



CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 103: The strengthening of international security ( <i>continued</i> ) . .	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 inform the Committee that there are only five speakers on the list for this morning, besides the representative of the Soviet Union, who has asked for the floor in order to make a brief statement. There are six names on the list for this afternoon. Should any representative intending to speak tomorrow or later wish to take the floor today instead, he would be most welcome to do so since he would thus enable the Committee to utilize its time more fully.
2. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): In compliance with the request you made at an earlier meeting, Mr. Chairman, I should like simply to say that the delegation of Jordan wishes you, the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur all success during this session of the Assembly.
3. We must at the very outset express our gratitude to the Soviet Union for having presented this timely item for our deliberation. The various statements which have been made reflect the importance of the item and the need for adequate action. Mr. Araujo Castro of Brazil emphasized the fact that the philosophy of sheer power now prevails everywhere and that, because of the lack of effective action, power and violence enjoy respectability inasmuch as theories and doctrines are advanced to justify them [1652nd meeting]. Unfortunately, that is true. This new trend, which was very ably analysed by Mr. Araujo Castro, can be even better understood when we consider its background.
4. Why is it that people resort to force and violence as a substitute for the law of the Charter? The answer is simple. The failure of the world Organization to invoke the Charter and impose its will to prevent the flouting of Security Council resolutions is one of the main factors in this new trend and for that reason, as Mr. Aylwin, the representative of Chile, rightly reminded us, insecurity has become the symbol of our time [1657th meeting]. The leader of the Chilean delegation also reminded us that this unfortunate trend will continue because there can be no security unless there is true peace, and true peace can be built only on justice.
5. People cannot take us seriously, no matter how many days and weeks we spend debating a threat to peace, unless our actions reflect a genuine desire and determination to check threats to peace. No unanimity or consensus is enough if the paper on which it is written is meant only for the archives of the United Nations.
6. The Soviet appeal [A/C.1/L.468] has rightly drawn a clear distinction between the legitimate struggle of people to assert their rights to country, freedom, dignity and self-determination and those cases where aggression has been resorted to to deny those rights. Ambassador Malik has ably stressed that distinction. In this legitimate struggle people resort to arms because every means of peaceful expression has been taken away from them and the world Organization, despite persistent appeals, has not come to their help. I am referring to the struggle now being waged in several areas of the world, including the Middle East, Viet-Nam and Africa.
7. The Security Council has decided on condemnation too many times. It has issued warnings time and again. Neither those condemnations nor those so-called final warnings have been followed by adequate action when even violations of a graver nature have been committed. Against this background do we in all sincerity expect the people of the world to take us seriously? Indeed, how can such utterances lead to fruitful results?
8. In this field, the political field, there is not much to be said about United Nations successes. Fortunately, the United Nations is also concerned with other fields of human endeavour. We must give full credit to the Organization for what has been achieved in the field of economic, social and other non-political matters. If the United Nations has scored successes in non-political fields, it is mainly due to genuine co-operation by the international community which has not been so very evident in the realm of politics.
9. The United Nations was able to stop bloodshed and achieve a cease-fire. But we know that a cease-fire alone is not enough. Nor is a truce of an armistice enough unless it is followed by the immediate withdrawal from territories occupied by force. That too is not enough unless the Security Council works for permanent peace based on justice.
10. Those are Charter principles. Their abandonment can lead only to a return to the law of the jungle and political anarchy. A cease-fire in this case becomes a licence for occupation and consolidation of power over the van-

quished. The inaction of the Security Council, particularly of some of the Powers which have special responsibility under the Charter in such cases, becomes an open violation of the Charter. This is all the more so since paragraph 4 of Article 2 of the Charter states that:

“All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.”

11. Let me also emphasize in that connexion the question of the double standard dictated by power politics or political expediency. In order not to discuss things in the abstract let us compare two living examples of occupation: one in the Middle East and the recent one in Latin America. When part of the territory of a Latin American State was occupied by the forces of its neighbour this summer, the United States was instrumental in bringing about unconditional and immediate withdrawal from that territory. Ninety-six hours were fixed for withdrawal. But when there was a similar situation earlier in the Middle East, no such speedy action was taken. No time-limit for complete withdrawal was fixed. No application of the relevant provisions of the Charter was encouraged. Inaction was the symbol of the United Nations on this problem. While 96 hours were fixed for withdrawal in Latin America, the Israeli occupation of our territories has now continued for over 28 months, but no action has been taken to bring it to an end. On the other hand, when in Latin America the State concerned refused to withdraw from the occupied territory until certain conditions were met, the United States and other Members refused to accept that request and insisted that withdrawal should be unconditional. And when withdrawal was delayed, a draft resolution was presented to the Organization of American States calling for the following measures: first, the breaking of diplomatic relations; second, the breaking of consular relations; third, the interruption of trade in arms or implements of war of any kind; and fourth, the interruption of all trade, direct or indirect, with the exception of foodstuffs, medicines and medical supplies that might be sent for humanitarian reasons.

12. In the Middle East, where the situation is much graver, the United States has not seen fit to advocate similar measures. On the contrary, it has taken steps to strengthen the aggressor and to provide him with the most modern weapons of destruction, including the latest aircraft, to destroy our economy and kill our people. And Jordan is a friend of the United States.

13. Jordan was given United States assurance of its territorial integrity. Now, Israel would like to see the United States become, and here I am using the phrase of our newspaper *Ad-Dustur*, “an open recruiting centre for it”. A spokesman in the American Embassy in Tel-Aviv said, according to a Jewish Telegraphic Agency message of 14 October 1969, that “Americans could no longer lose their citizenship if they become citizens of Israel or serve in Israel’s armed forces”.

14. We were told that American military personnel are not serving in the armed forces of Israel; but we are further told

that those who are serving are doing so as individuals. To us it makes little difference whether they serve as individuals or in any other capacity. The fact still remains that they are American nationals and that American laws are being stretched to the point of enabling them to participate actively in a war against a country that the United States Government itself recognizes as friendly.

15. On the same day the American denial was published, that is, Sunday 19 October, *The New York Times* reported that a 19 year-old American had died in a training accident with the Israeli army on 5 October. Is it not an irony that the United States, which exported educationalists and missionaries to our area in the past, is now exporting young Americans, and Phantom Jets and other destructive weapons? In the light of what has been recently revealed, we find no assurance that American citizens of the Jewish faith did not participate in the Israeli armed aggression of 5 June. Now, more are enlisting. Shall we take it that the United States, instead of exporting the values of Jefferson and Washington and others, is now sending its youth to fight in Viet-Nam and with Israel against its own self-interests?

16. Do these measures lead to the strengthening of international security? No, both wars are immoral and both are wrong and the United States would be better off if it stopped feeding them. This is a very bad investment; it creates bitterness and leads to more wars. The American people should always remember that the United States involvement in Viet-Nam started with sending a few advisers to the area. Now the Israelis are getting many American nationals acting either as advisers or in some other capacity.

17. Hardly a day passes without Israeli aircraft raiding our towns and villages, spreading death and terror. And never, I am sure, has the world ever heard of Jordanian planes playing the same role over Israel. We do not even have planes to defend our skies. If any help is to be offered, it is to the victim, not to the occupier. These are the values of the Charter, as we understand the Charter. Certainly this policy does not promote international security. Nor is it within the scope of the Charter, which was intended to save future generations from the scourge of war.

18. In the Security Council, Israeli withdrawal from our lands was incorporated in a resolution that had other principles worded in a manner that encouraged mis-interpretation. To my knowledge this is a unique case in the history of the practice of the Security Council of the United Nations.

19. The United Nations has accomplished very little to bring about permanent peace based on justice because its practice has been confined mostly to palliative or temporary measures. It was able to stop the fighting but, we submit, this is not all the United Nations can and should do. Cease-fire and truce and armistice are military matters of a temporary nature. They do not settle disputes. If permitted to continue they may freeze the situation for a while but wars eventually may not be avoided.

20. We have witnessed such developments in Asia and Africa; we may witness more of this if the United Nations continues to be a place for freezing problems, not solving

them. The unfortunate thing is that cease-fire and truce or armistice have apparently developed into a common practice which has become a goal in itself. It has become a device for the containment of minor wars. It has taken the Security Council away from its main function of maintaining peace and finding permanent solutions to a situation where it has become concerned mainly with military supervision of cease-fires or armistices.

21. It is also worth mentioning that even when the Security Council calls for a truce and even after an armistice agreement is reached and becomes an instrument of the Security Council, approved by it, certain members in the Security Council do not have the courage or the will to ensure the sanctity of the Security Council agreement.

22. I refer to another specific case: and I do so simply in order to avoid discussing things in the abstract. We have to look at our past practice, see the defects in our work and have the courage to admit our mistakes and find out how to avoid them.

23. In 1948 the Security Council came to the conclusion that the situation in Palestine had become untenable and on 16 November 1948 called upon the parties to negotiate an armistice.<sup>1</sup> The armistice agreements were reached pursuant to that resolution. What is more, the action of the Security Council was taken in accordance with Chapter VII: Chapter VII was invoked by the Security Council to bring about these agreements. Article I of the Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement states, *inter alia*:

“1. The injunction of the Security Council against resort to military force in the settlement of the Palestine question shall henceforth be scrupulously respected by both Parties;

“2. No aggressive action by the armed forces—land, sea, or air—of either Party shall be undertaken, planned, or threatened against the people or the armed forces of the other; . . .

“3. The right of each Party to its security and freedom from fear of attack by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected;

“4. The establishment of an armistice between the armed forces of the two Parties is accepted as an indispensable step toward the liquidation of armed conflict and the restoration of peace in Palestine.”<sup>2</sup>

24. Those provisions amount to an agreement of non-aggression. But later, when it suited Israel, this non-aggression pledge, the Armistice Agreement, was unilaterally revoked. The Security Council resolution on this very matter, adopted pursuant to Chapter VII of the Charter, was thus defied by Israel. The Security Council did nothing to stop the Israelis and safeguard that instrument. One wonders how it happened that the armistice agreements in the Middle East were concluded under Chapter VII but later Chapter VII was not invoked to protect those very

agreements. There was no doubt about the Israeli abrogation of the agreements, or about the 5 June aggression. But how is it that the armistice agreements were not protected by the very organ which sponsored them and brought about their creation? Instead of invoking Chapter VII the Security Council started all over again to look only for a cease-fire and observers, an attitude which frustrated the hopes of the peoples of the United Nations.

25. It was such circumstances which brought about the present developments in our area, in Viet-Nam, in Africa and in other regions. It was that development which brought about what is taking place in many regions today. Certainly, when the United Nations does not act the people have to find other means to protect their rights. They took a dim view of the United Nations. They had a bad experience. Today there are dark clouds over many areas in the world. It is bad for the United Nations and bad for the whole world to permit political or territorial designs to prevail over Charter principles and values. This policy of contradictions and accommodations encouraged the use of force to dictate terms and conditions. Those responsible for it bear a grave responsibility.

26. What is more ominous is the attitude of the Members who incorporated Chapter VII in the Charter as the remedy to ensure peace and justice and who now passively observe forcible occupation of territories. In that context the principle of inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force is flouted and grossly violated. Our Secretary-General stated in the introduction to the annual report on the work of the Organization submitted to the twenty-second session: “It would, in my view, lead to disastrous consequences if the United Nations were to abandon or compromise this fundamental principle.”<sup>3</sup>

27. By virtue of paragraph 1 of Article 4 of the Charter all States undertook to carry out their obligations under the Charter. Furthermore, as a condition of its admission to the United Nations every State undertook to abide by the Charter and all United Nations resolutions. However, when a State defies United Nations resolutions and adamantly refuses to carry out its obligations we find that the United Nations confines itself to a mere repetition of its resolutions, an attitude which undermines the Charter and weakens the Organization and does not help the cause of peace or generate faith and confidence.

28. I have touched upon some points and dwelt in more depth on the issues affecting our part of the world. If I have not mentioned other important questions specifically, it is because they were ably treated by many colleagues around this table. The debate, to which I have listened attentively, has demonstrated that the appeal by the USSR is a timely one. We have come to a point where, in our opinion, a renewal of faith in the Organization and a renewal of determination to abide by our obligations under the Charter and comply with the resolutions of the appropriate organs of the United Nations has become imperative. The Soviet appeal aims at the fulfilment of those objectives. It recognizes that the ills lie not in the Charter but in the Member States of the United Nations. My colleague

<sup>1</sup> Security Council resolution 62 (1948).

<sup>2</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Fourth Year, Special Supplement No. 1.*

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 1A*, para. 47.

Ambassador El-Zayyat of the United Arab Republic eloquently asked the question: "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?" [1657th meeting, para. 56.]

29. We wholeheartedly endorse the Soviet appeal, which may need some strengthening, such as the addition of the subparagraph suggested by Ambassador Khatri of Nepal which would request the Security Council to take effective practical steps against those who are responsible for situations that constitute a threat to peace and security. We shall also support any changes that may strengthen the text. Many ideas have been presented by representatives here. We shall look favourably upon any text which may strengthen the appeal of the Soviet Union so that it may become a renewal of faith and determination to take practical and appropriate steps to strengthen international peace and security, something which is badly needed today.

30. Mr. BORCH (Denmark): Mr. Chairman, respecting your wish but also trusting that you full well know in what high regard you are held by the Danish mission, let me start immediately with my remarks on the item "The strengthening of international security".

31. The document introduced by the Soviet Union deals with a broad range of far-reaching international issues. The problems of international *détente* and security are of decisive importance to all nations, not least the smaller countries. My delegation welcomes the Soviet initiative in bringing forward this subject. We feel that we too should make a few observations of a general nature.

32. Maintaining international peace and security is the basic purpose of the United Nations. In some cases the United Nations has made valuable and often decisive contributions towards this objective. On the other hand, we must admit that in other cases the United Nations has been unable to prevent or to stop conflicts in various parts of the world. Some of these conflicts still go on at this very moment. At the same time the strategic arms race is accelerating dangerously. And a situation in which two thirds of the world's population live in poverty and misery and in which the gap between the more and the less developed countries is widening not only is morally unacceptable but contains the seeds of future conflicts.

33. If we are faced with international tensions and conflicts it is, of course, because of underlying political differences of interest between nations. But it is also true that across all national and ideological barriers all nations have a deep common interest in maintaining peace and strengthening the possibilities of peace. That is the very *raison d'être* of the United Nations. The question is how to translate that common interest into concrete action. Part of the answer must surely be that through our policies we should aim at strengthening the authority of the United Nations and the future possibilities of the United Nations as a factor for peace. The work of the United Nations should be carried on and intensified on all the fronts of peace.

34. My Government feels that in a number of areas there are concrete possibilities of constructive action by the

United Nations. I am thinking particularly of disarmament and arms control, decolonization, respect for human rights, and economic and social development. Let me just mention a few specific issues which in our view should have high priority in our deliberations, not wanting thereby to attach less importance to the other problems just mentioned.

35. First, disarmament. The lesson of the sixties has been that agreements and understandings on disarmament and arms control contribute to international confidence and security. Denmark's interest in the cause of disarmament was expressed in our rapid ratification of the nuclear test-ban Treaty,<sup>4</sup> the Treaty on outer space,<sup>5</sup> and the non-proliferation Treaty.<sup>6</sup> New steps should be taken very soon to keep up the momentum of the international disarmament negotiations. The news that prospects are favourable for agreement on demilitarization of the sea-bed is very encouraging. But the most pressing problem is the need of steps to limit the spiralling strategic arms race. Here the chances of success obviously depend on the attitudes of the great Powers. I shall return to this matter in a moment.

36. Second, peace-keeping. Denmark's interest in this field of United Nations activities is well-known. We have taken part in practically all the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. It is important that studies currently under way should be stepped up in order that we may be prepared should situations arise in the future in which international peace-keeping operations will once again become an essential element in the settlement of conflicts.

37. And third, peace-making. In the long run the objective must be a situation in which the United Nations is an effective instrument of the rule of international law. In the short run we can contribute to developments in that direction by strengthening existing machinery and developing new methods with a view to ensuring that the problems and conflicts inevitable in a world of rapid change are solved in a peaceful manner.

38. In the sphere of military technology we are faced with new developments. During the sixties the strategic balance has been relatively stable. With the development and deployment of new arms systems the strategic arms race is entering a new and much more unstable phase. If the accelerated arms race is allowed to continue unchecked this may have dangerous consequences for the international political climate and the possibilities of international *détente*. An agreement on limitation of offensive and defensive strategic arms would be an extremely important step which would moreover pave the way for further progress in the field of disarmament. It is the hope of my Government that negotiations on those problems will be opened as soon as possible.

39. Several speakers have referred to the question of a conference on European security problems. The views of my Government on that issue are well known. Our position

<sup>4</sup> Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

<sup>5</sup> Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies; see resolution 2222 (XXI).

<sup>6</sup> Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; see resolution 2373 (XXII).

is that a European security conference is one of the means that can help promote *détente* and co-operation, provided that it is properly prepared in terms of participation, timing and agenda. We have welcomed the initiative taken by Finland. We intend to contribute towards the preparatory work. At the moment we are discussing with other countries the whole problem of future East-West negotiations, which concrete issues best lend themselves to fruitful negotiations and an early resolution, and how a useful process of negotiation could best be initiated.

40. The debate has shown that on a number of points the language of the Soviet paper reflects controversial evaluations and views. On other points the wording calls for further clarification. I agree completely with our British colleague when he said that we should be extremely careful to say exactly what we mean in any statement and not to be led into misconstructions of the Charter or into careless phrases which could later be abused.

41. And sometimes one has the impression that perhaps we do not mean exactly the same things even if we use the same words. I am thinking for instance of the reference in the Soviet paper to "...the principles of sovereignty, equality, territorial inviolability of each State, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the rights of all peoples freely to choose their social system" [A/C.1/L.468, section III] against the background of other recent statements and events. To us those principles have universal application.

42. At the same time we have noted with satisfaction several elements in the Soviet paper that we welcome as evidence of a positive attitude towards the United Nations. Let me for example mention the interesting remarks about peace-keeping and the role of the Security Council.

43. If we are to pursue the matter beyond this debate, I believe that we would be well advised to base ourselves upon the elements of the debate that could serve as a reaffirmation of basic purposes and principles of the United Nations and as a high-lighting of tasks which should have first priority in our work for peace and *détente*.

44. Mr. PINIES (Spain) (*translated from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, I would like to comply with your request, but both I personally and my delegation find it difficult not to pay you a well-earned tribute for the zeal with which for many years you have devoted yourself to the tasks and activities of the United Nations. For that I offer you my congratulations and my respect, taking the opportunity at the same time to congratulate the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur.

45. The day on which the United Nations made peace-keeping the primary article of faith in its political creed and the backbone of its institutional system, it was giving concrete form to a human aspiration as old as man himself, an aspiration always pursued but never attained by man in his long pilgrimage through history. The time has now come, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, to make a fresh effort in the interests of the noble, intriguing, ambitious and necessary task of achieving and safeguarding peace. For that reason, any proposal calculated to strengthen peace and security will be

given the highest priority and urgent attention by my delegation.

46. In this renewed effort to find solutions to the problems inherent in the strengthening of security, in my delegation's view we have to start out from the basic fact that the strengthening of peace and security presupposes the strengthening of our own Organization, as the channel for all constructive efforts towards peace and the institutional framework within which, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, operative instruments capable of establishing peace on just foundations are devised.

47. In the general debate in plenary that has just ended, a common theme running through all the speeches has been a unanimous appeal urging the dramatic and urgent need to salvage, before it is too late, the prestige and moral authority of the United Nations, the ultimate hope of a world still ravaged by injustice. Today more than ever before we must hold on to the fact that the Organization is the only body that can establish an international order of peace based on the regulation of force and the working out and developing of principles of international ethics and rules of law governing the conduct of nations. But it will only be able to do so insofar as it has sufficient moral strength to put a curb on the political power of States and make them comply with its resolutions.

48. The Organization will be unable to survive if States, particularly those having special obligations because they have been granted special powers, systematically refuse to comply with the resolutions of its principal organs, basing their refusal on unilateral interpretations serving their own ends and flouting the interpretation of its norms and principal given by the Organization through its resolutions. If we deny these resolutions their objective value as a source of international obligations, we are depriving the United Nations of the only instrument it possesses for imposing the principles and purposes of the Charter. For if private interests prevailed over the criteria laid down by the Organization, the hypothetical bases for coexistence and international order would disappear and the door would be left open to arbitrary action and injustice of every kind.

49. If strengthening the moral authority and prestige of the United Nations is the first of the tasks we must set ourselves, my delegation considers that it would also be appropriate simultaneously to strengthen the whole institutional machinery of the United Nations and thus turn the Organization into an effective instrument in the service of peace and security. We feel that the Charter signed at San Francisco has been overtaken in many respects by the dynamic events of a historic period characterized by swift movement and the horizontal expansion of the international community; and while it is true that its purposes and principles retain their full validity, it is equally true that the institutional machinery of the Organization has grown old and cramped, and that the structure and functions of its organs call for urgent reform.

50. The establishment of peace is a joint operation in which all States are called upon to make their contributions; it cannot be left exclusively in the hands of the great Powers. Indeed one of the serious ills afflicting the

Organization is that the requirements of what the great Powers call realism act as a curb on the adoption of resolutions and even on the discussion of items. The United Nations is thus gradually becoming a vast sound chamber, devoid of all political content and of all power of decision.

51. One of the most encouraging aspects of the Soviet initiative [A/C.I/L.468], and one that could open up new and hopeful prospects for making use of the machinery that the Organization now places at our disposal is, we feel, the proposal that the Security Council should be convened under Article 28, paragraph 2, of the Charter in periodic meetings, with the participation of members of Governments, at which important agreements could be reached for the general strengthening of international security.

52. The persistence of conflicts and tensions endangering peace is largely due to the difficulties the Security Council has in formulating its intent. To avoid a possible use of the prerogatives granted by the Charter to its permanent members, the Council is forced to seek a consensus sufficiently broad to be acceptable to all and hence open to different and contradictory interpretations which finally rob it of all content.

53. That is why my delegation considers that by giving life to Article 28, paragraph 2, we can open up a new path rich in possibilities. In addition to the regular meetings of the Security Council there would be others which the Charter terms periodic meetings. These periodic meetings would provide a suitable framework for examining questions affecting the general state of international security and causing permanent danger and tension. They would deal not with urgent issues but rather with the kind which give rise to constant tension and on which the General Assembly has already repeatedly expressed its opinion and crystallized the views of the Organization, or with the kind of weighty issues that have not even been submitted to it on the grounds that, for the reasons already mentioned, no solution is likely to be forthcoming from that quarter. The fact that these periodic meetings would not be required to adopt urgent decisions would make it desirable for the permanent members to waive the prerogatives granted them under Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter.

54. If while the Security Council was holding a periodic meeting urgent events or events calling for the adoption of specific measures were to take place, the meeting would automatically become a regular meeting of the Council. If new machinery on these lines were adopted, it would be possible to take more flexible and effective decisions that would help to remove the stalemate on many of the serious conflicts and tensions that call for a solution if a just and lasting peace is to prevail in the world.

55. In this connexion my delegation, which is a member of the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression and the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, considers that those Committees, as well as the Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, should conclude their work as soon as possible on the basis of a general agreement. This would spell important progress in laying the legal and political foundations on which the Organization must operate in fulfilling its primary purpose of safeguarding international peace and security.

56. A matter of particular interest to my delegation is the establishment of regional security systems, with the participation on an equal footing of all the States in the region. Provision is made for this in Chapter VIII of the Charter, and it is referred to in section IV of the document submitted by the Soviet representative. My country, which is part of Europe for obvious reasons of geography, history, economics and culture, is most sympathetic to the idea of setting up a European regional security system that will provide the necessary institutional framework to secure peace on our continent and promote co-operation at all levels; and hence the Spanish Government responded affirmatively on 2 May last to an appeal from Budapest<sup>7</sup> for the convening of a conference on European security, and on 7 July gave an equally affirmative reply to the Government of Finland, accepting its generous offer to make Helsinki the headquarters of the proposed conference.

57. In this common task of securing, preserving and developing peace and security, the United Nations has encountered two serious obstacles which it has not yet been able to overcome: the occupation of territories conquered by armed force, and the persistence of colonialism in territories which are also used for establishing military bases.

58. My delegation has had occasion to state repeatedly in the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Main Committees that the acquisition of territory by force can no longer be tolerated under the new legal order embodied in the Charter, and that the passage of time can never legitimize an unjust situation, at variance with the postulates of international law, the principles and provisions of the Charter, and the resolutions of the principal organs of the United Nations. Withdrawal of occupation forces is therefore vital, for in addition their presence is a permanent threat to peace.

59. With regard to the persistence of colonialism and the establishment of military bases in colonial territories, my delegation wishes to point out here that such bases represent an intolerable violation of territorial integrity, infringe the sovereign rights of States, hinder decolonization, and are also a dangerous threat to international peace and security. Peace is one and indivisible in a world that has grown aware of its oneness; and the community of nations must consider itself threatened as a community so long as there are still territories occupied and military bases maintained in defiance of the resolutions of the United Nations and the principles of non-intervention and inviolability of the territorial integrity of States.

60. Finally, my delegation feels that the strengthening of international security must go hand in hand with a collective effort to secure true peace based on disarmament and reform of the economic and social structures of the international community.

61. We regard disarmament as a need that cannot be postponed, and we would have liked to see a section in the document under discussion appealing to the General As-

<sup>7</sup> Adopted by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty Organization at Budapest on 17 March 1969.

sembly to redouble its efforts to bring about true disarmament.

62. The reasons given us by the nuclear Powers to try to explain the present stalemate are based, as the representative of Brazil very rightly stated [1653rd meeting], on prestige and power, and are unconvincing.

63. The maintenance of the present balance of terror is a sterile, destructive idea which perpetuates fear and mistrust in a world in which true coexistence is becoming impossible. The balance of power is not sufficient to guarantee security. History shows that all mechanistic concepts of peace, based on systems of balances and alliances, are hopelessly doomed to failure. There is no security, in my delegation's view, except that which is born of disarmament; no other peace but that which arises from the establishment of just social and economic conditions making for the development of peoples, and in the final analysis permitting the rounded development of the human person. The concept of economic development thus combines with the idea of disarmament in the common endeavour to create true conditions for peace.

64. The Spanish delegation feels that without the disinterested co-operation of the developed countries and well-directed efforts by the developing countries, channelled through the United Nations and the appropriate specialized agencies, the basic requirements for true economic development will not be forthcoming; and until the dreadful problem of world poverty is solved, we cannot speak of true peace, for the only road left open to the needy peoples of the world will be the road to despair.

65. My delegation considers that the strengthening of international security calls for joint, balanced and harmonious action at all these levels. The channel through which this collective effort must flow can only be the United Nations, which in this critical time needs the support of each and every one of us if its prestige and power are to be strengthened and it can emerge from the stage of frustration and enter the era of hope.

66. The CHAIRMAN: I thank Ambassador Piniés for the kind remark he made about me.

67. Mr. KASSE (Mali) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, if we do not congratulate you and your colleagues on the Bureau, this in no way detracts from the deep satisfaction we feel at seeing you guiding our discussion in such an able and distinguished manner. We feel sure that the work of our Committee will be successfully accomplished.

68. May I remind the Committee that our delegation joined in the tribute paid to the memory of the great African, President Shermarke of Somalia. Through the representative of that brotherly country, I should like to express to the Government and people of Somalia the feelings of grief and sympathy of the Government of Mali.

69. Ten years ago the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics put forward and successfully brought about the adoption by the General Assembly of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial

Countries and Peoples [*resolution 1514 (XV)*]. This contribution has helped very considerably to speed up the process of liberation of peoples and the achievement of national independence by several States Members of the United Nations.

70. My delegation is happy to see that the same country on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization has presented to our Committee and to the General Assembly a proposal tending to strengthen international security, a proposal whose importance has been recognized and whose great interest has been stressed by practically all previous speakers. The need for peace and security concerns all peoples—all nations, large and small. This is one of the major objectives of our Organization and the fundamental principle underlying our Charter.

71. As the representative of a country which must do everything to safeguard its independence and build up its economy, a country belonging to one of the continents where the population of vast areas are still a prey to insecurity and the horrors of war, I cannot share the view that this can be treated as just a general problem for which a mere formulation of ideas and opinions or a reaffirmation of the fine principles clearly set forth in our Charter would suffice.

72. The tragedy of Viet-Nam, of Arab Palestine, the unspeakable and inhuman behaviour of the white racists in South Africa and Rhodesia and the barbarous repression by Portugal in Africa are not elements of the past or even of the recent past. They are parts of every day reality which we experience and regard with feelings of utmost indignation.

73. A glance at the international situation today shows that we cannot rely on justice, which must be the basis of relations between human groups; that hunger and poverty are still the lot of millions of human beings, whilst affluence is the rule elsewhere; and that tremendous material resources are used for purposes of war or prestige. Peace and security cannot exist when a people sees its lawful rights challenged, when it pines under the unjust and barbarous yoke of racism and foreign domination. Peace and security will always be threatened in a world where the gap between the rate of development of the rich and the poor is constantly widening.

74. The nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America are those most interested in the smooth operation of our Organization, since they wish first of all to strengthen their recently-acquired national sovereignty and their still very precarious economy. They are the most concerned by the tragedy of the United Nations, its inability to ensure the implementation of decisions taken by the General Assembly or its competent organs. Whether it be general and complete disarmament, prohibition or resort to force to settle international disputes, *apartheid*, the right of peoples to self-determination, whether it be respect for the territorial integrity and the sovereignty of States or "... the solemn understanding embodied in the Charter ... to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom and to employ international machinery for the advancement of the economic and social development of all peoples" [*resolution 1710 (XVI)*], all these questions have

been the subject of decisions by the United Nations or its main organs. Despite relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, such acts as war, the occupation of territories by force, the violation of the sovereignty and independence of States and the denial of fundamental rights and freedoms are still being perpetrated in Africa, in the Middle East and in South-East Asia. By the same token, the anguished appeal of the States of the Third World may have given rise to fine sentiments eloquently expressed in resolutions, has not as yet elicited a favourable and concrete response from the wealthy nations.

75. These considerations lead me to say that, in the view of my delegation it is not the absence of good principles, not the shortcomings of the Charter—though they are real enough—which are responsible; it is the inability of our Organization to ensure respect for its decisions. This is what must be remedied, and it is in that field more particularly that we shall probably have to look for practical and effective measures that may restore trust in the hearts of nations and promote peace and security for all.

76. This presupposes that the great Powers which have mastered science and technology and have war arsenals capable of eliminating the whole of mankind, will truly abandon their desire for hegemony and prestige to place their technology and resources at the service of man, to impose justice and to fight poverty. Power should have been used for such noble causes and not to enslave peoples and oppress the weak. This also presupposes that the great People's Republic of China, which is now a great nuclear Power, will return to the international community and take up its seat as a permanent member of the Security Council. It would then feel itself fully responsible and involved in weighty decisions aiming at solving the main problems of today, such as the maintenance of peace and the strengthening of international security, as well as their indispensable corollary, general and complete disarmament.

77. If on its twenty-fifth anniversary our Organization were able to offer mankind the picture of a world in which areas of tension and war had been eliminated, in which *apartheid* and colonialism had been eradicated and in which fruitful co-operation had been launched between the wealthy nations and developing countries, it would have made a signal contribution to the well-being of present and future generations and would have created propitious conditions for further efforts to strengthen international security.

78. In this connexion my delegation supports the proposal of the delegation of Iraq that a drafting committee be set up [1655th meeting, para. 61] to examine, on the basis of the proposal of the Soviet Union, all amendments, views and ideas on this question from the point of view of the effectiveness of the United Nations.

79. It is never too late to undertake a task and we can persevere without necessarily achieving success. Let us attempt this great undertaking proposed by the Government of the Soviet Union. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Coulibaky, stated in the General Assembly on 2 October 1969:

“The nations gathered together here can, in a surge of solidarity and mutual understanding, build that road

towards the light for present and future generations.”  
[1775th plenary meeting, para. 37.]

80. The road towards the light is through peace for all, progress in justice and happiness in freedom. In this difficult and exalting task, my country will make its modest contribution to the efforts of nations, to enable our Organization to face up to its fundamental responsibility: the maintenance of international peace and security.

81. Mr. KAYUKWA-KIMOTHO (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*translated from French*): Mr. Chairman, speaking for the first time in this Committee, despite your request that we should not congratulate you, I should like, without offending your modesty, to congratulate you on your election to the office of Chairman of this important Committee. With your qualities as a diplomat and your intellectual gifts, we have a Chairman who will be able to guide our often difficult discussions firmly, thoroughly and impartially. Through you, Mr. Chairman, I should like also to congratulate the Vice-Chairman and the Rapporteur. I am convinced that together you will form a highly competent team.

82. In the early part of this century, after the killing, suffering and the privations of all kinds brought about by the First World War, men united to create the League of Nations, in order to guarantee international peace and security. But man's memory is short and they speedily forgot all that had happened and began frenziedly to prepare for war once again.

83. It will very soon be 25 years since mankind suffered the most murderous of all wars. As if they were evil spirits, men unleashed a war which cruelly affected the whole world, a war that was a disaster for tens of millions of human beings, that destroyed all the acquisitions of history and inflicted grievous suffering, privations, destitution, disease and death all around.

84. Again, men met to create the United Nations in order to ensure international peace and security for future generations. Events seem to show that man slumbers in a lethargic dream or is in a state of subconscious inertia, and that he needs suffering and death around him in order to experience an existential shock that awakens him to the realities of the world and to his love of life. Such would certainly seem to be his fate.

85. Today, hardly a quarter of a century later, the same men have forgotten their sufferings and are again wanting war. The fact that at this time we are so concerned about the problem of peace and security as to examine it in this Committee is proof that at the international level matters are not proceeding too well, and that it is precisely peace and security which today, more than ever, are seriously threatened. In fact, we are living in a period of increasing nervous tension in the world when the international situation is imperilled by the obsession with violence, the display of force, the frenzied arms race and the urge to have, for absurd reasons of prestige, ever more numerous and powerful weapons of destruction. In brief, we are watching an international situation dominated by the madness of man bent on suffering and self-destruction.

86. But we know full well that if a third world war were to break out it would be the end of everything, a holocaust

in which both the victor and the vanquished and all the innumerable innocent victims besides would be consumed by the nuclear and thermonuclear flames.

87. Such a prospect should surely encourage us to study our fate and the fate of mankind more conscientiously at a time when we are considering the anguishing question whether or not we must avoid war. I believe that we must all speak the same language of humility and sincerity and that we, the great and the small Powers, should be firmly determined to find together radical and really effective solutions to guarantee and preserve peace and security for ourselves, for our children and for our children's children.

88. It is from this standpoint that my delegation wishes to make some observations on the ideas put forward by the Soviet delegation both in the document circulated and in the statement made a few days ago [1562nd meeting].

89. Reading the Soviet draft appeal to all States of the world [A/C.1/L.468], and hearing the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union, we felt first of all a sensation of comfort and relief at the fact that in the ideas expressed we felt the soul of a people that deeply loved peace, having known its cost, the soul of a people that was aware of the main causes of international tension and was deeply concerned over them, and that, when asking for the inclusion of this item in the agenda of the General Assembly of our Organization, was thus offering proof of its efforts and of its desire to search for solutions to the problems of peace and security among nations.

90. However, when we had finished reading the document and listening to the statement, a vague feeling of disappointment and dissatisfaction remained, an impression that the true solutions of the problem were being avoided. And in the end we cannot help seeing a type of haughty condescension towards those many countries of the world which, because they are not great Powers, have to bow to the requirements and intransigence of the super-Powers.

91. I think we agree that one of the reasons for tension in the world is undoubtedly the arms race. And the need to disarm is obvious to all those who want peace and progress. But who should disarm? Surely it should not be we, who are still defending ourselves as best we can with old hunting rifles. Those who possess atomic and thermonuclear weapons, those who have the rockets, rocket-carrying submarines, missiles and anti-missile missiles are the ones who must disarm.

92. But it is characteristic that in the field of disarmament we have got practically nowhere. In our Organization we set up the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament that worked for a number of years. We expanded it and gave it the rather pompous name of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament which produces one report after another as the days go by. For 20 years we have adopted many resolutions on general and complete disarmament.

93. Has this made the super-Powers agree to disarm? Have they agreed to stop the production of fissile material, the manufacture of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons and the stockpiling and testing of these monstrous devices? I

shall not go into that question. On the contrary, up to this moment they are testing weapons which are becoming ever more destructive. When they find it possible to experiment with them underground, they zealously make us sign a treaty prohibiting testing in the atmosphere and on the surface of the earth. When they fear that others may possess the same weapons as they themselves, they make us sign a non-proliferation treaty. We impotently have to follow them in their attitude of constant contradictions. I am bound to wonder whether there is here a real desire to preserve international peace and security.

94. The constant and wanton aggressions of the large States against the small, despite the principle of the sovereign equality of States, is another source of crisis and insecurity in the world. I should like here to show the distance that lies between the abstractions of the text proposed by the Soviet delegation and the situation in the world today. In section III of the draft we read:

“The General Assembly

“Declares further that in the interest of strengthening international security it is necessary for all States of the world: . . . *strictly to abide* in their international relations by the principles of peaceful coexistence of States irrespective of their social system—the principles of sovereignty, equality, territorial inviolability of each State, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the rights of all peoples freely to choose their social system; . . .”

95. In fact, not only do the great Powers fail strictly to observe these principles, but they do not want other States, because they are small, to decide for themselves, to select their own social system or to affirm their sovereignty and their independence.

96. Whether for reasons of economic or strategic defence, or for peculiar reasons of ideological protection, we have seen great Powers interfere in the affairs of other States against all the international rules in force; we have seen them sending troops and tanks to stifle freedom of expression and to break the will of a people freely to decide on its own future, in this case merely by choosing (and why should it not?) a new ideological road. We have seen these Powers bring to bear an entire new arsenal of tactical weapons upon a people bravely fighting for its independence, its territorial integrity and its right to self-determination, in order to make it bow to their will. We also see them militarily and economically supporting colonial Powers such as Portugal, the Rhodesia of Ian Smith and South Africa.

97. This is the everyday situation and when we are told of peaceful coexistence, we find it difficult to understand precisely what that means unless it refers to peaceful coexistence between the two great Powers, each remaining master of the area it controls. But if that is the case, why not speak up and say so?

98. The people of Africa and Asia will not forget the considerable role played by the two great Powers, particularly in the post-war period, in bringing about and accelerating their emancipation and allowing them to

accede to independence. Those two Powers, joined by many others that did not have colonial empires, proved to be true advocates of the colonized peoples, and today we have to reiterate our gratitude to them.

99. But there can be no harm, I think in pointing out to those great Powers that their former anti-colonial ardour has cooled off somewhat. When we ask them to use their wide powers of persuasion to induce Portugal, the United Kingdom, South Africa and other colonialists to liberate the territories that they illegally occupy and the peoples they oppress, these Powers resist, become embarrassed, prevent the Security Council from using the only measures that might do away with colonialism and resort to vague and gratuitous phraseology. Some of them even encourage Portugal, the United Kingdom and South Africa to refuse with impunity to carry out the many resolutions concerning them which have been adopted.

100. In the Organization we have repeatedly criticized this ambiguous attitude of certain Members of the United Nations towards colonial and racist Powers.

101. Millions of persons in Africa and elsewhere in the world are still enduring—for who knows how long?—the hateful oppression of certain lagging elements in history.

102. No appeal can be made to States in this matter. Specific measures must be announced in the Security Council so that an end can be speedily put to colonialism. That is what we are still waiting for.

103. I would not want to tax the patience of members of the Committee further. May I merely say that the views I have just expressed on colonialism also apply to racism and *apartheid*, two scourges which seriously undermine peace and security between nations.

104. I now come to the suggestions made by the Soviet delegation regarding the Security Council. Actually, no definite proposals are made, but a wish is somewhat casually expressed. After mentioning the exclusive powers conferred by the Charter on the Security Council to put an end to or prevent acts of aggression, and after recognizing that that body has thus far fulfilled its duties well, the representative of the Soviet Union feels that it can only be hoped that, when necessary, the Security Council will take effective practical steps against acts of aggression, having full recourse when necessary to the powers conferred on it under the United Nations Charter [1652nd meeting, para. 48]. I give up trying to understand this passage and shall not comment on it.

105. Many delegations will recall that in the course of the general debate in the General Assembly, more than one speaker stressed the shortcomings of our Organization and its powerlessness in solving certain important problems submitted to it. Numerous speakers have cited many resolutions adopted by the Security Council to which the Members of the United Nations concerned did not respond. All this attests to the fact that there is something wrong with the United Nations. Once Members no longer comply with the measures adopted by an Organization which they freely created or to which they freely adhered, and once that Organization itself fails to adopt any measures to

ensure respect by virtue of the powers vested in it, it will slowly and inexorably perish.

106. We are a long way from San Francisco, and since that time much has changed on this earth. Realities change from one day to the next. Men evolve, and so do States. The United Nations, like the States comprising it, must participate in this vast world evolution. It is essential that it should adapt itself.

107. If we wish our Organization really to be an institution for peace in the world, if we want it to be the guarantor of security for all States, great and small, it might be advisable to see whether some changes might not be made in the Security Council itself.

108. Can we honestly contend that the concept itself of a great Power still has the same political connotations as at San Francisco? Can we really maintain that the principle of the permanence and unanimity of the five great Powers and their right of veto are still appropriate? Is there not something anachronistic and outmoded in these principles which should be reviewed if the effectiveness of the Security Council and consequently of the United Nations as a whole is to be ensured? I believe that we should attack the root of the evil and not merely express pious hopes.

109. We must also consider the proposal to create regional security systems. Here, too, we earnestly hope that there will be no ambiguity. We know the world is already divided into military alliances and power blocs, and this cleavage is an undeniable fact consistent with the spheres of influence of the great Powers.

110. What we have to ask ourselves is whether regional security systems are not being advocated merely to put the seal of approval on an already existing situation.

111. But here I shall allow our Foreign Minister, Mr. Adoula, to speak for us. On 29 September, he declared in the General Assembly that our delegation support the concept of a regional security which, in defiance of the principles of the Charter, authorized a State to interfere in the domestic affairs of another and to violate its sovereignty and the right of its people to self-determination [1770th plenary meeting, para. 55].

112. Some time ago we saw how, in the name of regional security, the troops of one State invaded the territory of another, thus violating its sovereignty and hindering its people from freely deciding their own future.

113. Foreign troops should be withdrawn not only, to quote the Soviet document “from territories occupied as a result of action by the armed forces of some States against other States and peoples defending the independence they have won as a result of the collapse of the colonial system, and their territorial integrity” [A/C.1/L.468, section II].

114. My country which, following on its independence, experienced this kind of occupation, can only approve of such a proposal. But we should like to add to it the proposal of the withdrawal of troops from the territories of all independent States occupied by other States which, without respect for the sovereignty of the occupied States,

suppress the will of the peoples of those countries to choose the way they deem appropriate for their own development.

115. Regional security, properly understood, must include respect for the equality and sovereignty of all States concerned.

116. After all I have just said, it would be wrong to think that the Soviet document should be set aside completely. On the contrary, it should be remembered that my delegation was pleased by the Soviet Government's happy initiative in requesting our Organization to include this item on international security in the agenda of its present session. We were even among those that supported the request and we did so because, on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the existence of the United Nations, we wished that every delegation should thus have an opportunity to look back and to draw up a balance-sheet of what our Organization has done in the matter of international security. We agree with most of the statements in the Soviet document, namely that since its inception the fundamental task of the United Nations has been the preservation of peace and the security of nations; that for 25 years the United Nations, by being largely instrumental in saving mankind from a world conflagration, has been able to fulfil its mission honourably. We agree also that the United Nations must unremittingly pursue this task, and that much remains to be done, especially in the field of international security. And this calls for no further proof than the fact that the international tensions and crises which we have suffered have been pointed to by the Soviet representative himself: the armaments race, colonialism, the aggressive imperialism of some States, racism and *apartheid*. And let us add, as other delegations have done, the economic balance among nations.

117. While this is all true, I felt I must point out that my delegation was disappointed by the fact that the authors of the document before us did not deem it appropriate to outline concrete and effective measures to strengthen international security. No concrete measure has been proposed, for example, to put an end to the arms race and to disarm generally and completely; no concrete proposal has been made to put an end to the manifold aggressions of the large States against the small States, which are threatened more and more by the political and ideological intolerance of the great Powers.

118. A few days ago [*1656th meeting*] the representative of the Ukrainian SSR said that this document was being presented so that new measures to strengthen international security could be adopted. That was also how my delegate understood it. But since the security of nations nowadays is very precarious and since we wish to discuss strengthening that security, surely we should propose well-defined measures that will be studied and adopted if they seem appropriate to us.

119. We believe that there are wide gaps to be bridged here.

120. Furthermore, although we find that the document does contain certain proposals, they are formulated in such a vague and abstract manner that it is difficult not only to

grasp their true meaning, but to see how they fit in with the daily realities of the international situation around us.

121. Finally, I also want to say that my delegation does not have very much faith in the value of a simple appeal made to all States, asking them to proclaim their faith in principles which no one rejects anyway. It does not believe that what the insistent resolutions and statements of our Organization have failed to achieve could be miraculously brought about by a simple appeal, however moving it might be.

122. Such are the few comments which the delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo wishes to make on the problem now before us. We agree with the delegations which have proposed that a sub-committee of the First Committee should be set up to make a thorough study of the form which this document should take and what it should contain. Our Committee might then, at the present or at the next session, have before it a basic document which could gain the support of the majority of delegations.

123. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo for his generous words about me.

124. I now call on the representative of Italy and wish to thank him for responding to the general appeal I addressed to all members of the Committee to speak today—earlier than they had intended to.

125. Mr. VINCI (Italy): Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your kind words. Having had the privilege of nominating you as Chairman of the First Committee, I ask for your indulgence if I exceptionally take the liberty of renewing my heartfelt congratulations and good wishes to you personally and to the valuable and distinguished colleagues who will co-operate with you in the fulfilment of your important task—our Vice-Chairman, Mr. Kolo, with whom I have worked here and in Geneva; our Rapporteur, Mr. Barnett; the Under-Secretary, Mr. Kutakov, whose very efficient help I deeply appreciated during the twenty-third session; and the new Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Chacko, whose dedication to our Organization is well known to and appreciated by all of us.

126. Mr. Chairman, you have suggested that our interventions be brief. I shall comply with your request, the more willingly because I think that on at least one fundamental aspect of the item under consideration—namely, the usefulness of our present exercise—I do not need to elaborate. The Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report to the General Assembly, and most of the speakers in the general debate have, in fact, drawn a rather gloomy picture of the international situation and have thereby pointed out the urgency of the problem of peace and security.

127. I dare say that there is unanimity in that respect. And we cannot but be grateful to the Soviet delegation for having offered a timely opportunity to all Member States to exchange their views on this crucial subject and to try to outline—as our Swedish colleague has rightly put it—a world programme for the years ahead. Mr. Aström, however, has

warned us realistically that we are faced with a complicated and many-faceted problem which requires the establishment of a balanced programme, related to the requirements of the present world situation. I think that his assessment was sound and in fact, after a whole week of discussion, it is quite clear to my delegation that the unanimity or consensus desirable on issues directly concerning all and each of our countries is not emerging on the specific content of the Soviet document, on the analysis of the situation it makes, on the conclusions it draws and on the suggestions and proposals it submits to the approval of this Committee.

128. A great number of comments and reservations have already been expressed by other speakers. The Italian delegation shares many of them. Particularly, we share the view that it is hardly conceivable that we should do anything here now that might appear as an attempt either to redraft or to reinterpret the aims and principles enshrined in the Charter.

129. In his lucid and penetrating analysis Mr. Araujo Castro of Brazil stated that the Charter was a post-war document aimed at freezing the political and strategic framework of 1945. We were therefore gratified by the statements of the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom, who stressed that the Charter is not immutable and may be perfected. Provisions to that effect are embodied in the Charter and we may make use of them at any moment. And, as a matter of fact, if in the general debate a number of the weaknesses of the United Nations and its inability to act in order either to restore or to preserve peace, they have not questioned the principles and objectives of the Charter. What they have questioned, after a careful review and appraisal of United Nations records in these 24 years since its birth, is something quite different: they have questioned the structures and the functioning of United Nations organs.

130. So that as far as my delegation is concerned there is not the slightest doubt, in the light of what has been said so far, that if we wish to have an appeal made by the General Assembly there is only one which could be acceptable to all: one which reiterates the principles and provisions of the Charter in their very words. But is that enough on the eve of the twenty-fifth anniversary of our Organization? I believe not. What is required, in our view, is not words but deeds, as some other speakers have already noted. At the same time we do not think that deeds are possible unless there is a general plan of action, carefully studied and agreed upon, which indicates how we can carry out the main principles and objectives of the Charter in our troubled world of today. To do this will certainly need time and a firm political will—a political will, first of all, to fulfil those principles and objectives without any exception or restrictive interpretations, to carry them out in a consistent way. We would therefore welcome the Soviet draft appeal [A/C.1/L.468] if it meant a pledge to implement, without geographical or ideological waivers, the Charter provisions commanding the respect of sovereignty and territorial integrity, of non-interference and non-intervention, of equality of all States, of friendly relations and co-operation and of fundamental human rights.

131. Short of such an unspecified and unrestrictive expression of allegiance to principles, we risk making subjective

choices among them or, at least, establishing an arbitrary order of priority in the object and timing of their implementation. That would amount to an attempt to set up guidelines which, besides conflicting with the provisions of the Charter, would not, I believe, be consistent with the task or, even less, the powers entrusted to our Committee.

132. We must, on the contrary, do our best to put an end to outdated patterns of power politics and replace them, as advocated by so many speakers before me, by a wider respect for international law, by increasing international understanding and co-operation—to set up, in other words, a new international order based on human justice and adjusted to the present historic realities. To do so, in my opinion, we should concentrate our efforts in order to identify two important aspects of the problem of security: first, the root causes of international tensions and wars; second, the ability of the United Nations under its present structure and functioning, to cope with its responsibilities.

133. On the first aspect, I would begin by recalling the speech of the Italian Foreign Minister in the general debate, from which I quote:

“Peace-building must acquire new dimensions. This task cannot be reduced to preventing armed conflicts and overcoming the political disputes likely to provoke such conflicts. It involves much more: the gradual reduction of all social, economic and technological ‘gaps’ which operate as factors creating instability and disorder in international life; the conversion of the forces which today threaten us with destruction into instruments of creation, progress and well-being. In short, we must fill the technological and economic gap among and within States and between scientific-technological developments and political concepts, which are now worn out.”  
[1783rd plenary meeting, para. 11.]

134. This global concept of peace outlined by Mr. Moro implies a comprehensive approach to the problem of security. In other words, we believe that stability in international relations can be achieved only through co-ordinated efforts along the following lines:

(a) Respect for international legality and statutory obligations which implies, as I have already said, a sincere allegiance to the principles and objectives of the Charter. It requires also the establishment of an efficient machinery for peace-keeping and security operations and an accelerated effort towards the codification of the rules of international behaviour. In this connexion a firm engagement by all States to give a sound financial basis to the peace-keeping machinery would be of paramount importance.

(b) Abolition of any form of human discrimination and repudiation of the myth of racial superiority which extends the existence of absurd systems of *apartheid* and of colonial régimes.

(c) Elimination of poverty and, as a first step, of the ever-increasing gap between the industrialized world and the developing countries in the economic, social and educational fields, with a view of reducing, also, the dangers of a society inspired solely by criteria of productivity and of giving an ideal content to the life of the new generations.

(d) Adoption of an organic programme of general and complete disarmament under strict international control which could be embodied in the "Disarmament Decade" proposed by the Secretary-General and release important means for financing the "Second United Nations Development Decade".

(e) Full participation of all countries, and mainly of the developing countries, in the benefits of scientific and technological progress, specifically in connexion with new activities. We again recall that the development of international co-operation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy is a specific objective of the Non-Proliferation Treaty [see resolution 2373 (XXII)] and that it has inspired most of the recommendations adopted at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,<sup>8</sup> whose continuity we wish to see assured. In that spirit, we have also proposed some structural changes of the executive organ of the International Atomic Energy Agency. On the other hand, we have also maintained that the utilization of the sea-bed and of outer space must be based on the principles that mankind, as a whole, must benefit from it and that no exclusive advantage must be appropriated by individual States.

(f) Protection of the human environment and of basic human resources.

135. Our programme may appear ambitious and very far-reaching but we are deeply convinced that the experience of the last 25 years points to the necessity of attacking and eradicating the evil roots. We should not go on taking occasional action decided upon and carried out each time under the pressure of the events of the moment. Still less should we go on turning out rhetorical documents which live *l'espace d'un matin*. To cure a person who is sick—and our world is sick—you must find out, first of all, the cause of the illness and provide the appropriate medicaments.

136. The second aspect of the problem of peace and security on which we propose to concentrate the attention of this Committee is the appraisal of the present capacity of our Organization to fulfil its main task. As the Italian Foreign Minister has indicated to the General Assembly, "Let us seize this opportunity [of the twenty-fifth anniversary] to commit ourselves not only to scrupulous adherence to our statutory principles but also to the quest for more suitable means of attaining the perfection of our system at the institutional, organizational and methodological levels." [1783rd plenary meeting, para. 37.]

137. Our ideas are well known. May I recall, first of all, that it has been our consistent policy to ask for a close coordination of the activities of the various United Nations organs and specialized agencies within the framework of an over-all plan which would take into account all the objectives of peace-keeping and peace building. Such a coordination, in our view, should enable us to use the resources released by the disarmament process or by the use of outer space and the sea-bed or by other means for the progress of the developing countries, for the peace-keeping tasks of the United Nations and for the protection of the

human environment and of nature. In order to attain this objective we should also strengthen the United Nations system in the sphere of economic and social development, so that the Organization may become able to act with agility, be flexible in structure and have a rational coordination in its methods.

138. Finally, we must draw the conclusions from 25 years of experience and adapt the structures and working methods of the main United Nations organs to the new international realities. In some cases it will probably be necessary to resort to the amendment procedures embodied in the Charter, but we could achieve some important results already through a more functional interpretation and application of the Charter's provisions. This is true, in particular, for the Security Council since the correct and full implementation of Article 23 as it stands would lead to the constant participation in that body of the major Powers of all regional groups, which are better equipped, fortunately or unfortunately, to fully discharge the responsibilities deriving from membership in the Council and make the voice of their respective areas better heard by the super-Powers.

139. To save time I shall not go into the details of our proposals. They can be found by whoever is interested in the verbatim record of the 1783rd plenary meeting which contains the statement made by the Italian Foreign Minister on 8 October. We stand by those requests, encouraged as we are by many authoritative statements heard from the General Assembly's rostrum during the general debate.

140. The matter we are discussing is certainly complex and needs accurate and, therefore, lengthy consideration. That is why the Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs, while introducing the views of the Italian Government on a global strategy for peace, did not expect that its assessments and proposals would lead to the approval of a document within the few weeks which separate us from the conclusion of the twenty-fourth session. The same, I believe, can be said of the wide range of proposals made by the Soviet Union.

141. I suppose that most of the previous speakers who have put forward a great number of interesting ideas and suggestions feel the same way as we do. May I say, in passing, that if I did not quote all of them it was not for lack of interest. On the contrary, my delegation believes that they all deserve the careful consideration of all Member States. Other interesting views will, I am sure, be heard in the next few days. That is why, while we acknowledge the merit of the Soviet Union in having generated such a stimulating debate, our respective Governments will need some time to study these views and we hope they will come back next year for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations better prepared to discuss and adopt some meaningful programme of action for the next decade—especially if the time available is used in consultations between Governments and in their respective regional Organizations. If by any chance most delegations should feel that some action should be taken at this session, my delegation would not stand in the way. But we would certainly insist that, rather than indulging in the magic power of words—in which we place little, or no confidence—we should draw up a programme of action on the lines my Foreign Minister has indicated, or on other, similar lines, if that is the general feeling of the Committee.

<sup>8</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-third Session*, agenda item 96, document A/7277 and Corr.1 and Corr.2.

142. The CHAIRMAN: In view of the lateness of the hour, the representative of the Soviet Union will make his statement this afternoon. Before we adjourn I shall give the floor to the representative of Israel in exercise of his right of reply.

143. Mr. LOURIE (Israel): Despite the provocative references of certain Arab delegations to the situation in the Middle East, it is clear that the Committee has no desire to see this debate converted into an Arab-Israel confrontation. Indeed, no speech by any other representative in the Committee has pursued the initiative of certain Arab delegations in this respect. I have accordingly refrained from being drawn into a detailed response to what I would call—to put it at its mildest—highly controversial and tendentious statements of certain Arab representatives who have spoken.

144. However, I feel obliged to reply briefly to the statement made by the representative of Jordan this morning. The parallel which he sought to draw between the situation which arose recently between two Latin American countries and that in the Middle East is, I need hardly emphasize, totally false and misleading. Together with more than two million other Israelis I lived through those grim and fateful days of late May and early June 1967. The recollection of that period is indelibly imprinted on our minds and memories. The United Nations Emergency Force had been summarily, contemptuously ejected at the behest of the Egyptian Head of State from its positions in the Gaza Strip and Sharm el-Sheikh. The Straits of Aqaba had been closed to our shipping and commerce with the avowed object of strangling our trade and life. Together with my fellow Israelis—perhaps half of them, incidentally, refugees from Arab-speaking countries—we heard the Arab radios screaming day after day that our final hour had come. Characteristic of these statements were those of President Nasser of 26 May 1967: “The Arab people want to fight. We have been waiting for the right time when we will be completely ready. Now the war will be total. Its objective will be the annihilation of Israel.” And a couple of days later: “We intend to open a general assault against Israel. This will be total war. Our basic aim is the destruction of Israel.” That was typical of the kind of incitement which whipped the crowds in neighbouring capitals into a murderous frenzy.

145. The Jordanian representative spoke of Israel’s aggression against his country. On the morning of 5 June 1967 it was my duty to call in the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, General Odd Bull, and to convey to him as a most urgent message for the Government of Jordan, for King Hussein, that we had no desire for war with Jordan, or for that matter anyone else, and if they remained quiet we would remain quiet. Three hours later the first shells fell from Jordan on Israel Jerusalem and a two-pronged attack was launched on the Israel enclave at Mount Scopus and on the undefended United Nations Headquarters.

146. The acceptance of the cease-fire resolutions adopted by the Security Council in June 1967 signified the end of the military phase of the Arab aggression against Israel in that month. That aggression is well documented in the records of the Security Council and is confirmed by the

fact that, as my delegation has stated on several occasions in the past, both the General Assembly and the Security Council flatly refused, in the summer of 1967, to adopt any resolution determining that Israel had committed aggression. The references to withdrawal of armed forces made by the representative of Jordan and others simply tear from their context a few words in Security Council resolution 242 (1967) of 22 November 1967. In that resolution the Security Council called emphatically for the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East which it realized would constitute “the fulfilment of Charter principles”. It was in that context and in that context alone that the Security Council made any reference to the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territory occupied in the 1967 conflict.

147. It is again a matter of common knowledge that it is the Arab States which have refused to co-operate with the Special Representative of the Secretary-General appointed under that resolution “. . . to establish and maintain contacts with the States concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution”.

148. Israel wanted peace then, in 1967. We want peace now. What the Middle East needs and what the world needs is a movement not backward to belligerency but forward to peace. That was the objective of resolution 242 (1967) of the Security Council. It is our ardent hope that the Charter provisions for the pacific settlement of disputes by negotiation and for the respect, for the independence and integrity of Member States basic to that resolution 242 (1967) will yet be accepted as the basis for a solution of the problems of our region.

149. Mr. EL-FARRA (Jordan): I know the hour is late and I do not intend to tax the patience of my colleagues around this table. Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to answer the statement just made, if possible tomorrow when I shall have more time. I would simply like, here and now, to say that in my statement this morning I presented specific and well-framed issues. I did not want to indulge in stating our case, by referring to the daily acts of aggression against my country Jordan and the continued occupation of half its territory. I thought that this was not the place for doing that. I simply mentioned certain issues which are glaring examples of what the United Nations had failed to do. I referred to Latin America, yes, and to the area of the Middle East, yes. In both there was occupation and in both there was a call for withdrawal. In one, the United States was instrumental in having 96 hours fixed for withdrawal. In the other, 28 months have elapsed and up to now we still have the Israeli forces occupying half of Jordan. That is the issue which is before the Committee. It is part of the duty of the Committee, while considering international security, to look at its failures, United Nations failures, and benefit from those failures in order to find a solution to protect the dignity of the United Nations. That was the issue I raised.

150. Another issue was raised by me. It was not the specific case of Jordan but part of the item we are considering here and now. I refer to the issue of a cease-fire. Many speakers mentioned the need for protecting the

territorial integrity of every Member State. I heard the representatives of Sweden, Ireland, the Ukrainian SSR, Yugoslavia, Canada, Finland, Brazil, the USSR, Poland, Spain, Mali, Ecuador and others emphasizing this point. And if that is the will of the Committee, how is it that this will is not reflected in actions taken by the Security Council?

151. I shall not indulge now in a discussion of our case or in exposing the distortions of the Israeli representative. I am compelled to answer them tomorrow. But the issues before the Committee are issues which relate to international security, which we are discussing. Cease-fire alone is meaningless. Armistice is a temporary military measure. Just solution: yes. Why is it that in certain cases we find big Powers championing the cause, the Charter and Chapter VII, while in other cases they show indifference, lack of interest? Is it because of the influence that the Zionists and the pressure groups have in Washington and in New York—in an election year in New York now and in Washington tomorrow? These are points related to the very question of international security. And since distortions

were made this afternoon—although I tried to avoid discussing the issues of my case—tomorrow I shall be compelled to answer those statements.

152. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United Arab Republic.

153. Mr. EL-ERIAN (United Arab Republic): In view of the lateness of the hour I do not intend to take much of the time of the Committee to reply to the abusive statement made by the representative of Israel. I should like to content myself now with a brief statement.

154. The item before us relates to security and it bears on the question of aggression and defiance of the resolutions of the world Organization, and if the representative of Israel is going to use his right of reply whenever people denounce aggression and give illustrations of cases of concrete aggression, I am afraid he will be using his right of reply many many times.

*The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.*