired objectives. To this end, we think, first of all that a full reassessment of problems that are facing us must be made and, secondly, that a thorough study should be elaborated as to the ways and means to be applied.

85. The Ambassador of Brazil, at the end of his brilliant speech [*1653rd meeting*], stated that realism has failed and that we should now adopt idealism instead, however futile its prospects may be. I would beg to add to his inspired words and say that we have not lacked idealism, but so far we have only chosen to apply shortsighted measures of expediency without extending our vision to the real dynamics and perspectives of history. That is why we find ourselves today bogged down in a pathetic state of fear, suspicion and insecurity. At this historical juncture the choices confronting us are elemental. They are: poverty or welfare, injustice or justice, war or peace, total annihilation or survival. Our choice should not be difficult.

86. Mr. ALLIMADI (Uganda): Speaking in the First Committee for the first time I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and, through you, the Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

87. Considering that man has created conditions that put his own survival and that of his own planet in serious doubt, my delegation takes very seriously any measures geared to strengthening international peace and security. Our contemporary world is so characterized by the phenomenon of interdependence that the fate of one country affects other countries as well. Peace and security are necessary prerequisites for an atmosphere of development and progress. It is against that background that my delegation warmly welcomes the draft appeal on the strengthening of international security submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [A/C.1/L.468]. My delegation is giving this draft very serious study because we believe that it was introduced in good faith and with a genuine desire that it should contribute to the promotion of international peace and security, and because we consider that the draft covers a wide range of matters of international security.

88. It has always been my delegation's view that any genuine and effective efforts in the exercise of the maintenance of international peace and security requires the active and positive participation of all Member nations of the world community. Unfortunately there has been a tendency on the part of the big Powers to regard the problems of preserving international peace and security as their prerogative alone. That becomes quite clear when one considers the amount of weight given to the proposals of small States in what used to be the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee and also in the Security Council.

89. That brings me to the question of the effectiveness of the Security Council. It is a grave situation that resolutions passed unanimously or by an overwhelming majority in the Security Council have not been implemented. We attribute the failure of the Security Council to implement its resolutions largely to the conflict of interest within the States members of the Security Council and partly to the lack of genuine interest in solving the problems to which the resolutions are addressed. For example, the Security Council resolutions on Namibia and Rhodesia have not been implemented partly because some States have strong economic ties with South Africa and partly because of the historical bonds that exist between the racists in South Africa and some States having both the ability and the responsibility to implement these resolutions.

90. My delegation will lend its support to the proposal that seeks to take advantage of Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter to hold periodic meetings of the Security Council with a view to elaborating urgent measures to strengthen it. We shall lend our support to any other measures that in our view will strengthen the Security Council and make it more effective, because we believe that the success of the United Nations will largely depend on the ability of the Security Council to handle matters of international security.

91. May I now come to another question that is of fundamental importance to the discussion of any meaningful and lasting arrangements for the preservation of international peace and security. That is the question of involving the People's Republic of China in the discussions that affect international peace and security. The twenty-fifth anniversary of this Organization should be a period

when Member nations of this Organization should resolve to approach problems facing the United Nations more realistically. How can we afford to continue to exclude a Government that controls and represents the largest nation in the world, a nuclear Power, from the United Nations, the Security Council and disarmament discussions, and yet hope that any measures we take for strengthening international peace and security can produce long lasting results? My delegation appreciates efforts that have been made so far in the field of disarmament, for example the successful completion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [see resolution 2373 (XXII)], and the banning of nuclear armaments in outer space—and now on the ocean floor—although we think their usefulness is limited without the endorsement of some nuclear Powers, including the People's Republic of China.

92. During the debates that took place before the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was approved by the General Assembly, my delegation made it clear that we thought the fundamental issues of disarmament were being avoided and by-passed and that, instead, more efforts were being spent on disarming the States that were already disarmed, with insufficient guarantees for those States' security. We notice again that very little progress, if any, is being made in the field of vertical non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. If the nuclear power States are genuine in their desire to halt the arms race, they should devote serious efforts to achieving an agreement on total prohibition of underground tests and resume discussions on missile talks. Serious efforts must be made to control the continuing arms race because, as *The New York Times* put it, "the arms race feeds on itself in a cycle that can never stop short of world annihilation." The increased expenditure on research and development of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons by certain States contradicts any claims that any progress is being made in the field of disarmament.

93. We are also aware that the nuclear Powers devote a great deal of their efforts to the search for better ways to conceal nuclear missile sites and this too does not point in the right direction of strengthening international security. The strengthening of international security also requires that there should be a reduction in the manufacture and shipment of conventional weapons. The sale and shipment of conventional weapons, in particular to areas where threats to international peace exist, is viewed by my delegation with serious concern. My region of Africa is threatened by the stockpiling of conventional weapons by the racist régime of South Africa, which poses a real threat to peace and security. If the allies of the racist Governments of South Africa and Portugal desire international peace and security, they should cease contributing to the perpetuation of the inhuman and barbaric treatment of the black and coloured populations in those areas.

94. On the question of regional security systems it is the view of my delegation that such systems, based on the joint and harmonious efforts of the States of the regions concerned and set up in accordance with the spirit and provisions of the Charter, can promote the strengthening of world peace and security. My own region of Africa has made strides in that direction through the Organization of African Unity, but the peace and security of our continent, and indeed world peace, is being seriously threatened by

racism and colonialism in South Africa and the Portuguese-dominated areas of Africa. Secretary-General U Thant said in February 1964, referring to South Africa:

“There is the clear prospect that racial conflict, if we cannot curb and, finally, eliminate it, will grow into a destructive monster compared to which the religious or ideological conflicts of the past and present will seem like small family quarrels. Such a conflict will eat away the possibilities for good of all that mankind has hitherto achieved and reduce men to the lowest and most bestial level of intolerance and hatred.”

That prediction is rapidly coming true.

95. Referring to the threat of racial wars, my Foreign Minister recently explained:

“It is not for love of war but because of their commitment to the principles of human equality and dignity that independent African States are opposed to colonialism and racial discrimination, which is being practised in South Africa.” [1771st plenary meeting, para. 6.]

96. The United Nations, through its Declaration of Human Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [resolution 2106 A (XX)] set itself noble goals—goals that would greatly contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security—and now the United Nations should endeavour to find suitable tools for the implementation of those noble goals.

97. One of the major factors contributing to the worsening of international security is the failure to eradicate poverty from the face of the earth. We should like to see more genuine and serious efforts being made by this Organization towards the elimination of the discriminatory practices in international trade which impede the development of the poor regions. We also hope that the recommendations contained in the Pearson Report³ will be seriously considered by Member nations of this Organization. There will never be real peace and security unless the economic structure of the world is drastically changed.

98. In conclusion, I should like to make the observation that if, despite the 24 years of existence of the United Nations, our world is still beset by local wars, colonial domination based on racism and foreign economic interests, crippling poverty and social unrest this is not due to any major defects in this Organization's Charter, but rather to the failure of Member States, especially the Permanent Members of the Security Council, to adhere to the principles and the spirit of the Charter. The Soviet draft appeal gives once again an opportunity to discuss and earnestly search for international peace and security. We should, therefore, give this draft serious consideration.

99. The CHAIRMAN: I have no other speakers for this afternoon. If any representative intending to speak tomorrow or on Friday wishes to take the floor now I shall be

only too happy to invite him to do so. I should like to inform the Committee that after the list was closed two delegations requested permission to speak in this debate. At the same time, a few whose names had been inscribed have indicated that they may not wish to speak. If the Committee has no objection I shall include the two delegations which expressed a wish to participate in this debate after the list of speakers was closed.

It was so decided.

100. The CHAIRMAN: There will be two meetings tomorrow and 17 delegations have inscribed their names. For Friday also we have 17 speakers. I shall now give the floor to the representative of Jordan in the exercise of the right of reply.

101. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): If I referred to the Middle East question in my statement of yesterday it was only to give living examples of the deterioration of international security. My intention was not to go into a debate on the conflict in the area. Actually, it was the Israeli representative who chose to speak in such a context and to refer to what he termed highly controversial statements. Israeli forcible occupation of half of my country is not a controversial issue, nor is withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied territories a debatable question. It has become a pattern for Israeli spokesmen to talk about the grim and fateful days they experienced before 5 June 1967. They keep repeating a myth that they were forced to go into three wars, in 1948, in 1956 and in 1967, and that the Arabs were only waiting for the right time, and that as the Arabs chose 1948, they chose 1956 and they chose 1967 as the right time.

102. But the Israeli spokesman and others know better than that. They know that the right time happened to be an election year in the United States of America. This was true in 1948, it was true in 1956 and it was true in 1967. I need not dwell on this because the whole world knows that it is not the Arabs who benefited from an American election year. It is the Israelis and their pressure groups that benefit from every American election year. Simple logic, therefore, belies the Israeli allegation that the Arabs and not the Israelis started the war, or the three wars. It was not the Arabs who timed the war in every election year in the United States of America.

103. The fact still remains that Israel created incidents, intensified conflicts and initiated the war at a time of its own choosing against the Palestinians and the Arab States. Truth revealed itself after 1948 and after 1956. It is revealing itself now on the 1967 Israeli aggression. The myth which Israel tries to sustain is now tumbling down. Brigadier Mordehai Hod, the Commander of the Israeli air force, according to *The Sunday Times* of London of 16 July 1967, said about the plan for invading the Arab territories:

“Sixteen years planning has gone into those initial eighty minutes. We lived with the plan, we slept on the plan, we ate the plan constantly, we perfected it.”

104. The statement reflects not only Israeli aggressive designs but also the military structure and outlook of Israeli society and its policies on international affairs and security.

³ Commission on International Development, *Partners in Development* (New York, Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1969).

105. The spokesman for Israel said yesterday that his country had no desire for war with Jordan. That statement would have been true if the spokesman had qualified it and said that they had no desire for war with Jordan in the first few hours because their army was attacking the United Arab Republic then. Once it had finished with that, it turned to Jordan and Syria. The statement of Yigal Allon of 2 June, published in the Israeli paper *El-Haartz* of 4 June 1967, was revealing and more congruent with the facts than the statement which we heard yesterday from the Israeli representative. Allon said:

“There is not the slightest doubt about the outcome of this war and each of its stages; and we are not forgetting the Jordanian and Syrian fronts either.”

That was said on 2 June, not 5 June, 1967.

106. Those are only some of the facts about Israel's aggression against three Arab States and its occupation of substantial parts of their territories. This continued Israeli occupation is an open defiance of the principles of the non-acquisition of territory by force. It ignores the Charter, to which the Israeli representative gave lip service yesterday. He did not mention withdrawal as a fulfilment of Charter principles.

107. It is our failure as Members of the United Nations to take adequate measures to ensure the implementation of these principles that has encouraged Israel to violate the Charter and to defy this Organization—to which Israel owes its very existence; it is the only State at this table which was created by the United Nations.

108. It is indeed ironic that the representative of Israel should come at this time and simply tell us that the Arab States have refused to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. When Mr. Jarring reports on this—and others, like the late Count Bernadotte have submitted reports—people will know who did and who did not co-operate with Mr. Jarring. It is common knowledge, however, that Israel has not even declared its acceptance of the November resolution [*Security Council resolution 242 (1967)*], let alone its readiness to implement the resolution in its entirety. Instead, Israel is proceeding with its own unilateral plans to annex territories, confiscate land and buildings, and expel people in order to make room for new Jewish immigrants. Those people include mayors, lawyers, doctors and other leaders from the west bank. Israel can deceive many people for a time; it can deceive some people for some time; but it cannot deceive all of the people all of the time. Truth will ultimately win.

109. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of Israel.

110. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): I have no desire to go into any further discussion of the Middle East issues which have been so lengthily discussed on other occasions and in other Committees. I wish merely to say that I am confident that the history of events as they developed, whether in 1948 or 1956, or from 22 May to the outbreak of the six-day war, as well as prior to that, is sufficiently well known at least to the bulk of the members of this Committee to make it unnecessary for me to enter into a discussion of the

statement of the representative of Jordan or to refute the inaccuracies which it contained.

111. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of the United States in exercise of his right of reply.

112. Mr. VREELAND (United States of America): I just want to make a brief statement in reply to one of the earlier speakers this afternoon. The true facts of the situation concerning United States nationality laws have been set out in two letters to the Secretary-General from the United States Permanent Representative, both dated 20 October, which have been distributed to all delegations.

113. It is not true that any United States military personnel are serving in any of the Israeli armed forces. It is not true that the United States Government encourages American citizens to serve in the armed forces of Israel or of any other country. The facts are quite to the contrary.

114. It is true that the United States citizenship laws are world-wide in application, and in this respect there is no difference between their application to the actions of dual nationals in Israel and their application to the actions of dual nationals in Southern Yemen.

115. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of Jordan.

116. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I said yesterday that it made little difference to Jordan whether those Americans who are being enlisted now or who are there are military personnel or not. They are Americans sent to work with an army, to fight a country which the United States tells the world is a friendly country. Whether they are soldiers or only Americans of Jewish faith, they are used to fight a friendly country. This poses a real question which every American should ponder.

117. The United States is a country of minorities. If every minority were to have the right to fight in other places, I am sure that this would not strengthen international peace and security. What is more, if the Israelis are going to claim that every American Jew is Israeli and therefore has the duty and obligation to go and fight in a country which he has never even visited, by the same token Lebanon could invite the half million American Lebanese to go and serve their country—and they belong to Lebanon, unlike the Americans vis-à-vis the Jewish State—and then there would be Americans fighting Americans: a kind of civil war. Is that the intention of the United States in the matter of strengthening international peace and security, to have American Lebanese fighting American Jewish volunteers in Israel? The American Jew would hold two flags, American and Israeli. In case of conflict, since it is claimed that Jordan is a country friendly to the United States, where would the loyalty be? Would the United States then say: “Our Constitution permits every minority to go and fight, and therefore we can do nothing about it”? Or should the consequences of such an elastic law of the United States be pondered?

118. I could mention another minority. We know that there is some conflict now in Europe. What would happen

if that minority here were to leave the United States and go to fight another country friendly to the latter?

119. Would this serve and strengthen international security? We are discussing a very important item. I think that this matter is part and parcel of that item. It is very important for the United Nations here to express its position clearly on a dangerous principle that has now been introduced in international relations by the United States.

120. It is not easy for Jordan to come here and raise this question. But it involves our very being, our very existence. When almost half of Jordan is occupied by Israel, the

United States is not only sending Phantom jets, not only sending Patton tanks, not only sending Skyhawk jets, but even, by its inaction, helping every American of the Jewish faith to leave here to go to fight the Jordanians. Fight for what: Fight to accommodate the continued presence of the Israeli aggressor on the west bank of Jordan.

121. This is not an easy matter that can be handled in a simple way by this Committee. I think it should be given careful consideration and should be considered as a very important aspect of the item we are now considering.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.