

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1733rd
MEETING**

Friday, 9 October 1970,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 32:

Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)

Page

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. Mr. GALINDO POHL (El Salvador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, may I begin my statement today by addressing my congratulations to you and to Venezuela. My Government and my delegation are particularly happy to see you occupying the high post and assuming the great responsibility of Chairman of the First Committee. Apart from our congratulations, of course, we address to you our greatest confidence in the successful conclusion of your work. My Government and delegation also greet and congratulate our Vice-Chairman, Ambassador Farah, and our Rapporteur, Ambassador Cerník, since we recognize, their great ability and devotion to the cause of the United Nations. I should not like to impinge upon your modesty, Sir, but I would say that the officers of our Committee fully meet the highest of standards.

2. The basic concepts of my delegation regarding the strengthening of international security lie in the fact that international security today is expressed in the form of two divergent policies: first, that of balance and second, that of collective security. However, collective security is more than a policy, it is a system organized through the Charter of the United Nations. It is therefore not a question only of strengthening international security, but rather of strengthening it through collective security. I say this without underestimating the side issues and the shadowy areas that must lie between these basic ways of seeking international security. The truth of the matter is that as the system for collective security recovers its validity, so that policy of the balance of power will have to give way.

3. An analysis of international security cannot be used to increase antagonisms, to level accusations or to lead us on the downward path towards a complete schism. That would compromise any attempt to safeguard and rescue what security there is. The analysis of this subject must be made with the spirit of the naturalist who is confronted by complex social phenomena whose emergence cannot scien-

tifically be attributed to anyone in particular, but which are the fruit of the immaturity of the contemporary international community, which only in this twentieth century has found expression through such organized centres as the United Nations.

4. Traditionally, the European international policies were governed by the concept of balance whereby no State alone could acquire sufficient power to absorb or dominate the rest. Security was therefore obtained through the weakening, by alliances, of those who were growing in military, economic and demographic strength. Each time a State developed in any significant fashion, the others made alliances in order to reduce the possibility of the former becoming the leader. That was the ebb and flow of history in Europe for many centuries and when this was extended on a world-wide scale, it gave rise to the two world wars of the twentieth century.

5. In order to replace that policy which, by its very essence, was not conducive to peace but led to war, a new idea gained ground: collective security, which as an organized system would have to subject its operative means to legal regulations. While the balance of power policy rejects juridical order because its needs are constantly changing, collective security, on the other hand, adapts itself to an international juridical order of equality. It allows States to develop without any let or hindrance, except of course in so far as the arms race is concerned and makes of peace the common blessing of the international community.

6. Obviously, the policy of disarmament must go hand in hand with the system of collective security, hence the importance the subject has acquired in the course of the twenty-five years of the existence of the United Nations. At present the definitive expression of collective security is the Charter of the United Nations. The Charter of the United Nations set forth a system of collective security for all Members, including those that possess the right of veto. But the Charter also makes a differentiation under which five States can, if they so desire, through the use of the veto, escape any or all effective measures, whereas for the rest of the international community the system provides effective measures.

7. That being the case, we could hardly say that we lack juridical or legal norms as far as the five Powers that possess the veto are concerned; rather the effectiveness of those norms can be paralysed through the use of the veto, a weapon that is politically and legally authorized. Therefore, again, it is not a question of our lacking tenets and standards, nor ways of ensuring effectiveness; rather it is a question of paralysis—paralysis through political means that have been given legal shape.

8. That paralysis has meant that in practice it would appear that five States stand outside collective security; but, within the system of the Charter, that is not the case. Yet it has allowed the old policy of the balance of power to be recreated and at this conjunction of five points, balance has in fact replaced collective security. Although this consequence is not in keeping with the legal system set up through and in the Charter, politically it is possible and to a certain extent even tolerated and condoned by the Charter itself, and thus it has become one of the great realities of the last few years.

9. Although policies in conformity with the Charter should yield collective security without any breach, the truth of the matter is that the apex of the system can, without violating any of the tenets of the charter, select—and has in fact selected—the policy of the balance of power.

10. The arms race, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*resolution 2373 (XXII), annex*], and even the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks held alternately in Helsinki and Vienna between the United States and the Soviet Union, meet the need of this balance of power. There have been favourable results from this policy, but if history is to teach life itself, the men of today cannot rest on such a policy to achieve peace.

11. At this moment the world has gone back to that balance of power, after a brief period when quite seriously it was proposed that we make a system of collective security a living reality. But the international community has bound itself, through perfect legal commitments, to achieve collective security. Collective security is a worldwide legal system that has been gradually eroded. That system that underlay the somewhat weak League of Nations and the stronger United Nations does have a flaw which is tolerated by the constituent legal instruments. That flaw has become more obvious in the last few years, and in order to bridge the gap we could act in stages. First, we must deal with its expansive effects, so that, once reduced, we can confront the gap full face.

12. The expansion of that breach is due to the fact that the balance of power has now been extended to all regions of the world and implicitly accepted by all States without exception, and that through that process, large areas of the world escape the system of collective security.

13. The Charter has therefore become a reference, a series of maximum delimitations of international action and, although it continues to be useful, it is still not fully performing the role for which it was originally drafted. Within the framework of the Charter, the great Powers can adopt a policy of balance of power without necessarily violating any norms or tenets, although it would still be outside the framework of both the letter and spirit of the Charter; but it is disturbing that in the past that policy has never yet been able to maintain peace.

14. As far as peace is concerned, at present there is no recourse to any system that can effectively replace collective security. History shows very clearly that the balance of power has never been able to avert wars and it might be felt that if it has averted a third world war, it has been not because of its qualities or advantages, but rather because of

the presence of a new element: the danger of a nuclear holocaust, which, of course, immediately upsets all traditional calculations, and strategic assessments have to be readapted and reassessed to cope with it.

15. It would be unrealistic at this stage to ask the great Powers to return forthwith to collective security and thus to fit all their decisions into the juridical system of the Charter. That desirable and necessary return will have to be built through many ties of co-operation and by means of an atmosphere of friendship and trust.

16. But with all that, and since the great Powers are deterred by nuclear fear, and since the greatest tensions and armed conflicts have occurred for the last 25 years among other Members of the international community, it would appear that we might be able to ensure the existence of collective security through stages, beginning with that enormous portion of the international community composed of those States deprived of the right of veto. The political will of States, and particularly the political will of the veto-wielding States, should decisively turn towards the existence of collective security.

17. To that end, then, since the body that can make decisions on this matter is the Security Council, the best step to begin with would be agreement among the great Powers. We cannot go very far if the great Powers are in disaccord on the establishment of collective security, but it is true backwardness when those great Powers project their politics of balance of power into different regions of the world. Although the great Powers, in their mutual relations and in accordance with the structure of the Charter, can adopt a policy different from that dictated by collective security, legally speaking they are bound by Article 2, paragraph 5, of the Charter, as are all Members of the United Nations great, medium and small, to give assistance in the fulfilment of the terms of the Charter: and the system of the Charter is collective security.

18. The most delicate aspect of collective security is precisely that projection of the balance of power to the rest of the world. Within these lines, we might even consider, if we wanted to review the Charter, somewhat limiting the power of veto; limiting it say, only to those matters which directly affect the States which possess the veto, and waiving or cancelling it when it is a question of matters concerning other members of the international community, guided in this by the system of collective security. But, of course, to speak of the review of the Charter, as far as the veto is concerned, is at present the greatest of all Utopias. Yet my Government would launch the idea of a limitation of the veto, so that, linked to many other ideas that may be taken up during this twenty-fifth anniversary session of the United Nations, it might await a better moment.

19. Therefore, setting aside any possibility, for the moment, of such a review of the Charter, there is still the chance of a political decision on the part of the great Powers to ensure that collective security be brought into force and, among those members of the international community that live under those symbols, in the fullest and most complete form imaginable.

20. The Charter offers the key to the system of collective security through the peaceful settlement of disputes,

renunciation of the use of the threat of force against the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of other States, the support to be given the measures of this Organization regarding preventive or coercive action, non-intervention in the affairs of other States, and the fulfilment in good faith of commitments assumed. These, are the pillars of the system of collective security on which the United Nations rests, which we might term the pillars of wisdom.

21. The United Nations has to sharpen a few of its instruments in order truly to live in keeping with the spirit of its Charter; some of these instruments call for political readjustment, which depends on the will of States, such as the Security Council, but others are of a technical and legal nature.

22. Among the legal instruments, international security would gain most if the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression were to be able to achieve its objective. Aggression should no longer be considered a purely political question, defined according to each separate case. A definition must also be found for economic aggression, which, when persistently, and intensively resorted to, can replace armed aggression. Pursuant to this concept of defining aggression, some work should be done regarding the definition of self-defence, because self-defence attenuates the apparent violence of an aggressive act and is an inherent and non-negotiable right of States. Obviously, something more than a mere definition, by the State concerned, of the legitimacy of its self-defence is called for. And that is a gap, a very obvious gap, in the system of the United Nations, one that should be filled. The study of aggression, therefore, cannot fruitfully and coherently be pursued unless it be directly and closely linked with self-defence.

23. With regard to technical means, the work of the Special Committee on Peace-Keeping Operations will be of the greatest assistance whenever the United Nations has to devise means to safeguard collective security. The work of that Special Committee adheres best and closest to the line of prevention.

24. The Security Council needs to be politically readjusted, which obviously must involve all its component members, but particularly those Powers which possess the veto. The Security Council is the decision-making body of the United Nations. Yet, in the last few years, it has used its powers of decision less and less and is gradually becoming a restricted General Assembly because of the nature of its decisions and its procedure of work. In point of fact, the Security Council is gradually becoming satisfied if its decisions in their practical consequences, retain the strength of recommendations. That policy surely does help in reaching agreements, but by the same token it weakens and saps the authority of the decision-making body of the United Nations. Open, frank and controversial disagreements and arguments or views have now been replaced by hard won formulas supported by heterogeneous majorities and particularly by the great Powers, in an exercise that draws from resolutions their best features. The concept of unanimity, consensus or large majority is now the way of obtaining agreements, yet, those agreements are obtained at the expense of exaggerated generalities and of the suppression of anything that might be harsh and, even at times, of

momentary irritation to the vested interests at stake. Were this to take place in the General Assembly, we could condone it in certain cases because the General Assembly can only make recommendations. But these situations are now taking place in the Security Council as well; and if it follows this line—being the great decision-making organ of the United Nations—it will have signed its own death warrant. Thus, the authority of the most important body of the United Nations system of security can be eroded and worn away as acts differ from agreed plans and from decisions foreseen.

25. The Security Council should assess its own work during the last twenty-five years so as to have an effective starting point for the establishment of a cohesive policy in matters of international security. Furthermore, the Security Council should take up the question of international security as a whole, based upon its own experience and delving into the matter more thoroughly than can the General Assembly. An assessment is a political judgement, in a way, but within a technical framework and for that purpose, the type of international security that we are seeking and which is set forth in the Charter would have to be defined within the working procedure.

26. We should particularly assess the results of obtaining a consensus and its effect on resolutions. According to the structure of the Charter, that consensus is necessary for the Security Council to act, for its opposite is the veto and therefore paralysis. But in this case we are not dealing with the consensus which, by the structure of the Charter, is the very crux of effective action. We are speaking of that consensus which is based upon the conscious and agreed pruning of all significant meaning from decisions and which has gradually become part of the procedure in order to allow varied interpretations of one consensus and thus satisfy the most antithetical interest. Thus, without anyone specifically proposing it, a new chapter is being added to the old disputations.

27. A minimum adjustment of the present Charter, based naturally upon the political will of the parties concerned, would be in the agreement to apply collective security to the international community and no longer to allow it to be covered by the retention of the balance of power. The Security Council, or a body set up by it pursuant to Article 29 of the Charter, or else the Secretariat could carry out technical studies of the problem of security in its political, legal and socio-economic implications based *inter alia* on those political elements contained in the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General [A/7922 and Add.1-5], pursuant to General Assembly resolution 2606 (XXIV), and in the debates in the First Committee and in the plenary Assembly, so that in a systematic and coherent way this important subject could be studied on a continuing basis. It would be useful to assess and codify the diverse ideas voiced and prepare a programme of policies and means to promote international security, and particularly to give full vigour to the Charter system.

28. This year mention is being made of some reviews of the Charter, and my Government again wishes to state that we feel it would be of extreme interest and value to consider at some more appropriate time restricting the use of the veto so that the policies of power could not be

projected to other spheres of the international community. But obviously a review of the Charter even along these lines could in no way replace the political will of States. Yet we would do away with a means whereby slowly and gradually the whole system of the Charter is being altered.

29. Although to some extent we might consider ourselves satisfied that the veto is no longer wielded as it was in the past, we must nevertheless recognize that that is not due to some agreement to implement collective security, which is what the international community needs, but to an agreement to inject into the system of collective security the outmoded policies of power, and to limit within it those subjects that might lead to confrontations and antagonisms. We must recognize that that policy has relieved many people in many fields; but by the same token we must not forget that it is so conceived that, as we are taught by history, it can lead to catastrophe. Balance is a form of security, but never in the past could it ensure peace. It could only splinter and stagger wars.

30. The United Nations represents a world system of security, and what cannot exist through the Organization and according to its provisions will not be achieved by other means, and certainly not through the balance of power which has repeatedly led to catastrophes and bellicose confrontations.

31. Although it is possible to restate the system through a review of the Charter, it would be far more realistic to think of strengthening it, or rather, to apply it within the framework of the already existing Charter. The Security Council must fully enforce its competence and utilize those powers vested in it. If the United Nations is unable to live up to the concept of collective security, then it is, accepting not only a gap between principles and practice but the interposition of a different type of policy and is adopting a historically inadequate policy and thereby rejecting the system which, resting on the policy of legally equal States, alone can give some hope of lasting peace.

32. Legally speaking, the United Nations represents collective security. It is not an agency for the policy of balance of power. International security cannot only be seen as the absence of armed conflicts, but in a series of factors that avert such confrontations, and therefore the policy of development to which the United Nations is giving itself is, in the long run, the best and perhaps the only way of achieving security, since through it ties of co-operation are established as well as links of confidence and trust among peoples.

33. It is also particularly important that human rights be respected, since it is a well-known fact that refusal to respect human rights has been, and still is, a cause of conflict. Security cannot be achieved purely through legal means, nor through “gendarme” types of activity, but by the creation of a true infrastructure that will work on the causes of events and not merely take into account their effects. Yet the Charter of the United Nations was conceived within that philosophy; it is therefore not an advisable procedure to act only on the effects, we must act both on effects and their causes.

34. Another procedure that tends to weaken the United Nations internally is the tendency to confront the interna-

tional community with agreements that are negotiated in committees or groups on the pretext that much work was necessary and that they represent the only possible agreement among the great Powers. Sometimes that argument may have a certain weight—for example, when the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was under consideration, for that document was agreed to substantially just as the nuclear Powers had accepted and submitted it.

35. Yet even at that time some small changes left the imprint of the General Assembly and set forth the important precedent that even in the most delicate of circumstances all States possess both the right and the duty to examine proposals put to them and to pronounce upon them in accordance with what they consider to be the greater interests of the international community and their own national interests.

36. However, there is a precedent gaining ground that certain documents negotiated in small committees are to be presented to the General Assembly as something not negotiable. My delegation believes that we are doing the United Nations a great disservice thereby. This has lately been the case with the report of the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States,¹ whose draft declaration was presented with the argument that not a comma, not an iota, could be changed in it, since it represented the work of many years and, furthermore, the hard won agreement of the great Powers.

37. Without discussing the merits of the Declaration,² my delegation cannot agree with this procedure, and therefore, without going into the substance of the matter, we abstained in the vote that approved that declaration. Anything that might diminish the internal vigour of the Organization and delegate or centralize the right to study and act in the United Nations weakens this Organization, as national communities are weakened when their public opinion lacks initiative and receives judgements handed down by certain centres of power.

38. Since three draft resolutions have been submitted, in documents A/C.1/L.513, A/C.1/L.514 and A/C.1/L.517, I shall, if you will allow me, comment on these drafts now that I have the floor.

39. These three draft resolutions take up the purposes and principles of the Charter; they are based on previous resolutions of the General Assembly; they raise questions of international security; but they place varying emphasis on their component elements. It will probably be the same with other drafts that may be submitted. The solution will lie in finding a common denominator which will satisfy all the States and groups of States of the international community, since the declaration on the strengthening of international security should be unanimously adopted. In the declaration to be adopted we should like to see echoed the doctrine that international security must be sought through the system of collective security and that collective security must be considered, among other ways, in the light

¹ *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 18.*

² For the text, see resolution 2625 (XXV).

of its economic and social contents, as well as the validity of human rights and non-intervention.

40. In the search for this common denominator we must take into account that many countries lay particular stress on the social, economic and political components of international security and that this position must be reflected both in the preambular and the operative parts of the declaration to be adopted. The mention of these component elements should be highlighted in the declaration. In fact there can be no security unless there be full and effective respect for fundamental human rights. There can be no security if there is intervention in the affairs of other States. There can be no security in a world torn by increasing economic differences that are a challenge to the sense of international justice and the indivisible solidarity of peoples.

41. In draft resolution A/C.1/L.514 mention is made of the fact that international security is contingent upon the strict observance of the principles and the provisions of the Charter and the unconditional adherence to and application of international law. That international security hinges upon the strict observance of the Charter cannot be denied, for the Charter as a whole is the system of international security and as such cannot be validly replaced.

42. With regard to the unconditional adherence to international law, I think some comment is called for. In treatises on international law stress is laid upon scrupulous adherence to international law, but I do not recall that this fulfilment has ever been termed "unconditional". This would not appear to be the usual way of bringing out the importance of international law for the calm development of international relations. International law is very wide, and does not only cover international security yet obviously international security rests upon the observance of those parts of international law that refer to it. To refer to unconditional adherence to international law in terms that cover the entirety of international law when some parts of the latter are still being reviewed and revised and in some aspects are found lacking, when some States consider that certain precepts belong within the framework of international law whilst others deny it, would be to over-simplify a matter which in itself is extremely complex. We could agree with the unconditional observance of the principles of the Charter, because its precepts are certain, known, and precise. Although all States adhere to international law, some parts of which are upheld by the consensus of the international community, we have to set in motion the decolonization of international law where it was devised for specific periods and different circumstances from those obtaining today. The use of the term "unconditional" adherence smacks somewhat of unconditional surrender.

43. Furthermore, in the draft emphasis is laid on the interdependence of different aspects of the Charter and it is said that "in order to fulfil the purposes and principles of the United Nations, all the provisions of the Charter must be duly respected and implemented." This sentence is particularly important since it must do away with the interpretation—which in fact would be false—that when these principles are mentioned other principles are thereby waived or underestimated. The Charter defines an indivisible system, and each of its components is conditioned by and interdependent upon all others.

44. In the drafts before us mention is made of international security, but no mention is made of collective security. In other words we merely mention the genus, and, with a subsequent loss in precision, nothing is said of the species of international security which has been agreed upon through the Charter. The declaration as submitted does not exhaust the subject, and therefore we hope that the First Committee will consider all aspects of the matter and will also decide to continue consideration of international security at the next session. The declaration as a reaffirmation of purposes is important but it postpones effective measures whereby to restore to the Charter its true value and meaning concerning its implementation. It also postpones a programme of work which is urgent and which would revitalize the United Nations as a whole.

45. The strengthening of international security, therefore, as far as my delegation is concerned, lies in the full implementation and validity of the Charter of the United Nations and in the development of all possibilities it offers. This can be done through dedicated, intelligent and imaginative work that will truly apply the true spirit of the Charter to matters of international and collective security, based upon the wide principles of co-operation, as contained in international law, and upheld by economic and social development, respect for human rights, and non-intervention in the affairs of other States.

46. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of El Salvador for the very kind words he addressed to the officers of the Committee, and, for his very kind reference to my country and to me.

47. Mr. KHIM TIT (Cambodia) (*interpretation from French*): Speaking for the first time in this Committee, I should like at the outset to address to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the other officers, the warmest congratulations of the Cambodian delegation and our most sincere wishes for the Committee's success in carrying out its heavy task during this historic twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

48. As was stated in the General Assembly by our Minister for Foreign Affairs [*1855th plenary meeting*], the appeal by the Charter of the United Nations for peace and international co-operation remains as necessary and as urgent as it was 25 years ago. That is why we are very happy to join in the initiatives taken during this session for the strengthening of international security.

49. For the United Nations it is a matter of taking concrete measures which are defined in the Preamble of the Charter, that is to say, "to practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples".

50. Cambodia, with its peace- and justice-loving people, is at this very moment the victim of aggression and of a veritable undeclared war waged by the Viet Cong and North Viet-Nameese troops and their allies. Despite the desire of

our people to remain neutral and outside the conflict in South Viet-Nam, despite all our efforts for a peaceful settlement, the Viet-Cong and the North Viet-Nameese and their allies came to occupy our land and to violate our territorial integrity. We are therefore compelled to fight to preserve our independence and neutrality. Like all the other peoples of the world, we have the right to defend ourselves with all the means at our disposal and to ask for assistance—starting, of course, by resorting to the United Nations, for a peaceful settlement, in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Organization.

51. I wish solemnly to inform this Committee, in the name of my Government and the Cambodian people, that this war that has been imposed upon us is waged and sustained by a great Power whose objective is to spread disorder throughout the world. If this war is not stopped in time, I fear that it will degenerate into a world conflagration. For at present, as everyone knows, almost the whole of South-East Asia is being put to the fire and the sword.

52. As is known, we appealed to the United Nations from the very outset of the aggression. That appeal remains just as urgent today and we continue to hope that measures will be taken for the restoration of peace in our country. Therefore, we hopefully join the present efforts to strengthen international security.

53. There is no need to insist on the need to strengthen international security. This is amply confirmed by the present events in South-East Asia and the Middle East, as well as the increasing manifestation almost everywhere in the world of a kind of international banditry against peaceful diplomats, journalists, innocent peasants and passengers on commercial aircraft. My delegation considers that these acts are absolutely unjustifiable and must be severely condemned, no matter what political or ideological reasons are invoked.

54. We consider that international security means not only the absence of war, but also the absence of disorder of any kind; it means security for the economic development of all countries, large and small, which, as the Secretary-General said, must “strengthen the force of law against the law of force” [A/7922, para. 5].

55. We therefore recognize the right of the Security Council under Article 34 of the Charter to “investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute”. We also accept the Secretary-General’s suggestion that the Security Council be given the possibility of investigating, at an early stage, disputes and situations of this kind, but we wish to see applied, when necessary, other measures to implement decisions of the Security Council if need be, namely, those contained in Articles 41 and 42 of Chapter VII of the Charter. Article 41 of the Charter states that such measures “may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations”. Article 42 states that such measures “may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations”. We consider that, as the Secretary-General said in his report: “the consolidation of peace and security calls

for general and strict observance by all States Members or non-members of this Organization of the principles of the non-use of force or the threat of force, non-interference in international affairs, equal rights, mutual advantage and the right of each nation independently to decide its own way of life and foreign policy”. [Ibid.]

56. We also share the conviction of the Secretary-General that “the United Nations collective security system has to function well enough to make it unnecessary for Governments to rely on the residual provisions for individual and collective self-defence, provided for in Article 51 of the Charter”. [Ibid., para. 12.] But, in conformity with our policy of strict neutrality, we prefer—except in case of vital need—the collective security system instituted by the United Nations to regional agreements for the strengthening of international security.

57. Thus, all our appeals for assistance have always made within the framework of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of the Geneva Agreements of 1954 on the cessation of hostilities, and so far we have not adhered to any regional agreement of this nature.

58. Those are the points of view of my delegation concerning the strengthening of international security.

59. We are a peaceful Buddhist people, that is to say, we are radically opposed to the use of force or to the taking of life in any form. The Cambodians wish only to live in peace in conditions of independence, neutrality and the territorial integrity of their country. We are ready to subscribe to all efforts undertaken to strengthen international security. However, in view of the large number of draft resolutions now before the First Committee, we prefer not to present any formal proposal at this stage of the debate, and we reserve our right to speak later, if necessary.

60. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Cambodia for his congratulations addressed to the officers of the Committee.

61. Mr. BENITES (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, may I first of all express the great satisfaction of my delegation and my own personal gratification at seeing a person of your calibre presiding so wisely and cordially over the extremely difficult and complicated work of this Committee. This satisfaction is all the greater for me since you come from a country which is linked to mine by means of all the ties of history and covered as we are by one and the same flag.

62. I wish also to extend my most cordial congratulations to Mr. Farah, our Vice-Chairman, and Mr. Cerník, our Rapporteur. In the course of my stay and my work at the United Nations I have enjoyed ties of very close and cordial friendship and respect with both of them.

63. I think it a most happy omen that the subject of strengthening international security should have been raised this time on the strength of specific draft resolutions instead of a series of abstract, doctrinaire statements. This permits an objective and precise approach.

64. We must, however, start from one inevitable general premise, and it is that the strengthening of security must be

placed within the framework of the Charter. Perfect or flawed though it may be, it is a multilateral treaty, all of whose parts we have accepted as a single indivisible whole. The obligations it imposes are not narrowed down only to the purposes that it sets as goals and the principles it establishes as means in Chapter I, but also those contained in the Preamble which are a series of norms guiding the conduct of an organized international community, which is the United Nations.

65. In point of fact, the Charter is intended to create a secure world which had already been outlined in the Atlantic Charter as the basis for a just and lasting peace. That is why all the provisions of the Charter are so interrelated that it would be a dangerous mutilation to separate some principles from others to set up some type of hierarchical selection of them.

66. The essential and primordial aim of those people who 25 years ago established the United Nations was "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". The war that was fought took place mainly as a result of power politics that wanted world hegemony by one State, one ideology and one race. The Charter thus had to reaffirm the sovereign equality of States, non-intervention in domestic affairs, fundamental human rights and faith in the dignity of the human person without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

67. Obvious facts and direct experience showed that peace without justice was not true peace, and this forced the United Nations to commit itself to creating those conditions under which justice could be maintained; and, since justice without progress is illusory, they agreed to raise the standard of living within a wider concept of freedom.

68. Thus peace, justice and progress are the conditions for security. Nor must we forget that the world war from which the United Nations emerged was a war of ideologies in which the fight was carried both by those who advocated what was termed representative democracy, which is the political expression of economic capitalism, as well as those who, still true to the historic materialism of Marx and Engel, adapted to the Russian idiosyncrasy by the genius of Lenin, believed in a classless international society through the union of world proletariat.

69. The need for peaceful coexistence had to be expressed, therefore, in a compromise to practice tolerance and live in peace as good neighbours. If the entire Charter rests on the need to create an internationally secure world, to achieve it a very close relationship was established between the basic ends outlined in the Preamble and the purposes set as goals and those principles that it establishes as necessary conditions for the achievement of those purposes.

70. Therefore we must with reason ask ourselves: why discuss the subject of strengthening international security? As my delegation sees it there are only two roads open: either a review of the Charter so as to improve it—which does not seem practical at the moment—or the progressive development of the principles contained in the Charter and the clarification of methods in order to ensure greater effectiveness of United Nations action.

71. The progressive development of the principles was entrusted to a series of special committees or commissions, two of which have arrived at significant conclusions: the one which studied the development of friendly relations among States and the other which studied the process of liberation of colonial countries and peoples. We trust that their drafts will be approved unanimously during the commemorative session. The same applies to the declaration on the Second United Nations Development Decade. Another special committee is studying the question of condemning aggression but, unfortunately, has not yet arrived at any conclusions.

72. But therefore again we must ask ourselves what the essential content of the subject before us is, without falling into the trap of duplicating declarations or contradicting them.

73. My delegation believes that the first point is universality. The United Nations must increasingly be the Organization of the international community and correspondingly less an organ of power politics or a carry-over from the time when it was a group or club of nations which had won the war possessing the right to exclude those others which had either lost, or had not participated in the war.

74. The reaffirmation of universality must be made in three directions: first, as the right of all States able to fulfil their international commitment to be Members of the Organization; second, as the reaffirmation that the Charter is a multilateral treaty, freely entered into, whose provisions are binding, without allowing domestic jurisdiction to be adduced in respect of any of its provisions; and third, as the right of colonial countries and peoples to become independent States.

75. The second principle—namely, the accepted obligation to practise tolerance and live in peace as good neighbours—is the one on which I should like to dwell. This is more than peaceful coexistence. To coexist is a passive concept, which means merely to exist together. To live together is an active concept; it is joint living. The formula of a joint or shared life can be expressed as co-operation for peaceful purposes, which constitutes the essence of good-neighbourliness.

76. Certain duties flow from this principle of coexistence as peaceful co-operation, and are the indispensable means of maintaining peace and, therefore, international security. One of those duties is the obligation to settle disputes peacefully through the means set forth in Chapter VI of the Charter, including regional agreements and organs so long as these are subordinated to the provisions of Chapter VIII; also worth mentioning are the very useful suggestions to give the Secretary-General greater scope for action and more frequent recourse to the International Court of Justice. It is not very encouraging to note how seldom recourse is had to the peaceful settlement of disputes and of situations which might lead to a breach of the peace and the almost total lack of advancement towards the progressive development of institutions designed to prevent conflicts or to provide assistance in the case of latent but potentially dangerous disputes.

77. It is true that aggression is being considered in a special Committee that has still not concluded its work. But

I think we ought to develop the concept that “armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest”, as the Preamble to the Charter says, which obviously means that it is only justifiable in the cases laid down in Chapter VII. With regard to the use of force for self-defence it can only be utilized within the classic concept of repelling illegal aggression by means commensurate with that aggression and pending action by the Security Council.

78. The principle of non-intervention in the international affairs of States was admirably dealt with in General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX) adopted on 21 December 1965, which has almost totally been included in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.³

79. The development of international co-operation, referred to in the third of the purposes of the United Nations in Article 1 of the Charter, must be defined as one of the conditions for international security. The Charter was born of the Second World War, which in turn was based on the brutal idea of the superiority of one race, and the United Nations has endeavoured to abolish for ever any discrimination for reasons of race, sex, language or religion. In the course of its first 25 years of existence the United Nations has given dedicated attention to the development of human rights from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to the different covenants protecting them. But the persistence of racism as a State doctrine in southern Africa calls for special mention of that abominable survival of racism in the form of *apartheid*.

80. Nor can we forget that peace based on economic injustice does not bespeak international security. The growing recrudescence of injustice in terms of trade, the stabilization of or even drop in the *per capita* income in the developing countries and the miserly attitude of the industrialized countries are all creating a deep division between the industrialized north and the developing south.

81. We must also state that the Charter has established the achievement of independence by the former colonies not as a matter of choice for the administering State but as its imperative obligation, and that no change in the status of the former colonies can be brought about without consulting the freely expressed will of the peoples of the Territories and acceptance by the United Nations.

82. Having outlined all the principles the development of which would be conducive to the strengthening of international security, there is one inevitable conclusion to be drawn, that is, that in the Charter we have not only the guiding principles but also the machinery to strengthen security. A strict application of the letter of the Charter would suffice. But now, as in the Biblical aphorism, it appears that “the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life”, for what is truly lacking is the will to fulfil the spirit to give reality to the letter of the Charter.

83. Whilst we are uttering statements and giving new forms to old ideas, day by day the arsenals of death swell; vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons continues, new chemical weapons are stockpiled; biological weapons are

perfected; means of delivery are made more sophisticated; and the world's arms budgets reach the almost astronomical figure of \$200,000 million a year.

84. General and complete disarmament seems daily to become more remote, and we only hear of it as a means of propaganda. And what is more serious still is that even the collateral and partial measures fail to be fully effective. Although my delegation intends to speak on this question when we discuss disarmament items, I want specifically to state that without the true will to adopt positive decisions in the sphere of disarmament and to channel the resources thus liberated to the development of the economically developing countries, it will not be possible to give the world the impression that we are truly concerned with strengthening peace, but rather that we are merely juggling words, albeit elegantly.

85. The last point to which I should like to refer is that there can be no strengthening of international security without respect for and obedience to the decisions of the United Nations organs.

86. It is true that the General Assembly is not a world parliament, nor are its resolutions laws. Many of them are purely procedural and others are merely recommendations. But the declarations and the resolutions of the General Assembly that are based upon the purposes, principles and aims of the Charter have the Charter's binding authority. The Charter being a multilateral treaty, it imposes unquestionable obligations on its signatories, including the one whereby any treaty that is incompatible with it is invalid.

87. As far as the Security Council is concerned there can be no doubt whatsoever regarding the obligation set forth in Article 25 imposing on all Member States the duty to comply with its decisions.

88. Having made this general statement, I should like to say that the two drafts—the draft declaration, submitted by a number of socialist countries [A/C.1/L.513] and the draft resolution submitted by Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan and the Netherlands, [A/C.1/L.514] are both excellent and contain very useful ideas. But we could not accept them in their entirety.

89. I shall refer to them in chronological order. In document A/C.1/L.513 operative paragraph 1 refers to the purposes and principles of the Charter contained in Chapter I, but it overlooks the basic aims contained in the Preamble of the Charter. Furthermore, when referring to the purposes and principles it seems to have selected some—or, at least, it seems to have established some selective hierarchy. We believe that all Articles of the Charter, including the Preamble, form a single unit that cannot be divided.

90. Operative paragraph 2, which more or less includes, word for word, Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter, is one of the most important and basic principles of the Charter and is based upon the rule that antedated the Charter and which comes from the Pact of Paris of 1928, to the effect that war is not a way of creating, cancelling or altering rights, and therefore, that conquests obtained by the threat or use of force cannot be accepted. We could also

³ *Idem*.

not accept paragraph 4 of the draft declaration, which seems to hinge on action by the Security Council and not flow from the principles of the Charter. Paragraph 4 is very closely linked to paragraph 5, which contains a partial interpretation of Article 25 of the Charter. Article 25 defines the obligation of Member States to comply with all decisions of the Security Council, and not only those taken to quote the draft Declaration, "in exercise of its powers to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace".

91. It is our understanding that operative paragraph 7 of the draft resolution does not refer to regional agreements as covered by Chapter VIII but rather to regional co-operation, which is very different.

92. Finally, we believe that paragraph 12 has upset the order, since it would appear more logical to believe that the social and economic progress of peoples contributes to the strengthening of peace than vice versa, although that correlation is pointed out later in the same paragraph.

93. I shall now briefly refer to draft resolution A/C.1/L.514. In general, it is excellent, but it suffers from the same tendency as draft resolution A/C.1/L.513 that is, of making a hierarchical selection of principles, albeit in a much attenuated form. I shall merely indicate some of the points that make this draft resolution unacceptable to my delegation.

94. Our gravest doubts in connexion with this document arise from the use in the Spanish text of the words "*sistemas y organismos regionales*". This term is used in both the ninth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 2, but we should like to know what is meant by "*sistema regional*". The expression does not hold together grammatically in Spanish, nor does it possess a precise legal or logical meaning. The United Nations Charter does not refer to "*sistemas regionales*" but to "*organismos y acuerdos regionales*".

95. Confusion is possible in this draft because the terms are too vague, too imprecise. Operative paragraph 1 reaffirms "the unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter", but in the following paragraphs the purposes outlined in the first four paragraphs of the Charter are overlooked and they refer only to the principles that are the norms of conduct laid down for the implementation of those purposes and which are contained in Article 2 of Chapter I of the Charter.

96. Thus, operative paragraph 2 reaffirms that all Member States are bound to act in accordance with those principles and goes on to state that "regional arrangements or agencies should deal with such matters relating to the maintenance of peace and security as are appropriate for regional action for the prevention of conflicts and the reduction of tensions, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent"—in the Spanish version, the word is "*compatible*" "with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter".

97. Now Chapter VIII of the Charter authorizes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional

action, provided that their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter—and not with the principles alone. Article 52, paragraph 2, provides that Members entering into such arrangements shall make every effort to settle "local disputes", and paragraph 3 provides that the Security Council shall encourage the settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements. But when, in Article 52, paragraph 4, it is clearly stated that that Article "in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35", it transforms such recommendations into mere alternative powers with regard to the Council, and reaffirms the right of Member States to present their controversies directly to the General Assembly or the Security Council if they so decide without there existing jurisdiction excluding the regional organizations.

98. The statement contained in draft resolution A/C.1/L.514 that "regional arrangements or agencies should deal with such matters relating to the maintenance of peace and security" has an apparently binding and compulsory character very different from that of Article 52, paragraph 4, of the Charter, which I have just cited. Furthermore, it is not a question of regional arrangements or agencies being consistent with Chapter VIII, as the draft resolution says, but of their being subject and subordinate to, Chapter VIII, as provided by the Charter.

99. My delegation has co-sponsored draft resolution A/C.1/L.517 not because we believe it is perfect but because we believe it provides a good basis for negotiations to arrive at a unanimous solution or at least to a solution that can gain substantial majority support in the Committee.

100. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Ecuador for the cordial and generous congratulations he addressed to me, and his reference to relations between his country and mine.

101. Mr. BOYE (Senegal) (*interpretation from French*): Since I am speaking for the first time in this Committee, I should like very simply to tell you of the high esteem and admiration I have for you and your country, Mr. Chairman. We have known each other for a few years, Sir, and we have worked together in a harmonious, pleasant and effective way. I should also like to congratulate the Vice-Chairman, my friend Ambassador Farah, and the Rapporteur, Mr. Cernik, upon their election.

102. Last year, in the general debate at the twenty-fourth session [1756th plenary meeting], when I had the privilege of hearing the distinguished Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, say that the question of strengthening international security should be inscribed on the Assembly's agenda, I immediately felt that at last something positive was going to intervene in the routine of the Assembly's agendas.

103. I think very sincerely that we should pay a tribute to the felicitous initiative of the Soviet Union—especially we Afro-Asians who have always enjoyed the frank and loyal support of that great country every time we have been confronted with serious problems of racial discrimination and colonialism, which unfortunately still exist in our areas and even affect the security and integrity of our young States.

104. My delegation will not, however, be counted among those who criticize great countries like France, which, at a given time in its history, granted independence to African countries—and not as the result of any kind of pressure, and Great Britain, which granted independence to its former colonial possessions. Nor will my delegation criticize groundlessly another great country, the United States of America, which, it must be recognized, strives in its own way to solve and settle once and for all the bloody conflicts that are bringing ruin to millions of persons.

105. But that does not prevent me from saying quite clearly that we do not agree with countries that deliver any kinds of weapons to racist, colonialist and illegal régimes, weapons used by those régimes in attempts to exterminate our African brothers who are fighting to ensure the triumph of the ideals and goals of our Organization. We condemn those deliveries of weapons, which serve to kill men who aspire to dignity, peace, justice and progress for their peoples. We express our active sympathy for all those freedom fighters. Of course, those countries will one day be free. But when, and after how much loss of human life? That is why we should like to ask our friends to help us to make it understood firmly and vigorously that it is not sufficient to proclaim the principle of self-determination of peoples, but that it is necessary for all to sit around a table and try to determine in the clearest possible fashion the process which would enable those humiliated peoples to accede to international sovereignty and, in the meantime, to ensure that repressive measures are ended immediately. This, for those friends, would be a glorious action which would be inscribed once again in the pages of colonial history.

106. Often I hear criticism of the impotence or even the uselessness of our Organization, as if this Organization were not an association of States. My opinion is that if our Organization is powerless, it is because our States, which are Members of this Organization, are powerless or incapable of settling their own problems, incapable of agreeing on certain points which are dealt with in the Charter to which we all subscribe. The impotence of our Organization would be nothing other than the impotence of the States composing it. Therefore, to criticize the United Nations is to criticize all our States. Let us leave that irresponsible criticism aside and sincerely try to devote some thought to what we should do in this historic year.

107. In truth, the problem facing us is a problem of the exact interpretation of the various provisions of our Charter. The very distinguished President of the General Assembly, with his well-known legal competence, has studied this Charter. I believe that if all of us want our Organization to become an effective instrument of peace, justice and progress, we should go back to the preparatory work which preceded the drafting of the Charter and try to find there the elements which would enable us to solve the serious problems which today appear to be insoluble.

108. We thought that some Charter provisions should be revised. We know that for the time being that is legally not possible. But our request was founded on the fact that States which had not taken part in the drafting of the Charter should be able to have inscribed in it some principles which they hold dear. But actually it would

suffice simply to have a round table discussion in order to consider together the various Charter provisions and to agree on a common interpretation. I have read and re-read all the Articles of the Charter. I have seen that we can find the solution to all present problems in it. But the difficulty resides in the fact that everyone of us had his own interpretation of any given provision.

109. This is an opportunity for me to tell our eminent Secretary-General, U Thant, of all the admiration that I have for him, for his courage, his intellectual honesty and his lucidity. Our Organization for many years will stand in need of his experience, his counsel and his skill.

110. To condemn the United Nations means to condemn without discrimination all States composing it. If indeed the great Powers have primary and particular responsibility in the field of the maintenance of international peace and security, the small States can and must undertake strong and often effective action to influence the great Powers so that they do not ignore the interests of these peoples. It will suffice for the small States to agree among themselves to try to find persuasive arguments and to request a round table discussion with the great Powers to present to them clearly our problems and our views on the most appropriate manner to settle some disputes. I am not to be counted among those who have a preconceived idea on any approach. We must be able seriously to state our problems, to believe in the good faith of the other party, to listen to the other party and to try to find common ground. I honestly think that this method would be much more effective than all the resounding speeches, forgotten the next day, which gather dust in the archives of our Organization.

111. I have heard it said sometime ago that the Africans were only interested in African problems. Indeed, if some of the Members do not seem to be very interested in the fate of the millions of Africans who, as I saw myself, are victimized in a most ignoble and barbarous manner; if some of the Members of the United Nations do not care too much about the numerous death sentences carried out in the gaols of Pretoria, Robben Island and Salisbury; if some of the Member States of the United Nations are content with making mere platonic statements when elements of the regular Portuguese army enclose hundreds of people in sacks which they throw into the sea from the planes given to them by some Powers; if some of the Members of our Organization do not care too much about the fact that the Portuguese spray innocent people, their fields and their rivers with the most poisonous chemical substances and with napalm with which they inflict horrible burns upon small children, whom I saw myself, with their fixed stares, in their hospital cots—well, it is then necessary for us Africans to denounce in front of world public opinion these acts of cruelty which have repercussions even in our own independent States, whose villages are shelled by elements of the Portuguese army. This does not mean that we are indifferent to the other problems of the world. We follow with the closest attention and the greatest concern the subversive activities which seem to be spreading in friendly Latin American countries, which also wish only to live in peace and to ensure the development of their area and the well-being of their peoples. We follow with the greatest concern the events in the Middle East. Senegal, for

its part, spares no effort to make possible a just, lasting and equitable solution within the framework of the relevant decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly, in order to put an end to the suffering of the millions of Palestinians who, for over twenty years, have lived in shameful conditions, under tents in which they suffer from all the ill effects of weather conditions. In this connexion, we should like to reiterate the solidarity of the Senegalese Government and people with its Arab brothers. Also, we welcome the remarkable efforts made in this field by the Soviet Union and the United States, with the valuable assistance of France and Great Britain. How can I fail to stress once again the political courage, the lucidity and the abnegation of a man, Gamal Abdel Nasser, who until the very last minutes of his life completely devoted himself first to the working out of a common and realistic political strategy of all those who shared his convictions, and then to the negotiating of a lasting peace.

112. My delegation, for its part, can only encourage the leaders of the Middle East area to try to find a negotiated political solution which would be lasting so that all the States together could devote their energies to the development and the exploitation of the great natural wealth of this area.

113. The three suffering peoples, this trilogy, the Negro, the Arab and the Jew, must one day form a fraternal chain before the rostrum of mankind.

114. We are not indifferent to the tragedy in South-East Asia. We ardently wish to see the Paris conversations lead to a realistic solution. But I think that it is necessary also to eliminate all acts of subversion there and enable each country freely to determine its fate in accordance with its convictions and in a democratic manner.

115. I have heard it said that the prestige of the United Nations is decreasing a little more every day. I do not want to believe that those who speak in this fashion are thinking of the activities undertaken for several years by the young countries which have become Members of this Organization. No, the truth is simple; the mentality of all of us must be adapted to the new political, social and economic factors of the present time, because the reduction in the prestige of the United Nations would be nothing but the reduction in the prestige of the Member States and especially of the prestige of the great Powers. My delegation trusts the latter and thinks that around the table, free from any noisy publicity, it will be possible for them to agree on ways and means to act together. We firmly believe in the advantages of dialogue and we are convinced that with two exceptions all Member States have the same objectives defined in the Charter.

116. What leads to disagreement, if it does not divide us, is the question of what means to apply to reach these goals. We are forming an association of States of different cultures, different political, social and even economic systems. But none of this is insurmountable. It would be sufficient for us to have the will to live together, to decide to try to understand the political and social concepts of the others, that we should have the will to try to sacrifice a part of our own national sovereignties in order to put it at the disposal of the international community without any

reticence and I very sincerely believe that this is not within the realm of Utopia. I think that it would be a way of evincing political realism. Let us meet as often as possible informally and let us consider what we can do to instil in our peoples an unshakable confidence in our will for peace, security and progress.

117. How could we fail to welcome the political courage and the realism the present Head of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, who did not hesitate to undertake a dialogue with another party which was also ready to co-operate, because we know its will for peace?

118. In this connexion, I must say how highly I value the initiative of the delegation of Finland advocating periodic meetings, without any preconceived agenda, of the Security Council at a high level.

119. Let us try to liquidate the two blocs which would share and divide the world and try to have the small countries in their own camp. Why not go beyond the notion of peaceful coexistence? Why can we not seek to establish friendly, frank and loyal co-operation among all countries, to try to help each other, to help peoples which are now deprived of what they need to raise themselves to the level of the industrialized countries? This is a long-term programme, no doubt, but we must know how to begin. The economic imbalance in the world is one of the main causes of world tension, and that is why we must encourage the creation of sub-regional economic bodies to harmonize the points of view of their members in order to spread the influence of these sub-bodies to wider bodies until we set up a system which would be sufficiently wide and effective to do away with the causes of irritation of the "have-not" peoples and to put at the disposal of these peoples the technical resources which are today so jealously guarded by some large industrialized countries.

120. Let us do away with the causes of political tension by abandoning spheres of influence, by ensuring the total destruction of all atomic, chemical, biological and other weapons so that our peoples will no longer live in fear. I know that this cannot be done overnight. Here again frank discussion and progressive disarmament stages will probably be required. We also wish to welcome the political courage of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States who have begun to travel along that road.

121. We must condemn without any limitation the barbarous repression in southern Africa and in territories under military occupation. Let us help the Africans and the Palestinians to free themselves and to enjoy self-determination.

122. Let us allow peoples to live in peace, peoples who freely choose an economic, political and social system to their liking, on the sole condition that their political system should not infringe upon the purposes and principles of our Charter, in other words, the principles of civilized humanity.

123. Let us not encourage subversion in countries which wish to live in stability. Let us decisively condemn such subversion; let us try to eliminate it through dialogue, then through persuasion and finally, if need be, through the legal means enshrined in the Charter.

124. In this connexion we must unite our efforts to prevent the acquisition of foreign territories through war. We must urgently demand the withdrawal of troops which are illegally occupying territories as a consequence of war. The great Powers must be able to guarantee the security of every independent State.

125. The Security Council should play a more active and more dynamic role. It should abandon once and for all a phraseology which is so shopworn that nobody pays any attention to it any longer. The Charter provisions, conferring upon the Security Council primary responsibility in the field of preventing or stopping any threat to the peace, must be strictly applied and correctly interpreted.

126. My delegation also thinks that it is essential to set up a corps of inspectors of the United Nations, chosen by the Secretary-General which, pursuant to a request from our Organization or the Secretary-General or any Member of our Organization, would be able urgently to travel to any area where the maintenance of peace is threatened, where they could undertake a complete investigation and report to the Security Council. The latter would then, within the framework of the Charter, be able to take the necessary firm and effective measures.

127. I know that there are several draft resolutions on this question. I read them attentively; many provisions of these drafts deserve to be taken into consideration. I would express the wish that there be a meeting devoted to conciliation so that a single draft could be adopted unanimously and be solemnly proclaimed on 24 October, so that the whole world would know that on this twenty-fifth anniversary all the Member States of our Organization resolutely decided to travel the path of peace and of social justice in a world from which fear, war, repression and hunger would be eliminated once and for all, a world where there would be a common will to live together in conditions of dignity and friendly international co-operation.

128. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind congratulations addressed to the officers of the Committee. Personally, I want to thank him also for his comments regarding my country and myself.

129. Mr. NAVA CARRILLO (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Speaking for the first time in the debates of this Committee during the present session; the delegation of Venezuela wishes first of all to repeat its sorrow at the death of President Gamal Abdel Nasser, head of State of a friendly nation, an exemplary patriot, a statesman and a leader who will forever be remembered for dedicating his best efforts to the restoration of the dignity of his people, elimination of the sequels of colonialism, the suppression of injustice and inequality and the improvement of the living conditions of the less favoured in his country. With this sincere homage to the memory of President Nasser, my delegation wishes to reiterate the feelings that were so eloquently expressed on behalf of our own country and of Latin America as a whole by the representative of Brazil in this Committee and in the plenary Assembly.

130. Also we wish to request the delegation of Malaysia to receive and to transmit to its Government our condolences

on the death of Ambassador Ramani, whose contribution to the work of our Organization as a jurist and diplomat is remembered with appreciation and admiration by all.

131. The delegation of Venezuela considers that the strengthening of international security can be studied from two entirely different standpoints. The first approach is purely negative. It is, at all costs to preserve a specific state of affairs, even though unjust, and thus avoid armed conflicts by means of the traditional system of the balance of power and the division of the world into spheres of influence of the powerful States. This standpoint overlooks causes and seeks merely to correct their effects. It does not try to cure the disease, but to eliminate its symptoms.

132. Efforts based upon these ideas are, we believe, doomed to failure. Even were there to be a momentary peace, because of agreement among those who wield power, it would only be an imposed peace and therefore only an apparent peace. It would be an order whose maintenance would call for an ever-increasing use of force as tensions generated by unresolved problems grew.

133. The second approach to the strengthening of international security, and as we believe, the only correct one, is like a search for justice. Only if we open the road to the redressing of injustice can we expect those suffering from injustice to contribute to the effort of maintaining order. Only if we seek out the true causes of conflicts and set up effective ways of eliminating them can we expect all to refrain from violence.

134. These facts, obviously, are equally applicable to the international order and to the domestic order of States, and they lead the delegation of Venezuela to believe that when considering measures for the strengthening of international security the General Assembly cannot limit itself to a study of mere machinery to do away with specific manifestations of conflicts. It must seek out the root causes for the situations generating such conflicts.

135. Perhaps the most obvious cause of insecurity lies in the confrontation of two great groups of countries, for ideological reasons and because of differences in their socio-economic systems. Thus, any progress that may be achieved towards obtaining mutual tolerance and a desire to coexist must be welcomed by all nations. The final liquidation of the sequels of the cold war in itself is also highly desirable. Yet the co-operation that we should like to see developed amongst those that were at one time irreconcilable adversaries should be directed towards the establishment of true peace based upon justice for all peoples and for all men. We will have advanced but little if that co-operation is simply intended to replace the insecurity generated by violence by an immutable order perpetuating present injustices.

136. Justice implies a full and effective enjoyment of rights by men and peoples. If we are to strengthen international security it is essential that we adopt the necessary measures to do away with the existing flagrant violations of both of these rights.

137. Thus the existence of systems based upon racial oppression is incompatible with the concept of interna-

tional security. If we explicitly mention this type of violation of human rights it is not because we consider other rights less important or their violation less serious, but because it is one of the greatest causes of international tension. Thus, too, among the violations of the rights of peoples we consider to be particularly perilous the persistence of colonialism and acts contrary to the sovereignty, independence or territorial integrity of States.

138. Also contradictory to justice is the great distance that separates the developing countries from the very few that enjoy high standards of living. Want and misery are in themselves a source of instability and tension; but misery next to opulence must sooner or later lead to explosive situations. Therefore it is indispensable for action during the Second United Nations Development Decade to mobilize and utilize effective means and produce concrete results.

139. Furthermore, there can be no doubt that the arms race, which is both an effect and a cause of insecurity, must be halted. In addition, in this, the Disarmament Decade, we must start and continue a race in the opposite direction, namely, towards the goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

140. The close link between disarmament and development is obvious. Although development cannot depend on disarmament, the resources liberated by disarmament would doubtless be a powerful motive force behind development.

141. Peaceful coexistence, and tolerance, disarmament and development, human rights and decolonization are, in the eyes of my delegation, the fields where the most intense work must be done during the next decade, and beyond it, in order to strengthen international security and finally to make a reality of the aspirations to peace, justice and progress of the world.

142. Very briefly, these are the convictions that have led the delegation of Venezuela, together with other countries of Latin America, to sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/L.517. My delegation has studied with great interest the other draft resolutions submitted on this subject. In the other draft resolutions we have found many concepts with which we would have no difficulty whatsoever in agreeing, but we consider that the draft resolution of the twenty-three Latin American countries places a much clearer emphasis upon the fundamental concepts that I have outlined and at the same time avoids singling out and selecting certain situations or principles whose mention might be inappropriate for the achievement of the goals that we have set for ourselves.

143. Mr. Chairman, before concluding, my delegation wishes to express its great satisfaction at seeing Ambassadors Farah and Cerník co-operating with you as officers of this Committee. Their ability, which has been so often demonstrated, stands as a guarantee that the work of this Committee will be successful.

144. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): Mr. Chairman, as this is the first time I take the floor in the First Committee, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, upon your unanimous election to this Committee's Chairmanship and, at the same time,

extend my delegation's congratulations to the other officers of the Committee. For the sake of brevity, I just want to assure you and your colleagues of my delegation's continual co-operation in the performance of your arduous tasks.

145. As to the matter under discussion, I want to state at the outset that, in the view of my Government, the common interest in peace and security in the world of today is more profound than ever before. For this reason we, in the Netherlands, pay particular attention to ways and means of strengthening international security on the broad, comprehensive basis of the Charter of the United Nations, which, as many preceding speakers have remarked, gives us ample scope to improve the existing unsatisfactory situation.

146. My Government responded last April [*see A/7922*] to our distinguished Secretary-General's letter of 3 February 1970, and my delegation has been in consultation with a large group of like-minded delegations since last May, in order to investigate the possibility of arriving at a draft resolution for the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly which would embody as many constructive elements from the answers received by the Secretary-General as possible, and which might therefore command wide support. My delegation feels that the draft contained in document A/C.L.514 represents such a text and we are consequently pleased and proud to sponsor this draft.

147. The representatives of Italy, Canada, Belgium, Japan and Australia, the other sponsors of the draft resolution, have, in their statements before the Committee, analysed the text of document A/C.1/L.514 in a penetrating and exhaustive manner, and I wish to state here that my delegation subscribes to the views and conceptions expressed by them. In order to avoid repetition, I shall refrain from making a general and comprehensive analysis of our text, but I shall endeavour, briefly, to concentrate on a few elements which seem to my delegation of particular interest.

148. Listening to the debate in this Committee over the last few days, I found that I had to remind myself, from time to time, that the item under discussion is entitled "Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security". It seems to me that various delegations approached the subject matter as if we were discussing an item called "the maintenance of international peace and security". The difference may seem a question of semantics, but I submit that this is not the case and that the difference is substantial. We recognize—and I wish to make this clear from the outset—that the competent organs of the United Nations, primarily the Security Council, must play an essential role in maintaining international peace and security. The strengthening of the Security Council's procedures and respect for its decisions are, therefore, of paramount importance.

149. But the strengthening of international security comprises more than the usual and familiar structure of military-political matters. It goes far beyond the normal field of action of the Security Council, beyond the implementation of its decisions, regional security systems, disarmament, even beyond the peaceful settlement of disputes.

150. During the last 25 years many local conflicts have broken out and today a number of disquieting threats to the peace persist. But it is a matter of gratification that at least global peace and security have been maintained. The question now before us is how to strengthen global security. Of course, security may be strengthened in the military-political sense; but all other fields of United Nations endeavour—economic, social, legal and humanitarian—should be awarded their proper place in the over-all fabric of world security.

151. International security depends on more than a military balance. It depends, in the long run, on the well-being of the peoples of this earth. Peace is not static; it is a much more ambitious goal than the non-existence of war.

152. That is the reason why I should like to draw particular attention to two paragraphs in draft resolution A/C.1/L.514, which affirm the need for continued, concerted and sustained action to promote international stability through a better and more effective system of international co-operation in order to banish the present disparities in economic and social development, and which urge intensified efforts during the Second United Nations Development Decade. Our action in this respect should be designed to make the world a better and therefore safer place to live in.

153. In this respect, I should like to recall that in the speech from the Throne last September, Her Majesty Queen Juliana stated, in a paragraph about the United Nations:

“In 25 years of its existence the Organization has performed an indispensable function in the maintenance of world peace especially by promoting international co-operation in economic and cultural spheres.”

154. My delegation is, of course, well aware that the maintenance of international peace and security is the basis for a successful outcome of all our endeavours in other fields. But when we examine methods of strengthening world security, we should bear in mind the importance, often the decisive importance, of our decisions outside the limited military-political framework.

155. This is where the draft contained in document A/C.1/L.513, in our view, fails. It is a static, conservative document, based on the misconception that the prevention of conflict should imply the general maintenance of a *status quo*. The opposite is the case: suppression of evolution will lead to insecurity and instability. Political oppression and economic exploitation carry in them the seeds of conflict. The progressive view is—correctly, in the eyes of my delegation—that international security can only be strengthened if adequate attention is also paid to the promotion of the respect for human rights and democratic freedoms, to the implementation of the principle of self-determination of all peoples, to an ever-increasing co-operation in economic and social development, and to the further development of and respect for international law. These considerations should, in our view, be at the heart of a resolution of the General Assembly on the strengthening of international security, and we feel that draft resolution A/C.1/L.514 represents these ideas satisfactorily.

156. I am pleased to note that the same general concept appears to have inspired the delegations sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/L.517. I therefore can assure these delegations that we are studying their draft with sympathy.

157. A good deal has been said by previous speakers on the necessity for adequate fact-finding machinery, on the promotion of peaceful settlement of disputes, on the role of the International Court of Justice, and on many other important aspects. Our views on these subjects are well-known and I shall therefore refrain from repetition. Today I want to limit myself to the observations I have made on the theme that measures to strengthen international security should comprise progressive developments in all major fields of activity of the United Nations.

158. In our internal, domestic political situation security should not depend on our police forces or our armies, it should depend on the acceptance of a system of law and order which is generally felt to be just and equitable. In the international community the situation is basically no different. I venture to refer to the last sentence of my Government's reply [*ibid.*] to the letter of the Secretary-General:

“Eventually, the security of mankind can only be ensured by the development of a world legal order based on justice, in which the issues of international politics will have been transformed into issues of global domestic politics”.

159. The matter before us is of great importance, but it is complicated and, perhaps, intractable. The debate in this Committee has so far demonstrated that generally acceptable solutions will not be easy to find. We have before us three draft resolutions and some amendments. More drafts may be presented. Reserving the right of my delegation to speak on any draft resolution or amendment at the appropriate time, I wonder if I might refer for one moment to the suggestion made during this debate for the establishment of a working group to try to work out an agreed compromise text. It seems to us that there is substantial merit in this suggestion, but at the same time we feel that the establishment of a working group does not in itself render the substance of the matter less complicated. No benefit will accrue to the United Nations, in the view of my delegation, from hastily drafted compromise texts. I venture to suggest that the First Committee should not allow the thoroughness of its labours to be impaired by rushing the work on such an important item as the strengthening of international security.

160. The CHAIRMAN (*interpretation from Spanish*): I thank the representative of the Netherlands for his statement and for the congratulations he was kind enough to address to the officers of the Committee, as well as for his offer of co-operation.

161. On my list of speakers for this morning we had nine delegations and we have now heard six of them. Since it is now rather late, it might not be appropriate to continue our work. The situation confronting us for this afternoon is the following: first of all we will hear the delegations that appear on the list for this morning's meeting and who were not able to speak because of lack of time, that is, the

United Arab Republic, Romania and Pakistan. Then we will go on to the next speakers, the United Kingdom, Austria, Nigeria, the United States of America, the Ivory Coast, Argentina, Algeria and Kuwait. The representatives of Ethiopia and Cyprus are also prepared to speak. That would

make a total of thirteen speakers. Your Chairman's hope, of course, is that we might be able to hear all the speakers on the list at this afternoon's meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.