

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1663rd
MEETING**

Thursday, 23 October 1969,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

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

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

Mr. Kolo (Nigeria) took the Chair.

AGENDA ITEM 103

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

1. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*translated from French*): The delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria respects the Chairman's embargo on congratulations. However, it feels it must express its satisfaction at seeing the representative of Pakistan, one of the most enlightened diplomats of the United Nations, presiding over the work of the First Committee. At the same time it wishes to express its gratification at the election of Mr. Kolo, representative of Nigeria, who has proved his skill as a negotiator, as Vice-Chairman, and of Mr. Barnett, representative of Jamaica, as Rapporteur.

2. Today, 25 years after the end of the Second World War and the founding of the United Nations, and despite the unflagging efforts of peoples to provide for and implement collective measures to avoid the threat of a war of extermination, world peace and international security are still nothing more than an ardent hope nurtured by the peoples of the world. A precarious situation still prevails in international relations. That is the unanimous opinion that we have reached in the general debate in the General Assembly.

3. Thanks to the ever-increasing power of the forces of peace, to the great surge in the movement to defend peace, and to the efforts of all those struggling against colonialism and for their national liberation, it has become possible to avoid the unleashing of a new world war. Although that is the case, peace is still being disturbed in many parts of the world. Acts of aggression are being committed against independent States and countries that have only very recently shaken off the colonial yoke. Their national territories are invaded by foreign troops; efforts are made to impose upon them once again oppressive régimes by force and through economic and other types of pressure.

4. Local disputes, created and nourished in the aftermath of the colonialist policy of certain imperialist Powers—known as “the divide and rule” policy—have found and are

finding expression today, more than is usually the case, in many statements in exercise of the right of reply made in the course of the general debate, as well as during debates in the various committees. But these occurrences, however moderate they may be, are none the less dangerous at a time when the world is filled with weapons of immense destructive power, which, if unleashed, might destroy all human life on our planet.

5. It has already been pointed out that fear and insecurity today pervade all nations, including the great Powers, and that in such circumstances even small nations are not averse to using force if they feel that the circumstances are propitious and their impunity is assured. We have, unfortunately, had striking examples of this, and flagrant repetitions of such acts in the last few years. In such a situation, it is perfectly natural that we should consider the strengthening of international security as the most important and urgent task confronting peoples and Governments, and hence the United Nations. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, this Organization was to be an instrument to strengthen peace among peoples, “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”. The United Nations must not only bend every effort to ensure the peaceful settlement of conflicts and disputes among States; it should also endeavour to prevent them by creating an effective system to safeguard and strengthen world peace and security.

6. The proposal of the Soviet Government to make an appeal to all States of the world to strengthen international security [A/C.1/L.468] has come at a very appropriate moment and is of exceptional importance. This proposal, as far as it is possible to do so, contains a whole series of steps intended to diminish international tension, to strengthen peace and security and to prevent a war of annihilation. This is the essence of the Soviet proposal.

7. The main elements of the proposal apply to different spheres of political activity.

8. The withdrawal of troops from all territories occupied as a result of action by the armed forces of States against other States and peoples defending the independence they have won as a result of the collapse of the colonial system is surely one of the most important measures in this proposal. The adoption of such a measure would mean immediate cessation of all armed conflicts that have followed the presence of foreign troops. Such a measure would strengthen the independence and the sovereignty of the young States born after the collapse of the colonial system.

9. The immediate cessation of any act to repress the movements of national liberation of peoples still subject to

colonial domination and the granting of independence to those peoples would contribute to the final elimination of the vestiges of the colonialist system. At the same time, it would help to do away with several sources of tension and conflict among States. Strict compliance with the principles of peaceful coexistence among States, irrespective of their social systems—respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and equality of rights of all States, non-interference in their domestic affairs, the peaceful settlement of disputes, the right of peoples freely to select their own social systems—must surely create an atmosphere of confidence among States, conducive to a new impetus being given to the movement of understanding among peoples.

10. The idea of setting up regional security systems in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations should certainly encourage initiative and goodwill among the peoples of different geographical regions. It would induce them to find new ways and means of strengthening the security of their region, and that in turn would contribute to the strengthening of world security.

11. Initiatives along those lines are already being taken in Europe. European security is not only of regional interest. The creation of a system of European collective security might help to strengthen world security for obvious reasons. In Europe the two world systems possessing enormous means of destruction are in direct contact. Revanchism and neo-nazism in Western Germany, two very serious threats to European and world peace, are encouraged by the reactionary forces of the world. Furthermore, it was in Europe that, in the course of the last 50 years, the two world wars broke out. Any military conflict in Europe would, in view of the modern means of destruction, undoubtedly be disastrous for all mankind. It follows that the setting up of a system of collective security in Europe would be not only of vital importance for the peoples of Europe, but also for the peoples of the world as a whole.

12. The appeal of the socialist countries that are parties to the Warsaw Treaty¹ opens a new and realistic road towards dealing with questions of European security and peaceful co-operation among the European States. The holding of a conference of all European States would be a new and constructive step in the development of peaceful coexistence and co-operation among the States of Europe.

13. European security, however, depends on certain essential elements. It can be based only on the inviolability of frontiers in Europe, and more particularly of the Oder-Neisse frontier and the frontier between the Democratic Republic of Germany and the Federal Republic of Germany, both of which frontiers were established after the Second World War, and also on the recognition as a fact of the existence of two German States. It is also high time to put an end to all discrimination in the United Nations against the Democratic Republic of Germany.

14. Although the Balkans are only a small part of Europe, they are of great importance in the maintenance of peace

and security. As the members of this Committee know full well they had the sad repute of being the "powder keg" of Europe, and, surely, that is one more reason to make every effort to strengthen security in that part of the European continent.

15. For obvious reasons, the People's Republic of Bulgaria attaches great importance to security in the Balkans. The Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria has stated that "The Bulgarian Government attaches the greatest importance to the development of relations between our country and other Balkan countries, and to the strengthening of friendship and peace in the Balkans".

16. Our country is deeply convinced that at the present time conditions are conducive to an ultimate improvement of relations among the Balkan States, to the solution of important problems of Balkan security and to the transformation of the Balkans into a zone of peace, good neighbourliness and fruitful co-operation. It supports the efforts being made to create collective security in Europe and the whole world, a system that would obviously serve as a basis for strengthening security in the Balkans and ensuring co-operation among the Balkan peoples.

17. The role of the Security Council, the United Nations organ on which falls the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, is of capital importance. It has no doubt contributed to the settlement of conflicts between States by availing itself of the powers conferred upon it by the Charter of the United Nations. However, the Council should give special attention to the creation of conditions of peace and security, to the prevention of any violation of the provisions of the Charter and to the scrupulous observance of decisions adopted. That means that an end must be put to anomalies such as the refusal by certain States to comply with the most important decisions of the Council.

18. The holding of periodic meetings of the Security Council in accordance with the terms of Article 28 of the Charter, during which attention could be given to important questions having a bearing on the strengthening of international peace and security, might facilitate the accomplishment of this task.

19. The establishment, as soon as possible, of a definition of aggression and the formulation of principles governing friendly relations among States would also facilitate the task of all the organs of the United Nations which deal with matters bearing on the maintenance of peace on the basis of strict compliance with the terms of the Charter.

20. The idea of addressing an appeal to all Governments on the strengthening of international security and of inviting them to take the necessary measures to do whatever is needed to achieve such a strengthening, has been welcomed by almost all delegations. A number of constructive suggestions have been made and should, in our view, be examined by our Committee. Those who have tried to reject the Soviet proposal out of hand stand alone.

21. Some comments have been made which are of special interest. It has been pointed out that the Soviet appeal

¹ Statement calling for a general European conference to discuss problems of European security and peaceful co-operation, adopted by the Political Treaty Organization at Budapest on 17 March 1969 (document A/7536).

contained no proposals for disarmament measures. According to some delegations, such an attitude is in keeping with the changes that have taken place in the respective positions of the great Powers on matters dealing with disarmament, despite the fact that disarmament is an important and constructive element in international security.

22. We entirely agree that disarmament measures, and particularly measures for general and complete disarmament, could be not only an important factor in the process of strengthening international security but even the basic element in that process.

23. The socialist countries have always maintained that one of the best ways of ensuring security in the world is to rid it of the burden of the arms race and particularly of the nuclear arms race. In view of such a clearly defined attitude, long held by the socialist countries, it is surprising to hear certain representatives state, without making the necessary distinctions, that in the lexicon of the great Powers the word "disarmament" has been replaced slowly but progressively by such expressions as "control of armaments" or "limitations of armaments". Thus the great Powers are held to have renounced the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament.

24. But, only two days ago, the representative of the Soviet Union confirmed the position of his country on the question [1660th meeting] when he said that the Soviet proposal on general and complete disarmament, as well as the other proposals on disarmament, are still valid.

25. As we know, all the proposals were categorically rejected by the main Western Power. On various unconvincing pretexts, it has refused to give serious consideration to the proposals made by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

26. My delegation has mentioned all this so that there should not be any doubt as to where the responsibility lies. If delegations which have expressed the desire to see disarmament and certain of its specific aspects included in the Soviet proposal have proposals and suggestions to make to that effect, the socialist countries would not object. On the contrary, we should find it extremely helpful if all the elements of disarmament were contained in the context of a document concerning the strengthening of international security.

27. But, in the light of the difficulties and the obstacles to achieving tangible results on the road to disarmament, even in the appropriate Committee, because of the negative attitude of certain Powers, is it not understandable that the Soviet Union, which has always endeavoured to safeguard peace and security, has tried to find the lowest common denominator as a basis for the strengthening of international security? Surely, it is with this intention of contributing to the strengthening of international security that the Soviet Union decided to prepare and submit that minimum programme in the form it has now adopted, namely, the appeal.

28. However, this initiative is apparently coming up against the refusal, on the part of the delegation of the United States, even to discuss the question. Such a position

is contrary even to the declarations in the General Assembly by the President of the United States.

29. Thus it is our understanding that the statements made here without any distinctions for very obvious reasons regarding the super-Powers' alleged replacement of the words "general and complete disarmament" by ephemeral formulas such as "arms control" or "limitation of armaments", are only intended to let the responsibility fall where it belongs without any mention being made by name of the Powers actually responsible. The representative of the Soviet Union has made this point clear by stating only two days ago that the Soviet Union has always been ready to honour the proposals it has submitted.

30. As the members of the Committee will remember, the Soviet Union has made the following proposals on disarmament: the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament; the conclusion of a treaty prohibiting underground tests of nuclear weapons; the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons; the elimination of military bases on foreign soil; the creation of denuclearized zones in different parts of the world; the conclusion of a convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons and on the destruction of such weapons, the last of which is on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. The representative of the Soviet Union has told us that these proposals are still valid. All we are waiting for now is the affirmative reply of the delegation of the United States on all these points.

31. It would doubtless be of great importance if unanimity could be reached on the initiative of including in the appeal on the strengthening of international security a paragraph concerning the proposals on disarmament which have been before the United Nations for many years. The initiative now lies with those who have made suggestions on the matter.

32. The form chosen by the Soviet Government, namely an appeal addressed to the Governments of the entire world to make known explicitly their desire to co-operate in the strengthening of international security and in the concrete measures included in the appeal, is of great importance. Such a procedure would make it possible to review in future those measures which different Governments are ready to take in applying a policy of international security. A study of those measures, that would be contained in the replies of the various Governments at the next session of the General Assembly would be not only useful but indispensable. It is for this reason that the inclusion in the agenda of an item "The application by States of measures to strengthen international security" as soon as the appeal was adopted would undoubtedly prove most useful both for the work of our Organization and for the promotion of international security.

33. The appeal should obviously be addressed to all Governments; in fact it would be futile, since a large number of States want to include disarmament measures as a step towards strengthening international security, to seek to strengthen it merely by ensuring that Member States of the United Nations disarm; the strengthening of international security and of world peace are incumbent on all

States, regardless of whether or not they are Members of the United Nations, and this is all the more important since there are States, more particularly in Asia and Europe, without whose participation it would be impossible to set up true international security or strengthen world peace in a stable manner.

34. All peoples are concerned about security and peace, and it is important therefore that the appeal for the strengthening of international peace should be addressed to all. The adoption of such an appeal would be one of the important acts that the United Nations could perform on the eve of its twenty-fifth anniversary. To a large extent, this would contribute to clearing the international atmosphere, to reducing international tension and to the general improvement of the present international situation.

35. Mr. BAYULKEN (Turkey): As I am speaking for the first time in this Committee, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to convey through you the warmest congratulations of my delegation and of myself to Mr. Shahi on his unanimous election to the chairmanship of this Committee. I also wish to express our sincere congratulations to you and to our Rapporteur on your elections to your important posts. There is no doubt that this composition of the Bureau of our Committee is the best guarantee of the successful conclusion of our important work here.

36. I trust that this friendly and modest challenge to the ruling of Mr. Shahi, to the effect that no time should be wasted in paying compliments to the Bureau, will be accepted with his customary kindness and generosity, since these wishes are inspired not only by the most cordial and fraternal relations existing between Pakistan and Turkey, but also by my long-standing personal friendship with him.

37. Various aspects of the item we are dealing with have already been explored, interpreted and commented upon by several speakers who preceded me. It is evident that the item "The Strengthening of International Security" proposed by the Soviet Union [A/7654] and included in the agenda of the twenty-fourth session by unanimous agreement is being considered with the attention its importance deserves.

38. I should like to say at the outset that Turkey has always attached the greatest importance to the realization of real security in international relations, as conceived by the Charter of the United Nations, and has worked relentlessly in this direction. In our judgement, international security is one of the foundations of international relations on which alone real peace and friendly relations can be based and through which progress can be achieved towards a better world order.

39. To return to the item, however, accepting the importance of an idea is one thing and finding a way to carry out this idea to its goal is another. Establishing the link between these two is, of course, a question of method. As the importance and the scope of the item we are discussing has wide implications, my delegation is gratified to observe that the method employed in this Committee in dealing with this item has been constructive and promising. In fact, such subject matters of vital importance always require a most careful analysis and study. In doing that, one method

is to turn back to the past, to analyse and evaluate the subject-matter in the light of experience and precedents. However, too much emphasis on the past would result in using a magnifying glass to scrutinize disjointed events, which may prevent us from reaching correct conclusions. The second method is to look at the future of the subject while keeping the lessons of the past in our minds. Such an approach, with emphasis on the future, would not, I think, obstruct our view with the ashes of extinct fires and yet would remind us of the agony we have endured.

40. When we look back on the 24-year history of our Organization, we note that it has gone through several stages, each of which is characterized by the outstanding events of the period. Those of us who served in the United Nations in the early fifties and who have the honour of serving again now in the late sixties are keenly aware of the changes that the image of our Organization has undergone. I shall not attempt to enumerate these stages but one aspect has remained constant throughout—the yearning of all peoples for a just and enduring peace and the desire of all nations to strengthen international security as a *sine qua non* for maintaining and promoting the kind of order to which we all aspire. This is also the principal objective of the Charter and the main purpose of the United Nations. We are, of course, all aware that this desire for peace and security cannot be fulfilled in one spectacular leap. Without going into examples from the distant past, we can find many instances in the relatively short history of our Organization which bear witness to this fact. Indeed, we should not be disillusioned or disheartened when confronted with this reality, because, as several speakers have remarked, the process of securing and finally establishing a lasting order of international peace and security is not a simple problem with only one or two facets. It is a multi-dimensional subject which embraces a great number of important human problems and is closely interwoven with all of them.

Mr. Shahi (Pakistan) resumed the Chair.

41. One hardly needs to point out that the provisions of the United Nations Charter enshrined all the noble aspirations of mankind. It is a document which constitutes a guide *par excellence* for regulating international relations and leading humanity to the ultimate goal to which we all aspire. It is almost impossible to separate and differentiate between those basic provisions and to ascribe to them varying degrees of importance.

42. As a matter of fact, even if we ignored for a moment the binding nature of those provisions, how could we set aside the immense intellectual and moral contributions that the purposes and principles, set forth in the preamble as well as in Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter, have made—and, I am sure, will continue to make—in conjunction with the efforts of Member States towards a better world order, peaceful, secure and friendly for all, large and small States alike?

43. It has been stressed by previous speakers, and especially by the representative of Sweden, that principles, however solemnly declared, however eloquently phrased, are no substitute for day-to-day observance of those principles. I will even go a little further and say that it is

not enough only to observe those principles faithfully: it is also vitally important that Members should constantly endeavour to promote them. The picture drawn by many representatives of the existing contradictions and gaps between the principles of the Charter and the reality of the situation in many areas of the world is definitely not a bright one. Although our Organization has to its credit a great number of achievements, relating also to the maintenance of peace and security, its failures and omissions constitute grave challenges which will require our constant vigilance and efforts to meet.

44. The vestiges of the era of colonialism still constitute anachronistic problems, especially in the continent of Africa. Those problems are far from being settled. The winds of change have not yet penetrated many areas of that continent where people are still struggling for independence, equality and non-discrimination. They earnestly look forward to the day when their human dignity will be restored. This deplorable situation persists ten years after the adoption of the historic Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. It would appear appropriate, therefore, that in its proposal for strengthening international security [*A/C.1/L.468*] the Soviet Union has stressed that problem.

45. I am sure there is no doubt in anyone's mind that the elimination of the last vestiges of colonialism and the assurance of respect for human dignity through the implementation of human rights and fundamental freedoms embodied in the Charter and innumerable decisions, resolutions and international instruments of the United Nations family are prerequisites for the attainment of a just and lasting peace and international security.

46. On the other hand, while the concept of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest remains one of the fundamental principles of our Organization, the persistent and grave violations of that principle continue to endanger international peace and security. The Soviet proposal, by pointing to this state of affairs, brings to the attention of Members an important element which is part of the concept of security as stated in the Charter of the United Nations.

47. Furthermore, is it not a fact that all attempts to achieve real and lasting security are condemned to fail as long as one section of mankind lives in affluence, while another, comprising the majority of humanity, remains prey to hunger, disease, ignorance and misery? Our world is constantly shrinking and, alas, there exists an enormous gap between the living standards of the developed and the developing nations. Worse still, this gap continues to widen with each passing year. While this explosive situation persists and is not remedied by constant and organized joint efforts, who can claim that peace and security will not remain illusory? Whether security is going to be strengthened in the world will depend in no small measure on our ability to improve the lot of the peoples of developing countries in the decade of the seventies.

48. As for the disarmament problem, there surely exists a unanimous view that this vital problem for the survival of mankind is most intimately linked to the establishment and maintenance of a lasting peace and real security.

49. I have attempted to touch upon some fundamental principles and concepts of our Charter which undoubtedly constitute the pillars of the kind of peace and international security to which we should all dedicate our efforts, energies and actions. I have also referred very briefly to our achievements, as well as to our failures. As I stated at the beginning of my intervention, the balance-sheet that we draw should not discourage us. I have also emphasized that during the stages through which our Organization has evolved in the past 24 years we have fully understood that peace and security are interwoven concepts, the promotion of which, first and foremost, demands from all of us a sincere observance of the Charter and the conduct of our mutual relations within the framework of its purposes and principles.

50. This calls for the building of confidence. As there has been a promising development towards *détente*, we should be well advised to work for closer understanding and not create unnecessary discord. It is on the continuous process of encouraging this new development and securing the relaxation of tensions that the successful outcome of our attempts to strengthen international peace and security will ultimately depend.

51. It is gratifying that during the general debate in plenary meetings, as well as in the consideration of the present item in our Committee, the need for strengthening the United Nations has been a most prominent theme. My delegation considers that a good augury, especially on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization. If our words are matched by our deeds, the recognition of this need and the consequent actions to be undertaken by the Members for this purpose will surely serve the cause of peace and security.

52. While welcoming this auspicious general understanding, my delegation believes that we should be doing well if at the same time we took imaginative, constructive, balanced steps in line with the spirit and letter of the Charter in order to bolster international peace and security. As will appear from what I have said up to now in these reflections on our previous endeavours in that direction, to work for lasting peace is a noble but at the same time an arduous task which requires, above all, a sincere attachment to the principles of the Charter, as well as unrelenting efforts, patience and dedication. We should strive, therefore, to attain our goals, even if the method we employ takes us there only step by step, bit by bit.

53. It took perseverance, good workmanship and strong mortar to build the seven wonders of the world. What we need to bolster the structure of international security within the concept of the Charter is goodwill, trust and realism as our materials and a common yardstick as our tool.

54. Let me stress once again that the Charter of the United Nations is a body of interwoven organs, functions and balances created in keeping with its lofty purposes and principles. Therefore while attempting to strengthen one of the organs, care should be taken not to weaken the others. In the light of these considerations, we feel that the activation of paragraph 2 of Article 28 of the Charter would be useful for ensuring the holding of meetings in the

Security Council with participation on the governmental level.

55. My delegation shares the views of those speakers who call for an intensification of the efforts of the Special Committees dealing with the definition of aggression and with the principles of friendly relations and co-operation among States. The importance of also arriving at an understanding on United Nations peace-keeping operations need not be stressed. It is clear that such an understanding would be important from the point of view of contributing to the strengthening of international security.

56. As regards regional arrangements coming under Chapter VIII of the Charter, these can play an important part in the promotion of international peace and security. My delegation, hoping that it also reflects the sentiments of other delegations, believes that securing unanimous support for strengthening international security in accordance with the principles of the Charter is our common objective. It devolves upon all of us to find the best and most constructive method to be employed in attaining this objective. We are confident that the wisdom and experience of our Committee will lead us to the most productive method.

57. At this late stage in the debate my delegation has in mind the necessity of avoiding long statements. We have, therefore, refrained from indulging in an exhaustive analysis of the subject. The foregoing remarks are some observations of a preliminary nature reflecting the views of my delegation.

58. The CHAIRMAN: I thank Mr. Bayulken of Turkey for the kind words he has said about my colleagues on the Bureau and myself. The spirit in which he made his remarks in regard to my own person reflects the fraternal relations existing between Pakistan and Turkey.

59. Mr. EL BOURI (Libya) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all congratulate you on your election to the office of Chairman of this important Committee. Knowing as we do your qualities as an eminent diplomat, your objectivity and your devotion to the principles of the United Nations, we feel sure that the First Committee will, under your wise leadership, carry out its work with full success. May I also congratulate the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur on their well-deserved election.

60. As we are nearing the end of the debate on this item of the agenda and as several of the speakers who preceded me have spoken in considerable detail on the problem affecting international security and on the means of safeguarding or reinforcing international security, I shall speak very briefly, as you requested.

61. At a time when the United Nations is preparing to commemorate its twenty-fifth anniversary, the Soviet Union's initiative in submitting the item on the strengthening of international security for inclusion in the agenda of the General Assembly points to the great importance attached by the various countries of the world to international security, to its strengthening and to the elimination of all that still threatens the peace of the world, hampers

co-operation between peoples and poisons the international atmosphere.

62. Thus it is quite natural that after 25 years of existence, an appraisal of the balance-sheet of the United Nations is needed. As the representative of France said in his excellent speech of 17 October, the United Nations should scrutinize itself so that its members may lay down the most appropriate means of reaching the assigned objectives [*1657th meeting, para. 11*].

63. Since the end of the Second World War and the explosion of the first atomic bomb, the aim of maintaining international peace and security has had first priority in the United Nations.

64. The tragic destruction wrought by the first two world wars and the interminable succession of local and colonial wars, the scores of millions of victims of those wars and the development of nuclear arms have left no doubt about the consequence of a new conflict on the same scale. For some 25 years now this destructive nuclear weapon has dominated international life and led to a mad race to improve it.

65. The sufferings endured by humanity and the determination of peoples to save future generations from the scourge of war inspired the victorious Powers of the Second World War to found the United Nations.

66. However, the world has undergone great changes since 1945. The evolution of a balance between the major Powers, the existence of nuclear weapons, the accession of scores of countries to independence and their admission to the United Nations, the reality of great China—all these factors have created new conditions in power relationships. The face of war has become more menacing, more terrifying. The prospect of mass destruction by nuclear arms has united humanity into a single family. Progress in the field of technology and science, the speed of communications, and the penetration of space by man have rendered peoples more conscious of the smallness of their planet and of the fact that they have a common destiny. The peace and security of the world have become indivisible: any event wherever it occurs affects us all. In a constantly shrinking world, the interdependence of nations and of continents has become a reality.

67. Peoples are conscious of the fact that without sincere co-operation and without justice, it will not be possible to construct the better world envisaged in the Charter or to avert the annihilation which threatens all of us.

68. The United Nations, in conformity with the spirit of the Charter, is the only international organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and for the promotion of co-operation between peoples. The strengthening of the effectiveness and of the prestige of the United Nations is the best way of enabling humanity, through a collective effort, to strengthen international security.

69. Nevertheless, it is true to say that the United Nations, which has achieved substantial progress in its struggle for cultural, economic and social objectives, has not been able to fulfill its main task, for which it is the sole competent

body, namely the establishment of peace and security throughout the world. However considerable the achievements the United Nations has to its credit, the aim of the Charter to ensure and maintain peace throughout the world has not yet been brought about. The impotence of the United Nations in certain cases is particularly due to its Members, and more particularly to the permanent members of the Security Council. We are convinced that if the great Powers give proof of their goodwill and of being sincerely attached to the maintenance of peace, it will be possible to reinforce the role of the United Nations when it has to block attempts to violate peace and to prevent conflicts by the means provided in the Charter.

70. However, at a time when the United Nations is nearing its twenty-fifth anniversary, we regret to note the manifestations of violence and the constant recourse to force, whether to settle international differences, to achieve expansionist aims or to continue to exploit and oppress peoples living under colonial domination. Resolutions of the United Nations are flouted and ridiculed, and international conventions are systematically and arrogantly violated. The arms race continues on its frenzied course, whether the weapons are nuclear, chemical, bacteriological or conventional. This arms race uses up enormous material resources while the gap between the poor and the rich countries widens and two thirds of the world continues to live in conditions of poverty, ignorance and disease.

71. We are witnessing serious armed conflicts in certain parts of the world where blood flows freely every day and where peaceful civilian populations are attacked by aircraft and napalm bombs.

72. The role of the Security Council in the last few years has been limited to sterile debate and to the adoption of stillborn resolutions, which no one troubles to implement for fear of the coercive measures provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter. The main cause of this failure to act has always been the lack of agreement between the major Powers.

73. My country, Libya, a small country that struggled for many years for its independence and which bore enormous material and human losses during the Second World War without being a party to the conflict, is, like all other small countries of the world, sincerely attached to peace and to the Charter of the United Nations, in the hope that the Charter would provide the Organization with a basis for a vigilant and effective international organism for peace and world security.

74. However, the present situation does not fulfil our hopes. We are witnessing today flagrant violations of the Charter and of its principles, and the systematic defiance of United Nations resolutions.

75. The apathy and inaction of the Security Council in the face of the crises and serious conflicts that occur in the world are mainly due, as I have already pointed out, to the lack of agreement between the major Powers, to their conflicting views on the basic points of the questions considered, despite the fact that the Charter has placed the responsibility for peace and international security in the hands of those major Powers which are permanent members of the Security Council.

76. This antagonism and lack of agreement between the major Powers responsible for the maintenance of peace and security in the world were clearly evident during the war which broke out in the Middle East in June 1967. A Member State of the United Nations committed a flagrant aggression against three other Member States and occupied parts of their territories. The Security Council, when the matter was brought before it, proved incapable of complying with the principles of the Charter and its traditions by condemning the aggression and ordering a return of the invading forces to their starting point. When, six months later, the Security Council, as a result of combined efforts, adopted resolution 242 (1967) which it considered an equitable basis for the settlement of the Middle East problem, Israel refused to accept the resolution, rejected the mediation of the major Powers and continued to insist upon direct negotiations which would allow it to dictate its conditions and legalize its annexation of occupied Arab territories which the resolution rejected in principle. What is more, Israel has rejected all the resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council on the status of Jerusalem and for the past 20 years has refused to implement the General Assembly resolution on the repatriation or compensation of Arab refugees from Palestine.

77. There can be no doubt that Israel, which is a small State of 2 million persons without any basic economy, could never have allowed itself to take up such a provocative attitude towards the international community had it not been supported and encouraged by a major Power, a member of the Security Council, namely the United States of America. The United States not only provides Israel with the most advanced and deadliest weapons, but goes so far as to encourage its nationals to serve under the Israel flag in combatants units.

78. Another example of the impotence of the United Nations to ensure respect for the terms of the Charter is the well-known case of Namibia, where an international Territory is illegally occupied by a State Member of the United Nations, without the United Nations having either the power or the authority to compel the Government of South Africa to vacate the Territory in question and to recognize its international character.

79. We may also note the challenge of Ian Smith in Southern Rhodesia and the sad fate of the populations that are still under the Portuguese colonial yoke.

80. I have no intention of leading the Committee into a debate on the problems of the Middle East or on decolonization. I simply wanted to show that the Charter of our Organization contains all the necessary provisions to ensure international peace and security and co-operation among the peoples, that the Security Council remains the only international organ capable of ensuring the maintenance of peace throughout the world and that humanity has no other alternative than the United Nations.

81. Nevertheless the manifest impotence of the United Nations before certain grave problems such as the ones I have referred to imposes upon us the duty of seeking other means and other ways of increasing its authority, ensuring respect for its resolutions and restoring the faith that the weak and small nations placed in it.

82. The Soviet initiative should be considered from this point of view and the appeal that the Committee will judge it desirable to make will certainly serve to strengthen the confidence of peoples in the United Nations and to reinforce international security.

83. We should recall, however, that any attempt to strengthen international security will be vain if unaccompanied by measures leading to the final elimination of colonialism, to a strict implementation of the principles of self-determination and to a sincere understanding on the part of the richer nations of the conditions of those who are less favoured. These measures would prove ineffective if the international community did not undertake to respect right and justice. We must endeavour to ensure that the principle of the rule of law is considered an imperative rule in international relations. Similarly, without justice as its foundation, no permanent settlement of the problems faced by the world today and which bar the road to peace and international security may be found. A permanent peace which, as the representative of Brazil said in his fine speech [1653rd meeting], would consecrate and legalize a situation born of menace and of the use of brute force, would be an ill service to the cause of the United Nations.

84. In conclusion, I should like to congratulate the Soviet Union on its initiative, which should enable the United Nations to draw up a balance-sheet showing its debits and credits and to put forward new ideas and methods to increase its effectiveness and prestige and strengthen the measures for international security.

85. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Libya for the kind words he said about the Bureau and about me personally.

86. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Ceylon): The cause of international peace and security is and must be the overriding concern and principal preoccupation of the United Nations. For that reason, if for no other, we must welcome any effort to compel the Organization's attention to this question. It is in this spirit that we acclaim the Soviet initiative in bringing the matter before the General Assembly [A/7654] at a crucial moment in the existence of the United Nations. The approach of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization offers the best occasion and excuse, if excuse be needed, for us to review and assess our performance, to probe into our deficiencies, to attempt to ascertain the reasons for the lack of more positive achievement and to find the remedies. We have maintained this thesis in our statement in the general debate on 8 October [1783rd plenary meeting].

87. The General Assembly must at the same time, however, be satisfied that our approach to the question does not amount to a mere tedious reiteration of the principles that we have been voicing with the utmost solemnity for the last 24 years but to which so many of us have accorded little more than the ritual distinction of lip service. We have ourselves, in the general debate, stated that the moment is opportune for a reaffirmation of our faith in the principles and purposes of the United Nations, but that is too simple an exercise unless it is carried out in a spirit of genuine sincerity. Further, in the case of those whose single-minded pursuit of their selfish and narrow national interests has

blinded them to the principles of the Charter, there is a need for a repudiation of the cynical doctrine of nineteenth century diplomacy that a nation should have neither friends nor enemies but only interests. That doctrine may have suited an era when territorial aggrandizement and the exploitation of the weak and defenceless were as popular a pastime of nations as fox-hunting was for the aristocracy. Twentieth century morality and technology alike both demand a different code of international conduct.

88. It is of the greatest importance that an appeal such as that proposed by the Soviet Union must in tone, in terms and in spirit be universally acceptable and thereby qualify for unanimous endorsement. It must not be partisan nor must it contain any implied reproach. Furthermore, it must be frank enough to admit that there is no single factor or situation that creates international tension, that each crisis that arises from time to time or that exists today is the result of some vaster or more complex combination of continuing circumstances.

89. Few would challenge, however, the proposition that the principal causes of international tension are the lust for national power, an eye for the main chance, and implacable hostility and irreconcilable differences between rival economic and social systems which, in order to win adherents to their cause, resort to the very methods which the Charter condemns in spirit and in letter. Among this complex of factors is the acquisition of overwhelming strength and power that gives a feeling of absolute superiority or an exaggerated sense of responsibility combined with deep suspicion and mistrust of others' motives.

90. It has been stated that the benchmarks of contemporary history are not 1945, 1969 or 1970. In the same sense it has been stated that we must not look backwards but rather look to the future. But this is not what history teaches us. The explanation to the present can be found only in the past—though not merely in one single feature of the past. The very first paragraph of the Soviet draft appeal [A/C.1/L.468] records, and rightly so in our opinion, the incontrovertible fact that 1945 marked the victory over the Fascist aggressors in the Second World War. Although the Charter makes no explicit reference to the fascist aggressors, it was the holocaust for which they were responsible that provided the impetus for the creation of a world Organization dedicated to the maintenance of international peace and security.

91. The United Nations can claim credit for having succeeded in avoiding the scourge of a world war for a third time in our lives, but it has failed to prevent several wars more restricted in their scope but no less savage than those that have preceded them. The cardinal injunctions of the Charter in regard to the maintenance of international peace and security are contained in Article 2 relating to the obligations of Members. They are:

firstly, "... [to] settle their... disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security... are not endangered";

secondly, "... [to] refrain... from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state";

thirdly, "... [to] give the United Nations every assist-

ance in any action it takes in accordance with the . . . Charter, and [to] refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.”

These injunctions derive from a certain set of circumstances which prevailed at the end of the Second World War.

92. Relying on these circumstances and beguiled by the tenuous relationship prevailing among the victorious Allied Powers, the Charter proceeded on the facile assumption, soon to be contradicted, that the victorious alliance of convenience against fascism and nazism would endure in substance and that the Allied Powers would continue to have a community of interests even after their common enemy had been destroyed. Unfortunately, this community of interests was sought to be maintained by a tacit understanding regarding division of authority and influence between the two blocs in the alliance, in vital and strategic sectors, an understanding now better known to the world as the doctrine of spheres of interest.

93. The Charter failed to take account of the irreconcilable contradiction between the social and economic systems represented by the two blocs. The history of the uncompromising conflict between these two systems and of their ill-concealed policy and purpose of subverting each other's influence by all available means, not excluding force, a policy only temporarily kept in abeyance during the period 1939-1945, was glossed over by the well-intentioned architects of world order who met in San Francisco in 1945 to erect this monument to human idealism on the unstable foundation of human frailty.

94. Other nations were drawn into this conflict between the two power blocs either through a natural sense of affinity with one faction or the other or through the feeling that they could protect themselves best by an alliance with one or the other of the two power blocs. Fortunately for the world, there existed a third group which stood aloof and uncommitted and sought by a policy of non-alignment to make a contribution to international peace and security. It is from the efforts of this group that the international community can derive some inspiration to fortify its avowed desire to establish international peace and security.

95. There is another document from which equally powerful inspiration can be drawn, that is, the Bandung Declaration on the Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation adopted by the Asian-African Conference of April 1955 which was convened on the initiative of the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia and Pakistan, and attended by 24 other countries. It is worth noting that the participants in that conference and the signatories to the declaration included the People's Republic of China, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the State of Viet-Nam, as well as countries which later did not come within the non-aligned group, such as Iran, Japan, Philippines, Thailand and Turkey.

96. The 10 precepts of the Bandung Declaration,² like the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter on

which it is based, constitute the most elaborate and comprehensive prescription for international peace and security that has yet been formulated. I should like to draw special attention to item 6 of the Bandung Declaration, which sets out the following principles as necessary for the promotion of world peace and co-operation, namely: (a) abstention from the use of arrangements of collective defence to serve the particular interests of any of the big Powers; and (b) abstention by any country from exerting pressure on other countries. Sub-paragraph (a) of this item was later to become the foundation of the policy of non-alignment and an indispensable qualification for membership of that group.

97. The essential spirit and character of the Charter are affirmative and constructive. The use of force for the attainment of peace is only a residuary provision and an ultimate resort. Even Chapter VIII of the Charter relating to regional arrangements envisages them essentially as a means for achieving the pacific settlement of local disputes and makes the proviso that all arrangements or agencies and their activities contemplated under that Chapter are to be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

98. In practice, however, what the world has witnessed after the establishment of the United Nations has been the creation of powerful military alliances and reliance on force as a means of maintaining peace, rather than the resort to pacific means of settlement of disputes in order to avoid the resort to force. It is the latter approach that the Bandung Declaration sought to stress in its item 6.

99. All this might be construed as implying that the sole responsibility for the strengthening of international security devolves on the major Powers and especially the two super-Powers. By definition they have a special responsibility, but lesser Powers are not absolved from the duty of practising what they profess and preach. There needs to be more punctilious observance of and recourse to the provisions of Chapter VI, especially Article 37, and in any revision of the Charter the desirability of making the procedures under Article 34, and paragraph 1 of Article 35, mandatory, deserves careful attention.

100. The benefits and advantages of peace and international security are transcendental. If a secure world order can be attained only through some slight surrender of national sovereignty, we must be prepared to make that sacrifice. No purpose would be served by equipping ourselves with all the paraphernalia and accoutrements of peace-keeping, if we fail to make a conscientious commitment to the principle of pacific settlement of disputes.

101. In our statement in the general debate on 8 October, we dealt with the question of regional security schemes with special reference to the proposal for a system of collective security to ensure peace in Asia. We note that section IV of the Soviet appeal on the strengthening of international security recognizes that such regional security systems in the various parts of the world must be “based on the joint efforts of all States of the areas concerned, set up and acting in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations”, if they are to promote the strengthening of international security. We must reiterate

² Declaration of Principles made by the Asian-African Conference, held in Bandung, 18-24 April 1955.

our conviction that the idea of a collective security scheme, if it is conceived and executed in the military sense, would presuppose the existence of an enemy outside the region, or a breach of the peace by a member of the region. Any regional security scheme to be effective would have to include one or more of the major Powers of the world and cannot fail to become subservient to their own policies and interests. As we have already indicated, such an arrangement is at variance with the principle of non-alignment and is, therefore, not acceptable to us. We would, however, welcome any system of regional co-operation for trade, economic and cultural purposes, as well as for the pacific settlement of local disputes and problems. To describe it as a system of collective regional security would, however, be to give it a name which its habitation does not deserve. The cause of regional security, particularly in the Asian region, could be even better served by international agreement to exclude military establishments from the Indian Ocean area and to declare it an area of peace, as we have already stressed.

102. We agree that the General Assembly should encourage the special committees and bodies that have been set up to define aggression and to codify the principles of friendly relations and co-operation between States to persevere in their efforts. We do not suffer from any illusion that the mere definition of aggression will result in preventing or averting aggression, nor are we convinced that, even if agreement were reached on the definition of aggression, the identification of any act as one of aggression would automatically result in effective action by the United Nations. We must not, however, be deterred by the remoteness of the ideal but must patiently work towards it. A clear definition of aggression based on objective criteria and accepted by the United Nations would at least make the identification of the aggressor possible.

103. We support the proposal that the Security Council should assume a more active role, as provided for in Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter, but without any diminution of the functions and powers of the General Assembly.

104. The delegation of Ceylon would like to stress the self-evident proposition that the foundation of peace and security is justice. All efforts at ensuring international peace and security would be futile without the realization of the principle of universality in the membership of the United Nations and participation in its activities. We are unswerving in our support for the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China as the sole representative of the people of China. The Organization should no longer seek refuge behind a fiction that was created in 1949 and is still being maintained as an obstacle to the participation of the People's Republic of China in the activities of the United Nations on the only terms which it considers consistent with its national dignity.

105. We have heard with interest the suggestion made by the representative of Iraq [*1655th meeting*] that a representative group be appointed to study the effectiveness of the United Nations and its organs in the field of international security in its political, economic and social aspects, as an essential part of a general review of the world situation and the role of the United Nations. It is a suggestion that we consider worth pursuing.

106. The representative of Turkey made a reference this morning to the balance-sheet of the United Nations at the end of 24 years. I am afraid that we are in the red in many respects. We shall need to make a very strenuous effort to achieve financial solvency and to avoid moral bankruptcy.

107. We believe that the strengthening of international peace and security depends ultimately on the abandonment of the politics of power, the renunciation of the threat or use of force as a means of asserting claims or settling disputes, the composition of differences between the rival ideological groups and the pursuit of a policy of genuine peaceful coexistence between them, the final extirpation of the evils of colonialism, *apartheid* and racism, genuine respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States, large and small, and scrupulous abstention from interference in the internal affairs of States. Without an unequivocal commitment on the part of all nations to these principles, the appeal that we are now discussing will serve no better purpose than another prayer added to the already overburdened litany of the United Nations.

108. U SOE TIN (Burma): Tomorrow we celebrate the twenty-fourth anniversary of the United Nations. A year hence the silver jubilee of the United Nations will be celebrated with something more than a mere customary festivity. A top-level preparatory committee has been entrusted with the task of preparing recommendations and plans for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. It has been agreed that that anniversary should be a solemn occasion for reflection and stocktaking of the quarter century of our Organization's existence and for renewed dedication to the achievement of the ideals the members set out to attain 25 years ago at San Francisco.

109. In these circumstances it is only fitting that the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly under your dynamic chairmanship, Mr. Chairman, ably supported by your distinguished colleagues in the Bureau, should also be indulging in a fruitful and constructive exercise aimed at renewing our efforts to promote the cause of international understanding and at rededicating ourselves to the principles of international order and morality set out in the Charter.

110. It is in that light that the delegation of Burma welcomes with understanding and appreciation the initiative taken by the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in introducing the item "The strengthening of international security" which we are now discussing. At the same time, I should like to repeat here what my Foreign Minister said in the general debate in the plenary regarding the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary. He said:

"With increasing age some of the lustre may have been lost from the ideals that were set at San Francisco, but it is the view of the delegation of Burma that we should neither despair at this loss nor yet cynically accept, in the name of realism, some of the failures attendant on the activities of the Organization. A renewed determination by all nations to practise—I repeat—"to practise more consistently the principles enshrined in the Charter would surely be the most effective rededication by the membership to the ideals set out at San Francisco." [*1766th plenary meeting, para. 48.*]

111. Twenty-four years have passed since the 51 nations, determined to banish war for all time and to create a peaceful, happy and prosperous world, and vowing to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours and to unite their strength to maintain international peace and security, drew up an international Charter of peace, justice and freedom for all mankind and founded the United Nations Organization.

112. Membership of the Organization has today grown to 126 in number. The years since the setting up of the Organization have been most eventful. Monumental achievements have been made by man in the field of science and technology which veritably place within his grasp a golden key to a golden future, the means and opportunity as never before in history, to build for himself and for generations to come a better and fuller life and a new international order as envisaged in the Charter.

113. But it is a sad reflection of the weakness of man that, having understood and conquered in large measure the mystifying forces of nature surrounding him, having conquered space and having landed man on the moon—which is indeed a truly great achievement of human genius and a culminating feat of science and technology—man finds himself still unable to gain mastery of himself or of his fears or to overcome his suspicion towards his fellow men. The trust and understanding that seemed to have existed among nations at the end of the Second World War have given way to fears and suspicions. Thoughts and actions, energy and resources have come to be directed more towards making massive preparations for a possible future war than towards creative conditions for a lasting peace and widening prosperity.

114. Thus, against his best interest and frequently his better judgement, man has for nearly a quarter of a century been devoting by far the greater part of his extensive knowledge, his creative genius and his massive energy and resources towards increasing his capacity for self-destruction, towards making and perfecting diabolical weapons which he instinctively knows could or should never be used. That senseless waste of human energies and resources has not only placed all mankind constantly under the sinister threat of total annihilation but it has created deeper divisions, bedevilled relations among nations and made peace—genuine and lasting peace—even more difficult to attain. The inevitable result is that conditions in this world of ours have not evolved in the way envisaged in the Charter.

115. Indeed, conditions that are a far cry from those conceived in the Charter have generally prevailed and, disturbingly enough, are being accepted as normal. It is tragic that the world, not having known genuine total peace for so long, should have come to accept as peace the absence of a global war. It is all the more tragic that even some sort of peace can only be maintained precariously by the so-called balance of terror. It is a disquieting thought that force—the threat or use of which in relations among nations in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations, is forbidden in the Charter—has in practice become the condition for peace; that the uneasy peace of the world is maintained not through co-operative action but only through mutual terror, only through a massive threat of mutual annihilation.

116. Peace, it seems, is attainable only as the synthesis of conflict, not through common sense and good will. Far too often have we found settlement becoming possible only after collision, agreement only after struggle, and *détente*—even of a limited and partial character—only after narrowly averted catastrophes. All that is a measure of our world's failure to live up to the ideals and high principles which we ourselves laid down at the time of the drafting of the Charter to guide our future thoughts and actions.

117. As the United Nations approaches the quarter-century mark, the delegation of Burma considers that it is time that the nations of the world began programming for the strengthening of international peace and security in earnest, setting targets and, wherever possible, the time in which they are to be attained. The nations of the world must have a new set of values, a new code of conduct to guide one another's relations. We must discard old ways and old concepts that have not been conducive to peace and understanding among nations, and we must refrain from reasserting in any shape or form outmoded and anachronistic doctrines and practices.

118. By the very nature of things, peace based on the balance of terror is not peace; security based on the concept of "defence through deterrents" is insecure; and understanding generated by fear cannot endure. We must have the vision and the courage to do away with those false concepts and seek new ways and means of maintaining and promoting international peace and security through the positive motivation of good will and not through the negative propulsion of the fear of extinction. We must seek to preserve and strengthen the ground rules of peaceful coexistence among States and peoples. It is only through universal respect for and application of those fundamental principles, notably, sovereign equality of all States, non-interference in internal affairs, inviolability of territorial integrity and political independence, and peaceful settlement of international disputes, that friendly relations and co-operation among States and peoples can be founded.

119. The delegation of Burma would like to interpose here a thought it has often expressed that the concept of peaceful coexistence should transcend all regional and ideological barriers, so as to encompass relations between all nations, big and small alike.

120. Having spoken on the grave danger to mankind posed by the unrestricted armaments race and, also, of the senseless waste of human energy and resources that could otherwise have been profitably used in the building of a better and fuller life and a new international order, the delegation of Burma would like to associate itself with the suggestions made by delegations who have already taken the floor on the need for inclusion of the subject of general and complete disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, in any future programme of work on the strengthening of international peace and security.

121. I should here like to reiterate what the chairman of my delegation has said in the plenary debate on the subject:

"It would be infinitely more meaningful if today's nuclear-weapon Powers, as a positive action towards dismantling their own nuclear arsenals, took at least the

essential first step of limiting their nuclear weaponry. The world has been looking forward expectantly to the day when the United States and the Soviet Union will commence their bilateral discussions on the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear weapons" (*ibid.*, para. 37).

122. The delegation of Burma sincerely believes that even limited progress in nuclear disarmament would, in fact, reduce the tension and relieve the anxiety now being felt throughout the world, and also create an atmosphere conducive to the taking of further measures towards general and complete disarmament.

123. The economic and social problems of the world are no less a menace to the world than the threat of war. Unless gross inequalities in wealth and social injustices are duly corrected in time, they might well prove to be a potential source of friction and strife, thereby threatening international peace and security. In view of this interrelationship, my delegation would wish that the problem of economic development be also included in the elaboration of the appeal.

124. Programming for peace and international security also requires that the United Nations be strengthened in every way possible. As we see it, there is nothing wrong with the principles, purposes and basic organizational framework of the United Nations. The inability of the United Nations to resolve certain contentious issues affecting the maintenance of international peace and security is due not to any institutional weakness of the Organization, but to the lack of agreement among its Members, in particular the major Powers, or the lack of will on their part to take decisive action. The United Nations can only be as strong or as weak as its Members make it or want it to be.

125. One basic shortcoming, however—and that, too, a man-made one—is the lack of universality in its membership. It is an undeniable fact that the effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and in ensuring that it has the good will and co-operation of all nations would depend, in large part, in seeing that its membership shall be truly universal. This lack of universality in present-day United Nations membership imposes a severe and unwarranted handicap on the United Nations and limits its effectiveness. The delegation of Burma sincerely believes that discussions affecting international peace and security would be more realistic, and solutions reached would be more lasting, if all the Powers envisaged in the Charter as permanent members of the Security Council were to be parties to them as rightful Members of the United Nations. It is with this qualification that the delegation of Burma welcomes the suggestion made in the draft appeal on the holding of periodic meetings of the Security Council under the provisions of Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

126. On the question of the withdrawal of foreign troops from occupied territories and the cessation of measures for the suppression of liberation movements of the peoples still under colonial rule, the delegation of Burma considers these are just remedial measures to rectify the unwarranted consequences arising out of the violation and non-observance of the fundamental principles of respect for

territorial integrity and political independence of all States and respect for equal rights and self-determination of peoples, principles which our country has scrupulously subscribed to and respected all along.

127. The delegation of Burma is also in general agreement on the need to reaffirm the importance of formulating a generally acceptable definition of aggression to expedite agreement on the principles of friendly relations and co-operation of States, as well as to arrive at some constructive and meaningful understanding on United Nations peace-keeping operations. What is really required in the matter, however, is for the major Powers to enter into serious negotiations in the respective special committees in a new and constructive spirit of accommodation and good will, rather than sticking to their old rigid positions.

128. With regard to the question of establishing regional security systems in various parts of the world, my delegation would like to restrict its views in the matter only as it concerns the area in which Burma is situated, and based on its own concepts and experience. Since its re-emergence as an independent sovereign State and its admission to the United Nations in 1948, Burma has consistently followed a policy of peace and friendship with all nations and has scrupulously avoided getting itself entangled in Power-bloc politics. Based on its own conviction, Burma has followed a policy of non-alignment and positive neutrality. Adhering to this policy of non-alignment, it has refrained from joining any of the political-military Power-blocs, nor has it entered into any military or security alliance or defence pacts. It has permitted no foreign military bases on its soil. Its abiding faith lies only in the universal collective security system established under the Charter of the United Nations. Burma has remained ever convinced that this is the policy best suited to it in the context of prevailing world conditions, and it sincerely believes that its faithful pursuance best serves the larger interests, both of Burma and of the world. It has, from time to time, reaffirmed its unswerving dedication to the ideals of peace, friendly relations and co-operation among all nations based on international justice and morality, and its wholehearted support of complete faith in the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

129. It is not the intention of the delegation of Burma to make here any unfavourable or critical comments on the idea of regional security arrangements. But we shall be failing in our duty if we do not say that we are not convinced that regional security systems, especially in Asia in the face of the present-day situation, can promote the strengthening of international peace and security, either in Asia or in the world at large. Having said this, my delegation would hasten to add that Burma, on the other hand, recognizes the sovereign right of independent States to enter into any regional security system or military alliances for collective security purposes. Sufficient provisions already exist under Chapter VIII of the Charter to take cognizance of such regional arrangements.

130. Before concluding, the delegation of Burma would like to express its satisfaction with the Soviet statement made during the debate of 21 October [*1660th meeting*] in which the Soviet representative, Mr. Malik, assured the Committee of his delegation's readiness to analyse, study,

consider and enter into consultations on the various suggestions made and proposals offered in the course of the debate. It is the cherished hope of our delegation that these further consultations and exchange of views, conducted in a spirit of co-operation and good will, will lead to a constructive and meaningful outcome on this important item.

131. Mr. VAKIL (Iran): Mr. Chairman, complying with your request to do away with complimentary remarks, and also with your appeal for brevity, I shall not go beyond a simple expression of satisfaction at seeing the representative of a brotherly nation, who himself is like a brother to me, presiding over our deliberations this year in this Committee. I wish also to convey my congratulations and good wishes to your distinguished colleagues, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur.

132. We are grateful to the Soviet Union for having brought up a subject of great relevance to our Organization. This is all the more important at a time when, approaching the twenty-fifth anniversary of its founding, the United Nations is unhappily beset by a crisis of confidence. While a public debate on these issues would be useful, it is doubtful that it could resolve the problems that have plagued the peace and eroded confidence in the efficacy of our Organization.

133. We therefore have illusions neither about a miraculous outcome of this debate, nor about the power of persuasion of an earnest appeal. Obviously, an Organization that is not equipped to maintain peace can do little to enhance world security. It therefore remains our task to assess the potentialities of this debate and try to make the best use of it. The issues of this debate are broad in scope and intractable in nature. To serve a useful purpose, they must be brought to a focal point, one that stands a reasonable chance of bringing diversity of views into unity of action.

134. For one thing, we can attempt to improve the shrinking image of our Organization. If the decisions of this body are to be reckoned with, and are to be given the weight they require to serve the cause of peace, the distrust with which the Organization is viewed by the world public must give way to respect and confidence. We cannot hope to enhance its prestige by claiming credits that do not accrue from the actions or the mere existence of our Organization. If a new all-out war has so far been averted, it is not the United Nations, but, ironically, what it was meant to substitute that is entitled to the credit. This, while unfortunate, is nevertheless a fact. To cope with the credibility gap our word should be truly credible. To us the international Organization is a process. The United Nations represents only a phase of that process which has been reached at the present time. Its effectiveness must be measured in terms of its inseparability from the political forces and trends of our times.

135. We might promptly spare the Organization the unqualified blame it has been taking by mustering the tremendous force of our unanimity behind a manifestation that would lay bare these facts, and would underline the top scores our Organization has so far made. This frank and unpretentious appraisal of the Organization could well form

the preambular part of any document emerging from the present debate, and must address itself to sophisticated public opinion throughout the world.

136. Along with this and similar steps in the direction of confidence building, measures are required to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations as an institution of peace. The Soviet draft appeal [A/C.1/L.468] contains a number of useful proposals aimed at this purpose. For example, the idea of revitalization of Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter through convening of periodic meetings of the Security Council at the ministerial level, could add a dimension of peace-planning to other activities of the United Nations.

137. Along the same lines, I would mention proposals to invigorate the activities of the Committees on the definition of aggression, peace-keeping operations and friendly relations governing the activities of all States. In passing, however, I wish to make some comments on this last point.

138. In enunciating principles and formulating ideas, we must be cautious that our understanding of, and interpretations of what emanate from, those ideas and principles do not differ from one another. If they did, it would create a false sense of progress, resulting in further dissension and frustration.

139. Measures suggested in the draft appeal to further the effectiveness of our Organization are by no means exhausted. Conspicuous by their absence are references to machinery for disarmament negotiations and proposals for increasing its effectiveness. We have already indicated on more than one occasion—and most recently in the course of the general debate—our sense of disquiet at the method and the manner in which disarmament negotiations are conducted. We have noted that although disarmament appears on our agenda each year, we do not take any decisions on it. While we exhort and urge, decisions are taken elsewhere.

140. A further alienation of the United Nations from the main current of disarmament negotiations was marked by the recent decision of the co-Chairmen to agree upon a number of States to join in disarmament negotiations. We hasten to add that we have no doubt of the useful contribution that the new members could make to the work of the disarmament forum, nor do we question the need for the enlargement of the Committee. In fact, we were among the first to advocate and seek the broadening of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament with a view to rendering its composition more in line with the Charter of the United Nations. But we have serious misgivings about the procedure applied, and we question the propriety of this type of action. However, I shall not dwell on this aspect of the question at this juncture. Here we are concerned not so much with procedures applied by the super-Powers, but rather with the meagre implementation of the agreements that are essentially the product of the disarmament machinery.

141. Thus, we note with regret that the non-proliferation régime still has only a horizontal and no vertical dimension; that no move towards nuclear disarmament, as envisaged in article 6 of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear

Weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*] is yet in sight. Even in the selective trend of limitation of the means of delivery of strategic weapons, we still await the protracted beginning of the talks. This unhappy state of affairs certainly calls for some action. This action can and must be taken in the context of measures to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations as a means of ensuring the peace and security of the world. Disarmament is the business of the United Nations, and there are specific Articles in the Charter defining its responsibility in this field.

142. Our suggestion is that the relationship of the negotiating machinery of disarmament with the United Nations be defined in accordance with the authority and the responsibility that the Charter has vested in our Organization.

143. Measures of the nature referred to above could only have side effects and may not make up for the debility of our Organization, unless we are prepared to do something about the root cause of the problem. Any diagnostic probe would bring us to the procedure laid down in Article 27, paragraph 2, whereby the concurring votes of all the permanent members have been made a requisite for binding decisions taken by the Security Council. As far as we can see, this procedure is going to remain intact, if only because it reflects the realities of present world politics. But, is there a way to reconcile the compelling force of reality with the needs and aspirations of the smaller Powers? Some have alluded to the need for the revision of the Charter. We do not disagree. Yet, if we are to follow the road the Charter has suggested for its revision, I am afraid that road is also blocked by the same requirement of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council.

144. The question that comes to our mind is how long will the major Powers insist on retaining such crippling procedures. Can we wait until hell cools down? Since the Charter was signed 24 years ago, 55 armed conflicts and military confrontations of considerable scale and intensity have occurred.

145. At times the world faced nuclear confrontations and barely warded off a holocaust. Are we to infer that that pattern of violence will change and that the world will be spared further bloodshed once aggression is defined and a peace-keeping corps is at hand? Perhaps we can supplement all those good measures with a set of rules which will not be regarded as law but will have the virtue of a code of ethics to bind the activities of Member States and infuse a restraining element into their use of prerogatives bestowed on them by the Charter. Perhaps we could expect the major Powers to refrain from the application of the veto in any given situation, whereby the ascertained views of a two thirds majority of the Members of the United Nations require a Council decision.

146. I have deliberately made no reference to the other measures suggested in the Soviet appeal. That is not because I consider them less important or unworthy of mention. As I have indicated at the outset, any attempt by this Organization to strengthen the peace and security of the world should begin with a self-scrutinizing and diagnostic search to mend its corroded peace-making machinery. That

does not mean that we do not appreciate the initiatives of the Soviet Union or disagree with the basic ideas and concepts contained in its draft appeal. On the contrary, we think that the draft has been presented out of a genuine concern for the problems of world security and deserves to be probed and scrutinized in the same spirit. Perhaps a committee could be assigned to consider the draft and all other ideas and proposals emanating from the present debate and come up with a document which, while reflecting the views and the legitimate interests of all, will not evade the hard facts and realities concerning the rule and the operation of this Organization.

147. The CHAIRMAN: May I say how deeply touched I am, Mr. Vakil, by the warmth of your reference to my country and to myself personally. Your remarks are in keeping with the fraternal relations which exist between our two countries and between ourselves personally. I should also like to thank you, on behalf of my colleagues in the Bureau, for the compliment which you have paid us.

148. Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan): I am willing to speak at this late hour because you have been kind enough to call on me. Since I am complying with your wish, I am sure that my apology will be accepted by my colleagues, if the meeting lasts longer than was expected.

149. After your appeal not to congratulate you and your colleagues in the Chair, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of Afghanistan I shall abstain from doing so.

150. Since the hour is late, I should like to request those of my colleagues who will be kind enough to give consideration to my statement to do so in the light of the statement I have made in the general debate [*1770th plenary meeting*], during the course of which I made a reference to the question of international security. That will shorten my statement now, and I shall proceed accordingly.

151. The delegation of Afghanistan welcomes this opportunity to participate in a comprehensive discussion of the all-important question of international security. It is the most important because it is, has been and will continue to be an item of timeless concern for this Organization.

152. Other items may come and go, many of urgency but temporary importance. The question of international security alone will remain a permanent fixture on our agenda for many years to come. It involves the first commandment of our Charter—peace in the world. Even if the United Nations were to embark on a single-track goal with none of the more than a hundred other items in our programme but this one, it would, in the agonizing concern of man for real security, have amply justified its existence. If we solve this problem, we have solved them all.

153. Why is this so? Because peace as a concept and as an ultimate goal is the great universal obsession in our time of all the peoples of the world—I repeat, of all the peoples of the world—and the one single item that commands universal unanimity. It was natural that it should have so readily been inscribed on our working programme by the General Committee, by the plenary session, and now in this Committee where it was given top priority on our timetable.

154. For my delegation the theme is the thing—international security. My delegation is not interested in carping innuendoes about who opened the debate, from what motives or what diplomatic strategy. In fact, we shall not, at this stage of a general debate, attempt to enter into a detailed analysis of the detailed proposals of the Soviet memorandum. They may be too restricted for some States, too broad for others. But they are a beginning, and we are confident that, as we build upon them to attain a set of basic principles—guidelines would perhaps be a better word—the rules we seek for international security, like water, will find their own level.

155. Of course we shall state our view in broad general terms, but one thing we shall not do. We shall not buy peace like a young lady who buys her dress by the label and by what emporium it comes from. We shall not judge this book by its cover, or even by its author. We thought the days were over when it was fashionable to see a Machiavelian thrust behind every big-Power proposal. In Afghanistan's consistent policy of non-alignment, and the political posture that has consistently matched it, we refuse to view the world as a jungle of political lions, bears, eagles and other such power emblems as paper tigers or even paper dragons.

156. Since we are talking about national security—and that is what we are really discussing when we speak of international security—we should make our own foreign policy clear. Afghanistan has no military pacts with any nation. We have no foreign military bases on our soil—we have not sold, bartered, hired out, leased or loaned any military bases to any foreign Power—for security or for economic gain, even though our land has been the main artery for some of the world's greatest transcontinental invasions in history.

157. We have a long border with the Soviet Union. For the last 50 years nobody in our country, in the Government or in the villages has lived in fear of our mighty neighbour to the north. Our defence budget threatens no one—and is beholden to no one. Our real defence is our policy of friendship for all nations, big and small, and of equal might and measure with the giants, regardless of their proximity or distance from our borders. Therefore in dealing with this question we shall not succumb to any policy expression—even that of damning with faint praise—which divides the big Powers or any combination of them in any real or fancied confrontation between them. Our guiding star here is a simple one. We respect the Charter which defines their unity under the unanimity principle. While this marriage did not turn out to be one of supreme bliss, we never participated in the post-war game of rewriting the Charter into a kind of Hollywood script in which the super-Powers are divided into villains and heroes. If the curtain on this melodrama is not soon rung down, its star performers, already showing signs of stage fatigue, will find themselves mouthing their empty lines before a bored and yawning audience of small Powers and all the world's cold-war peoples.

158. If I mention that at all, it is because, basically, this is what we are really trying to do on this item—to find a way out of an episode that has become a tedious anachronism which now hampers our work, as an infected appendix

hampers the pursuit of a healthy life. It was a costly performance, for all of us and especially the small countries, diverting the vast potential of the world's wonderful resources for peace to the astronomical orgy for the tools of war and destruction.

159. During this period, the pendulum-swing from the Charter to security pacts—the total sum of international security—has shrunk to the very opposite of total fear, total war and total destruction.

160. Today, when in certain circles it is fashionable to discuss so-called political revisionism, this deviation from the principles and the spirit of the Charter was probably the greatest revisionist fling in all modern history. When some speak of the revision of the Charter, let us not forget that the Charter was revised—I repeat, let us not forget the Charter was revised—not in words, but in deeds, which created new balances of power, new spheres of influence, a new war science and a new war psychosis. The distance between the aim of the Charter and what emerged is greater than the distance between San Francisco and New York. Now, 24 years later we can only ask: "Gentlemen, where is international security—or even national security—now?"

161. Now, if one of the big Powers, looking at this dismal balance sheet, finds that there has been been a fatal miscalculation and embarks on a bold new initiative to do something to reverse the situation, my delegation can only welcome such an initiative with open arms, just as we welcomed the great United States initiative when President Eisenhower came before the Assembly and laid on our agenda table his historic proposal of "Atoms for Peace".³ In this spirit my delegation wishes to express its profound gratitude to the Soviet Government for the initiative it has taken.

162. We consider of special significance the form and timing of the proposal. Its timing, it seems to us, is tuned to the great transitions that are taking place in our political world, as we round the corner to the second 25 years of our existence and to the second decade of our economic development. We should note the coincidence of those two landmarks, because it connotes to some extent their inseparability. In terms of the final draft of our appeal we might regard the anniversary and the decade not only as interdependent but as indivisible.

163. In general, we see each and the two in the following focus. I think there is already a general consensus that the anniversary cannot be a mere celebration of self-congratulations—certainly not in view of the self-criticism we heard in the general debate. If possible it should preview a programme of policies designed to reduce the relapse to nationalism and to make the United Nations truly decisive and perhaps a primary factor in the whole broad field of international co-operation. We also know that such a vision of political evolution is impossible without the simultaneous economic strategy envisaged in the preliminary plans for the decade of the 1970s. The timing factor here is, therefore, obvious. To leave both peaks in our history bereft of a formulation would leave both the anniversary and the decade open-ended items.

³ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 470th meeting.

164. There is another aspect of timeliness. There is the *détente* in the world atmosphere. All of us see its cumulus clouds in the thawing of the cold war, in the new forces for co-operation in Europe, in similar tendencies in other continents such as the Latin-American act of denuclearization. We heard it in the almost identical words of the representatives of the two super-Powers foreshadowing an era of negotiation instead of confrontation.

165. Do not these impending changes call for a re-thinking of general principles? Inevitably Governments will be compelled to reappraise their foreign policies in terms of these developments. The setting of sound principles by this Assembly would greatly contribute to the formulation of national policies in the light of the new international situation and world responsibilities.

166. We, the small Powers, have a special stake in the colouration of foreign policies as they are cross-referenced with international security—not only because our security lies chiefly in the Charter and in international law, but because a transition from confrontation, for us, has its own meaning. Power storms do not blow out to sea in a straight line. As in nature, they often spiral and take new directions in a path in which much damage is caused. Similarly, the big Powers, after neutralizing each other's momentum, may tend to push in the direction of the smaller States.

167. A feeling about that has been expressed in the weeks of this session. It would seem to us that we must at this stage try to establish a defined relationship between the big and small Powers. We take note of the proposal for high-level meetings on a concrete agenda in the Security Council which would establish one such relationship, since it would give the small Powers on the Council an initiative in international security they otherwise do not exercise. As we have said, we do not necessarily imply an amendment to the Charter, as has been suggested by some delegations.

168. For us the best amendment to the Charter is to return to it. Naturally, we are all rightly concerned with what may be called the tolerable limits of big power as a factor in the world security situation. This, we take it, is what the proponents of Charter revision have in mind. They would curb power by words, without abolishing the realities. It is these realities that must be changed. As we see it, some big Powers go much further when they call for a speed-up in the reduction of force—in the recession of force from great areas of the world. Arms, not words, are real power, and the massive reduction of the level of force is what will alter the ratio of big to small Powers. By making the big Powers less big you make the small Powers less small.

169. Until that is done, the curbing of power in terms of the cold war becomes somewhat irrelevant. Such is the nature of real power that, having abandoned their ideological struggle, the giant States will be diverting their policies in the direction of retaining power for power's sake. In fact, we are witnessing something of this transmutation now. The first and foremost limitation of power must not be juridical but based on the realities of power.

170. Even those realities change. The conventional power of the big Powers in San Francisco has altered with the

advent of many new nations and new weapons, but more radically with the rise of a new world economy. The big military Powers of San Francisco, along with their common markets, are also the big economic Powers of today. Bigness today is not only military: it is also economic. This has created a new type of antagonism, new tensions and new confrontations. Even if overnight we were presented with the Utopias of complete disarmament and perfect big-Power truce, the economic causes of new wars would remain, unless and until the affluent States recognize the principle that their economic advantage cannot, in terms of international security, remain the exclusive right of their national existence. If the big *per capita* wealth nations continue to spur their living standards to the point of irresponsible wealth, they must not be surprised if they provoke an irresponsible poor into a mutual struggle that would make international security unthinkable and impossible. Any package of guidelines that overlooks that aspect of new threats to peace will emerge here only as a born paraplegic.

171. As we probe the limits of power, we must also define the limits of international security. For us a United Nations is not enough. We seek also a united world, without which the first is just a name. Thus for us international security means security not exclusively for United Nations Member States but for all nations. In a world where war can be total, only total security can be real, complete and final. In the family of man there can be no orphan States. Those who are subjected to such discrimination, in violation of their equal rights as States, will only turn to resentment, hostility, enmity and war. Perhaps we should more accurately refer to the universality of international security, which is itself conditioned on the universality of international co-operation. We cannot understand how we can hope to get international security and the deliberate exclusion of States in one and the same breath.

172. I wish to underline two more basic principles. The question of the equality of States is being discussed in a number of United Nations organs, on the juridical and political levels. But, pending conclusions, this can be said of the relations of the big and small nations under that concept. As we see it, bigness is a matter of size, it is not a right—not a right to pressure, to dominate, to dictate. It is not a territorial dimension or the size of a national budget. Equality stems from the sovereignty of States and peoples and is the sole basis on which the rule of law can be erected. This is now an axiom, but it must be heavily underlined today, when small peoples and countries are becoming the prey of new dominating forces, including those which were colonies themselves. We should add, on the concept of the equality of States, that we assume that it would be a ruling principle also in the regional security organizations envisaged in the Soviet proposal.

173. Speaking of regional organizations, we do not have any difficulties in principle with the preliminary proposal, because we assume that it cannot have been designed to create new military blocs and alliances. As we understand it from the proposals made for an all-European security organization, it is just the opposite and is aimed even to abolish the two opposing pacts.

174. As a non-aligned nation we should of course have to determine the relationship of such a grouping to an

unattached foreign policy. If the final result produces a non-military association of nations to replace the military alignments, then we of the non-aligned who now consult as an international group—and Afghanistan is the oldest non-aligned State Member of the United Nations—would have to ponder carefully how the two can be reconciled. If there is no conflict, we should obviously have no objection to the expansion and the triumph of the doctrine of non-alignment. Similarly, with the sister-concept of self-determination. It, too, has become an axiom. Yet today it needs again to be re-emphasized when millions of people are fighting and dying to achieve that right. We must re-enunciate the principle of self-determination as the key-right of all rights, the father of human rights, the mother of that right, as it grows to an eventual sovereignty. Specifically, it means our resolve that the remnants of colonialism and alien domination in any form must be liquidated under a new and more rapid time schedule. Here the time factor supersedes the already accepted concept.

175. At this point we deem it important to introduce a rather new concept. We have in the past worked on the assumption that the principle of self-determination falls short of sovereignty until a people have attained their full rights freely to determine their fate including complete independence. The assumption was based on still another assumption, that the colonial Powers and other alien dominating Powers would co-operate fully with the aims and the procedures of the United Nations.

176. But now we see a tendency for these Powers to challenge both the United Nations and its conventional procedures. In many areas the United Nations is rebuffed and eclipsed. Still other areas are marked for a so-called micro-status of doubtful and precarious sovereignty. If we bow to this development, we are in fact going backward to the old colonial system where the ruling Power is the final arbiter of the fate of these territories and their peoples. This, we are sure, the United Nations will never accept. If it does, it will not justify its existence.

177. Accordingly, it is essential to enunciate and clarify the principle of sovereignty beyond its conventional limits of the sovereign State. People, too, are sovereign whatever the form of the society they inhabit. The State begins with people. A State without them is an unimaginable demographic concept. A people who have become occupied by force at some stage in history have not juridically lost their personality. Their inherent sovereignty was merely suppressed. The international community is not bound to the wrongs of history. Just the opposite: it exists in order to right those wrongs, to restore rights, and to proclaim their renaissance. All people are sovereign. If we inscribe this principle in our appeal, we shall certainly alter the whole aspect of decolonization in all forms, and speed up this process in the immediate years ahead.

178. This brings me to the form of the Soviet proposal. I think the form of the appeal is a happy one. A resolution

would be too much and too formal. A declaration would be too general and too vague. The appeal reflects the catalogue of principles and guidelines we envisage. It encourages implementation. It will do.

179. Now a word about the United Nations. We are interested in the new Soviet emphasis on making the United Nations stronger, and we especially welcome such a pronouncement of intention coming from a super-Power. But even this might not be enough if the United Nations is to be limited to the shallow effort of international co-operation. In this sphere the United Nations has in its first decade-and-a-half done much to foster the spirit of co-operation. But now this is not enough. Co-operation must now be followed by a firming up of the structure of security, of which there is precious little in the world today. It is on this point that we might concentrate our attention in forging the appeal.

180. My delegation is prepared to co-operate with other delegations in this important work to achieve a document of maximum consensus—with unanimity if possible, without it if it will dilute the whole purpose to a meaningless, bland and empty compromise that would leave us less secure than when we started out.

181. We look upon this as an opportunity to remedy those shortcomings of the Organization which we underscored so heavily in our breast-beating general debate statements. It is our chance to follow a chapter of self-criticism with a chapter of creative remedy. The opening of our session found the world in the doldrums of pessimism about the United Nations. With a united sense of purpose we can make this appeal an antidote to their despondency. This is the session perhaps; this is the hour perhaps. Perhaps last year might have been considered too soon. And perhaps next year may be too late.

182. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank the representative of Afghanistan for taking the floor past the usual time for the adjournment of the meeting. His co-operation will enable us to hear at the next meeting this afternoon all the 10 speakers who are listed on the agenda.

183. Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to make a brief statement. At its 1658th meeting held on 20 October, I informed the members of this Committee that the co-Chairmen of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament would be submitting their report on the progress of the disarmament negotiations in Geneva by the end of this month. I am glad to inform the Committee now that, pending the submission of that report, the Secretariat will be happy to make available to any delegations which may desire them the documents of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament pertaining to the joint draft United States-USSR treaty on the denuclearization of the sea-bed and ocean floor submitted to the Conference.

The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.