



CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| Agenda item 32: | |
| Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General (<i>continued</i>) | 1 |

Chairman: Mr. Andrés AGUILAR M. (Venezuela).

AGENDA ITEM 32

Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/7922 and Add.1-5, A/7926, A/C.1/1003, A/C.1/L.513-517)

1. Dr. SOLOMON (Trinidad and Tobago): Mr. Chairman, my delegation joins with those who have spoken before in congratulating you most warmly on your election to the Chairmanship of this most important Committee of the General Assembly, and we express the firm conviction that you will continue to preside over our deliberations with the skill and efficiency which you have so far displayed.

2. Our congratulations go also to your very excellent Bureau, whose assistance is so invaluable in the work of any committee.

3. The question of international security was referred for our discussion this year by the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly [*resolution 2606 (XXIV)*]. In the view of some, this was an appropriate matter for discussion during the twenty-fifth anniversary session. In the view of my delegation, however; this is not really an anniversary issue at all. The problem of international security is in itself sufficiently important to warrant discussion at any time and more particularly in these days when so many uncertainties surround us and when wars, however limited in scope, continue to plague us in the Middle East and in Viet-Nam and when unhappiness and discontent affect most of the peoples in all continents of the globe.

4. It is very appropriate that this matter should be discussed in the General Assembly, for although the Charter places on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, some responsibility does devolve on the generality of the membership of our Organization, as is indicated in Articles 10, 11, 12 and 14. Let us not forget, also, that although the Security Council numbers among its members the major Powers of the world, it does not by any means represent the majority of the membership of the world community.

Agreement, therefore, between the major Powers, and in particular the two super-Powers, while undoubtedly helpful in the maintenance of international peace and security, could, if injudiciously oriented, spell danger for the small and not-so-small nations which do not have infeasible membership of the Security Council and do not enjoy the luxury of the veto.

5. Already we have three draft resolutions before us on the subject of international security [*A/C.1/L.513, A/C.1/L.514 and A/C.1/L.517*] and undoubtedly there will be others before this debate is terminated. But we have by now grown accustomed to the idea, however unpalatable it may be, that General Assembly resolutions must be couched in comparatively modest terms if they are to gain acceptance, and so we can expect no world-shaking recommendations as a result of our debates. But at least we have the right to expect that any resolutions to which we give our approval should take into consideration the major causes of instability in the world today and offer some suggestions for dealing with them.

6. Our Charter contains impeccable principles and lofty ideals which even today, after 25 years, can still stand up to the acid test. Unfortunately, not all Members of our Organization do more than give lip service to the ideals of the Charter, while others interpret them in different ways at different times to suit their own particular convenience. More than once the very authority of the Organization has been placed in jeopardy because Members have turned their backs on decisions of the General Assembly and flouted directives of the Security Council.

7. The first consideration, then, in the maintenance of international peace and security is that all nations should pledge themselves to abide by the principles of the Charter to which we have all freely subscribed and to accept the authority of the appropriate organs of the United Nations.

8. The Charter makes specific reference to fundamental human rights and freedoms. After many long years of membership there are still countries in the world where these rights are denied their citizens and where discrimination is practised on the grounds of race, religion or colour. The principal offender in this respect is South Africa, which continues to maintain its infamous policy of *apartheid* in defiance of world opinion and of the decisions of the General Assembly and which has even taken steps to spread this offensive practice beyond its legitimate borders.

9. Side by side with human rights we must consider the question of self-determination. Resolution 1514 (XV) clearly spells out the duties of all States in this regard. We should, therefore, expect that at least in this anniversary year all those Powers which still retain colonies in defiance

of this resolution should take immediate steps to ensure that the peoples under their control are given an early opportunity to exercise their inalienable right of self-determination.

10. The Charter refers to the sovereign equality and territorial integrity of all States. I do not need to remind this Committee of the dangers inherent in attempted abrogation of this principle. The umbrella of the United Nations should be sufficient protection for all States, great and small, and the least that should be expected of the membership of this Organization is that States should freely recognize each other's rights to national existence and territorial inviolability, so that while no State would have the right to invade the territory of another, equally each State must recognize the national existence of its neighbours.

11. The Charter recognizes the need for international collaboration for the purpose of social and economic development. But few people have paid sufficient attention to this, which my delegation considers to be one of the most important functions of the United Nations. The tremendous economic imbalance between States, leading in some cases to exploitation or even to neo-colonialism, is not conducive to stability or personal happiness and therefore represents a potential threat to the peace of the world.

12. In another forum, discussions are going on with regard to the Second United Nations Development Decade. I should like to express the hope that in its deliberations the appropriate body would bear in mind the important security aspect of economic development and would urge all States which have the ability to do so to pledge themselves to contribute a fixed and generous percentage of their gross national product for aid to developing countries. But the problem goes beyond this. One of the important factors hindering the economic development of developing countries is the inability to find outlets for their produce. It cannot harm the developed countries to relax some of their restrictions on the importation of goods from developing countries, thus providing an incentive for employment in those countries where unemployment is a major socio-economic factor.

13. Our Organization comprises most of the countries of the world. But, unfortunately, there still remains outside it one of the largest and certainly one of the most populous countries of the world, representing approximately one quarter of the entire world's population. It is inconceivable that treaties, pacts and negotiations aimed at ensuring international peace and security can be fully, if at all, effective, without the concurrence of this large country of infinite potential.

14. The concept of universality is inherent in our Charter, though not specifically referred to as such, and every Member in one way or another has paid at least lip service to this concept. If we are dealing with the problem of international security, then let us urge all States to work towards factual universality and to place no obstacles in the way of admission to our Assembly of those willing and able to contribute to human happiness and progress.

15. One other important matter needs to be mentioned. Some three years ago the Latin American group presented to this Assembly the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, referred to as the Treaty of Tlatelolco.¹ This Treaty contains two additional Protocols – I and II – referring respectively to Powers with interests in the western hemisphere and Powers possessing nuclear weapons. There is continuing talk about disarmament, nuclear and total. Progress has been disappointingly slow in this respect. If the major Powers are really serious about the abandonment of nuclear weapons and the dismantling of nuclear arsenals, as well as about striving towards the very desirable goal of complete disarmament, then it would seem to my delegation that there should be no obstacle to the signing and ratifying of Additional Protocols I and II to the Treaty of Tlatelolco by those countries to which the Protocols refer and which have not already signed or ratified them.

16. Peace is not a negative factor. It means a great deal more than the absence of global conflict. It means a great deal more than the absence of sporadic shooting wars in various parts of the world. It means more than mere tolerance and coexistence. It means the absence of tension, the existence of goodwill, the intention to promote the betterment of humanity in the long run as against short-term, selfish advantages. It means that fear must depart and be replaced by hope. It means that the thousands of millions spent on armaments can and should be directed towards economic, social and cultural development. It means the freedom to pursue one's particular way of life without the fear of molestation or external aggression in any form.

17. May I express the hope that any resolution we may pass will reflect to some degree these hopes and aspirations.

18. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Trinidad and Tobago for his contribution to our work and for his very kind words of congratulation to the Officers of the Committee.

19. Mr. Otema ALLIMADI (Uganda): Mr. Chairman, allow me to offer my congratulations and those of my delegation to you on your unanimous election to your important office. I should also like to extend our congratulations to the Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur. You could not have had a better team.

20. My delegation is extremely pleased and gratified that, through the initiative of the Government of the Soviet Union,² this item, which is of importance to all mankind, has been brought forward for discussion last year and this year.

21. My delegation has always believed that the United Nations is the best hope for safeguarding the security and national independence of all States, and especially the small States. The provisions set out in the Charter of the United Nations are quite adequate to maintain and strengthen international security. The problem lies in the fact that we, Member States of the United Nations, have often acted in

¹ United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 634 (1968), No. 9068.

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 103, document A/7654.

disregard of and contrary to the principles and the spirit of the Charter. What we therefore need to do is rededicate ourselves to the faithful observance of the Charter of this Organization. The big Powers must realize that what the world needs—and what we ask—is not a universal ideology or philosophy, but peace and the right to self-determination of all peoples. We want international security questions to be settled within the framework of the United Nations in order to ensure that the wishes of the people whose fate is being determined remain paramount, and that the views of the world community are taken into consideration.

22. What is the Security Council for if matters affecting international security continue to be settled by the big four—or at times the big two—outside the framework of the United Nations? The Security Council must be strengthened and made more effective if it is to play the role that it was meant to play. We therefore welcome the recommendation made by the Security Council to hold periodic meetings at the ministerial level. While still on the question of strengthening the Security Council, I would like to state that my delegation does not share the view contained in paragraph 15 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.514, sponsored by some Western Powers, to the effect that members of this Organization should ensure henceforth—and I repeat, henceforth—the faithful application of Article 23, paragraph 1, of the Charter. Is there any reason to assume that this provision has not in the past been faithfully complied with? How do the States that sponsored this resolution determine the contribution made by any State to the maintenance of international peace and security? Are they aware that in fact some of the States that have contributed least to the maintenance of international security are to be found among the Permanent Members of the Security Council? Which are the States that in the past opposed invoking the enforcement measures contained in Chapter VII, when it was quite clear that acts had been committed that amounted to threats to the peace or breaches of the peace or even acts of aggression? Is it the small and weak but peace-loving States that are responsible for the ineffectiveness of the Security Council? The answer is definitely no.

23. Let me now turn to the question of disarmament. The United Nations goal should continue to be the attainment of general and complete disarmament. We welcome the progress being made in the strategic arms limitation talks. We hope that in this Disarmament Decade we are entering serious efforts will be made to deal with the threat caused by the presence of chemical and bacteriological weapons in some countries, and also the increase in conventional weapons in others. My country is a signatory of the 1925 Geneva Protocol on chemical and bacteriological warfare³ and intends to continue strictly to abide by it. We have in the past expressed grave concern over the serious situation caused by the increasing acquisition of military equipment by the racist minority régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, and also Portugal. The continued militarization of these countries not only perpetuates the oppression of the non-white majorities of these countries, but also poses a real danger of racial wars on the continent of Africa. We

³ Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous and Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare (League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV (1929), No. 2318).

know that Portugal with its crumbling economy would not have been able to wage its wars in Africa for over six years had it not been for the sustenance it received from NATO allies.

24. We know that South Africa could not afford its present very heavy military budget if it were not for the investments the United States, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Italy and Japan have poured into that country. We know that the Rhodesian régime would not have survived this long had measures been taken to stop South Africa and Portugal from breaking the embargo. If the United Nations seriously wants peace on the African continent, it must prevail on all the countries that have been accomplices, both as principles and accessories, to the continued subjugation of non-whites in South Africa, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Angola and Guinea (Bissau) to stop fraternizing with these racist régimes of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal. It must prevail on France to stop supplying arms to South Africa, and on the United Kingdom to abandon its intention to sell arms to the same South African régime.

25. It is also my delegation's view that another major cause of world tension is the existence of foreign military bases and big-Power military alliances. We should therefore take all appropriate measures to ensure that the military bases of any Power are confined within its borders, and to liquidate those military alliances. It is my belief that neither the present big-Power military alliances nor the existing bilateral or multilateral agreements under which foreign military bases have been established are within the spirit of the provisions of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, since they do not enhance the settlement of disputes by pacific means. While still on this question of foreign military bases, I would like this Committee to take note of the fact that not only has the racist South African régime built military bases on the borders of independent African countries, but it is being rumoured also that it has taken steps with a view to establishing foreign military bases in at least one of the African countries.

26. At the last session I spoke in support of the desirability of the universality of membership of the United Nations as a means of strengthening international peace and security. I would like to ask this Committee how long we can afford to deny the People's Republic of China its lawful right to its seat in the United Nations. I would like to ask how a reduction in nuclear armaments can be effected without the co-operation of the People's Republic of China. My delegation is dismayed also at the fact that France has not yet found it fit to join the disarmament talks and we hope international opinion will induce the Republic of France to play a positive role in this field.

27. I would now like to turn to the two areas today that pose a major threat to international peace and security—the Middle East and Indo-China. If there is to be peace in the Middle East, the big powers must stop supplying arms, which has led to the escalation of the war there. Secondly, the question of Palestinian refugees must be faced seriously and a solution found to this problem. The refugees who have lived in camps for 22 years cannot stay there indefinitely, and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, which has

fed them for 19 years, cannot continue to feed them indefinitely. We insist that the parties concerned heed Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of November 1967. The world community must refuse to give any recognition to the acquisition of any territory by military conquest. The parties concerned should extend the cease-fire period and support the efforts of Ambassador Jarring to find a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict.

28. In Indo-China any intervention by foreign military Powers should cease and the people should be allowed to exercise their right to self-determination. The United Nations could play a very important role, should come in to supervise, for instance, free elections that will provide the people with popularly elected governments instead of foreign-imposed puppet governments.

29. We are entering the Second United Nations Development Decade with a wealth of knowledge as to the causes of the failure of the first Development Decade. Taking the per capita income of \$1,000 as the dividing line, more than two thirds of the world falls into the category of the developing world. These same developing countries control only one sixth of the world output. This one sixth dwindles every day. Can we expect stable political institutions to flourish in a world where two thirds of the people live in perpetual poverty with very serious unemployment problems? During the Second Development Decade we should aim at reversing the present trend where the gap between developed and developing countries grows wider and wider. We must reverse the situation while it is still reversible. We should be willing to create more equitable terms of trade that will open up markets for both developing and developed countries. We should transform the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, regional banks and all relevant specialized agencies into more effective instruments of development. To ensure a strong basis for peace and stability, we must ensure higher productivity, larger per capita incomes and fewer unemployment problems.

30. Colonialism and *apartheid* must be eradicated from the earth if we are to have peace with equality and human dignity. *Apartheid* as practised in South Africa is a form of genocide. It is not by mere accident that the infant mortality rate in Namibia is so high among the non-white population, and continues to rise higher and higher. The heavy expenses incurred by the South African régime to provide extensive family planning clinics for the black population, while at the same time appealing to the white population to expand the size of their families, is further proof that the South African régime is determined to exterminate the African population. Is there a difference between genocide that is carried out slowly but consistently and genocide that is carried out in the Hitler style? Is it less a crime when the South African style of genocide is accompanied by a system that perpetuates the degradation and dehumanization of a race gradually being exterminated?

31. The draft resolution sponsored by the Netherlands, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy and Japan [A/C.1/L.514], in its operative paragraph 5, recommends the "fullest possible utilization of" the International Court of Justice. I would suggest that the real issue here is how to restore Member States' confidence in the International

Court of Justice. I would like to point out that Uganda is one of the very few States that continue to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, while some of the States appealing for the fullest possible utilization of the Court are ceasing to consider themselves bound by this compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. It is very well known that the confidence of the world in the International Court of Justice has been shaken ever since its decision on the South West Africa case. We shall offer our suggestions for restoring confidence in the International Court of Justice when the question of the review of its role is considered in the Sixth Committee.

32. In brief, my delegation's proposals for strengthening international security are: that we rededicate ourselves to the principles of the Charter; that we implement the resolutions of the Security Council; that we eradicate colonialism and neo-colonialism and curb the commercial and political interests that sustain the racist régimes of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal; that we respect the principle of universality of membership of the United Nations; that we dissolve the big-Power military alliances; that we remove all foreign military bases from the continents of Asia, Africa and Europe; that the big Powers stop supplying arms to the troubled spots of the world; and that we aim at world peace through economic and social progress.

33. In conclusion I should like to recall the following words used by our beloved Secretary-General, U Thant, at Uppsala University in 1962:

"The other role of the small nations is to give expression, so to speak, to the still small voice. More often self-interest rather than conscience 'makes cowards of us all' and prevents us from speaking out the truth as we see it. It is again a proper role for the small nations to speak the truth as they see it, and let the chips fall where they may."

34. My delegation has tried to speak the truth as it sees it.

35. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Uganda for the contribution he has made to the discussion of this item and for the kind words of congratulations which he addressed to the officers of the Committee.

36. Mr. Dosumu JOHNSON (Liberia): Mr. Chairman, my delegation would like to join those that have extended their congratulations to you on your election to the chairmanship of this important political Committee, and, through you, our congratulations are expressed to the other officers of the Committee. We are confident that, with your collective wisdom and experience, success will attend our deliberations. We assure you of the whole-hearted cooperation of the Liberian delegation.

37. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, at a time when "explosion" is one of the more frequently used words, at a time of exposure to worlds outside our own, and at a time of arrogant claims of science and armaments, offers a challenge to the nations of the world and demands of them a reconstruction towards a more dynamic conception of the eternal and altruistic principles

of “saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war” which motivated the war-weary founding fathers of this Organization in 1945. The foundations of this Organization were piously laid in the overruling providence of God. They saw all men then as beings of infinite virtue and thereby endeavoured to revitalize the principles of equality, justice and humanity which underline the doctrine that all men are created equal; hence, the very comprehensive wording of the Charter they projected.

38. To achieve peace and security is the chief aim of the United Nations. No diplomatic adventure should be more exhilarating than the quest for world peace, the achievement of which must transcend all other mundane considerations. Peace through the United Nations is man’s only hope for survival. Therefore, the item before us deserves serious consideration to remove all controversies and hindrances to positive *détente* and universal coexistence and thereby abolish the use of force and subversive activities as instruments of national policy.

39. Contrary to the innuendoes of detractors, there is nothing wrong with the spirit of the United Nations and its Charter. With minor modifications to bring it in line with current social trends, it is the best instrument for peace since man began to discuss international peace. Any and all wrongs or failures of this great Organization must be attributed to its Members which, by commission or omission, by contemplation or intendment, have rendered its organs inoperative. Our first duty, then, is not so much to pass new resolutions but to change men’s minds and attitudes.

40. In our effort to resolve the problem of international peace and security there appears retrospectively a network of political conditions which demand understanding before we can begin to project meaningful panaceas for the peace and security of the world. First and foremost is a recognition of the thesis that peace-making, peace-keeping and international security are the primary responsibility of all States, large and small.

41. My next observation relates to the mistake of the founding fathers of this great institution in ignoring completely the influence of the supernatural in the affairs and thinking of both primitive and modern mankind in social aggregate. By that we mean the negation of the spirit of God in the councils of the United Nations. The absence of the theological, which is innate in all men, is more or less responsible for the confusions and disagreements which have robbed us of the correct approach to the solution of world problems. It borders on nihilism. Since the beginning of modern political society nations have always conducted their affairs more or less successfully with some concept of a God. You can find communities where there is no vestige of so-called organized institutions, such as schools, hospitals and even governments; but communities existing without some concept of a God have never been seen by man. As a basis for clear perception and moral discipline directed towards short-term national advantages and long-term international objectives we need something beyond man. The fear and influence of a supernatural force are a help in resisting the temptation to take attractive and selfish by-ways for transient gains.

42. Guided by a spiritual or ethical underpinning, the super-Powers of this Organization would have seen the welfare and peace of mankind as their pristine responsibility. They would have seen their continuing existence and socio-economic progress as predicated on the peace, tranquillity and progress of all the peoples of Europe, East and West, of the peoples of the North and South Atlantic, of the peoples of the Middle East, the Far East and the Near East, of the peoples of Africa and Asia—the rich, developed nations of Europe and America and the poor, developing nations of Asia and Africa. They would have seen that there is not much material difference between the communist world and the world of diversity.

43. We cannot emphasize too strongly our opinion that the first step towards global peace and security is a clear understanding of the potentialities, powers, responsibilities and deficiencies of other nations, and underwriting them towards abundant living. It is only in this frame of reference that even the super-Powers can fit themselves effectively into the moral and material leadership of small States and into the confidence of the whole world. This thinking calls for a new power structure in which the two super-Powers will function as a unit, without regard to past ideological affinities.

44. We are conscious of the fact that it is difficult to attain such a posture of big-Power unity in short order; but, with goodwill, this is the basic road to ultimate survival, to international peace and security, to self-respect, world recognition and a better standard of living for the millions recently liberated from colonialism and now seated as Members of the United Nations. Involved in the economic and political problems of the developing States, the United Nations is in duty bound to give them the help and protection and happiness they need.

45. Power and responsibility in political life are not abstract things. They have concrete relevance in a changed and changing world, and the super-States must take cognizance of this and reshape the structure of their power towards a more effective and peaceful sharing of the responsibilities of world politics. They must stop ideological bickerings and end the corrosive national rivalries that have made the United Nations impotent.

46. The ideological division of the major Powers, East and West, tends to hinder them from making concrete contributions to peace. Tied to obsolete antagonisms and old-line diplomacy and obsessed by the idea that arms and more arms are the sole means of security, they are unwilling to make concessions unless on a *quid pro quo* basis. Frustrated by such trends and tendencies since the birth of this Organization, it becomes our compelling duty to take the maintenance of peace and security of the world out of the hands of a small group of great Powers and commit it to the hands of the many. How to do so in the face of the veto is the greatest problem before the United Nations within the context of item 32, dealing with the strengthening of international peace and security.

47. The present posture of world affairs threatens our existence. If we are to live together amid the shifting forces and strains of a technitronic age, we should rethink our way of life with a purpose, for the changes of the past 25 years

have caused a climate of persistent danger, compelling necessary, if unpleasant, decisions. We must adjust our Organization to the requirements of the times or destroy it. The super-Powers must ponder how they can effectively employ their great but finite power towards a good life for all mankind. Too much time has been spent on analysis; we must now embark on the search for synthesis.

48. The communist East, plus its satellites, and the capitalist West, plus its satellites, must come together and work together for a life of value or continue their sterile confrontation between crippled ideological systems. Words must have the same meanings to both sides in the cold-war monolith. The bliss of destructive indifference to the plight of the have-nots must give way to the boldness of constructive behaviour. Without the rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States there would have been only one Korea, only one Viet-Nam, only one China and only one Germany.

49. In our interdependent world it is time the great Powers realized that there are certain fundamental values which do not change; and among these is the power given to each of them to increase goodness, brotherhood, tolerance, genuine happiness and peace by their individual acts.

50. This item is designed to rescue mankind from the horrors of a thermonuclear holocaust through diplomacy. Since diplomacy should settle disputes by negotiation, it presupposes a recognition of the need for lasting harmony among the nations of the world. But diplomacy in the United Nations, as we see it, must depend by and large upon the attitude of the small States. In matters affecting their collective interest the developing States should speak out and seek all possible means of getting the super-Powers to work together without regard to ideologies. We should not allow ourselves to be manoeuvred into a state of helplessness by the pejorative sense in which some people use the words "imperialism", "colonialism", "neo-colonialism" and other shibboleths within the context of so serious a debate. Unemployment, hunger, disease, illiteracy and other deadly evils cannot be erased from the world by words but by a willingness to come to grips with realities founded on a united front in which the great Powers share. International anarchy is incompatible with the spirit and letter of the United Nations.

51. The inventions of today have caught the United Nations in an awful dilemma; but we are optimistic that the Powers that make and direct the course of these modern inventions will assume their responsibility for peace before it is too late.

52. History should guide mankind towards a reconstruction of its living process. All attempts to prevent wars and conflicts since The Hague Peace Conference of 1899 have failed. In the wars of 1914 to 1918 and 1939 to 1945 men lost all sense of morality, not because they did not desire peace but because of their incapacity to understand and master the objective forces that cause wars. But we think that 25 years of pooling ideas within the United Nations, though very short for the reconstructive process, should induce a redoubled effort to see peace not as the rhetorical dream of prophets and philosophers but as the *sine qua non* for the survival of all mankind.

53. Your atomic stockpiles, all your implements of war, cannot save you. No nation can attain security by isolationism, preparedness or alliances. The balance-of-power principle in restraining war has failed tragically. International relations are of vital interest to all peoples of our world.

54. In retrospect, every peace treaty since the Napoleonic wars invariably contained the seed of another war: the Treaty of Vienna in 1815 put an end to the Napoleonic wars and prepared the way for the wars of nationalism; the Treaty of Paris in 1856 ended the Crimean War and paved the way for the Russo-Turkish War; the Treaty of Frankfurt in 1871 ended the Franco-Prussian War and prepared the way for the First World War. Versailles, in 1919, prepared the way for the Second World War. To cure this and other unforeseen imbalances is the *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

55. Unless there is a change of heart in the chancelleries of the world, regionalism is not our answer to peace and security. Failure in the past to make the United Nations instrument work effectively led to a series of regional pacts. The Rio Treaty of 1947, the Western European Union of 1948, the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 and the Warsaw Pact of 1955 are all of good intentions, but they have proved to be no substitute for a universal arrangement for universal peace within the United Nations.

56. Regional arrangements lead to the compartmentalization of the world, with evil consequences. They may be effective in economic and cultural associations, but for the type of peace envisaged within the context of agenda item 32 they are wholly inadequate. And the human equation being what it is, they will lead to jealousy, rivalry, fear and, ultimately, war.

57. The Charter gave the Security Council the primary responsibility for international peace. But in practice the Council has lost its pristine significance as peace-maker and peace-keeper.

58. The Charter and the founding fathers counted heavily on the loyal and unbiased co-operation of the permanent members of the Security Council to attain through the Council their highest objective—peace. The veto was a makeshift, and it was thought that it would wither away through disuse. It was to be used sparingly and only to prevent military attacks against, or meddling in the domestic affairs of, the permanent members. As we now know, the veto has been used a number of times, sometimes for trivial or ideological reasons. The veto power exclusively in the hands of the great States is immoral and prejudicial to the welfare of small States without ideological alignment, in particular the 41 African States which have no permanent representation on the Council. In the circumstances, the veto power should be modified or abolished and the Council made to function on the majority principle, like the General Assembly. We are, of course, open to meaningful compromise.

59. The veto power confers second-class membership on 121 Members of the United Nations. The veto power keeps the United Nations in a state of "animated paralysis" as members of the Council indulge themselves in the multiplication of instruments for ensuring peace while they

obdurately reject the application of these instruments when their national interests are not served. With the Council determining issues before it on the basis of political expediency and national economic interest rather than on the basis of justice and/or merit, and being ideologically polarized, the non-permanent members should be wary of leaving the peace and security of the world to such a body. We should expect the members of the Security Council in all fairness to adjudicate all issues before it as neutrals, without regard to the policy of their respective States. The structure of the Council must be reviewed to inspire confidence.

60. The chief obstacle to international peace and security is fear, fear, fear, engendered by the division between the communist and the capitalist worlds. Since 1917 this division has been clearly marked and systematically pursued in all areas and at all levels. We see evidence of this here in this Committee.

61. In our view, unless we of the United Nations can devise ways and means of making peace between the United States and the Soviet Union, all our present efforts for peace will be protracted, if not in vain. The two must come together, because their common interest wills it and because they owe it to the world. It is not a hard thing for them to come together; there is very little difference between communism and capitalism: one says "evolution" and the other says "revolution". We can easily do away with that.

62. The mere passing of these resolutions before us cannot strengthen peace and security in the world so long as nations are afraid of each other, so long as they remain divided into aligned and non-aligned, big and little, developed and under-developed, "haves" and "have-nots". All barriers between the nations of the world must be removed by taking away the obstacles of ideology, secret diplomacy, prestigious and selfish nationalism, suspicion and fear of subversion.

63. To speak thus without submitting something would be out of place. We may start in the direction of bringing the super-Powers together first, by appointing a committee composed of socialists, capitalists and non-aligned countries to reconcile, marry or merge all the draft resolutions that will be introduced under this item. The adoption of any one of them without the mechanical participation of any of the sponsors of the others would be an exercise in futility. Secondly, improved transportation, growing economic interdependence and easy means of communication are conduits to a united world. Since there is a trend towards a common world market by the communist and capitalist economies—this can be seen everywhere now—international trade may serve as a means to ensure the coexistence of all States in world trade. With goodwill the great Powers can induce a change of public attitudes to remove restrictive trade legislation on both sides. Unrestricted trade relations will bring the communists and the capitalists together faster. Thirdly, international security implies an international defence pact in which all nations must be represented and stand ready to defend any State against violation. The inspection and control of arms would be under a United Nations agency to which all Members would report annually their stockpiles of arms and weapons systems. In this

context a disarmament authority might be set up to control all nuclear weapons and delivery systems. It would be composed of representatives of all States, who would act as world policemen and keepers of the peace, with the right to travel unmolested and see everything anywhere in the world; fear and suspicion would therefore be mitigated and we would have relative peace.

64. In conclusion, we cannot emphasize too strongly the imperative necessity of bridging the gap between the Soviet Union and the United States, and we sincerely believe that if the small nations take this idea seriously they can bring the super-Powers together without reference to socialism, capitalism or ideology. But let us begin by merging the draft resolutions before us so that they can be seen through one telescope. Let these draft resolutions be merged. Let the representatives of the Committee that you, Mr. Chairman, will appoint be those of the Soviet Union, the United States and the non-aligned countries and bring us one resolution instead of three, four or five. I implore you not to think of who is making this suggestion but to think of what good can be accomplished by it. My delegation reserves its right to speak on any relevant draft resolution that will emerge in due course.

65. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Liberia for his kind words of congratulation to the officers of the Committee and for his offer of co-operation.

66. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic congratulates you on your election to the responsible office of Chairman of the First Committee. We congratulate the representatives of the Somali Democratic Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, who have been elected Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur, respectively. We wish the officers of the Committee success in their work.

67. The item concerning the strengthening of international security, which was proposed by the Soviet Union,⁴ is the principal item on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly—the question which is most timely and of basic importance.

68. The discussion of this item at the last session of the General Assembly, the replies from Governments to the Secretary-General's inquiry [*A/7922 and Add.1-5*] and the fact that the First Committee has started its work this year with this particular agenda item all go to show that States Members of the United Nations are fully aware that this question is extremely important. Nobody will deny that only the adoption of measures to strengthen international security can create conditions conducive to the solution of other political problems and of social, economic and legal problems.

69. Practical measures to strengthen international security are particularly important because it is the security of all peoples and the peaceful life of each person on our planet which are at stake. It was for this that the United Nations was founded.

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 103, document A/7654.

70. The events occurring in various parts of the world, the armed conflicts and the acts of aggression committed by the colonialists and imperialists make it vitally necessary to take specific measures for the strengthening of international security.

71. In his report on the consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security, the Secretary-General of the United Nations notes: "The war in South-East Asia does not show signs of abating, the Middle East conflict continues. Potentially dangerous are tensions in Africa, where remnants of colonialism are allowed to exist." [A/7922, para. 7.] The continuing United States aggression against the peoples of Indo-China, the aggression by Israel in the Middle East and the colonial wars on the African continent are fraught with dangerous consequences for the cause of peace. In these circumstances, the strengthening of international security acquires a special urgency.

72. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic attaches paramount importance to this question. We prize the benefits of peace and are strongly opposed to imperialist wars. The Second World War, unleashed by Fascist Germany, caused irreparable casualties among our people. It will be recalled that one out of four Byelorussians died during the war. We know that the horrors of the world war were felt by many other peoples too. Inspired by the Leninist principles of peace-loving foreign policy, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, together with the other States in the socialist community and with peace-loving forces all over the world, is strongly in favour of protecting international security and is doing everything to ensure that succeeding generations will live and work in conditions of peace and tranquillity and that the scourge of war will never again bring sorrow and suffering to mankind.

73. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that a comprehensive decision on the strengthening of international security should be adopted at this session. For the cause of peace, however, it is very important what decision will be adopted—whether it will reflect the interests of the peoples and the interests of peace and international security or whether it will be incomplete and omit a number of vital principles and provisions on which the preservation and safeguarding of peace depend.

74. The decision of the General Assembly must contain those principles whose implementation will make it possible to preserve and strengthen peace and international security—in other words, to perform the main task of the United Nations.

75. All these requirements are met by the draft declaration on strengthening international security submitted to the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly by eight socialist countries, including the Byelorussian SSR [A/C.1/L.513]. The draft declaration contains very important provisions, which are in full conformity with the United Nations Charter, which deal with problems of great concern to literally all countries and all peoples and which reflect their interests.

76. The draft declaration of the socialist countries, which takes into account the views of all peace-loving States, is a

specific programme of action designed to preserve and strengthen peace throughout the world. All the provisions of the preamble and the operative part of this declaration, from beginning to end, all the paragraphs taken separately or together, are imbued with one central idea—the safeguarding of peace and international security.

77. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has already described in detail in the general debate at the 1854th plenary meeting in the Assembly the contents of the draft declaration, which was introduced in the First Committee on behalf of the eight sponsors and explained by the representative of the Soviet Union, Mr. Malik [1725th meeting]. Consequently, I should like to dwell mainly on the very important measures for the strengthening of international security which are not found in the draft of the six Western countries [A/C.1/L.514].

78. The draft of the Western countries makes no mention of the inadmissibility of military occupation and the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory as a result of war or the use of force, in violation of the provisions of the Charter, or of strict implementation of the decisions of the Security Council on the withdrawal of forces from territories occupied as a result of such conflicts. These provisions which are clearly formulated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft declaration in document A/C.1/L.513, are based on the Charter principle requiring States to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any States, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

79. It is quite obvious that those who are interested in peace and in the strengthening of international security cannot object to the very important provisions in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft declaration of the socialist countries. The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,⁵ adopted at this session, stresses that:

"The territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter. The territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force. No territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal".

80. These principles have already been recognized by many States. As early as 1967, for example, the group of Latin American countries referred, in one of their draft resolutions which was supported by the Western States, to the inadmissibility of recognizing the legality of occupation or acquisition of territory resulting from the use of force. The countries participating in the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lusaka in September, on the eve of the session of the General Assembly, requested that the Declaration on strengthening international security should include a provision on the prohibition of aggression and non-recognition of territorial acquisition by conquest. It is natural that the principles of the inadmissibility of military occupation and

⁵ For the text, see resolution 2625 (XXV).

the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory as a result of war or the use of force and the request for the withdrawal of forces from territories occupied as a result of armed conflicts should be clearly stated in a declaration on the strengthening of international security. This is exactly what the socialist countries are proposing, on the assumption that such statements would enhance confidence between States and eliminate the sources and consequences of many conflicts.

81. The adoption and implementation of these provisions of the draft declaration will not only produce an improvement in the present tense international situation but will also make it possible to strengthen peace and international security in the future.

82. One cannot overlook the fact that those who criticized the eight-Power draft declaration passed over these most important provisions in silence. How are we to interpret this silence? If it implies consent, why do these provisions not appear in the Western draft?

83. Ten years have now elapsed since the adoption of the historic United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. Much has been done to implement that Declaration. But further additional efforts are still required to eliminate colonialism once and for all. In a number of regions, the colonialists are suppressing by fire and sword the peoples' legitimate struggle for their freedom and independence and are waging bloody wars in order to preserve their domination. Hence the need to demand the cessation of all military and other action for the suppression of the liberation movements of peoples still under colonial or racist domination. Our draft includes a provision to this effect. It will be noted that this provision, which is extremely important in present-day conditions, is absent from the Western draft, which is, limited to general reminders that impose no obligations and have proved ineffective in practice.

84. The representative of Canada has expressed reservations [*1727th meeting*] about paragraph 9 of the socialist countries' draft declaration, concerning the participation of all States in the regions concerned in the development of international co-operation on a regional basis for the purpose of strengthening security. The conclusion to be drawn from his statement is that, while we socialist countries are speaking of true collective security in our draft declaration, the sponsors of the Western draft resolution are still thinking in terms of military blocs. The Canadian representative's viewpoint can be interpreted to mean that he considers it impossible for all States in a particular geographical region to co-operate on a regional basis for the purpose of strengthening peace and security.

85. He proposes different criteria, whose application after the war led to the establishment of a number of aggressive military blocs. Everyone knows that these blocs have not helped to strengthen international security but have aggravated the international situation. In view of this, the socialist countries also advocate a new approach to the question of regional co-operation. They are suggesting, for example, that all European States—I repeat, all European States—should take part in the formulation of measures

aimed at the achievement of a *détente*, the strengthening of security and the development of peaceful co-operation in Europe.

86. Some of the sponsors of the Western draft have unjustly criticized the draft declaration of the eight socialist States on the ground that it stresses expansion of the role of the Security Council allegedly at the expense of the other organs of the United Nations. Yet surely it is natural, in a document concerned with the strengthening of international security, to give specific emphasis to the Security Council, upon which the United Nations Charter has conferred primary responsibility in this respect. There was no intention on the part of the sponsors of the draft Declaration to belittle the other organs' powers, entrusted to them by the Charter of the United Nations. In this case, the establishment of some kind of "balance", as proposed by the sponsors of the Western draft resolution, would be inappropriate, if we adopt a position of strict observance of the United Nations Charter.

87. How can the socialist countries be criticized for underestimating the other organs of the United Nations, when in our draft we advocate acceleration of the attainment of agreement on a definition of aggression (this, incidentally, is not even mentioned in the Western draft) and on United Nations peace-keeping operations—in other words, on questions which are being dealt with by special organs of the General Assembly? Everybody knows the role which we assign to the General Assembly in the solution of questions of disarmament, both conventional and nuclear, decolonization and the social and economic progress of all countries, including the developing countries. All this can be seen from the text we have submitted.

88. We also note that the Western draft omits such important provisions as respect for the right of all peoples freely to choose their social system and the need for complete application of the principle of the universality of the United Nations. These provisions in the draft declaration of the socialist countries are irrefutable. It is impossible to speak of a desire for peace, without recognizing the right of peoples freely to choose their social system. Failure to do so would be a denial of peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems and an invitation to interference in the internal affairs of peoples and States. It is equally impossible to speak of enhancing the effectiveness of United Nations activities to strengthen international security, if at the same time one closes the door of this Organization to a number of States and thus in advance deprives the measures evolved for this purpose of their universal applicability, which is so necessary in order to achieve secure and lasting peace.

89. The sponsors of the Western draft resolution who spoke here tried to convince the members of the Committee that their draft took fully into account all the proposals made in States' replies to the Secretary-General's inquiry. The omissions and substantial shortcomings which I have noted in the Western draft in connexion with the most important questions demonstrate that the sponsors of that draft not only did not take into consideration but actually disregarded the positions and proposals of the socialist countries and of many other States and in a number of instances formulated provisions which are incompatible

with the United Nations Charter or attempt to prejudice the results and procedures of the work of certain United Nations organs. I am referring, for example, to the fact that in their text the Charter requirement concerning equitable geographical distribution of the elected members of the Security Council is deliberately waived; they ask more of Member States than is envisaged in the Charter in connexion with the role of the International Court and other procedures of peaceful settlement and try to resolve certain matters which are within the sole and exclusive competence of the Security Council.

90. The representative of Canada, trying to show the advantages of the Western draft, went so far as to present its shortcomings as merits and criticized us for not having included in our draft declaration a provision concerning human rights, for example. This is a quite unfounded assertion, since our text is designed to ensure the exercise of the basic human right—the right to life, to life in conditions of peace, friendly relations and co-operation among peoples.

91. With regard to the form of the document on the strengthening of international security, certain delegations saw fit for some reason to express doubt about the advisability of adopting a declaration, referring to the “nuclear status” of such a document.

92. I should like to make two points in this connexion. First, the General Assembly has previously adopted declarations and it would be strange now, 10 years after its adoption, to cast doubt on the status of so important a document as the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The declaration became a tangible weapon in the hands of the fighting peoples of the colonies and played a significant role in the development of the national liberation movement. Secondly, the question of unprecedented importance which we are now discussing undoubtedly deserves a General Assembly decision couched in the form of a declaration, particularly at this solemn time when we are celebrating a quarter of a century of United Nations existence.

93. The delegation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, we could do nothing more honourable and more important than to make new efforts for the strengthening of international security and solemnly proclaim once again that all States Members of the United Nations will cherish peace above all else and do everything to preserve it, as envisaged in the draft declaration on strengthening international security submitted by the socialist countries.

94. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic for the congratulations and good wishes he has conveyed to the Officers of the Committee.

95. Mr. MASHOLOGU (Lesotho): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Lesotho is pleased to associate itself fully with the warm congratulations that have been extended to you on your election to preside over the deliberations of this Committee during this historic session of the General Assembly. We also congratulate the other officers of the Committee.

96. My delegation has asked for the floor in order to indicate very briefly its thinking on the subject of international security, which is the central concern of the United Nations and which is also a matter of crucial importance to small States. Small States are inescapably forced by circumstances to mobilize all available resources for economic and social development, as these are areas of highest priority for them. Yet without security these objectives cannot be pursued. The small States' search for security cannot be in the direction of costly expenditures on armaments and defence. For them, security lies in the faith they have in the Charter of the United Nations and in policies which are committed to the search for peace and justice in relations with other States.

97. There is little comfort to be drawn from the fact that, in spite of the United Nations Charter by which all Member States implicitly bind themselves to conduct their international affairs, there still exist many areas of seemingly irredeemable tensions and conflict in the world today. Moreover, it is no longer useful even to make academic distinctions between so-called world wars on the one hand and local or regional conflicts on the other. Every conflict between States, irrespective of its classification, eventually has global repercussions which are felt by all. After 25 years of the United Nations, which have witnessed at least 50 major conflicts, small States are determined to seek anew within the framework of the Organization the assurances of their security.

98. During this tenth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to colonial countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*], it is relevant to observe that many of the smaller States owe their existence to the implementation of decolonization, which in itself is in accordance with the principles of the Charter. It is therefore perfectly in keeping with the spirit of the Charter that upon the attainment of independent statehood those States should look to the United Nations for the means of preserving peace, because security depends on a continuing harmonization of relations in what has become essentially a changing world community. Our first conclusion is that a significant contribution to international security will be made if the former colonial Powers genuinely and fully apply themselves to the attainment of new relationships in accordance with the principles of the Charter and, in particular, by the full application of the principles of the sovereign equality of States and non-interference in domestic affairs. In that way the Charter will be given new life and a new impetus by the recognition of the continuing evolution of the international community.

99. In his intervention during the current debate, the representative of Japan stated:

“Everyone knows also that the formulation of elaborate rules and regulations for the conduct of international affairs or the drafting of solemn declarations containing beautiful words will be merely a futile exercise unless every nation of the world assumes an attitude of genuinely seeking peace and of putting into action what is written on paper.” [*1729th meeting, para. 51.*]

That observation should in our view be applied not only to the document which we hope will emerge from the

deliberations of this Committee, but also to the Charter itself. International security requires a political commitment to the principles of the Charter. It needs to be said most emphatically that, without the necessary political will on the part of all Member States to be guided by the Charter, it will remain a dead letter in the face of potential or actual conflicts.

100. Furthermore, States can no longer afford the luxury of choosing which provisions of the Charter they will observe and which they will ignore. Already, deliberations on this item have revealed the immense breadth and complexity of the problem of attaining international security. Against this complex problem it is disturbing to note the growing tendency of some Member States to be selective about the provisions of the Charter which they choose to emphasize and to follow. What the subject demands is a total rather than a selective approach to the security provisions of the Charter. A great deal of emphasis has correctly been placed on the powers and responsibilities vested in the Security Council. We share the widely felt concern about strengthening the Council and improving its effectiveness. However, we also believe that, as the representative of Canada stated in his intervention [1727th meeting], emphasis on the importance of the Security Council should not be disproportionate. In the search for international security, efforts should be made to activate every relevant organ of the United Nations and to ensure that all the provisions of the Charter are brought into play and used to their maximum capacity.

101. We are aware of the immense role which falls upon the big Powers, and more particularly upon the super-Powers, in the pursuit of international security. We have observed the relative stability which has often followed their concerted actions. We have also noted the widespread international turmoil that has sometimes followed upon their disagreements. We fully recognize the immense power and influence which they can exert in the interests of peace, but it must also be said that international security cannot be the responsibility of the big Powers alone. It is the responsibility of all States to reaffirm their commitment to the basic principles enunciated in Article 2 of the Charter. In our view, it is also by scrupulous observance of these basic principles that medium-sized Powers and small States can hope to extricate themselves from the position of being mere pawns in the hands of the big Powers and the helpless victims of the so-called limited conflicts.

102. It is only logical that in our search for international security we should also look into collateral measures such as disarmament. The world community cannot hope to attain lasting peace while the arms race and the development of ever more deadly weapons and their introduction into hitherto peaceful areas go on unchecked. Accordingly, the strengthening of international security requires progress in disarmament measures so that insecurity and the inherent risk of a destructive war caused by the mere existence of vast stocks of armaments, both nuclear and conventional, may be removed from the international system.

103. If we are to speak realistically about peace-keeping and peace-making, we must also strive to ensure that adequate machinery and procedures are available at all

times to Member States that may require them. Only when there is adequate machinery and basic agreement about procedures which can be activated when any situation threatens peace will all nations be encouraged to place a sober trust in the role of the United Nations in peace-keeping and peace-making.

104. We have been encouraged to note that in the debates on this item there has been concern not only with prescriptions to apply in the event of actual breaches of international peace but also with the removal of the basic causes of international tensions before they occur. In this connexion we should like to stress the promotion of economic and social development as a priority in the alleviation of international insecurity. It would be futile to speak about security when millions of men are daily on the brink of desperation because of poverty. Equally, one cannot truly expect peace and orderly progress when many millions are subjected to intolerable political and social situations in which they cannot fully live as human beings. The urgency of commitment by all to the goals outlined in the strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade must, therefore, not be underestimated. And in the interests of peace there should be an active commitment to the realization of the social and political rights of all peoples through peaceful means.

105. It is in that spirit that my delegation wishes to enter a reservation on any proposal, either in this or any other organ of the United Nations, for the attainment of social and political rights by other than peaceful means.

106. In conclusion, my delegation is studying the draft resolutions that have thus far been submitted and is willing to participate constructively in any further efforts to reach a conclusion which will compromise a basic and comprehensive rededication to the achievement of international security.

107. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Lesotho for his congratulations.

108. I now propose to call on the representative of Brazil, Ambassador Araújo Castro, who wishes to introduce a draft resolution co-sponsored by a group of Latin American countries. This draft resolution has already been circulated as document A/C.1/L.517.

109. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil) (*interpretation from Spanish*): On behalf of 23 Latin American delegations—namely Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela—I am pleased formally to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/L.517. I should add that, after this document had been circulated, the delegations of Barbados, El Salvador and Guyana expressed their intention of supporting the draft and of adding their names to the list of sponsors.

110. In introducing this draft resolution, the aforesaid Latin American countries wish to make an effective and constructive contribution to the consideration of the basic problem of our Organization, namely, the problem of international peace and security.

111. For the 23 delegations that are sponsoring this draft, peace is not only the supreme objective of the United Nations, but the very foundation of the development of the creative capacity of all nations and all men. Peace will have to be achieved through international security, and the draft resolution interprets this security as meaning security for all—I repeat, for all—nations.

112. The sponsors of the draft resolution have considered and examined carefully the texts contained in documents A/C.1/L.513 and A/C.1/L.514, and they have found in those documents many positive elements, in so far as they reaffirm rules of international law and the principles of the Charter, which obviously seems to us to be of the utmost importance in the daily effort to bring about peaceful coexistence between States and nations.

113. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.517 never by any means had the idea or intention of seeking a conciliatory position, mid-way between those two texts, nor had they any idea of offering an intermediate compromise solution. We are affirming an autonomous position of our own, linked to the political and legal traditions of Latin America. It is not a question of a formula; it is rather an affirmation by Latin America, which does not abdicate its right and its duty to express its opinion on international issues. It is not a diplomatic device or a working paper for subsequent negotiation in a drafting group. This is essentially a political document.

114. Actually, although we appreciate the reasons that led the other two groups of delegations to work out their own texts, the 23 Latin American delegations have sought to find a completely different focal point from which to approach the problem of peace and international security. As far as we are concerned, it is not a question of stressing respect for and observance of one principle or another; what we are trying to do is bring out the need to reaffirm all principles and to activate and reactivate certain machinery with a view to ensuring their execution and their full application.

115. Draft resolution A/C.1/L.517 does not try to offer specific solutions to this or that question which may be fraught with danger and may create problems for world peace and security. It is obviously designed to remedy certain aspects of an unconcealable institutional crisis in the United Nations and to neutralize certain tendencies which, if allowed to persist, would condemn the United Nations to a state of impotence and ineffectiveness. In one word, the draft resolution seeks to strengthen international security through a strengthening of the United Nations as a political institution and as a centre for diplomatic activity and negotiation. It does not seek a direct, magic solution for the international crisis, but rather a solution for the institutional crisis of the United Nations.

116. The 23 Latin American countries sponsoring this draft resolution do not consider peace as a state of absence of war or as a state of tension at a tolerable level. As is set forth in the second preambular paragraph of the draft, they seek “world peace based on justice and guaranteeing the security of all nations”.

117. The draft solemnly reaffirms that true peace and genuine security require that all States, large and small,

should strictly respect the principles and comply fully, with the purposes of the United Nations Charter and should base their conduct faithfully on the ideals and standards set out in the Preamble.

118. For that very reason every effort to bring about international security and to achieve a relaxation of tension will have lasting and irreversible results just so long as they are carried out within the framework of the San Francisco Charter and seek the establishment of an international order which will ensure justice for all States and for all mankind. Obviously we do not want to see a peace that is a mere perpetuation of the conditions of war.

119. The sponsors of this draft resolution consider the purposes and principles of the Charter as a true bill of rights for States, peoples and nations.

120. The draft resolution solemnly reaffirms that in case of conflict between the obligations assumed by Members of the United Nations in accordance with the Charter and their obligations assumed under any other international agreement, the obligations imposed by the Charter shall prevail. No principle seems to us more vital or more important in so far as it establishes the primacy of the Charter and, accordingly, the primacy of its purposes and principles above all other rules of international behaviour. Article 103 of the Charter, together with the simultaneous affirmation of its purposes and principles, makes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of a State illegitimate and unlawful regardless of the treaties or alliances that may be invoked within a given context.

121. I should like to recall a few ideas which we had an opportunity to set forth recently. Why, we asked, should the United Nations be cautious or hesitate to accept obligations under specific bilateral or multilateral treaties and agreements, inasmuch as the principle of non-aggression is already more than a principle for it is actually an integral part of positive international law? The only valid—and, I must say, sad—conclusion is that multilateral obligations assumed under the United Nations Charter which is a solemn treaty are taken with less seriousness than bilateral or multilateral obligations assumed under specific treaties. We should carefully analyse this and explain why obligations lose their solemnity—why they become less binding and less prohibitive—in inverse proportion to their degree of universality. Why should an obligation taken vis-à-vis the community of nations prove to be less binding or less prohibitive than a commitment to a specific State or group of States?

122. The draft expresses serious concern at the very slow pace at which negotiations in the field of disarmament are proceeding and proclaims the need for urgent, concerted international action based on a global strategy designed to reduce and eliminate the disparity between the developed and developing countries, which constitutes the condition *sine qua non* for the establishment of international peace and the strengthening of security for all—I repeat, all—nations.

123. To the degree that it seeks to reflect an authentic Latin American position towards world problems, draft resolution A/C.1/L.517 could not fail to call for more

concrete measures to promote the economic development and social progress of all peoples. One day we shall have to proceed towards the affirmation of the principle of collective security in the economic field similar to that which we tried to delineate in San Francisco on still shaky foundations in the specific field of peace and world security.

124. In a word, it is a question of deciding whether the United Nations will or will not accept collective responsibility in the problem of under-development. For the co-sponsors of the draft resolution economic development is a condition *sine qua non* of security, and this is clearly set forth in operative paragraph 8 of our draft resolution. For this reason the Latin American delegations cannot conceive of a draft resolution on international security in its broadest sense failing to concern itself with one of the primary factors of insecurity and unrest among nations. For the authors of this draft resolution peace is identified with security, and security is identified with development. This is the basic concept of the draft resolution that we, the 23 countries of Latin America, are offering for the consideration of this Committee.

125. The draft resolution thus tries to define a strict and intimate relationship between the three concepts of strengthening of international security, economic development of the developing countries and disarmament so that any progress that is achieved in any of those directions would constitute progress towards all of them. This is the central concept of our draft. It proclaims that true peace presupposes the full exercise of human rights and the end of colonial domination and reaffirms the universal vocation of the United Nations. As a practical measure it seeks to reactivate the diplomatic machinery offered to the United Nations through a more systematic and fuller utilization of the means and methods authorized under Chapter VI of the San Francisco Charter. In our opinion, that would be the only approach likely to return to the framework of the United Nations the problems that are now being discussed in very limited groups of Powers. In a word, what the 23 Latin American countries are proposing is the reactivation of the diplomatic machinery of our Organization. If we wish to rehabilitate the United Nations as a political institution we shall have to reactivate its diplomatic activities because we tend frequently to forget and ignore the diplomatic side of the United Nations which, as we have said, today is the only institution specially set up for world peace and security.

126. Finally, in the last operative paragraph, the Latin American countries that at the last Assembly fought for

continuing consideration of the problems of international security formally request the inclusion of the item on the provisional agenda of the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. This means that we want to see this exceedingly important political debate continue unimpeded by any mechanical considerations.

127. I do not think I need to dwell on the language of each and every one of the paragraphs of the preamble and the operative part. The texts are clear and self-explanatory. I have tried, on behalf of the 23 delegations that sponsored the draft resolution, merely to explain the broad lines of the draft resolution which the Latin American countries are bringing before the General Assembly of the United Nations on the occasion of this twenty-fifth anniversary as a testimony of faith and confidence in this Organization, which, for all its failures and shortcomings, still represents the great hope of mankind in the field of international peace and security.

128. More than a text, this draft resolution is an appeal to fulfil the obligations of the Charter. It is an appeal to ensure that relations between Member States are set free from the application of absurd and outmoded theories of power politics and zones of influence. It is an appeal to justice and freedom. It is a reaffirmation by countries which want to defend their fundamental interests in the field of peace, security and development. It constitutes basically the position of the Latin American countries vis-à-vis world problems. The draft resolution represents a Latin American position based on the idea of justice and, what is equally important, the Latin American position on peace based on the free exercise of freedom. It is in this spirit and with this understanding that the 23 co-sponsors have submitted their ideas and their draft resolution for the consideration of the First Committee.

129. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to urge any delegation or group of delegations that intends to submit draft resolutions on this item or proposals or amendments to texts already submitted to do so as soon as possible.

130. Lastly I should like to remind representatives that the list of speakers, in accordance with what was decided by the Committee at its meeting yesterday afternoon, will be closed at 6 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.