



CONTENTS

	Page
Expression of sympathy to the Government and people of Yugoslavia following the earthquake in their country	1
Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security (<i>continued</i>) . .	1

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

Expression of sympathy to the Government and people of Yugoslavia following the earthquake in their country

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before we begin our proceedings this morning, may I, on behalf of the members of this Committee, express our sincere sympathy to the Government and people of Yugoslavia on the catastrophic earthquake which occurred there yesterday. According to news reports, the earthquake destroyed a Bosnian town, causing death and injury to many and rendering thousands homeless.

2. I would ask the representative of Yugoslavia to convey our expressions of sorrow to his Government.

AGENDA ITEM 103

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

3. Mr. LEGNANI (Uruguay) (*translated from Spanish*): I would like to associate myself with the condolences expressed yesterday at the sad death of Mr. Mongi Slim, a former President of the General Assembly and a man of great stature in international affairs. It is right and proper that those who represent general and collective international interests should pay tribute to one who generously made the valuable contribution of his energies and abilities to those interests and to the solution of the community's problems. On behalf of the Government of Uruguay and on my own behalf I wish to join in the tribute and to express to the representative of Tunisia our sympathy in his country's bereavement.

4. Please forgive me, Mr. Chairman, if in spite of your expressed wish I leave the item under discussion aside for a moment and offer to you, Mr. Agha Shahi, to the Vice-Chairman Mr. Alhaji S. D. Kolo, and to the Rapporteur Mr. Lloyd Barnett, our congratulations and our thanks: our congratulations on being appointed to perform your tasks as officers of the Committee, which implies recognition of

genuine previous personal achievements and a tribute to the delegations to which you belong, and our gratitude for the benefit we derive from the special services you and they have undertaken to perform in the Committee.

5. An item as important as that of "the strengthening of international security" proposed by the Soviet Union delegation [A/7654], which might be thought of as the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations and its ultimate goal embracing all the other goals, was bound to arouse and has aroused the natural and lively interest of all the members of this Committee.

6. The many suggestions inherent in the item as presented have not been lost on me. Indeed they have led me to consider what path might be taken to ensure the peaceful development of the life of nations and peoples, of families and individuals, since all this generates or contributes to the strengthening of international security, not forgetting that strengthening international security in turn assists and reinforces the conditions in which those other aspects of human life develop.

7. It must be recognized that human solidarity, like international co-operation, implies the previous agreement of men; moreover, in our view it must be recognized as a definite historical fact that, leaving aside differences, controversies, and gory struggles with their distressing aftermath of adversity and suffering, human society has endeavoured spontaneously and naturally to achieve the fellow-feeling that makes for the unification of all men. As nations come to know one another and to relate to one another, they cease to live in watertight compartments and draw closer together, and the bonds tighten between them. It is not unduly rash to say that today this long and slow process is likely to be speeded up and given a boost by the modern mass media, the benefits deriving for the whole of mankind from the exploitation of the sea-bed and the conquest of outer space, and the exigencies of collective needs that are creating many and varied instances of social involvement and integration.

8. The United Nations Charter has encouraged and stimulated this process, endorsing principles to regulate it fully, while respecting strictly and scrupulously the social and political realities coming within its purview.

9. Peace, dignity and human worth, equal rights for men and women and for nations great and small, self-determination and the sovereign equality of States constitute principles that the peoples making up the United Nations set out to organize in such a way as to make their natural development orderly and sober, painless and free of the folly of resort to violence.

10. The rules laid down in the Charter, and firmly rooted in reality, respect the complexities of the fabric of nations and consciously recognize that the process of the unification of men might crystallize in regional agreements and organizations; and they are carefully worded to ensure that such partial instances of unification occur and evolve free of the anomalies that stand in the way of unification of human society as a whole.

11. Regional agreements were to be “consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations”, leaving no scope for special racial or religious prerogatives; and here, too, assurance had to be given that some men would not subjugate others or kill others simply and solely because they differed in religious beliefs or convictions of any kind; for no difference places a man outside the pale of the human species and the common destiny that awaits us all.

12. The United Nations was and is set up to promote understanding between nations, between peoples and between men. The Organization was intended to be a permanent watchdog standing guard over international peace, preventing any State from impairing the development of other States while avoiding interference with the principle of the self-determination of states. At the same time, recognition by the Charter of fundamental human rights, the dignity and worth of the human person, and men’s equality before the law, was to ensure that the application of the principle of self-determination did not whittle away the rights, the dignity and the worth of the human person. By making understanding and human solidarity possible, the United Nations was gradually to extend its sphere of action and assist and promote this process of unification of all men and in the course of time to become the organization of all mankind.

13. The activities of its institutions were designed to safeguard the freedom of States, just as the exercise of State authority, accepting the validity of the principles laid down in the Charter, was to safeguard human liberty, allowing every man to think, feel and act without impairing the right of other men to think, feel and act.

14. Let me point out that what I have said about the institutional structure of the United Nations is a digest or synthesis of the political philosophy underlying the nature and functioning of Uruguay’s political organization. This reflects the principle that inspired and was inspired by that great statesman José Artigas, whose motto, “with freedom I neither offend nor fear”, meant that a man acting in exercise of his freedom must not impair the rights of his neighbour or the rights of the community. It also meant that acts in exercise of the right to freedom could not be subject to sanction. When a man’s activities remain within the framework of his freedom, he does not offend third parties and does not fear the law.

15. In accordance with what I have said, I maintain that the United Nations has at its disposal a series of lofty principles and wise rules. They may not be the ultimate goal or the acme of perfection, but they are on the right and proper path, and by following it we can achieve the estimable benefits which the strengthening of international security can bring. Yet here we are, confronted with a proposal that an appeal be made to the Member States with

a view to achieving this. Let me say at once that we feel it not merely necessary but vital to make an appeal to all Member States, for purposes to be specified.

16. But we are convinced that the current international law, the rules laid down and the principles embodied in the Charter, the organs it provides for, and the jurisdiction and powers it confers constitute a body of institutional canons which, if properly followed, would strengthen international security and put a full stop to the state of tension and to the third world war already being waged in the world even though we are unwilling to see it clearly and in its true proportions.

17. Let us not delude ourselves. The world picture is one of war, with no real evidence of a genuine easing of tension. Everywhere we find aggression, violation of frontiers, outbursts of violence with dead and wounded by the thousand, and at every turn utterly unstable situations with the world standing on the very brink of one crisis or catastrophe after another; and at the same time the difficulties pile up to prevent the United Nations from carrying out its task of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

18. I do not want to be unduly pessimistic or to indulge in fault-finding. My critical comments and those of other representatives make it clear that in this instance, if there are dark shadows it is because there are points of light which throw the shadows. Thus, for example, the work of the United Nations in the social, economic, cultural and health fields is most praiseworthy.

19. Moreover, any criticism offered here is well-intentioned and constructive, and implies a recognition that unless there is a clear atmosphere of stable and lasting peace it will be difficult for us to consolidate international security and ensure the gradual development of nations. Hence my country reiterates its fervent adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter and gives its blessing to any proposal aimed at improving the ways and means of coping with conflicts or tensions. It will also back any measure, negotiation or treaty, making for total disarmament or at any rate implying progress towards disarmament or arms regulation or control.

20. The purpose of the draft before the Committee [*A/C.1/L.468*], according to the explanation in the explanatory document and the text itself, is to get rid of acts of aggression throughout the world, to encourage national liberation movements, to induce States not yet Members of the United Nations to behave peacefully, and finally to prevent the consequences of the present situation in the way of loss of human life, damage and destruction. In other words, the draft contains a series of recommendations designed to restore peace and security in those parts of the world where they no longer exist. Yet it is abundantly clear that such acts inimical to peace and security in themselves represent a manifest transgression of the very clear and precise provisions of the United Nations Charter. The question therefore arises whether, instead of making declarations or appeals to avoid or end such transgressions it would not be more to the point to determine how far the existing rules of law have been violated and, in accordance with those rules, to take proper steps to ensure complete and faithful compliance with them.

21. The San Francisco Charter does contain rules governing the relations between States, and since they are juridical in character, or rules of law, their specific purpose is to ensure peace and security. It is, after all, the law that provides ways and means of settling conflicts and thus makes for peace. The law likewise determines what the individual may or may not do and what he can expect others to do or not to do.

22. We consider that strengthening international security means increased respect for and observance of the law. Only thus, by respecting the law and complying with its rules, can we hope to carry out successfully the task of winning the war on war, which today is not merely necessary to strengthen international security, but an indispensable condition for the very survival of mankind.

23. Yet we must recognize that the purpose underlying this appeal is sound, and that it has provoked a wide-ranging debate on the problem of international security that could form a basis for a declaration at next year's session, following very thorough analysis by Governments. In the meantime, observance of the principles set forth in the Charter would give the necessary fillip to international security. Nor have we any doubt that the United Nations could greatly strengthen international security by exercising its lawful functions and answering the questions asked by the peoples all over the world.

24. For example, it might give an honest reply to the mute yet eloquent interrogation of the peoples still without enough to eat. It is scandalous, because it is at variance with all elementary feelings of justice, that there should be peoples with food to spare at the same time as there are others that go hungry. It is equally scandalous that the peoples of the world living side by side should be struggling to devour one another economically. To repeat what we said recently, the principle of self-determination of peoples laid down in the Charter is not disposed of merely by political liberation and the acquisition of sovereignty; self-determination calls for successive and repeated liberations, the most urgent being liberation from hunger, ignorance, and disease, from the need for housing and the other unsatisfied needs characteristic of poverty today and representing cruel and unjust tyranny.

25. An appropriate response to the economic needs of peoples would be a satisfactory development strategy that would secure the means of overcoming that tyranny, laying a firm foundation for peace and friendship among nations, and strengthening collective security in an atmosphere of growing human well-being, without holding up the process of new and successive liberations to make the self-determination of peoples steadily more valid.

26. An effective and sound economic development strategy reflected in social development would no doubt call for an appeal to Member States to adopt and practise close and genuine international co-operation. They should also be urged, through appeals or declarations, to guard jealously the effective enjoyment of human rights.

27. With regard to the freedom of peoples and their sovereign self-determination, it would be well to recognize that these things must go hand in hand with unqualified

respect for human rights, the observance of which must be properly protected internationally, and their violation condemned by all States.

28. Uruguay was represented at the Teheran Conference last year,¹ and acceded to the proclamation, the resolutions and the Final Act approved there; but we believe it appropriate to appeal for urgent and positive action to preserve the principles proclaimed on that occasion. Their effectiveness can only be ensured by implementing the two International Covenants on Human Rights and the Optional Protocol,² which my country signed and ratified. Frequent and periodic revision is called for, to expand or adjust the theoretical definitions, above all organs and machinery guaranteeing the full effectiveness of fundamental rights. Failing this, there is a danger of their vigour being whittled away and of acquiescing in the frequent and widespread assaults on the rights and freedoms of human beings coming to be regarded as inevitable. Neither peace nor freedom nor security can bring progress and achievement so long as colonialism and under-development afflict vast sectors of the world community.

29. In this connexion my delegation urges the need to establish a High Commissioner's Office for Human Rights to promote and encourage universal and effective respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

30. It must be recognized that an appeal to Member States or a declaration by this august Organization containing every single one of the principles underlying the rules of the United Nations Charter would be an act of confirmation or reaffirmation of our adherence to these lofty principles. But such a declaration or appeal would certainly not have any more virtue than simple obedience to those rules, which, as has been said, organize human society in such a way that its natural development towards unification will come about quietly and calmly, without the sufferings that violence brings in its train.

31. Finally, if the existing rules of law call for changes and improvements, we must confidently believe that human ingenuity, which in the scientific, technical and technological fields has achieved feats that seemed beyond its capacity, can bring about the necessary reforms and improvements, overcoming political passions, stamping out the mad violence which has always beset us, and reaffirming the subordination of might to right, which must create and recreate specific instruments for strengthening international security. Either the law will bring peace to men and create international security, or mankind runs the risk of disappearing from the face of the earth.

32. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Uruguay for his kind words about the officers of the Committee.

33. Mr. ANDRADE (Colombia) (*translated from Spanish*): On behalf of my delegation, let me first express to the

¹ International Conference on Human Rights, held from 22 April to 13 May 1968.

² International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

representative of Yugoslavia our deepest feelings of solidarity and sympathy on the occasion of the earthquake that has struck Yugoslavia, a country with which my Government enjoys very cordial relations.

34. It is particularly gratifying for the Colombian delegation to take part in this well-timed debate—the fundamental importance of which is fully realized by the distinguished members of the Committee—on the item “The strengthening of international security” [A/7654], proposed by the Soviet delegation. The exhaustive examination of the topic, approached by virtually all the members of the Committee from the general angle of carrying out an essential if painful scrutiny of the effectiveness of the United Nations as the highest organ for regulating peace, already suggests a definite consensus on specific points which, like the problem of disarmament, give rise to concern and alarm in all quarters.

35. It is evident, as has been stated repeatedly, that the strengthening of international peace is the primary objective of this Organization now preparing to celebrate its twenty-fifth anniversary. Hence I think the right moment has come not only to examine the Soviet proposal, whose importance my delegation endorses substantially on all points, but to reiterate one or two arguments already put forward by the representatives of Colombia at this and other meetings on matters partly dealt with in the document and the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik [1652nd meeting].

36. The United Nations, set up 24 years ago and unanimously endorsed as an organization for maintaining international peace and security, is now faced—as has likewise been reiterated in the Committee—with overwhelming problems in achieving its fundamental purpose. My delegation has argued that the actual structure of the Organization, which today suffers from palpable shortcomings and no longer caters for human development at the present stage with its rapid political, scientific and social changes, cries out for revision. The fact that one of the so-called super-Powers has felt it necessary to propose an appeal to all the Governments of the world to avoid aggravating present conflicts, indicating new aspects of the development of international relations and drawing attention to conditions in which, “with States in possession of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, the escalation of conflicts is fraught with still graver consequences to mankind” [A/7654], fully proves my points.

37. I do not pretend that I am making an original comment when I emphasize views I have heard put forward in the course of this debate which are fortunately shared by my delegation. But it might be appropriate to recall the very precise point made by the President of my country, Dr. Carlos Lleras Restrepo, speaking to the Security Council on 16 June 1969, when he stressed the Colombian Government’s concern at the steady deterioration of irreplaceable United Nations machinery responsible for keeping and safeguarding peace and protecting mankind from the appalling prospect of a world conflagration. President Lleras Restrepo said:

“Today the world wonders, when considering the question of the maintenance of world peace and the

precarious and partial peace in which we live, which has the greatest influence: the existence of a juridical organization which should seek the peaceful solution of disputes and conflicts, or the policy of deterrence, which in the final analysis is nothing more than a strategy of terror. Unfortunately, we must conclude that the balance is in favour of stockpiling of weapons—weapons possessing a terrifying power of destruction—rather than in favour of a general agreement to accept peaceful solutions. We hear discussion daily of new investments which are deemed necessary to carry out this tragic and ruinous arms race. It is true that some efforts are being made, especially regarding the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, which give rise to some hope. But . . . the conversations which have taken place in Geneva are merely peripheral in character, and far from reaching the crux of the problem. Moreover, not all the nations capable of using nuclear power in war are participating in those talks.”³

38. That judgement is still valid. It is based on the hard facts of international life, and it is inspired by the desire to contribute to what the representative of Mexico, Mr. Alfonso García Robles called for in his excellent statement of 22 October [1661st meeting], namely a calm and objective analysis of the causes of international insecurity in order to devise some adequate remedy. To try to limit our efforts to an appeal, doubtless inspired by a sincere desire for peace, and to avoid that wide-ranging, honest, self-critical analysis of the very roots of the problem whether mankind shall be confronted with mass destruction or whether certain rules of law governing peaceful coexistence shall prevail, would be an immoral act, the failure of peace-loving men to do their duty, an incredible piece of bungling by those who, as in the present instance, have the overriding duty to salvage the modest achievements of the Organization so as to give the world a stable peace. This must be peace based on the respect of different systems of government one for another; on the abolition of imperialism or colonialism of any kind; on the elimination of the abysmal gulf between a few wealthy countries which devote a large part of their resources to the systematic and unending task—the monstrous task I would add—of equipping themselves with new weapons of destruction and terror, and other countries striving against intolerable odds to combat under-development and poverty. As the Secretary-General of the United Nations, U Thant, said in 1964, this is not simply an ideal or theoretical goal, but a vital practical need.

39. This is the basic premise on which I am expressing my Government’s views. I am not diverting the issue from the main point, namely the Soviet proposal; indeed, I consider the inclusion of that additional item in the agenda of this Committee a timely proposal. I shall refer to the proposal with the consideration due to a world Power which, side by side with the United States, has enormous responsibility for the peaceful development of the world and which has repeatedly stated here its advocacy of the peaceful settlement of all conflicts. Not that such a statement implies any other desire on the part of the United States or of the other countries which made up the original United Nations at San

³ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1969, document S/9259.*

Francisco, in the wake of the common struggle against the brutality of nazism and the rule of force.

40. My distinguished audience is aware that the Foreign Minister of Colombia, Dr. Alfonso López Michelsen, in his statement to the General Assembly on 26 September [1768th plenary meeting], urged the need for reform of the United Nations Charter, an instrument drawn up at a stage in international affairs that is now bypassed and within the framework of a world suffering in the aftermath of savage aggression. After reflecting on the many statements we have heard here, my delegation is even more convinced of that need, while fully realizing the delicate negotiations any such reform would involve. The request by the Soviet Union is a good indication that the United Nations is witnessing a gradual weakening of its power, a growing inability to find timely solutions to conflicts that are ravaging the world and if allowed to continue indefinitely could lead to the scourge we are striving to prevent. Furthermore—and I would like to express my delegation's gratitude for this—representatives of countries with different political systems have expressed or suggested the same concern.

41. The question, then, is whether the time has not come to face the problem resolutely, to examine it closely, and to give countries in a similar position to ourselves the definite feeling that we are not skeletons at the feast, members of a club where the VIP's take the final decisions to suit their own interests, while other members, theoretically having similar responsibilities and rights, stand helplessly by watching international relations grow worse, and the spokesmen of the 126 countries represented here vie with each other in expressing their endorsement of agreement, dialogue and negotiation as the only alternative to the horror of nuclear warfare.

42. My delegation is ready to examine any proposal calculated, like the one now before us, to lead to practical results. But we do not find it reasonable to establish limitations beforehand to prevent us from tackling the substance of the problem. Here I am glad to say that I agree with the representative of Chile, Mr. Patricio Aylwin, who asked for a maximum degree of realism in the study of this problem, and stated as follows:

“The international community is organized essentially to ensure peace among peoples. That is the ultimate goal, the purpose and the spirit underlying all the principles, organs, and procedures embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. Unfortunately, as has been stressed in the past few days both in the General Assembly and in this Committee, the world is far from having achieved a state of security. On the contrary, at the end of the 24 years of existence of the United Nations, despite all the efforts made and some successes achieved, the sign of the time seems to be insecurity. As was stated in the course of a symposium convened by the Nobel Foundation of Sweden, as reported in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 7 October, with the advent of nuclear weapons mankind is living on borrowed time. While the watchword here is peace, there are places in the world where men are bent on killing one another. While the Organization proclaims the right of peoples and nations to self-determination and independence and the principle of non-intervention of

States in the internal or external affairs of other States, there are peoples on the earth enduring the occupation of their soil by alien armed forces, pressure of all kinds, interference, or threats which encroach on their freedom. While here and elsewhere disarmament is demanded as an imperative need, the great Powers have not even begun the promised conversations on the limitation of nuclear weapons, and the world seems to have been relinquished to the uncurbed folly of the arms race.” [1657th meeting, paras. 36, 37 and 38.]

43. I would add that it is a very strange paradox that the States that fought against the doctrine of force, expansionism and terror and paid so high a price to restore to mankind the right to freedom, still cling in the present day and age to the theory of peace-keeping by means of the button that has to be pressed to launch the thermonuclear missile, while weapons of mass destruction continue to be manufactured. History has never known a more dangerous instance of approval of the mistaken principle that the basis of law is force, the power of weapons.

44. I would like to corroborate the argument used by the Foreign Minister of Colombia in pinpointing our views on the need to reinforce the United Nations Charter and bring it up to date as a practical and concrete way of preserving world harmony. He stated as follows:

“We have before us, however, armed conflicts which have remained unsolved for years, in the face of the impotence of the United Nations and of the super-Powers themselves. The cases of Viet-Nam and of the Middle East, no less than civil or racial wars, are obvious examples. Here in this very Assembly, we have witnessed the great paradox that Viet-Nam, which is not on the agenda of the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, has been the central theme of many speeches. In like manner, we have seen how the Middle East conflict, on which there was rare unanimity in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, has been delegated to the so-called Big Four, with a last hope of reaching agreement in view of the failure of the regular organs of the Organization to make their own resolutions effective. Colombia regrets this state of affairs but understands it. It is better to seek, at whatever cost, the re-establishment of peace through the agreement of the great Powers than definitely to give up the search. But does not this state of affairs indicate to us not only the need to assess the results achieved by the Organization in this quarter of a century but also the desirability of its being restructured institutionally in some respects?” [1768th plenary meeting, para. 30.]

45. My delegation is of the opinion that the philosophy which gave birth to the Charter must be preserved, and it has no wish to distort or undermine it. We are anxious to arouse the concern of the Assembly on this point which we regard as a practical step towards the common effort which peaceful coexistence of peoples demands when we propose a universal goal for the United Nations and advocate specific reforms calculated to make the organs responsible for collective security really function. To that end, what I consider most important is the objective examination of problems dealt with in a general way in the declaration under discussion, e.g. the question of providing the Security

Council with a permanent military force, the strengthening of the functions of the Secretary-General, and of course the urgent task of defining aggression.

46. At one point in his statement, the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik, stressed the open-minded nature of his proposal and repeated his invitation to submit constructive proposals concerning it. I have no intention, at this late stage in the debate, of taking up each of his suggestions point by point. But it seems a good idea to hand over document A/C.1/L.468 to a special committee for study; and on behalf of my delegation I reserve the right to speak again on the subject.

47. If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, with the best of intentions I would like to disobey your request to dispense with congratulations in this debate, and to express the great hopes awakened by your work and that of your distinguished colleagues.

48. We have in our hands the greatest and most noble task men can be given—that of preserving peace. My delegation's fervent wish is that on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary we may be able, in a united effort, to present mankind with a world from which terror has been driven out. That is our major commitment. The United States has succeeded in putting man on the moon. Let this feat bring home to us how insignificant we are in the cosmos, how foolish our disputes and how undreamed of our possibilities for the future.

49. Mr. AL-ATTAR (Yemen) (*translated from French*): We have just heard the bad news of the earthquake in Yugoslavia, which has caused several deaths and destroyed almost the whole city of Banja Luka in Bosnia. My delegation wishes to associate itself with your statement, Mr. Chairman, and would ask the delegation of Yugoslavia to express to the Government and people of that country our condolences and our feelings of solidarity and sympathy.

50. Mr. Chairman, I shall comply with your recommendation and abstain from extending to you the congratulations which I should have liked to offer to an outstanding man, whom I know well and who is the representative of a fraternal country, Pakistan. However, may I say how gratified we are to have you presiding over the First Committee, and to have Mr. Alhaji Kolo as Vice-Chairman and Mr. Barnett as Rapporteur. The three continents which you respectively represent, the ones that need peace most in order to devote themselves to their development, are thus represented in the Bureau. You may rest assured of the full co-operation of my delegation in this Committee following your advice, I shall try to be brief.

51. My delegation has studied very carefully the interesting proposal put forward by the representative of the Soviet Union on the strengthening of international security. My Government has judged that very important proposal at its true value. As you know, Yemen has just emerged from a seven-year war. It knows the sacrifices and suffering brought about by war and it would like to see peace prevail throughout the world. The Second World War, according to Mr. Malik, caused 50 million deaths, and at present each day brings with it its quota of victims in Asia and Africa.

Thus it is essential that peace should be restored wherever there are still wars, even if they are undeclared wars.

52. But is it possible to establish peace without justice? Should not those two terms be combined and the two concepts be given a joint definition, so that justice could be ensured not only for the countries which have been victims of aggression but also for those peoples whose national soil has been taken from them, and for those dominated in their own territory by the forces of colonialism, fascism and racism? It is obvious that we are referring to the aggressor and usurper which is the Zionist State, which defies the whole world by refusing categorically to comply with the resolutions of the Security Council and continues to occupy territories of three States Members of the United Nations, thus dispossessing the Palestine people from its own land. An entire people, the people of Palestine, have to live either under military occupation or as refugees subsisting on international charity.

53. We do not intend to examine here the problem of the people of Palestine which, today more than ever, is taking charge of its own destiny with unshakeable will and determination in order to recover its usurped lands.

54. But how can we remain silent about that problem when discussing a question such as the strengthening of international peace and security, if some States—intoxicated with precarious military success, a success which will in any case be only temporary—display incredible arrogance despite international condemnation? How can we remain silent about the war imposed upon the people of Viet-Nam, which wants peace and justice and at the same time will never yield on the question of its independence and of the system of government it has chosen? How can we remain silent about the struggle waged by our brothers in Africa—in Angola, Mozambique, Southern Rhodesia, South Africa and elsewhere—to recover their independence and their dignity as free men?

55. Our answer is unequivocal: there cannot be any peace or international security unless there is national liberation, unless an end is put to policies of foreign intervention, and unless racism and its corollaries of fascism, colonialism and neo-colonialism are condemned.

56. We for our part think that to speak of the strengthening of international security means that it already exists and that it is indeed effective. The examples that have been given suffice to show that for several countries the situation is different. The fight waged by those peoples is not only just but essential. That is why we should be quite clear about what we mean by the "outlawing of war". We ourselves would have preferred the words "strengthening of international security" to be replaced by a more specific phrase, namely, "conditions and undertakings for the strengthening of international security".

57. We think it would be advisable—and the initiative of the Soviet Union affords us an excellent opportunity—to recall briefly the essential principles of the Charter: the territorial integrity of States, the prohibition of conquest, the condemnation of aggression, the principle of national independence, self-determination, and international co-operation without any direct or indirect economic domination.

58. With regard to the principle of direct negotiations, we consider that there cannot be any negotiations imposed by force or threat, especially in cases of occupation and aggression. How can there be negotiations between an aggressor and its victims? Let us rather speak in such cases of a *diktat*, pure and simple.

59. This is also true of the word “borders”. What does this word mean? What is then to be done with the usurped, conquered and occupied territories? The concepts of negotiation and border must be more specific and need more detailed study. The strengthening of international security means, above all, ensuring respect for the fundamental principles of the Charter, and consequently the application to recalcitrant States of the sanctions laid down in the Charter and the adoption of measures that can brook no delay.

60. No one will then be surprised at hearing my delegation reaffirm that there can be no international security unless the above-mentioned conditions are fulfilled. The fact that we reaffirm our duty to respect the principles of the Charter is all the more justified since certain States flout the obligations they have assumed. Among those States we regret to note a permanent member of the Security Council, the United States, which is supposed to safeguard international security and not infringe on the fundamental principle of national independence; and which does not hesitate to launch against a small country, Viet-Nam, a fearful war, in which the most modern means of warfare at the disposal of a great Power are used.

61. What is more, the United States encourages and gives its unreserved support to the Zionist State which has dispossessed and driven out from their homeland the greater part of the Palestinian people and placed the remainder under military occupation. Do not recent official measures governing dual nationality give legal guise to what is in practice a new form of support enabling American military and civilian technicians to be sent to the Zionist State, which has already received Phantom Jets and important financial aid?

62. How can we interpret these acts, that are indirectly aimed at the Arab States, and this special enmity towards the people of Palestine? Are we to assume that this is being done to safeguard security and restore peace in the area, or is the reason a simpler one—to maintain unimpaired the imperialist interests there? Other States, that wilfully ignore or flout the principles of the Charter, still exert some influence and play a role in the United Nations, among them South Africa and Portugal.

63. Respect by Member States for the fundamental principles of international law, as set out in the Charter, and the strengthening of the Security Council should be demanded firmly and without any slackening of effort. It is essential that bilateral and multilateral relations should be based on the principles of the Charter and on the concept of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States as well as on mutual interest, that is, strict respect for the right of each people freely to choose its own social system.

64. In addition, when economic development and social progress are held up by a hypocritical policy of inter-

national co-operation whereby the wealthy countries impose what are often draconian conditions upon so-called “beneficiary” developing countries, could not such cases also be termed interference with international security? We must honestly admit that there can be no international security so long as the main basis of international trade is the domination by imperialist countries of the economies of certain developing countries. Let us not forget that such a form of exchange is at the root of the hunger and poverty of millions of men throughout the world. The aim of international co-operation, in practice and as a concept, should be to provide genuine international assistance, technical and financial, where the interest of the parties would be safeguarded for the good of all.

65. Thus a great effort still has to be made in order to create the necessary conditions for international security. However, the principles of the Charter are not to be blamed for delays in the achievement of international security, but rather the inability of our Organization to win respect for its decisions.

66. Yet, the Security Council, the primary organ of the United Nations, was invested with special powers by the Charter to maintain international peace and security. Among the factors that would strengthen the authority of the Council we must mention, above all, the reinstatement of the People’s Republic of China with all the powers and obligations pertaining to a great permanent Power. Is it not ludicrous to confer these important powers on a so-called Nationalist China that does not exist in international life? By restoring its lawful rights to the People’s Republic of China, the United Nations would strengthen its international authority. We believe that an appeal for international security would remain ineffective unless it were accepted and applied by the People’s Republic of China.

67. My delegation supports the principle of the peaceful coexistence of States, regardless of their social system, on condition that such coexistence does not lead in practice to a new form of political and economic domination by certain Powers or that such a seemingly peaceful policy does not eliminate the national independence of small countries.

68. Finally, on the eve of the Second United Nations Development Decade, it would be appropriate to stress that the huge resources devoted to armaments could be better invested in the constructive needs and the development of the world. We hope that useful conclusions would emerge from discussions and negotiations on disarmament.

69. Such are the few remarks and ideas which the initiative of the Soviet Union has suggested to us. The great number of delegations which have taken part in debates in our Committee is enough evidence, if it were needed, of the interest they attach to this vital problem. Thus this great country once again furnishes proof of its devotion to the achievement of peace in the world. We should like to believe that this peace will be founded on respect for the vital interests of States and peoples, for justice and for the dignity of man.

70. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Yemen for the compliments he addressed to the Bureau.

71. Mr. BOMBA (Central African Republic) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, despite your request that we should refrain from making compliments, may I at this stage in our work associate the delegation of the Central African Republic with the tribute which was paid you by previous speakers on your unanimous election as Chairman of this Committee. May I also, without taking up the Committee's time, express our congratulations to its other officers.

72. Since the speakers before me have commented at length on the problems of security and the need to strengthen it, my statement will be very brief.

73. A feeling of imminent nuclear catastrophe now weighs on the international community. Mankind is in some ways at the crossroads. It can either allow itself to be engulfed by a total war of extermination or, aware of all that is at stake and guided by the only ideals worthy of men of the twentieth century, it can establish institutions which should ensure permanent peace.

74. The statements of delegations which have spoken in this debate so far and which have put forward numerous ideas and interesting points of view have clearly shown that the world situation is characterized by tension, and that the evolution of international relations has reached a dangerous stage. The Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report stressed that "during the last twelve months the deterioration of the international situation . . . has continued" and that "in the field of disarmament progress is indeed very limited".⁴

75. Therefore, the time has come to make the necessary efforts to arrest this trend of humanity towards world war and to strengthen international peace and security.

76. Thus, at this time of confusion and conflict, the delegation of the Central African Republic highly values and welcomes the initiative of the Soviet Union to work for the preservation of international peace and security by asking for the inclusion of this item—the strengthening of international security—on the agenda of the General Assembly. My delegation supports this idea, which seems a good way of promoting a relaxation of tension and of encouraging co-operation.

77. During the general debate in the plenary session, the Central African Republic, through its Minister for Foreign Affairs [*1774th plenary meeting*], reaffirmed its devotion to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and we think that the Organization must make every effort to attain the fundamental objectives which its founders at San Francisco laid down: the maintenance of international peace and security and the preservation of future generations from the scourge of war.

78. Yet in the everyday life of mankind, nothing or almost nothing can lead us to think that peace among nations, equality, world brotherhood and solidarity are living realities. We are fully aware of the spectre of insecurity hovering over all mankind. Man refuses to disarm, and it is

indeed unfortunate that the headlong nuclear arms race, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the pollution of the atmosphere are not to be eliminated yet. In fact, the great Powers are continuing to stockpile ever more weapons the destructive force of which is capable of destroying our planet.

79. In the view of the Central African delegation, the search for peace based on compromise or expediency cannot replace a search based on the conviction that the whole of mankind is one, and that no nation, no matter how powerful, can enjoy the benefits of peace if they are not won and preserved for the good of all mankind.

80. We therefore believe that all means to ensure general and complete disarmament must be employed so that the Powers concerned will realize their grave responsibility towards humanity, a humanity which they deliberately condemn to famine, ignorance and poverty by spending on the arms race unbelievable sums which they should devote to the well-being of two-thirds of the population of the earth.

81. We think, therefore, that in order to bring about indivisible peace among nations and peoples, the strengthening of equality and friendship among all men, rich or poor, must be envisaged on a world scale, so that the ideals which inspired the creation of our Organization and which must justify its existence and its true usefulness, can be expressed in deeds, that is in peaceful coexistence between partners, whether near to or far from one another, in order to safeguard international peace and security.

82. Since the concept of peaceful coexistence is linked to the principle of sovereignty, equality, the inviolability of the territories of States, non-interference in internal affairs of States and respect for the right of peoples to self-determination, failure to observe these truths necessarily leads to the disturbances and misfortunes which now prevail in explosive areas of the world. In that connexion, we feel we must denounce the policy of oppression and *apartheid* which deprives men of their self-esteem in southern Africa, and is an act of defiance of the Charter and a threat to international security.

83. These facts, though they may seem surprising, show how much the world is still living in the shadow of conflict and crisis. Nations are therefore in duty bound to respect the obligations imposed on them in the United Nations Charter.

84. In this field, however, we regret to note that the efforts made by the United Nations in many cases were not crowned with success, especially when peace and security had to be maintained.

85. We must recognize that the prospects for a better and more peaceful world, which seemed practical at the time of the signing of the Charter, have in fact proved to be remote and the distance still to be travelled before we obtain this objective was reflected in the feelings of concern and sometimes even of serious apprehension of the delegations which have spoken before us in this debate.

86. My delegation therefore welcomes the Soviet proposal to strengthen international security, which it deems appro-

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A*, paras. 1 and 2.

ropriate on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization, for it will give all Member States an opportunity to reconsider their attitudes in order to make our world a better place to live in.

87. Therefore, so that the question may be studied in further detail, my delegation supports the proposal of the delegations that have suggested the setting up of a committee which would examine all amendments, suggestions and opinions relating to the draft appeal of the Soviet Union, so that at the next session of the General Assembly a document may be submitted stating what effective action should be taken in the matter by the United Nations and how States could make a wider contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security.

88. In conclusion, my delegation wishes to associate itself with the sympathy expressed to the delegation of Yugoslavia on the occasion of the disaster that has overtaken its country.

89. Mr. BENHIMA (Morocco) (*translated from French*): First of all, Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate the Moroccan delegation with the words of sympathy that you addressed to the delegation of Yugoslavia on the further catastrophe suffered by his country. In Morocco a few years ago we also experienced a dreadful earthquake; we know what a catastrophe of this nature can do, and we sympathize most sincerely with the Yugoslav people.

90. Mr. Chairman, you asked us to refrain from congratulating you. We cannot, of course, challenge your decision, but may I say that the feelings which made you take that decision are an agreeable confirmation of the sound choice we made in entrusting you and your eminent colleagues with the task of directing our work.

91. It is most encouraging to see that one of the two super-Powers of the world has expressed its concern and its anxiety over the deterioration of the present situation in international relations, and has proposed to our Committee—whose competence on the problem had for a long time been overlooked—that it examine the ways and means of strengthening international security.

92. Not that this initiative should surprise us, coming, as it does, from the Soviet Union. We must admit that several times and in varying circumstances, more particularly in the course of the last few years, the Soviet Union has shown concern at the threats to international peace and has, in one way or another, asked that the situation in the world should be examined in order to redress any imbalance which it considered prejudicial to its security and dangerous to international security as a whole. The exceptional nature of the present initiative lies in the fact that this time it is not taken at the usual meeting places or at the end of periodic meetings or in communiqués at the conclusions of official visits—in circumstances which might easily cause those who were ill-disposed to describe these proposals as mere rhetoric or propaganda.

93. The Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union first spoke himself of this item in his statement to the General Assembly [*1756th plenary meeting*] and Mr. Malik then submitted the matter to our Committee in a well-prepared

and well-commented document [*A/C.1/L.468, 1652nd meeting*]. This time an invitation is extended to all Member States to assume their responsibilities and engage in a debate and consultations so that they can jointly decide on the principles and premises which would provide international relations with a basis and a mechanism that would rule out the methods which have frequently threatened the somewhat shaky international structures of the last 25 years. The courage shown by a great Power in taking this step is commendable, and the satisfaction of the small and medium-sized countries is all the greater.

94. For, in fact, this idea of the strengthening of international security has for long been upheld almost exclusively by that large majority of States that wish to depend only on the force of law and the principles of peaceful coexistence to build an international community, whose diversity of systems and differences of levels of power represented a permanent danger.

95. Eminent speakers have recalled here the evolution of international affairs since the end of the Second World War and have described the confrontations that pitted certain countries against one another because the solutions provided by the great Powers to several of their problems resulting from the war were inspired by motives in which the interests of the peoples concerned played only a secondary part or were entirely overlooked. Others have stressed the insufficiency or impotence of the Charter of the United Nations as an adequate and effective instrument for finding successful solutions to the conflicts which the Powers most active in the preparation of the Charter hoped to be able to solve primarily in their own interests.

96. All these remarks have been most pertinent, and we agree that, if the post-war idealism did inspire the aims and purposes of the Charter, many of those provisions reflect rather more the concerns of the victors and their wish to reorganize the international community on the basis of power politics and spheres of influence. As a result serious contradictions in the provisions of the Charter between the meaning of the words and the interpretation of the principles were bound to emerge sooner or later. The best proof of this phenomenon, we believe, lies in the fact that very serious divergencies appeared only a few years after the Charter was adopted between those very Powers that had jointly prepared and drafted the Charter. And if the main objective of the Charter was to safeguard international peace and security, that objective was challenged because the controversies and confrontations which arose led the world on several occasions to the brink of new disasters.

97. Each of the great Powers then formed alliances and supporting groups, and the concept of international security became for each of the two camps the fundamental argument to be invoked in order to ensure its own security and the defence of its own interests. It will be recalled that during that period of permanent crisis between the great Powers which perturbed the whole world, the medium-sized and small nations used all their patience and their skill to try to intercede and to stand between the blocs in order to replace by some useful dialogue this confrontation which constantly threatened the peace of the world.

98. We particularly concentrated our efforts on the search for what the Charter could offer to one side and the other

so that peaceful ways and means would prevail over the intransigence, born of the awareness of power and of the will for domination, which was present in both camps, though in different forms.

99. In particular, the role of the non-aligned nations, which was neither enviable nor easy and which at times caused some of us to be suspected likewise, was recognized much later as a determining factor in the safeguarding of peace.

100. The retrospective analysis of those years of crisis and of the role that the secondary Powers and the small nations played to maintain what confidence existed in the Organization and to preserve the peaceful methods it recommends leads us to give the greatest attention to the proposal of the Soviet Union. But let us first agree on one principle which we do not believe should again be challenged. We take it that the Soviet proposal in no way intends to alter the Charter. The Charter contains many provisions which if properly understood clearly define the nature of the relations to be maintained by States to ensure their development free from any threats of aggression and attacks on their freedom, integrity or independence. The Charter also invites States to act in concert, through the United Nations, to solve problems affecting their respective vital and direct interests, as well as problems that endanger the peace and future of the world.

101. In both cases, the basis for action to ensure international security lies in the Charter. Is there any need to repeat that the different interpretations, which in themselves are born of the defence of individual interests, have in practice vitiated the spirit of the provisions of the Charter or led to their being ignored? It should indeed be possible, in the spirit of the Soviet proposal, to find a formulation which might usefully support those provisions of the Charter by filling in omissions or clearing up any ambiguities in them. The working out of such provisions should give rise to a discussion broad enough to ensure general support for their scope and significance.

102. We should also like to stress the need for all Member States to be more closely associated in these activities, not only because they are fully entitled to participate on an equal footing in all matters of general interest, in particular the future of the international community, but also because experience has shown the usefulness of their active participation in the solution of grave international problems.

103. We agree with the Government of the Soviet Union that in the present circumstances all Members of the Organization should be reminded of their duty to abide unhesitatingly by their obligations arising from their adherence to the Charter, although we know that failure to comply with these obligations is not due to any inadequacies in the texts defining those obligations or the penalties for transgression. But we must repeat that the Charter is disregarded by those States which in their international activities deliberately give priority to the defence of their own concepts which, in many cases, run counter to the accepted principles for defending the interests of the Charter out of strict respect for the interests of others. And we have no objection whatever to joining, in a spirit of re-examination of conscience, in the proposed

appeal, provided that the principles mentioned in it are expressed in a collective effort and by common agreement.

104. Our claim that all countries should contribute is due to two aspects of one fact: on the one hand, the exclusive activities of the great Powers have often been conducted in disregard of the interests of the rest of the international community, which has given rise to many conflicts, and, on the other hand, the participation of the secondary Powers and the small and medium-sized nations has often proved both necessary and effective. Who can overlook the role played by the small countries in crises such as those of Korea, Suez, the Congo and Cyprus, whether they participated through diplomatic action, by the sending of forces to areas of tension, or by making financial contributions to the extent that their means allowed? Furthermore, who would minimize the perseverance of these countries, the constancy of their efforts to ensure that the principles of peaceful coexistence prevailed, and their efforts in pursuit of disarmament?

105. Some may object that, when all is said and done, decisions are taken by the great Powers directly concerned. But the voices of these small countries and their conviction and determination have helped considerably to impose or facilitate the holding of a dialogue that has served to prevent or avert serious confrontations and, in the end, held out favourable prospects for the re-establishment of a spirit of *détente* in the international situation. Thus their right to be associated unconditionally with any new action aimed at strengthening international security is no longer challenged on either moral or political grounds. They can no longer be satisfied with the role of observer, but must take an active part in the creation of peace, in the clear awareness that the future of mankind no longer depends on a limited number of countries, however powerful or great they may be.

106. The text of the Soviet proposal has the merit of raising a number of basic principles which must be respected if international peace and security are to be safeguarded. First among them is the total elimination of colonialism and the right of all peoples to self-determination and independence. Indeed, there can be no international security where entire peoples remain unfreed and still cannot control their own destiny. In this respect too, the Charter has made all necessary provisions. It is in this area that the Organization has perhaps achieved most, but a vast amount of work remains to be done, as the agenda of every session of the General Assembly shows.

107. The Soviet proposal also raises the problem of disarmament. We reject any scepticism that difficulties may justifiably give rise to, but we must recognize that this problem, which dominates all others because it is the main factor upon which hinge war and peace, is still the subject of depressing and interminable negotiations. Agreement between the Powers directly concerned has been reached only on problems of a secondary nature which have been technically obsolete for a long time. While negotiations drag on, the progress made in the armaments race has reached a stage at which international security is constantly threatened, causing justifiable anxiety to all mankind. It is difficult to see how international security can be strengthened when two super-Powers are engaged in a breakneck armaments race and want to limit the armaments possibili-

ties of other countries which quite justifiably feel that they are threatened by one side or the other or both.

108. We sincerely believe that the first response to this draft appeal should be a strong effort to achieve some outstanding results in disarmament negotiations.

109. The existence of such big Powers—and even lesser Powers that are economically and militarily advanced—in the international community makes it difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of any safe or peaceful existence for the rest of the world. We do not ask that all States should be brought down to the same level, but we do consider it essential, things being what they are, that a precise definition of international security should be agreed on and respected by all. At present the concept is essentially a fluid and elastic one, and can be manipulated by all and sundry according to their selfish and subjective notions of national security.

110. We all remember the arguments advanced in certain conflicts of the past, and even in recent crises, touching on what it was customary to refer to by such terms as “the defence of the West”, “the superior interests of such and such a Power”, or “the defence of the Socialist camp”

111. Finally we should like to know precisely where the national security of a country begins. On its geographical frontier? In its zones of economic settlement? At the limits of its ideological expansion? Who knows if tomorrow it may not depend on the demarcations that separate one race or religion from another? Who can be anything but disquieted on hearing one or another Power state that it considers regions of the world far from their own national territories to be zones vital to their national security?

112. We ask ourselves many questions today and I think everyone will agree that we should ask what precisely is meant by “secure and recognized frontiers”. Is there a concept of national defence and security which implies that in a given region a country can arbitrarily decide to include within its own national territory portions of neighbouring countries, just because certain heights or rivers or topographical configurations will afford it greater military protection? And what would such a State itself think of the new situation—not only from the point of view of the rights of others, but from that of their security and ability to defend themselves, since those States would then be exposed to the consequences that its neighbour had illegally tried to avoid?

113. Many examples could be given of this flexibility in the definition of the concept of international security. This is why, in associating ourselves with the Soviet appeal, we wish unreservedly to participate in defining the principles and concepts of international security, which should strengthen the legal and political bases upon which we have thus far tried to preserve peace among nations.

114. I come now to another basic idea put forward in the Soviet proposal: the question of strengthening international security by creating regional security systems. My country is firmly convinced that there must be closer relations between neighbour States in a given region. Even before our

independence, we had regarded our struggle in a spirit of solidarity which comprised the entire region to which we belonged, and we knew that success was possible only if the struggles in each of the neighbouring countries were not isolated. Furthermore, when our problems were happily solved it was difficult to consider arrangements based upon differences of status in the region, and, at the outset of our independence, one of our first acts on the international level was to call a conference of the countries of the region to lay the foundation of a comprehensive area that today we call the Maghreb. Many factors constantly confirm the need to make further agreements in all fields, so that all the potentials of the region may be combined and harmonized.

115. Furthermore, we believe that though the fact that countries are neighbours can give rise to conflicts of interests, a regional system should be best able to reduce those conflicts and should provide for all possible types of disputes solutions that can ensure that solidarity and mutual advantage will prevail over special interests that might at first have seemed incompatible. We are happy that this system is becoming general throughout the African continent, and we believe that the unity of Africa could be more rapidly achieved through organized regional agreements than by lateral arrangements alone. What is true for our continent is equally true elsewhere. Even if agreements at first give priority to economic and social problems, we know that in the long run the interests of the community will create the desire to ensure common security. We view favourably any groupings of this nature which might take place in other continents.

116. We should like to point out in that connexion, however, that while the organic structures of such regional systems may bind the partners together, they cannot be opposed to other States or international groups in accordance with the well-known fact that international law must prevail over regional arrangements, as well as over national law itself.

117. It will be recalled that in this same Committee and room, in the debate in 1962 on a grave regional crisis, the Moroccan delegation openly opposed the concept that important political decisions taken in a regional organization could have the force of law or the authority of *res judicata* as far as the United Nations is concerned.

118. This leads me to express the views of my Government regarding the legal subtleties to which the United States Government resorted in order to justify the presence of its citizens in the Israeli armed forces. At all times, citizenship has given prerogatives within the national territory and established well-defined privileges in other countries in accordance with private or public international law, but the concept of a friendly country is not enough in a court of law and in the light of international law to authorize the citizens of one State to enlist in the army of another State that is guilty of aggression and has been consistently condemned by the United Nations for its behaviour. The extension of citizenship on the pretext of dual nationality is in such a case nothing but an indirect way of progressing from the status of a friendly State to that of an allied State, thereby incurring all the responsibilities resulting from such a *de facto* alliance.

119. The Soviet Union, in submitting this draft appeal, has invited us to make any suggestions or comments we might

wish to offer. My delegation has endeavoured at this stage of the discussion to make certain comments which it felt were essential. I know that I have not analysed all the problems raised by the Soviet initiative. We believe, however, that we shall be offered other opportunities during the year to complete our remarks. My delegation is gratified at the Soviet initiative and at the goodwill shown, and will, in a spirit of co-operation and frank discussion, make any contributions it deems useful and essential.

120. Mr. JOHNSON (Jamaica): Before I begin my intervention, permit me to add my country's expression of sympathy to the Government and people of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in connexion with the devastation recently wrought in that country by natural disaster.

121. I would like to speak briefly on the item "The strengthening of international security", but before doing so, I wish to congratulate you and the other members of the Bureau on your unanimous election to the posts you now hold.

122. Indeed, the title of the item under review begs certain questions. The first is—what is international security? The second is—to what extent does international security now exist? The mere posing of these questions illustrates the difficulties involved in answering them. Collective security is accepted as one of the essential ingredients of international security. However, it seems that we are not here primarily concerned with the strengthening of collective security systems as such—at any rate, not in a comprehensive sense. Perhaps we ought to look at the issue of international security from a different angle—by seeking to determine the roots of the insecurity of nations and by trying to see how this insecurity can be ameliorated.

123. Surely, it is clear that mere appeals are insufficient. States feel insecure because of economic and social problems within and between them, the existence of racial discrimination and colonialism and, most importantly for the small Powers, the *hubris* of the great Powers. It is interesting to note that it is a super-Power, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which has tabled this appeal. It would be salutary and of major importance to the international society if this proposal could be taken as a commitment to the principle of non-interference in the affairs of small States and as a resolve on the part of the super-Powers to end their demands to expand their influence throughout the world in absurd competition with each other, and to the detriment of the other members of the international community.

124. Unfortunately, there is no such evidence. The proposed appeal, praiseworthy though it is, would do little to diminish the insecurity of States. After all, the Charter of this Organization embodies ideals which, it must be assumed, we all share. Year after year it is invoked by each of us in different ways. Year after year appeals are made on the basis of the Charter, but the instability of the international society remains. There has been no shortage of appeals or resolutions of this Organization. Nor has there been a shortage of machinery or institutions through which nations could attempt to overcome their differences and lower the state of tension between them. The existence of the Charter and of the Organization in the post-war world

has not prevented the insecurity of States and hence international instability. We therefore cannot only look to appeals, to institutions, to mechanisms or to machinery to ameliorate conditions which need more fundamental treatment.

125. Unlike some of the preceding speakers, I will not attempt a textual analysis of the proposed appeal [*A/C.1/L.468*]. I prefer to concern myself with two or three basic propositions. The first is that international insecurity can be mitigated only if and when the great Powers of the world refrain from interfering or intervening in the domestic affairs of other States. The principle of non-intervention is essential in any conception of a world freed from insecurity. We recall that it was the initiative of the Soviet Union which led to the adoption of resolution 2131 (XX), entitled "Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty". This resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority of Member States of the United Nations, but unfortunately there is no evidence to show that actions of the several members of the international community have been affected thereby.

126. The second proposition is that the economic and social well-being of peoples is an essential prerequisite to stability between States. The proposed appeal says nothing of this aspect, but a later statement by the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik [*1660th meeting*], shows that he has taken cognizance of the statements previously made in this regard, particularly those by the representatives of Yugoslavia [*1655th meeting*] and Sweden [*1654th meeting*].

127. The third proposition is that the striving for prestige and glory has as a necessary corollary the seeking after power, and the most obvious and menacing aspect of the power of States is their military might. Consequently, although we cannot or may not wish to eradicate from the breast of man his primitive desire for glory and prestige, we ought to strive to remove from international society the menace of arms. It is true that insecurity is invoked for the acquisition of more and more horrendous and refined weapons of destruction which themselves further feed insecurity. Therefore, an essential factor in the instability of our international society is—and will continue to be if not stopped—the proliferation of armaments of all kinds.

128. We have thought it best to be brief, not because the item does not deserve lengthy and detailed consideration; rather we feel that its very importance merits further examination in the light of what we have all said in this debate and what may be said following further review by our respective Governments. It is for this reason that we would support any move which would use the highly-valued draft appeal by the Soviet Union, as well as the statements made in this Committee, as the basis for a thorough examination of the question of how to strengthen international security so that a most worthy document may be prepared for the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly which would be such as to merit not only the transitory acclaim of public opinion but active participation and implementation by the States members of the international community.

129. Mr. SINHA (India): Before I proceed to the substance of my speech, I should like to ask the Yugoslavian

delegation to convey our heartfelt sympathies to the bereaved people and Government of Yugoslavia in regard to the tragic earthquake that has taken such a heavy toll in life and property.

130. Mr. Chairman, I should like at the outset to offer you our most sincere felicitations on your election as Chairman of this Committee. We are confident that under your guidance and leadership the deliberations of this Committee will lead to successful results. My delegation was interested to hear the reference in your opening statement to your Government's policy and the relation it bears to that of non-alignment. Like my colleague from Ceylon, I would also express the hope that your Government will take the essential steps to make adherence to this cause possible.

131. I should also like to extend our congratulations to our colleagues, Mr. Kolo of Nigeria and Mr. Barnett of Jamaica, on their election as Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur respectively.

132. My delegation has chosen to speak so late in the general debate on this item not because it does not evoke our interest but because we wished to hear the views of other speakers and to consult extensively with our colleagues in the Committee with a view to determining the areas of general agreement on the dimensions of the problem under discussion, as well as the specific action which this Committee should take on the proposal before us. In view of these considerations, it is not our intention to make an exhaustive statement of our views at this stage.

133. My delegation welcomes the initiative taken by the Soviet delegation in raising the question of the strengthening of international peace and security. On the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, it is both appropriate and timely that we should have this opportunity to review the record of the world Organization in the vital area of maintaining international peace and security. If this appraisal can lead to positive guidelines for more effective performance in the future, it will indeed have served a most useful purpose.

134. Several of the earlier speakers have referred to the shortcomings of the United Nations Charter in the light of the considerable transformation of the pattern of international relations since the Charter was adopted. Others believe that it is neither necessary nor expedient to think in terms of revising the Charter. Whatever the merits or demerits of these different points of view, there is obviously a general consensus on the proposition that the root of the problem of growing insecurity lies in the blatant failure to observe the rules and regulations of the Charter. The authors of the Charter were led to believe that peace and security could be maintained in the post-war world principally through the co-operative efforts of the permanent members of the Security Council, on whom special responsibilities were conferred by virtue of certain positions they enjoyed at the time. The international community has every reason to be disappointed by the failure of the great Powers to live up to those expectations. The behaviour of the great Powers has tended to lower the general standard of international morality and, as a result, medium and small Powers have been encouraged to pursue narrow selfish interests in violation of all the established norms of international conduct.

135. The authors of the Charter sought to establish a delicate balance between the principles of the sovereign equality of all States and of the special responsibility of the permanent members of the Security Council. Events over the last 24 years have demonstrated that this balance has ceased to have any real practical application. Force has become an increasingly important factor in the determination of relations between States. What is worse, the indiscriminate exercise of power has become a passport to political respectability. On the other hand, States which seek to order their behaviour in accordance with the established principles of international conduct and which eschew recourse to the threat or use of force find that their principled restraint places them in a disadvantageous position in the contemporary political world. The concept of spheres of influence, which is growing in strength, is the very negation of the principle of equality of States. Attempts to remedy this situation by the positive evolution of the policy of peaceful coexistence have been stifled by a growing desire to freeze the *status quo*. In these circumstances it is not surprising that the Secretary-General had to remind us again this year in the introduction to his annual report,⁵ of the further deterioration of the international situation.

136. Any review of the role of the United Nations in the maintenance of international peace and security cannot be complete without a reference to certain past and present conflicts whose settlement has been sought to be effected outside the aegis of the United Nations, either because the forum of the world Organization was found inappropriate or unacceptable or because it was in any case found more convenient for certain reasons to deal with these conflicts outside the framework of United Nations arrangements for the restoration of peace and security.

137. Irrespective of whether any of these efforts at settlement prove partially or wholly successful or not, it cannot but be a matter of regret to the international community that the United Nations has been unable in these situations to play the role envisaged for it by the Charter. I should not wish to take up the time of the members of the Committee by referring in this context to the unfortunate war which continues to be waged in South-East Asia with tragic consequences for life and property.

138. I would, however, wish to refer quite specifically to the question of West Asia in regard to which the United Nations has been fully involved. So far as this particular problem is concerned, it is more than unfortunate that the resolutions and decisions of the world Organization have not been implemented or translated into action due to the intransigence of one Member State and the difficulties the great Powers appear to find in arriving at agreed solutions. While on this subject, I wish to recall the appropriateness of the reference in the Soviet draft appeal [A/C.1/L.468] to the principle of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by conquest and the need for the withdrawal of foreign forces. My delegation has repeatedly asserted the view that the continued occupation of Arab territories constitutes the most serious obstacle to the peaceful solution of the situation in that strategically and economically important part of the world.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 1A.

139. It is only proper that we should search our consciences to determine why peace and security have become so difficult to maintain and restore. We are all agreed that the remedy lies not so much in repeated declarations of intent but in their translation into practice. Article 2 of the Charter contains the basic code of international ethics. What is required is not mere rededication to these principles but their effective and scrupulous implementation.

140. The search for security has to be both serious and pragmatic. The single greatest threat to security lies in the spiralling arms race. It is axiomatic that armaments and weapons of mass destruction cannot constitute a basis for security. It is only through disarmament that a durable peace can be achieved. It is a sad commentary on the divergence between agreed objectives and progress towards their realization that efforts to conclude a treaty on general and complete disarmament have been all but abandoned.

141. Instead, efforts are being made to produce agreement on partial and discriminatory measures which tend to aggravate the general state of international security. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*] has been the most notable demonstration of this tendency. The fact that it was negotiated by the nuclear-weapon Powers without any serious consultation with the non-nuclear States is a vivid example of a growing tendency on the part of the large and powerful to impose arbitrary and unjust instruments on the powerless small. A treaty which seeks to bind the hands of those without nuclear armaments and licenses the unlimited production of nuclear weapons by Powers which already possess over-kill capacity, and which at the same time does not even prohibit the use of these weapons against non-nuclear States, is as unequal as it is ineffective. It cannot increase security; it can only aggravate the already alarming state of insecurity.

142. The expectation that the conclusion of the treaty would be followed by meaningful agreements on the limitation of strategic armaments has failed to be fulfilled. If only to compound the situation, the Security Council has, at the behest of three of its permanent members, by its resolution 255 (1968), sought to withdraw assurances of security implicit under the Charter to States which for legitimate reasons of political principle and national security do not find it possible to subscribe to a particularly unbalanced and wholly discriminatory treaty. Such undermining of security arrangements established under the Charter through the machinery of the United Nations itself can hardly inspire confidence in the protection which the world Organization is expected to provide.

143. I do not wish to refer to other related areas in which the most militarily powerful States have sought to work out secret agreements and to impose them on less powerful States. It has been suggested that it is inevitable that those principally concerned or having the greatest responsibilities in a given situation may well have to consult together in the first place in order to contribute to wider agreement. I would only say that, while we would not question this approach in principle, we regret that it is mainly honoured in the breach. If confidence has to be restored and security has to be strengthened, an entirely new approach based on recognition of the rights of all States, whether large or

small, to be consulted and to contribute to the formulation of solutions to international problems must be found.

144. This approach can be fostered and developed only if nations are prepared to abide by the fundamental injunction contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter which requires all States to “refrain . . . from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations”.

145. If force can be eliminated and the principle of non-intervention strictly observed, the waging of war or the exercise of pressure in the name of freedom, security, ideology or even religion in violation of Charter principles will become both impermissible and unnecessary, and power and force will cease to become the determining factors in international relations. If such an order can be established, States will find that the incentive to acquire military and economic superiority at the expense of the achievement of “social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom” will cease to have a compelling influence.

146. It is a well-accepted proposition that the movement towards a world in which justice becomes the predominant factor can be facilitated by the creation of conditions of greater security. At the same time, it must be realized that conditions of greater security are dependent to a larger extent than we are prepared to admit on the transfer of resources from armaments to the requirements of economic and social development and the progressive elimination of disparities between the rich and the poor. Article 26 of the Charter, which deals specifically with arrangements for the maintenance of international peace and security, refers to the need for the “least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources”. We can continue to ignore this important injunction at our own peril.

147. The unequal division of the resources of the world and the failure to share the application of modern science and technology on an equitable basis constitute a growing source of dissatisfaction and a major threat to peace and security. It is imperative, therefore, that the decade of the 1970s should be devoted equally to development and disarmament. During this decade equal attention will have to be paid to the elimination of the pernicious practices of racial discrimination and *apartheid* which, if allowed to persist, will result in the outbreak of hostilities on a much wider scale than that of the religious and ideological wars of the past. Finally, security can never be assured until the cancer of colonialism and the suppression of subject peoples by alien Powers is eliminated from the face of the earth.

148. The General Assembly and the Security Council have attempted in the past to take decisions calculated to deal with these problem areas. These decisions either have not been commensurate with the dimensions of the problems they sought to solve or have remained partly or wholly unimplemented because they have been regarded as purely recommendatory in character or because there were no effective sanctions to enforce them.

149. The Security Council’s performance has fallen far short of the expectation of Member States. Its record of

achievement under the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter has been desultory and totally inadequate. For reasons to which I have referred earlier, it has failed to take any effective action under Chapter VII. The inhibitory factors militating against the operation of a more effective system of collective security can be eliminated only by the subordination of national interests to the proper exercise of responsibilities by the Security Council and more particularly by its permanent members.

150. Despite the advice tendered by three Secretaries-General, the provisions of Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter have remained a dead letter. We would welcome any move which can be made to reopen this avenue for action, but find it necessary to state that it is not paper decisions but a tangible demonstration of political will to strengthen the machinery and effectiveness of the United Nations which can make periodic meetings at an appropriately high level meaningful and useful.

151. The provisions of the Charter in regard to regional arrangements were carefully drafted and are clear in regard to their role and scope. The principal requirement is that regional arrangements should be consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. Under the Charter these regional arrangements can undertake certain responsibilities for the pacific settlement of disputes or for enforcement action, but only under the specific authority of the Security Council. At the same time, Article 52, paragraph 4, and Article 54 impose definite and necessary restrictions on the role which regional arrangements can play in the maintenance of international peace and security.

152. Another crucial qualification is imposed by the provisions of Article 103 which clearly prescribe that in case of conflict between obligations under the Charter and under international agreements, it is obligations under the Charter which must prevail. It is perhaps for these reasons that the Charter refers to regional arrangements rather than to regional security arrangements. Irrespective of whether regional military arrangements are fully compatible with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter or not, it is clear that regional security arrangements should not seek to establish a juxtaposition of military capacities which would undermine rather than strengthen international peace and security.

153. It is in view of these fundamental considerations that the non-aligned countries have resolutely rejected the idea of military alliances in which the interests of the weaker Powers are subordinated to and controlled by the more powerful members of alliances in violation of the letter and spirit of the Charter. In our view, regional arrangements can promote the objectives of the Charter only in so far as they seek more comprehensive co-operation in all fields and at all levels between the countries of a particular region. It is essential for the United Nations to foster and encourage greater economic co-operation between the countries of each region with a view to ensuring that they develop a vested interest and a real stake in the continued independence, development and progress of their neighbours. This would constitute the most practical contribution to the development of conditions of durable security in each region.

154. We believe that early progress in defining aggression, in formulating principles of friendly relations among States and in working out acceptable arrangements for United Nations peace-keeping operations would facilitate the more effective functioning of the United Nations. On this proposition there is universal agreement. It is on the means to achieve these objectives that there has not been a sufficient degree of agreement. What we require, therefore, is not a simple demand that the Committees dealing with this question expedite their work but a demonstration of the necessary political will to make this possible.

155. As I said at the beginning of my statement, I have not attempted an exhaustive exposition of our views on the subject under our consideration, in view of the consultations in which we are engaged. I would only like to say in concluding my statement that the draft appeal presented to us by the Soviet Government has evoked a most constructive debate on questions which though of paramount importance to the world Organization have not been given, for quite some time, the serious consideration they deserve. We are confident that the consultations which will take place in the light of our most useful debate will produce some concrete results in our common quest for strengthening international peace and security.

156. Mr. MOJSOV (Yugoslavia): Mr. Chairman, before the conclusion of this morning's session of our Committee, allow me to express the gratitude of the Yugoslav delegation and people for the sincere sympathy and sorrow expressed by you, on behalf of the First Committee, concerning the catastrophic earthquake which, according to the latest information, almost completely destroyed Banja Luka, one of the biggest and most beautiful towns in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, causing death and injury, and rendering thousands homeless. Thus, for the second time in the last five years, devastating earthquakes have caused horror and sorrow throughout my country. On this occasion, I should also like, particularly, to express deep thanks for the warm sympathy and human solidarity expressed by the representatives of Uruguay, Colombia, Yemen, the Central African Republic, Morocco, Jamaica and India. On behalf of the Yugoslav delegation, I will convey the expressions of sympathy in this Committee to the Yugoslav Government and the peoples of Yugoslavia.

157. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of Syria who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

158. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all associate myself with you, Sir, and with all the previous distinguished colleagues who have expressed their sympathy through the distinguished Ambassador of Yugoslavia to the very sad event which took place in the very friendly country of Yugoslavia and to convey through him our most sincere sympathy for the plight of the friendly and brotherly people of Yugoslavia.

159. On Friday, 24 October, I made my intervention in this Committee. At the end of the meeting, the representative of Israel exercised his right of reply to my statement. Now, my statement has appeared in the record of the 1665th meeting and all the delegates, I am sure, can refer to it. In that part of the statement which aroused the anger of the representative of Israel, I exclusively and mainly

addressed myself to the representative of the United States. In fact, at least five times, throughout that part of my statement, I addressed myself—within the context of law, raising legal questions, as they had varied relevance on problems of international security—to the eminent jurist who is representing the United States in this First Committee.

160. It is very strange that the representative of Israel should have taken it upon himself to reply for the United States delegation. Until and unless we hear a definite answer or answers from the representative of the United States to the many legal international questions which I raised in my statement of 24 October, we do not consider that whatever has been said by the representative of Israel has any relevance whatsoever to any of the points that have been raised in that statement.

161. Now, with regard to the vilification, defamation and violent attacks which he made against my country and which are of the kind appearing in articles that one can read in *The New York Times* or the *Daily Post*, or any other such paper in New York, it would be beneath the dignity of this Committee, and, indeed, of my own dignity, to answer those attacks. In fact, I would be satisfied with what has been said in the very last statement that we listened to today by the representative of India on the plight of our part of the world, namely, the Arab world in the Middle East.

162. The CHAIRMAN: I give the floor to the representative of Israel who wishes to exercise the right of reply.

163. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): An examination of the document to which the representative of Syria refers will make it clear that I did not deal in any respect—and do not intend to deal, or seek to deal—with his references to the United States in the course of his statement. I dealt exclusively with his references to my own country. It is significant that in the course of the statement which we have just heard from him there has been no reference at all to the fact that Syria continues to be an accomplice to a gross act of piracy in the air; it is significant that a country which in these very days is actively engaged in further extending the areas of aggression against a Member State should come here and appear in the guise of an upholder of international peace

and security. I submit that that is a travesty of all that that concept implies.

164. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Syria in exercise of his right of reply.

165. Mr. TOMEH (Syria): I regret that I must speak once again, but I should like to ask: Is it a mere coincidence that so far the representative of Israel has not given any statement on the subject under discussion, namely, the strengthening of international security? Is that a mere accident? Certainly not. Because one who breaks the law cannot come to the defence of the law courageously, clearly and directly. He always has to attack, always to find “isms” in order to cover his own crimes. In this situation I cannot help but recall the very pertinent remarks made here in this Committee by the representative of the United Arab Republic, Mr. El-Erian, when he said that it is quite natural for the representative of Israel to come and exercise his right of reply whenever the word “aggression” is mentioned, simply because he is the aggressor. That will not change the situation. Whatever he said against my country, whatever points he made, I maintain that his statements are irrelevant to any aspect of the problem that we are dealing with.

166. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

167. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): I wish to add only one sentence. I did in the course of my earlier statement, refer the Committee—and I do so again—to the statement made by the Foreign Minister of Israel in the general debate on the problem in general [*1757th plenary meeting*], which I think adequately answers the point made by the representative of Syria.

168. The CHAIRMAN: Only one delegation—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—remains on the list of speakers in the general debate on this item. In accordance with the decision taken yesterday, after we hear the Soviet Union representative this afternoon, the Committee will take up the “Invitation aspects of the Question of Korea”, documents A/C.1/L.467 and Add.1 and 2, and A/C.1/L.469 and Add.1 and 2.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.