

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-FOURTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1657th
MEETING**

Friday, 17 October 1969,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 103:

The strengthening of international security (*continued*) . . . 1

Chairman: Mr. Agha SHAHI (Pakistan).

AGENDA ITEM 103

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

1. The CHAIRMAN: Before giving the floor to the first speaker, I should like to remind representatives that the list of speakers will be closed at 12 noon.

2. Mr. Dosumu JOHNSON (Liberia): Before I make my observations on the item before us, let me take this opportunity on behalf of the Liberian delegation to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of this Committee and through you to extend congratulations to our Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur. With men like you to guide our deliberations we have every reason to be confident of success. We assure you of our whole-hearted co-operation.

3. At the same time permit me to express to the Ambassador of Somalia the condolences of the Government, people and delegation of Liberia on the death of President Shermarke. He was one of the architects of the 1961 Monrovia Conference¹ which led to the formation of the Organization of African Unity in 1963. He will be missed by Somalia and all Africa. May his soul rest in peace.

4. In the fluctuating patterns of current social, economic and political trends and tendencies, no diplomatic adventure should be more exhilarating to States, great and small, developed and under-developed, than the realization that next to life the quest for peace must transcend all mundane considerations. Ideological wars or conflicts which have so long plagued the United Nations must give way to a genuine search for unity and the maintenance of peace, freedom and justice, not in the interest of the few, but as the lot and destiny of all, regardless of ideological or racial affinity. In our opinion, the transient splendours of power do not weigh in the balance of history. Real and appreciable greatness in today's diplomacy lies not in atomic stockpiles or industrial prowess, important as those are, but in the consistent endeavour to ensure the peace of the world and

help the less fortunate to overcome obstacles. To make this attitude meaningful and acceptable by all is the object of the present debate.

5. Peace through the United Nations as its guardian is my country's only hope for survival. Therefore, the Soviet draft appeal [A/C.1/L.468] for strengthening international security impresses us as one of the most ingenious proposals for peace in our time. It deserves the serious consideration of all Members of this Organization. Its merits lie in the fact that it seeks to put an end to all controversies in disarmament and peace-keeping conferences. It is a clarion call to positive *détente*, universal coexistence and the abolition of force and subversion as instruments of national policy. Finally, it is designed to end that type of national sovereignty which has long paralysed co-operative action in the United Nations and its organs. Policy, we are told, is the science of the relative. It is in that spirit that my delegation intervenes in this debate.

6. Contrary to the innuendos of detractors, there is nothing wrong with the United Nations or its Charter. It is as sound today as on the day it was first promulgated "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". It is the best instrument for peace that human ingenuity has ever been able to forge to guide the destiny of mankind. Without it, the world would have sunk into the deepest melancholy and distress. All mistakes or failures of this great Organization must be imputed to the nations comprising its membership, which, by commission or omission, by action or intent, have rendered its organs inoperative and thus made it a byword and an object of hissing. All our efforts at this stage and in this debate should be directed, in the first instance not to changing the Charter, but to changing men's minds and attitudes. The agenda item as read, "The strengthening of international security", is in our opinion synonymous with strengthening the United Nations.

7. Among mankind everywhere there is a growing realization that in our fast-changing and interdependent world there are fundamental virtues which do not change; among these is the power given to each of us to increase goodness, tolerance and brotherhood by our individual acts. In 24 short years, and despite the intransigence of some Members, the United Nations has deepened our sense of goodness, expanded our area of tolerance, and made more meaningful our conception of world brotherhood and unity and peace. To further that end the 126 Member nations of this Organization must strive with unflagging zeal and tireless fanaticism. For so long as this item of international affairs remains unfinished business, so long will the world be plagued by division and conflict.

8. In the item before us we are asking the United Nations to rescue mankind through diplomacy from the horrors of a

¹ Conference of the Heads of African and Malagasy States held at Monrovia, 8 to 12 May 1961.

thermonuclear holocaust; and since diplomacy can settle disputes only by negotiation, it presupposes that the nuclear Powers recognize the necessity for lasting harmony and thereby the need to subordinate cold-war disputes or ideological heritage to the survival and harmony of the world.

9. But diplomacy in the United Nations depends by and large upon the attitude of the developing countries. It is true that only the highly industrialized nations can wage modern war effectively because of the fact that such a war will be between machines rather than between men. Nevertheless, the small nations must speak out their convictions against war and find possible means of bringing the super-Powers together without regard to ideologies, for it is they, the small nations, that would suffer most from radioactive fall-out and, at war's end, be reduced to a state of helplessness and to a position of satellites of the powerful and aggressive. We must therefore bend our energies to reducing tension and to ensuring consistency of principles. We must tell the great Powers what we think is right and see to it that they do it. We do not know as small nations what it is that we can do; nor will we know until we have tried. We must be able to see beneath the placid and rippling surface of words the swift, deep currents that motivate them.

10. Unemployment, hunger, disease, illiteracy and other deadly evils will not be erased from the world as long as the super-Powers are afraid of one another and remain enemies, and rivals in the armaments race.

11. This debate calls implicitly and explicitly for thoughts of war and peace—war in retrospect and peace for the future. Any other issue is extraneous. This situation calls for realism. The high cost of war in life, property and in morale, coupled with the knowledge that no defence is adequate, should make every member of this Committee strive with the greatest zeal to put aside rancour and all controversial issues, and project a formula that will induce all the nations of the world to see eye to eye on subversion and to speak the same language on coexistence in the quest for a just and durable peace.

12. Talk of foreign bases, *apartheid*, imperialism, liberation movements and neo-colonialism within the context of so serious a debate of life and death of all mankind serves no useful purpose; it will only divide us. We can discuss these items in an atmosphere of peace and tranquillity in another context and dimension. Otherwise there will be no one left on earth to talk about them if all is lost in an atomic holocaust. At this moment of serious search for international world order, I implore every member of this Committee to let bygones be bygones. International anarchy is incompatible with world peace. The developing States will appreciate and love you more if you bring them lasting peace instead of words.

13. The inventions of today have caught man in an awful dilemma, but I hope that after this debate everyone will take a terrestrial view of man and thereby negate Julian Huxley's prediction that "by 1980 man's mental aberrations may prevent him from handling the machines he has created".

14. With seriousness of purpose we may emerge from this twenty-fourth session with a determination to apply the money now used for armaments to the benefit of the developing countries, and perhaps by 1980 we shall be so peace conscious that, instead of weapons of war, we shall put computers in every home and office and even in the United Nations. As members are well aware a computer never loses patience, never gets angry; it is never sarcastic, indifferent or inattentive; it is never jealous or cross. On the contrary, it is always friendly.

15. Improved transportation, growing economic interdependence and easy means of communication are conduits to a united world. Despite the notable advances in the United Nations, international conflicts engendered by ideological shortsightedness tend to keep the goal of world comity from us. The problem we face is how to resolve conflicts without the use of force. In the process we ask in the words of Alexander Dumas: "Why is it that while children are so intelligent, men are so stupid?"

16. The science which creates the good life is also creating weapons of destruction. All attempts to prevent war since The Hague Peace Conference of 1899 have failed. In the wars that followed from 1914 to 1918 and from 1939 to 1945, men lost all sense of chivalry, humanity and rules of conduct.

17. What is the root cause of all these wars? Because I am inclined to be optimistic, I should not believe that war is due to the "rooted bellicosity of human nature", but rather to our incapacity to understand and master the objective forces that make war. Every lover of mankind and of this world must hope and believe that the prospect of wholesale destruction, which will result from atomic and biological warfare, may induce this generation of men to "beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks" before it is too late. May necessity prove to be the mother of invention.

18. Twenty-five years in the life of an organization like the United Nations is very short. Let us redouble our faith and trust in it. All ideas take time to "jell". They must first pass through the theological or fictional stage, then through the metaphysical or abstract stage, then through the positive or scientific. They all come through knowledge tempered by experience; and the results of two calamitous wars are bound to make us see peace not as the rhetorical dream of prophets and philosophers but as the *sine qua non* for mankind's survival.

19. Statesmen must know that the peoples of the world want peace. Their eyes are focused on our doings in this hall and in this Committee. Your atomic bombs cannot save you. The balance of power principle in restraining war has tragically failed. International relations are no longer a subject for diplomats only; they are now a matter of vital interest to peoples throughout the civilized world. They know that total war today involves everybody, civil and military, combatants and non-combatants. They know that it means indiscriminate killing of men, women and children. Death will be at every doorstep, and no statesman will be immune to the effects of radiation. It is fatuous to think that no one will use the bomb, as is sometimes said. In my opinion, no nation or government will wish to lose a war

that is vital to its existence if it has the weapon with which to win it, and does not use it. No nation, great or small, can attain security by isolationism, preparedness or alliances. To seek your own security is to bring insecurity to others including yourself.

20. 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 nationalist wars that followed. The Treaty of Paris of 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 these and similar imbalances is the *raison d'être* of the United Nations.

21. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations should challenge its Members to a process of re-examination, reconstruction and rededication. It should mark the dying out of an old order of ideological conflict and the birth of a new order of co-operation for universal peace—a new order born to arrest fear of starvation for lack of the means of livelihood, born to arrest fear of the foreigner coming to rule and exploit, born to eradicate the fear of the sword hanging over each nation, born to advance immediate and drastic plans to ensure the greatest good to the greatest number.

22. Contrary to all prevailing ideas on regionalism, the opinion of my delegation is that regionalism is not the answer. Failure in the past to make the instruments of the United Nations work effectively led to a series of regional defence pacts; the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Western European Union 1948, the North Atlantic Pact 1949, the Warsaw Pact—all morally good. But regional defence systems are no substitute for universal arrangement for universal peace within the United Nations. Regionalism will compartmentalize the world. Regional systems are effective for economic and cultural association, but for the peace we envisage they are inadequate. They will lead to jealousy, rivalry, fear and ultimately to war.

23. The Charter gave the Security Council primary responsibility for security, but the Council has lost its pristine significance. In the Council the Charter and the founding fathers counted on the loyal and unbiased co-operation of the permanent members to attain its highest goal. It was thus thought that the veto would wither through disuse. It was to be used sparingly and only to prevent military attack against or meddling in the domestic affairs of the permanent members, but, as we see today, the veto, as we all know, has been used about 43 or more times and sometimes for trivial reasons.

24. The veto is against the best interests of all the small nations, particularly African States which have no permanent representatives in the Council and could not amend the Charter because of the veto. The veto power maintains the United Nations in a state of semi-paralysis, and has consigned it to creating international agencies, which issue reports on world problems. By this act, Members indulge themselves in the multiplication of instruments for ensuring

peace while they obdurately reject the application of these instruments where their national interests are not advantaged.

25. The small nations would like to entrust their security to the United Nations Security Council, but they are dubious of its fairness in matters affecting them. In recent years the Security Council determines issues on expediency and national economic interest rather than on their merits. It is politically constituted with national interests paramount; and since politics is selfish and, further, since the Security Council is ideologically polarized, small nations should be shy about leaving their national interests and security to such a body. At present, it is good only for the permanent Powers. The members of the Security Council, in our opinion, should adjudicate issues before it as neutrals, and without regard to the policy of their respective States. If I may go further, I would say that the Security Council should be constituted as an independent body of sound minds and not of politicians.

26. Small nations have a stake in the continued existence of the United Nations and its organs, but its structure must be reviewed to inspire our confidence. In its structure lies the root-cause of the flouting and non-implementation of Security Council resolutions. We do not agree with those who hold that the members of the Security Council are victims of circumstances. In our opinion they are creators of circumstances.

27. Anyone who has followed the history of the United Nations and/or international relations with discrimination will not fail to come to the conclusion that unless we can get the great Powers together there will be no world peace. Since 1917 this division has been clearly marked and systematically pursued in their social, economic and technological orientation.

28. In our view the most logical thing for this Committee to do, as we debate the security of the world, is to devise ways and means of making genuine peace between the super-Powers—to be specific, between the United States and the USSR. Otherwise all our efforts will be in vain. And they must come together because their common interests dictate it in the face of the prospect of a thermonuclear war. Their ideas must converge. Division of the world by ideologies is madness. Only co-operation free from fear will save them and mankind. The development decade and its soothing words will remain on paper until the great Powers make significant changes in their foreign and domestic policy and learn to truly coexist. They must do this by observing consistent principles to preserve civilization and mankind.

29. To keep peace or secure peace between the Soviet Union and the United States in particular, and the world in general, fundamental policies must change. We can ensure this perhaps—and I am not being facetious here—by making the Soviets more capitalistic and the United States more socialistic. They are perhaps almost that—I hope. With a little pushing it will be an accomplished fact. Whatever means you can use to bring these two great Powers together will be acceptable to my delegation, but please do it quickly or else it will be too late.

30. In the meantime we may perhaps revive the Baruch plan² to control nuclear stockpiles. Of course this is a hard nut to crack at this moment, but with good will nothing is impossible. What may have seemed intolerable in 1948 may not be so now. The Baruch plan, as all representatives know, was designed to internationalize the atomic bomb. The Security Council accepted it in 1948 and the Assembly endorsed it by an overwhelming majority with only six dissenting votes.

31. Better still, we might in this connexion establish a disarmament authority to control all nuclear weapons systems and delivery systems. Such an authority should be composed of small States, with the permanent members of the Security Council—but without the veto—as world policemen and keepers of the peace with the right to travel unmolested and to see everything anywhere in the world. Perhaps some other means could be substituted—for example, an international defence pact under which every nation would stand ready to defend every other nation.

32. Since the small nations, such as my own, can only talk and must leave everything to the great Powers to implement, if they wish, I leave it to them, in all seriousness, as a manifest responsibility, to put the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations on the road to a universal panacea for peace. If that is their intention, they will begin now to revitalize this Committee towards a *détente* between the super-Powers, which alone can enable us to resolve all the problems of which the United Nations is seized now. Where there is a will, there is always a way.

33. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Liberia for his congratulations to me.

34. Mr. AYLWIN (Chile) (*translated from Spanish*): I would like first of all to offer my congratulations on behalf of the delegation of Chile to you, Mr. Chairman, to the Vice-Chairman and to the Rapporteur. The best tribute we can pay you is to co-operate with the officers of the Committee to ensure maximum success in our work. At the same time I would like to express to the delegation of the Republic of Somalia our condolences in its bereavement.

35. In this debate on the strengthening of international security, the delegation of Chile, as representing a small country, has a word or two to say. When we speak of international security we have in mind the safeguards available to peoples to enable them to live and develop in peace, free from the threat of war or aggression endangering their lives, their integrity, their independence or their future. That being so, international security is today more than ever a vital need of all mankind. If the great nations need it to face the ghastly risks of destruction to which their very power exposes them, those countries whose only strength is in the force of law need it all the more, since they are exposed to the same risks through decisions taken by others.

36. It was to meet that need that this Organization was established and exists today. The international community is organized essentially to ensure peace among peoples.

² See *Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, No. 1*, first meeting.

That is the ultimate goal, the purpose and the spirit underlying all the principles, organs, and procedures embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

37. Unfortunately, as has been stressed in the past few days both in the General Assembly and in this Committee, the world is far from having achieved a state of security. On the contrary, at the end of the 24 years of existence of the United Nations, despite all the efforts made and some successes achieved, the sign of the time seems to be insecurity. As was stated in the course of a symposium convened by the Nobel Foundation of Sweden, as reported in the *Christian Science Monitor* of 7 October, with the advent of nuclear weapons mankind is living on borrowed time.

38. While the watchword here is peace, there are places in the world where men are bent on killing one another. While the Organization proclaims the right of peoples and nations to self-determination and independence and the principle of non-intervention of States in the internal or external affairs of other States, there are peoples on the earth enduring the occupation of their soil by alien armed forces, pressure of all kinds, interference, or threats which encroach on their freedom. While here and elsewhere disarmament is demanded as an imperative need, the great Powers have not even begun the promised conversations on the limitation of nuclear weapons, and the world seems to have been abandoned to the uncurbed folly of the arms race.

39. While here and elsewhere we describe as a serious danger to peace the wretched conditions suffered by many peoples—the so-called “under-developed” peoples—and stress the duty which justice imposes on the industrialized nations to contribute effectively to their development, promises are not being fulfilled; famine, disease, illiteracy, poor housing and economic backwardness still prevail among the majority of mankind, and the gap between the rich and the poor nations instead of closing is widening daily. The worst aspect of this is that the contrast between the hard and at times brutal facts and the fine words and sacred principles is often directly or indirectly the work of those who in this forum utter those words and proclaim those principles.

40. Nothing can be more demoralizing or destructive than this paradox. When people realize that the facts do not tally with the words, they become discouraged and despairing; and this leads to violence. When men lose faith in the way of reason to obtain justice, he tries to take justice into his own hands. When man loses faith in spiritual values, he becomes brutish.

41. Must we not see in this the explanation of the wave of violence that today sweeps over this world of ours? The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, in his statement to the General Assembly, referred to the grave threat posed by this phenomenon, which he described as the “glorification of violence, its intellectual justification, the fostering of its moral legitimacy and its total diffusion via the modern mass media” [1771st plenary meeting, para. 121].

42. Allow me, Mr. Chairman, with all due modesty but in a spirit of genuine concern, to urge the tremendous responsibility of the adult generations, and particularly of

those who have some influence on the governing of the world and of their own States, for the crisis of frustration and rebellion affecting the youth of practically every country, great or small, developed or under-developed.

43. Young men and women, who whatever part of the world they live in are by nature actuated by disinterested and idealistic motives, cannot help but be deeply perturbed by the demoralizing effect of what they regard as lying and hypocrisy. If they are genuinely to believe in the values we proclaim, it is vital that we begin by demonstrating to them through our actual conduct our faith in those values.

44. Following the historical tradition of Chile, and mindful in particular of that responsibility, I fully endorse the statement made here the day before yesterday by the representative of Sweden that "principles, however solemnly declared and however eloquently phrased, are no substitute for day-to-day observance of those principles" [1654th meeting, para. 59]. Without any doubt this is the basic premise, the *sine qua non* for the establishment of any effective system of security.

45. The delegation of Chile is ready, as always, to support any measure calculated to promote peace and security among peoples; but in all sincerity we do not believe that it is sufficient for this purpose to make new declarations. It is hardly out of place to say that the world is tired of declarations; it wants action. What kind of action can create the conditions necessary to ensure peace among peoples? It seems to me that many representatives have already answered that question, particularly the representatives of Brazil, Sweden, Canada and Yugoslavia. I would like to single out just a few of the types of action needed.

46. First, the scrupulous observance by all countries without exception—large, medium-sized and small—of the fundamental principles of the Charter, namely, sovereign equality of all States; fulfilment in good faith of obligations assumed; settlement of international disputes by peaceful means; categorical renunciation of the threat or use of force; self-determination of peoples; and non-intervention in the affairs of other States.

47. In this connexion it might be useful to recall the words of Secretary-General U Thant when he visited my country in August 1966: "The greatest obstacle to the realization of principles of the Charter is the inescapable fact that power politics still operates, both overtly and covertly, in international relations. The concept of power politics . . . is the natural enemy of international order as envisaged in the Charter. It is also an expensive, and potentially disastrous, anachronism."

48. It is quite evident that far from disappearing, the anachronism is more and more in evidence. Although history illustrates *ad nauseam* that peace based on balance of power is so unstable that it is bound to lead to war, yet the great Powers still seek their security on that basis. In essence this amounts to contempt for the principles of the Charter and refusal to seek international security through United Nations channels. Closely linked to this point is observance of the principle of non-intervention, which is of the utmost importance as a basis for international peace and security, particularly for small and medium-sized nations.

49. At its twentieth session, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2131 (XX), of which Chile was a sponsor, concerning "the inadmissibility of intervention in the domestic affairs of States and the protection of their independence and sovereignty". Although the text of that decision was categorical and uncompromising, over the last four years the world has witnessed many cases, some really tragic, of overt or covert interference—political, economic and even armed intervention—by certain States in the affairs of others. Power politics leads the stronger States to seek pretexts like the theory of "ideological frontiers" and other such sophistries in order to consolidate their own power at the expense of the freedom of other peoples.

50. Our own contention is that no pretext or argument can legitimize the interference of any State, in whatever manner, least of all by the use of weapons, in the affairs of another State. It seems to us opportune to reiterate here what the delegation of Chile said at the twenty-second session of the General Assembly, namely that any violation of the principle of non-intervention "because it corrupts international life, generates opposing attitudes that also tend to violate that same principle, and creates dangers for the small nations which the international community should prevent. It also gives rise to tense situations into which the great Powers are dragged, thus endangering world peace" [1567th plenary meeting, para. 53].

51. It would be an unpardonable mistake to believe that the great Powers can violate that principle with impunity without incurring those dangers, simply by the allotment of spheres of influence. As several speakers have very eloquently reminded us here, history is essentially dynamic, and no one can turn a blind eye to the process of political, social and economic change which humanity is constantly undergoing in its search for truth, freedom and justice. All experience teaches us that it is vain and foolish to try to halt that process by force.

52. Secondly, it is an indispensable condition for strengthening international security that disarmament should once and for all be undertaken seriously and resolutely. Since the Second World War the great Powers have all the time been promising to disarm. Disarmament bodies have proliferated, and their results thus far have been meagre indeed. The situation has latterly grown worse, since no one any longer speaks straightforwardly of disarmament, and there is not even any progress being made in the regulation of armaments we were promised.

53. The main responsibility for this state of affairs falls on the super-Powers. They have ignored the successive appeals of the General Assembly and the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,³ and also the promises they made when they proposed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.⁴ Vertical proliferation, as it is called, of atomic weapons, multiple-head rockets, and ABM defensive systems, are a symptom of a mad arms race. Add to this the increase in sales of arms all over the world, kindling latent wars, and the picture is very bleak.

³ Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States, held at Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968.

⁴ Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed in London, Moscow and Washington on 1 July 1968.

54. Here again the effect of power politics is evident. No argument based on reason or justice can be adduced for the claim that the medium-sized and small nations should disarm while the great Powers continue to arm. It is an absurd and arbitrary argument based exclusively on force; but peace and security cannot be established on such foundations.

55. We therefore reiterate the words spoken by our Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his statement already cited, to the General Assembly in 1967: "... it is imperative that real progress should be made in the conversations of the great nuclear Powers on the practical means for their own disarmament, since the renunciation by the small States of any attempt to develop their own nuclear weapons will be of no avail unless it is accompanied by the nuclear disarmament of all States without exception" [*ibid.*, para. 28].

56. In accordance with that view, the Chilean delegation wholeheartedly supports Secretary-General U Thant's proposal to designate the decade of the seventies as a Disarmament Decade side by side with the Second United Nations Development Decade. And now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to turn to the third factor I wish to stress among those that might be mentioned, a factor of vital importance for the strengthening of security, namely the progress of effective international co-operation for economic development.

57. Since the views of Chile on this matter are well known and were reiterated yesterday by its Ambassador, Mr. Piñera, in the debate in the Second Committee⁵ on the United Nations Development Decade, I shall merely repeat that there can be no true peace except on a basis of justice, and this requires that the material things needed for human development should be equitably distributed among men, in accordance with what the Venezuelan Minister for Foreign Affairs, speaking in the General Assembly [1779th plenary meeting], called "international social justice", and what he described as the "common weal" of mankind.

58. In the Consensus of Viña del Mar,⁶ the Latin American countries crystallized the principles which all of them felt should govern the next steps towards international co-operation for development. The Chilean delegation believes that the practical application of those principles would be a positive and concrete step in favour of international security.

59. In the general debate during the twenty-first session, my country stated that "the best proof of good will on the part of the great Powers and of a real intention to disarm would be to initiate a rapid process of arms reduction and to devote a considerable part of the resources released to increasing aid to the developing countries" [1424th plenary meeting, para. 78]. At that time the amount spent on arms by the industrialized countries amounted to \$120,000 million a year, while the amount they were spending on the elimination of poverty in the developing world was only

just over \$10,000 million. Whereas the latter figure has remained stationary, Secretary-General U Thant points out in the introduction to his annual report⁷ that the figure for world expenditure for armaments now amounts to about \$200,000 million a year. In other words, a reduction by a mere 5 per cent in military expenditure could double international co-operation for development.

60. I am convinced that if all the Members of the United Nations, beginning with the great Powers, decided forthwith to proceed along those lines, scrupulously abiding by all the fundamental principles of the Charter and hence renouncing power politics; undertaking disarmament and effective co-operation for development; and also making genuine efforts to achieve universality in the United Nations, we should be laying the best possible foundations for the strengthening of international security.

61. This is definitely the path to be followed, in our view, if we are willing to look squarely at the 25 years of existence of the Organization. These are the measures, embodying not mere declarations but deeds, which we must envisage for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations in relation to the vital issue of international security. These are the measures we must begin to apply within the next few months. Evidence of principles applied to life, our actual behaviour, is what we must offer the peoples of the world if we truly wish to bring about peace.

62. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Chile for his kind words about me and his pledge of co-operation. We particularly welcome his presence as Chairman of the Chilean delegation and as Senator of his country.

63. Mr. EL-ZAYYAT (United Arab Republic): Mr. Chairman, I hope you are not going to deny me the pleasure of congratulating you and, through you, Ambassador Kolo, our Vice-Chairman, and Mr. Barnett, our Rapporteur, on your unanimous election to the Bureau of our Committee. Responding to your wish for brevity, I shall not elaborate. I am confident that you will understand the pleasure of my delegation in working under the guidance of such distinguished officers.

64. I would ask your indulgence also in permitting me to express my shock at the criminal murder of the President of Somalia, Dr. Abdelrashid Ali Shermarke, a great leader of Africa and a most respected personal friend. I wish to express my sorrow and sympathy to the Government and people of his country.

65. There can hardly be a subject that is more important to all of us here than the one our Committee is now discussing—the strengthening of international security. Our Organization was established to preserve security and attain peace. Peace is the dream the dreamers of 1945 wanted to come true. For them peace was a positive, active condition in which man was to live a fuller life, aspiring to health, knowledge, prosperity and happiness.

66. Twenty-three sessions of the General Assembly have come and gone. They have all laboured for peace. Yet,

⁵ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Second Committee, 1255th meeting.

⁶ Adopted by the Special Committee on Latin American Co-ordination at Viña del Mar, Chile, 15-17 May 1969.

⁷ Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 1A, para. 40.

today we begin the twenty-fourth session of the Assembly with several wars going on. There are still nations denied freedom and peoples denied equality and justice or, even, shelter. The gap between the rich and the poor is wider than it was and is getting wider still.

67. Twenty-four years ago man believed that by our co-operation in this Organization justice could replace force, that the impoverished hungry could be fed and that diseased peoples could be cured. Today, force and not justice seems to prevail. The Charter is defied with impunity. The world Organization is frustrated, its efforts spent in producing resolutions and recommendations that it cannot or will not implement. How many nations dare dream those dreams of the Charter anymore? How many nations are still determined to translate those dreams into deeds?

68. People outside this Organization look at it today wondering if the high hopes which attended its birth were justified. The question is asked: has man, in truth, ever sought to live in peace and justice, or was the 1945 “determination” reflected in the Charter a fleeting one, born of the then apparent futility of force and violence in the immediately preceding years of war?

69. The mind reels when it contemplates the triumphs of man in our generation; in the field of sciences: United States astronauts landing on the moon and shipfuls of Soviet cosmonauts circling the heavens. People wonder if man will also be able to solve his basic problems on earth. Will he be able to obtain the security necessary to his growth and to the development of all his potentials? Will this Organization help? People outside are today full of doubts.

70. The initiative of the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gromyko, in proposing the inclusion of the item of the strengthening of international security on the agenda [A/7654] was therefore timely indeed. Appreciation for it was expressed by our Foreign Minister in the general debate [1761st plenary meeting]. Our delegation wishes to express here further appreciation for Ambassador Malik's opening statement in this Committee [1652nd meeting]. The interest generated so far by this agenda item is also gratifying. Restating our values and rededicating ourselves to our principles have their importance in these times of doubt and torment.

71. The approach of the Charter to peace and security is broad and organic. It does not seek only the absence of war; it seeks the creation of conditions of freedom and progress conducive to a just and enduring peace. This organic interrelationship between peace and its essential conditions is pertinently reflected in Article 55 of the Charter, which provides for the “creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples”.

72. Economic and social progress is essential for real peace, as has repeatedly been stated, but the maintenance of peace and security is imperative for the fulfilment of all other purposes of the Charter. Without an effective world

machinery that guarantees peace, nations will have to fend for themselves. They will have to resort to the acquisition of armaments and yet more armaments—and the world is now spending, as we are told by Secretary-General U Thant, an estimated \$200,000 million a year. In their pursuit of elusive security they most likely will lose meaningful peace.

73. Besides our general interest in the strengthening of international peace and security, as a founding Member of the United Nations, our delegation has a special interest dictated by bitter experience. We do not view this issue in the world of the abstract; we do not view this issue in a vacuum. This is the third year that a part of our territory, together with part of the territory of two other Arab States Members of the United Nations, have been occupied by the forces of aggression and expansion. It is the twentieth year of forced exile for a million, and more, of the Arab people of Palestine. The world Organization has adopted on these two problems a number of resolutions and has set up a number of organs for the implementation of those resolutions. The response to the resolutions has been, and continues to be, disregard of the injunctions of the world Organization, obstruction of its efforts and defiance of its authority.

74. We consider the first imperative of international security to be the strict observance by States of the basic Charter prohibition of the use of force against the territorial integrity of other States. That principle has, as its corollary, the equally basic principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by conquest, a principle which has been reaffirmed by the General Assembly and the Security Council in a number of resolutions—in particular, resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967, which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

75. That principle has also found solemn expression in article 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,⁸ which provides that “No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized”.

76. The paramount importance of the strict observance of that principle was pointed out by the representative of Ceylon in his address before the Security Council on 12 September 1969⁹ when he stated:

“If that principle were not scrupulously observed, and if it were not effectively enforced, the United Nations would have no meaning or purpose. This is the heart of the matter.”

77. The second imperative of international security is scrupulous implementation of the resolutions of the United Nations, and in particular of the Security Council. The Security Council is the organ on which the Member States conferred primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the organ that they agreed would act on their behalf and whose decisions they all undertook to respect and carry out.

⁸ Signed at Bogotá on 30 April 1948.

⁹ *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-fourth Year, 1510th meeting.*

78. The draft appeal [A/C.1/L.469] before this Committee, in recognizing the necessity, above all, to implement without delay the observance by States of relevant decisions of the Security Council on the withdrawal of occupation troops from foreign territories, sees the problem of international security in its true dimensions.

79. It will be recalled that in the early years of the United Nations, critics reproached the Security Council for what they called its failure to take decisions as a consequence of the use of the veto. What will those critics say when decisions adopted unanimously by the Council are not implemented? Disregard of such resolutions assumes a specially disturbing character when it is coupled with denunciation of that body, reflections cast on its membership, and open defiance of its authority.

80. The draft appeal, moreover, points, in this connexion, to a most pertinent Article of the Charter, Article 6. Article 6 states that any Member of the United Nations "which has permanently violated the Principles contained in the . . . Charter may be expelled from the Organization".

81. The third imperative of security is the collective responsibility of all United Nations Members for the strengthening of international security. Member States have pledged to unite their strength and take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression. One of the basic underlying principles of the Charter is the proposition that aggression against one State is aggression against the international community, and that is why repelling the aggressor is the collective responsibility of all United Nations Members.

82. In that collective responsibility the permanent members of the Security Council have a special role which was explicitly recognized, regulated and sanctioned in the Charter. In the "Statement by the Delegations of the Four Sponsoring Governments on the Voting Procedure in the Security Council"¹⁰ which was presented to the San Francisco Conference, the "primary responsibilities of the permanent members" of the Security Council were emphasized and presented to the Conference as "essential if an international organization is to be created through which all peace-loving nations can effectively discharge their common responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security".

83. The activation of the machinery of enforcement and the system of sanctions which the Security Council was empowered to apply to the lawbreaker and the aggressor is the fourth and last imperative. Chapter 7 of the Charter is a keystone in the long struggle for ensuring respect for the will of the international community and for ensuring compliance with its injunctions. Certain historians of the League of Nations attributed its failure to the lack of a well-defined system of sanctions and an effective machinery available to it. What will future historians have to say should the United Nations—our United Nations—continue not to avail itself of the well-defined means and machinery of enforcement provided for it in its Charter?

¹⁰ See *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945*, volume XI, page 710.

84. My delegation supports the inclusion in the proposed appeal of provisions relating to the importance of the elaboration of "a generally acceptable definition of aggression" [A/C.1/L.468, section VI, para. 1] the elaboration of "the principles of friendly relations and co-operation of States", and the achievement of "an understanding on United Nations peace-keeping operations". /Ibid./

85. Many years have passed since the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting in Cairo in 1964, recommended to the General Assembly of the United Nations that it adopt, on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary, a declaration on the principles of peaceful coexistence and considered that that "declaration" would "constitute an important step towards the codification of these principles".¹¹ We hope that the United Nations bodies entrusted with the study of these and other important subjects, such as *apartheid* and decolonization, will double their praiseworthy, if somewhat slow, endeavours in order to report such results as they may arrive at to the next General Assembly session.

86. In the brilliant statement made by Ambassador Araujo Castro of Brazil [1653rd meeting] he mentioned the necessity for revision of the Charter. We are sure that the Committee entrusted with that matter will give his remarks the attention they certainly deserve. But are the difficulties our Organization faces today the result of a defective Charter? Is it that our "bible" is not complete? Or is it that the "bible" has not enough believers, or that the believers do not practise what they believe? -

87. The United Nations is approaching its twenty-fifth anniversary. Organs have been set up to study the best means of celebrating that anniversary and a number of valuable suggestions and ideas have been put forward which will be carefully studied by all of us. The twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations is, or should be, more than a ceremony; it could and should offer a much-needed and invaluable opportunity for reassessment and re-appraisal, rededication and reactivation. Essential to any meaningful observance of such an occasion is the ensuring of full respect for the basic norms of the Charter. Faith and confidence of peoples in the United Nations as an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace and the promotion of progress should be restored. The proposed appeal gives an opportunity and poses a challenge for all peoples of the world to think and suggest how these goals can possibly be achieved.

88. Ideas expressed in this Committee about postponement or prolongation of this debate until the next session of the Assembly perhaps miss a point. The appeal invites responses. Those responses will be varied and will be coming, it is hoped, from nations and States which are not Members of the United Nations as well as from Member States of the United Nations. Such responses, together with comments made and to be made in this Committee, can be the basis of the final document that the representative of Sweden foresees. Any such document would have to reflect the consensus of our Organization. This is obviously essential for its effectiveness. Ambassador Malik has said that the draft is open to suggestions and changes, and we have no doubt quite a few will and perhaps should be made.

¹¹ See document A/5763 (mimeographed).

89. Let me make this point again: my delegation, having heard previous important statements made in this Committee, is of the opinion that differences on details need not delay the adoption by our Assembly of the proposed appeal. A more general, perhaps shorter, text may be agreed upon in this Assembly. Such a text will solicit opinions and suggestions that may be received by our Secretary-General before our meeting next autumn. Our Governments will have to be kept informed of any replies received. On the basis of all the replies and comments, the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly is sure to reach an agreed text to be declared at the same time as we celebrate our twenty-fifth anniversary.

90. It is important to assure the doubtful outside this Organization. It is important to reassert our faith and our commitments. It is important to solicit from outside the United Nations any aid that may be coming to us.

91. We believe that the United Nations has now what we hope will not become a lost opportunity to tackle anew the problem of the strengthening of international security. Let us hope it will succeed. Perhaps next year, next autumn, we can dare to think, in the words of Homer, of "good, joyful nations joining in leagues of peace".

92. Mr. MONTEIL (France) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, it is not usual for the French delegation to make long statements, and since this concern for brevity is in keeping with the wish you expressed, you will not mind if we congratulate you for having expressed such a wish, and if we add, with your permission, that we are most happy to see a diplomat of your experience, wisdom and reputation preside over the work of the First Committee. Our congratulations go also to your eminent colleagues on the Bureau, Mr. Kolo of Nigeria and Mr. Barnett of Jamaica. We are convinced that they will be worthy successors to the team so ably directed last year by Mr. Vinci.

93. Finally, Mr. Chairman, I should like to thank you for having expressed on behalf of all of us our deep regrets to the Government and people of Somalia at the tragic death of their President. May I ask the representative of Somalia to be kind enough to transmit to his Government and the family of President Shermarke our sincere and heartfelt condolences.

94. In making this statement my delegation wishes first of all to stress that it understands and appreciates the interest to which the inclusion in our agenda of the item on the strengthening of international security has given rise.

95. Like most previous speakers, I shall abstain from mentioning even in general terms the long series of conflicts and tensions whether past or present, which would recall our polemics and our differences, but which in fact justify our common concern. May I rather be allowed to regard the unanimous vote deciding on inclusion of the item proposed by the Soviet Union as the expression of the legitimate wish of the Members of our Assembly to make known at this session already their thoughts on a problem of whose specific importance we are all well aware.

96. This feeling of exceptional gravity can actually be explained by the many and various forms which the need

for security takes among the peoples of the world. It is because of this multifariousness that the conditions for security themselves seem so numerous. I shall mention only the main ones, and this in the briefest way, since in our view the very text of the Charter combines the essential elements in the purposes and principles it lays down for our Organization.

97. Brief as this enumeration of the general conditions for international security may be, my delegation feels bound to stress how much the present disarmament efforts, incomplete and illusory as they are, still cannot dispel the feelings of uncertainty and fear that so many men still have. In point of fact, we see in the very title of the item under consideration a confirmation of the state of affairs which we noted last year in the First Committee. No matter what the provisions of resolution 225 (1968) of the Security Council or those of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons [*see resolution 2373 (XXII)*] may be, many Members of the Organization doubt that their security is really assured. And how could it be otherwise as long as the process of nuclear disarmament, which France earnestly hopes will come about, has not really begun?

98. Nobody will be surprised either if the representative of France in this room points out once again that there can be no lasting international security if there is no general easing of tension, that is to say, if there is no disarmament of the minds, without the development of a wish for understanding and co-operation, and if, in areas where coercion and intrigue still prevail, men are not urged to come together and to co-operate.

99. The repudiation of any policy of blocs or hegemony also shows to what extent we can fall prey to discouragement, anguish, and finally to the insecurity created in some parts of the world by the contempt in which the minority holds the rights of the majority.

100. International security is in fact endangered by every type of contingency. It is endangered when fundamental freedoms, which must be guaranteed without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion, are infringed; when the territorial integrity or political independence of a State—of any State—is violated; when economic development is held up, because the fate of hundreds of millions of men is at stake, as well as their future relations among themselves and with the most favoured nations; and it is endangered, as I was saying a few moments ago, every time the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter are ignored.

101. For we must indeed recognize that the conditions, both general and particular, for international security are in fact laid down in the purposes and principles which the founding fathers of the United Nations set themselves almost a quarter of a century ago. Nobody will state that these objectives, dictated to the peoples of the United Nations by the most tragic of all experiences, have lost any of their importance but nobody will state either that they have been achieved.

102. To grieve over this failure is a waste of time unless we all sincerely want to join in a common effort to examine the causes of that failure and seek to remedy it. And since this debate on international security makes us go back to

reading the Charter and to considering the activities of the Members of our Organization, it seems fitting that on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations the possibility of such joint reflection should be afforded us by the inclusion of this item.

103. In any case that is how we have understood the appeal made to us and it is in that spirit that my country, which wants to join in any effort to promote a relaxation of tension among the nations and ensuring peace in the world, has given some thought to the ways in which we can abide by our collective obligations and encourage our Organization to achieve its aims.

104. From the comments and clarifications made by the sponsors and other delegations, we take it that the main purpose of the substance of the proposals put forward is to strengthen the action of our Organization. And our first thoughts are along those same lines as we believe that, as far as the substance is concerned, we should not only reaffirm the need of respecting all the principles of the Charter, but encourage the operation of its machinery or consider the implementation of some of its hitherto neglected provisions.

105. To reaffirm our duty to comply with the provisions of the Charter is all the more necessary today when experience has given us clear warning of the dramatic consequences of ignoring this obligation, and it might be appropriate in this connexion to allude more directly to some specific problems linked to infringement of the territorial integrity of States or the fundamental principle of national independence and self-determination which even today affect international security.

106. But the fact that we single out these principles because of their importance today and that we earnestly advocate their implementation does not mean that the General Assembly should give them special prominence. We would be weakening the authority of the Charter if we tended to grade its provisions and my delegation could not agree to view with a differing or varying degree of importance the violation of any specific principle. The strengthening of international security requires from all of us equal respects for every Article of the Charter. In this connexion we do not think it superfluous for Members of the Organization to remember the principles which must guide States in their international relations. These are the principles of co-operation, friendly relations, sovereignty, equal rights, territorial integrity, political independence, respect for the right of all peoples freely to choose their social system, and the principle that all disputes must be settled through peaceful means and without resorting to the threat or use of force.

107. To encourage the smooth operation of the Charter machinery is tantamount to expressing a wish that specialized committees such as the Special Committee of Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression, and the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, set up by our Organization, should redouble their efforts, and to reaffirming to them unanimously the active support of our Assembly. We also wish to note in connexion with the

preservation of peace and international security, the existence of regional agreements or bodies in which many States of the world take part. The French delegation considers that such regional organization, provided it is conceived without any idea of hegemony but, on the contrary, in a spirit of wide co-operation, can usefully serve the cause of peace.

108. Finally, we believe that the Soviet draft appeal [*A/C.1/L.468*] is right in drawing our attention to the possibility of applying Article 28 of the Charter concerning periodic meetings of the Security Council at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative. We are grateful to the representative of the Soviet Union for having made clear in his statement that the Council should not strive to replace at all costs bodies of the Assembly dealing with specific problems. My delegation would add besides that in its view nothing is more useful than the general outpouring of opinions and suggestions during a General Assembly session, and we consider it as a welcome token of the importance attached to our Committee that all its members are able to discuss a proposal concerning the Security Council.

109. But it is a fact that this body was vested by the Charter with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Charter has its shortcomings and its imperfections, but fundamentally it has established an appropriate balance among the main bodies and has made a realistic distribution of powers. The strengthening of international security is of necessity predicated upon a strengthening of the authority of the Council. We therefore think that any proposal designed to ensure the full implementation of the Articles relating to the powers of the Council and its operation deserves to be studied with the greatest interest by the Member States.

110. Such are the preliminary observations of the delegation of France on the substance of the themes which could be elaborated with a view to strengthening international security. With respect to the form that those proposals could take, that will be determined by the very nature of our debate.

111. Everything seems to show that it is essential for our Organization, meeting on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of its creation, to look closely at itself so that the Member States may decide on the most appropriate means of achieving the purposes they set themselves. For that reason the procedure of an appeal, more solemn than a resolution, seems more justified, and the French delegation willingly supports that choice. But that appeal will be more effective, will be better understood, accepted and complied with by the international community if it gains the unanimous approval of all Members of our Organization.

112. This aim to achieve unanimity will impose certain conditions. In the drafting of such an appeal, certain turns of phrases and specific ways of thinking, which do not seem to us the happiest way of expressing the general opinion, will have to be excluded. Account will have to be taken of substantive changes to which we, among other delegations, have alluded. Finally, the tireless search, in whatever way

necessary, for a common factor best able to express our will for peace will have to be pursued.

113. The difficulties of that task must not be underestimated since the success of our efforts depends to some extent on our evincing from the outset certain attitudes of mind which to us seem essential if we are to have international security: we must give proof of a spirit of co-operation, confidence and sincerity. But it is good that the Soviet initiative requires that we should from the outset, furnish proof of such an attitude, and what is even better is that the sponsors of the proposal have set an example by assuring us the first day, that they are open to all suggestions.

114. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of France for the generous sentiments that he expressed about me.

115. I should like to inform the members of this Committee that the list of speakers was closed at 12 noon and that 58 delegations have inscribed their names for this debate. In view of the fact that the time at our disposal is short, I hope that all the delegations will extend their co-operation to the Bureau so that the debate on this item can be concluded by the end of next week. Far be it from me to suggest anything which would curtail the sovereign right of expression of any of the delegations. Consistent with that, may I appeal for shorter statements so that we

may hear at least 12 speakers every day. Theoretically we have five working days and altogether we can hold 10 meetings but as a matter of practice it is extremely difficult to schedule more than eight meetings a week.

116. After the conclusion of this debate next week, it is my intention, in accordance with the decision taken earlier by the Committee, to take up for consideration at the beginning of the following week the invitational aspects of the Korean question. Last year we devoted five meetings to that matter. I would earnestly hope that this year we may be able to reduce the number. I am in consultation with the interested delegations to that end, that is, with regard to the invitational aspects of the Korean question.

117. In the matter of the present item, may I suggest that all delegations engage in informal consultations so that we may have a clear idea by the end of next week of the kind of action we should take to dispose of the item on strengthening international security.

118. On Monday, 20 October, there will be only one meeting, at 10.30 a.m. There will be no meeting in the afternoon because of the elections to be held in the General Assembly for the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.