

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SECOND SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, 576th
MEETING



Friday, 1 December 1967,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 37:</i>	
<i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (continued) . .</i>	<i>159</i>
<i>Organization of the Committee's work.</i>	<i>167</i>

Chairman: Mr. Humberto LOPEZ VILLAMIL
(Honduras).

AGENDA ITEM 37

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects: report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations (continued) (A/6815; A/SPC/L.148, A/SPC/L.150)

1. Mr. WALDHEIM (Austria): For years the United Nations has been engaged in a study designed to clarify the concept and notion of peace-keeping operations within the framework of the United Nations Charter. In the General Assembly as well as in earlier debates of this Committee, the importance of the United Nations peace-keeping function has been stressed time and again. Austria, being a member of the Committee of Thirty-Three,^{1/} has on several occasions expressed its views on this question and we have clearly formulated our attitude towards this problem.

2. The Austrian Government has not changed its opinion on the usefulness of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations and will continue to take an active part in the efforts to strengthen the peace-keeping capacity of our Organization. This attitude is illustrated by the participation of my country in peace-keeping operations previously undertaken by the United Nations as well as by our continued financial contribution to such operations. At present Austria maintains a police contingent and a medical unit with the United Nations Force in Cyprus. Moreover, the Austrian Government has established a standby force which can be put at the disposal of the United Nations whenever it is needed.

3. Peace-keeping operations are in our view indispensable for the international community and, as was stated by previous speakers, are in the interest of all Member States, big and small alike. Since they are of an essentially voluntary character they cannot be imposed on any country.

4. In the introduction to his annual report on the work of the Organization [A/6701/Add.1] the Secretary-General has put his finger on some of the most important problems and difficulties we encounter in our common endeavour to find the most appropriate ways and means of preventing and letting to prevent and halt conflicts with a view to bringing about lasting and peaceful solutions. In this endeavour the United Nations is confronted with manifold problems flowing from differences of interpretation and proposed methods concerning the fulfilment of the peace-keeping obligation of the United Nations. In the view of my delegation, these differences can be reconciled, given the clearly defined objectives of our Charter and the voluntary nature of peace-keeping operations. Nevertheless, a protracted and wide-ranging controversy about the many aspects of peace-keeping has arisen and, as our distinguished Secretary-General put it, has surely not contributed to the credit of the United Nations.

5. For years now we have tried in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations and in this Committee to overcome the existing difficulties related in the first place to the constitutional and financial aspects of the question. I do not wish to dwell here again on these aspects which were discussed at length in the Committee of Thirty-Three, where numerous proposals and suggestions were made. We regret that no practical progress could be achieved in these negotiations. But it would also be unjust not to recognize the value of the contributions in thoughts and ideas made by many delegations in the course of that debate. The lesson we have to learn from those negotiations is, in the opinion of my delegation, that we should not try to force the issue by imposing a majority opinion and that we should avoid bringing into discussion arguments that tend to confuse the problem, since such a procedure, we believe, would protract and complicate our efforts and would do more harm than good to the cause of peace-keeping.

6. There are, as we all know, two approaches to this problem. One is to try and to arrive at agreed guide-lines for future peace-keeping operations, including the financing and conduct of such operations, with the aim of providing a set of rules to become effective in potential international situations of tension and conflict. The other is a pragmatic, practical approach, deciding on an *ad hoc* basis what measures are to be taken in each particular case.

7. Much as we would welcome general agreed principles for such operations, we share the views of those representatives who have expressed doubts about the wisdom of adopting rigid guide-lines by majority decisions which in the long run would impair the value and effectiveness of peace-keeping operations. On

^{1/} Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

the other hand, past experience has clearly shown that it is quite possible to agree on practical measures in given situations without having to raise constitutional or other aspects of principle. What we want to say is that whatever the constitutional or theoretical aspect of the problem may be, it is, in our opinion, feasible and possible to solve concrete peace-keeping problems whenever the need arises. And it is also evident, that we, the United Nations, must comply with the request of countries seeking the help and assistance of our Organization. Such an approach however, should not exclude efforts to agree on matters of principle if time and circumstances permit.

8. Having these general considerations in mind, we hold the view that under the present circumstances the Special Committee should continue to carry out the task entrusted to it by the fifth special session of the General Assembly [resolution 2249 (S-V)]. Furthermore, besides extending the mandate of the Committee of Thirty-Three, we might refer to it the proposals made in the present debate, as well as the suggestions put forward by the Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report [see A/6701/Add.1, para. 31]. We have noted with appreciation his proposal to study such questions as the standardization of training and equipment for standby forces, the relationship of the United Nations to Governments providing such forces, as well as the constitutional and financial aspects involved.

9. We hope that the forthcoming debate in the Committee of Thirty-Three will concentrate on areas of agreement, leaving aside controversial issues which would only deepen existing divisions of views. We expect, however, that progress will be achieved with regard to two problems contained in the mandate of the Committee, namely, the financing of peace-keeping operations and standby forces for peace-keeping purposes. A number of suggestions on how to tackle these problems have already been advanced during the discussions in the Committee of Thirty-Three as well as outside that body. We are confident that these proposals will help the Committee in its further efforts to achieve its goal.

10. Some delegations have suggested that the practical possibilities for action by the United Nations under Chapter VII should be explored and that the Council should resume its study of this problem. We are of the opinion that such a study, although dealing essentially with enforcement actions, could represent a useful contribution to the work of the Committee of Thirty-Three, in particular with reference to paragraph 2 (b) of General Assembly resolution 2249 (S-V). I need not recall that by this provision the Committee of Thirty-Three was requested to review problems relating to the voluntary provision of facilities, services and personnel which Member States may provide for peace-keeping operations.

11. Before concluding I should like to say that we share the preoccupation of those delegations which have expressed their disappointment about the fact that the reiterated appeal for voluntary contributions has found no satisfactory response. My country has contributed its share of the financial expenses for peace-keeping operations. We not only paid our assessments but have also made voluntary contribu-

tions. May we express the hope that other countries will come forth with such contributions in order to liquidate this heavy financial burden of our Organization!

12. I have outlined briefly the position of my Government on the question of peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. We fully realize the enormous difficulties we are confronted with. Our experience in the Committee of Thirty-Three has shown us clearly that we need a practical, pragmatic approach to this highly important problem and that we cannot force the issue without impairing the result of our work. What we need is patience and perseverance. The debate in this Committee until now has convinced us that we are not alone in this opinion. May I express the hope that we will adopt a resolution which will be based on the above-mentioned considerations and thus lay the ground for a fruitful approach to one of the most important functions of our Organization?

13. Mr. IYALLA (Nigeria): I do not wish on this occasion to re-state the considered views of the Nigerian delegation in respect of the main points of discussion which have invariably been featured in the now prolonged debates on this item. The enunciations of our basic positions are amply on record. Indeed, my delegation believes that our debate on the problems of United Nations peace-keeping should now turn away from a forensic exposition of principles and legal tenets on the law of the Charter. Our purpose should be to desist from a constitutional contest in which no side can gain any worthy victory; and we must abandon the effort of seeking to enthrone any doctrine or to reject another orthodoxy. On the other hand, our needs are much less easily defined. Those needs are for us to persist together in seeking to create the conditions and instrumentalities through which the United Nations will always be in a position to respond—promptly, efficiently, effectively and harmoniously—to fulfil an important aspect of its fundamental responsibility to maintain international peace and security, namely, to play its role as the peace-keeping agency of our time.

14. The Nigerian delegation has never felt, in spite of the divergencies in the constitutional positions of the different interests here represented, that any disagreement or division in principle exists about the fundamental value of the peace-keeping concept as an essential responsibility of the United Nations. This conviction is evidently attested to by the fact that differences of viewpoints have never prevented peace-keeping operations from being mounted, even in the recent past, and have not hampered the development over the years of the practice and concept of United Nations peace-keeping functions. What has been lacking, and needs to be provided now, as was painfully revealed by the events which started off the active debate on this item, is the general agreement of Members of the United Nations for formalizing and instituting a suitable and dependable machinery for future peace-keeping operations. Such a peace-keeping scheme, we believe, given the collective and co-operative will, can be pragmatically devised by distilling the best principles and acceptable procedures from past experience and by constructing a flexible plan which would remain adaptable to evolving circumstances and the realities of the future.

15. In the view of my delegation, there are primarily two essential components for the kind of future peace-keeping scheme we envisage. The first relates to organizational matters bearing on the types and sizes of facilities, personnel, etc., which Member States may voluntarily contribute to United Nations peace-keeping missions. The second component involves the mode and method of providing adequate financing. My delegation was gratified to note that the Committee of Thirty-Three during its last session in the spring of 1967 adapted its procedure and the ensuing process of negotiations towards these two specific aspects of its broad mandate. We also recall with satisfaction that the General Assembly in resolution 2249 (S-V) of its fifth special session endorsed the fresh approach adopted by the Committee of Thirty-Three.

16. It will, of course, be recognized that, even within the definite framework of the two components to which I have referred, there are still many difficult questions and differences to be resolved and reconciled. The Secretary-General in the introduction to his annual report has, for instance, properly raised the need for a study of the standardization of training and equipment for standby forces for peace-keeping operations [see A/6701/Add.1, para. 31]. Members of this Committee are also aware that there are many Governments, particularly those of the Nordic countries and Canada, which have made their own national arrangements in earmarking standby forces for peace-keeping. It will, therefore, be useful to receive a memorandum or working paper from the Secretariat which can facilitate the continuing study of this mainly technical aspect of the matter in the appropriate deliberative organs.

17. At the same time, we must all be conscious that there are now crucial questions touching on the balance of international peace and security, notably in southern Africa, with which this Organization is concerned or may soon be confronted.

18. These unfinished problems are increasingly pressing forward for solutions which may require a commensurate deployment of the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter. In our view, therefore, delegations in this debate ought to begin giving equal attention and thought to the growing necessity of ensuring that the United Nations should not be inhibited, at any time, from taking sufficient measures in supporting its legitimate and just decisions and enforcing the civilized will of the community of nations in any part of the world. Such enforcement actions, like peace-keeping activities, are a legitimate means of securing the maintenance of international peace and security. In this connexion, my delegation notes that there has been no objection raised to the suggestion which has been reiterated on several occasions that action should be initiated to explore the possibilities of Article 43 of the Charter in relation to agreements. This, in our view, is a matter which deserves further examination. We also note that in draft resolution A/SPC/L.150 now before this Committee, which is co-sponsored by four African and Asian delegations and Yugoslavia, there is a substantive provision which seeks to reactivate the Military Staff Committee as a functional organ of the

Charter. This idea is also one that may be further studied.

19. In the field of financing there has also been a wealth of constructive and interesting ideas and suggestions covering the method of financing and the mode of assessments, including the use of an equitable special scale for contributions by Member States. In draft resolution A/SPC/L.148, the Deputy Prime Minister of Ireland, to whose inspiring dedication to the cause of the United Nations and international understanding my delegation wishes to renew its warm tribute, has once again submitted to this Committee [570th meeting], on behalf of his Government and eight other sponsors, a financing proposal which, though intended as an interim arrangement, must contribute validly to the search for a viable formula for peace-keeping financing. The Irish financing scheme, as well as other proposals which have been advanced in the past, in particular those contained in the document generally referred to as R.18,^{2/} all have the common feature of prescribing a limit of 5 per cent as the ceiling of the contribution by the group of developing countries towards the costs of peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditure. My delegation is glad to note the substantial agreement and wide acceptance accorded this idea. We also recall that in the meetings of the Committee of Thirty-Three in the spring of 1967, there was a fair measure of support for the proposal regarding the establishment of a joint peace-keeping finance committee.^{3/} My delegation believes that this proposal also deserves closer attention.

20. The Nigerian delegation is of the view that there are some significant meaningful implications in the recent experience derived from the practical manner in which the United Nations has tackled the crisis arising from the Middle East situation this year, engaging, as we have done, the complementary responsibilities and competence of both the General Assembly and the Security Council on the basis of Article 11, paragraph 2 of the Charter. These implications, and the principles inherent in them, need to be dispassionately assessed and clearly understood for the future. It may well be that the developments, pragmatic in themselves, may hold the clue to arriving at a modus operandi regarding the basic constitutional controversy which has arisen from some past peace-keeping operations.

21. We have attempted to demonstrate briefly that there is indeed no dearth of very resourceful ideas for establishing ground rules and guide-lines for peace-keeping operations. The ideas and possibilities which exist require to be further pursued and more earnestly studied. My delegation does recognize that we are still a long way from securing a peace-keeping plan for the future that will command the general, not to say unanimous, support of the United Nations membership as a whole. But my delegation does not believe that we should despair or even attempt to force the pace. Speaking in the general debate at the beginning of this session, Mr. Okoi Arikpo, Chairman

^{2/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 7, document A/AC.113/18.

^{3/} Ibid., Fifth Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 8, document A/6654, para. 93.

of the Nigerian delegation, said, *inter alia*, in reference to this item:

"... while one can understand the impatience of those who would like to see quick results in this area, it seems clear that harm rather than good is likely to result from forcing the issue at this time, and the Assembly would, in our view, be wise to give consideration to the recommendation of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations That recommendation is that the Special Committee should remain seized of this item, with the implication that the Assembly should refrain from any attempt to rush through any decision at this session which could prejudice the further work of the Special Committee." [1586th plenary meeting, para. 151.]

The Nigerian delegation stands firmly on this position today. My delegation also believes that the Committee of Thirty-Three should also be requested to redouble its efforts and to improve rapidly upon the progress which so distinctly marked its session in the spring of 1967.

22. Finally, there is, in our view, at least one constructive step which the Assembly can take this session that will not prejudice the work of the Committee of Thirty-Three and would be of great help to the United Nations. The Assembly can and should renew its appeal to those countries which have not yet done so to pay their voluntary contributions in accordance with the consensus decision reached at the close of the nineteenth session of the General Assembly in 1965.^{4/} Nigeria long ago made its own voluntary contribution. We must also not forget that financial difficulties were at the origin of the creation of the Committee of Thirty-Three itself. The Committee, we all know, is a representative body of the General Assembly; it is not an alien creature or an institution remotely removed from the feelings and aspirations of the general membership. The Committee of Thirty-Three cannot therefore be immune from the frustrating reality that the United Nations now stands in deficit to the tune of some \$36.5 million. Perhaps this fact, more than any other innate condition, accounts largely for the lethargy and sterility which have been so abundantly ascribed to the Committee of Thirty-Three.

23. The Nigerian delegation therefore joins in appealing solemnly and in the most pressing terms to those Member States, particularly to those countries endowed with great resources and power, to come forward now and help to put our Organization on its financial feet again by making unconditional voluntary contributions to liquidate the existing deficit.

24. Mr. KHANAL (Nepal): As the delegation of Nepal understands it, peace-keeping operations are United Nations operations which are midway between those provided for in Chapter VI of the Charter concerning pacific settlement of disputes and those provided for in Chapter VII concerning preventive and enforcement actions.

25. In the scheme of its structure of peace built in 1945, the United Nations Charter has placed a special

responsibility for the maintenance of peace on the shoulders of the Security Council. The operation of the Security Council, in turn, is based on the principle of unanimity among all its five permanent members. This scheme was considered to be both essential and viable principally on two considerations, namely, first, that the responsibility for the maintenance of peace should properly be left in the hands of the big five allies of the Second World War, and, secondly, that in view of the similar interest of these allies in ending that war and laying the foundation of a better world, the principle of unanimity governing the substantive functions of the Security Council would prove workable.

26. Within a few years, or almost immediately after the signing of the Charter, both considerations proved illusory. The cold war situation, particularly between two of those Powers, and the absence of the People's Republic of China from the Organization left the Security Council in a state of ineffectiveness, division and paralysis. In those circumstances the United Nations was faced with a most difficult situation in which, despite threats to the sovereignty and independence of nations and to international peace and security, the Security Council was not in a position to act.

27. However, it is a sign of the good health and vitality of the United Nations that, notwithstanding that impasse, the Organization did not allow itself to remain irresponsive to appeals for action when that was necessary in the interest of the preservation of world peace and security. Many difficult situations were brought under control by the United Nations by means of its peace-keeping operations.

28. My delegation feels that, as the United Nations is an Organization designed to maintain peace, none of its principal organs should be excluded from the ambit of that objective—that is, the maintenance of peace. Each one of those organs is entrusted with specific responsibilities. The Security Council is primarily responsible for the preservation of peace. However, we also recognize that the General Assembly, acting in accordance with its broad responsibilities under Article 10 of the Charter, is competent to exercise its authority in favour of peace if peace is threatened. Indeed, the General Assembly was called upon to exercise its authority as recently as July of this year. The competence of the Assembly in that regard becomes all the more apparent, and necessary, if and when the Security Council fails to perform its primary task of maintaining peace.

29. That situation, in which the immobility or inactivity of the organ primarily entrusted with the responsibility for maintaining peace had to be reconciled with the urgent need for action to help maintain that peace, and in which the General Assembly exerted itself on behalf of peace, gave birth to those United Nations activities which are generally referred to as peace-keeping operations.

30. As a delegation which believes in the positive interpretation of the Charter as a living instrument capable of growth and adaptation to developments, the delegation of Nepal has always supported the operations of the United Nations with regard to peace.

^{4/} Ibid., Nineteenth Session, Plenary Meetings, 1331st meeting, paras. 3 and 4.

Whether or not it has suited us, we have always put our faith in the collective wisdom of the Organization, complied with its decisions and met our obligations, financial or otherwise, in good faith.

31. Dag Hammarskjöld used to say that it was not the big Powers, the United States, the Soviet Union or the others, which needed the United Nations for their protection, but the small Powers. Our support for the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations is motivated by our strong belief in the indispensability of the Organization as a protector of the independence of small countries, such as Nepal, which left to themselves cannot defend their independence from external encroachment.

32. Addressing the General Assembly on 6 November, my august Sovereign, His Majesty King Mahendra, gave eloquent expression to the feelings of small countries. I can do no better than quote from his address:

"My country has come to the United Nations with as much faith in its organization as in its Charter, with as much faith in its effectiveness as in its ideal. For to a small country like mine, the United Nations represents the ideal as well as the practical. It satisfies us in so far as it helps us to work actively for larger unity and for the peace and prosperity of mankind; it satisfies us also in so far as it secures us morally and materially against encroachment and interference from others. A small nation has a stake in peace; a small developing nation such as ours, which is obliged to mobilize all its human and material resources for development, has a vital stake in peace. Though we have such a deep-rooted interest in peace, we have no means of preserving it alone. For this reason, the United Nations has more than ordinary significance for us because it provides, first, a feeling of collective security against encroachment and interference from others and, secondly, a climate of peace so necessary for our development. In short, we have come to the United Nations with a trust that is total and complete." [1595th plenary meeting, para. 4.]

33. Continuing, in another passage, His Majesty said that the failure of the United Nations to act effectively when world peace was threatened

"... leads to a general loss of faith in the United Nations itself as an effective instrument of peace. This breeds an atmosphere of depression. Big Powers are not likely to be so disillusioned because they have built their security systems outside the United Nations. But those of us who came to the United Nations with a total trust are bound to be differently affected." [*Ibid.*, para. 11.]

34. My delegation has viewed the question of the peace-keeping activities of the United Nations with these considerations uppermost in our minds. We do not think that substituting one United Nations organ for another would make for the better functioning of the Organization or help it attain its objectives of peace and security. We feel that in the interest of our very existence and self-respect it is necessary to support efforts aimed at making our Organization more capable of responding to emergencies and of

directing, financing and bringing to a successful end its peace-making commitments.

35. My delegation has always appreciated the contribution made by the Irish delegation and particularly by the Deputy Prime Minister of Ireland towards clarifying this question. In this respect, my delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/L.148. We feel also that the draft resolution submitted by five non-aligned nations [A/SPC/L.150] merits very close consideration and that the adoption of that resolution would help to clarify the situation in regard to the question of facilities, services and personnel which Member States might provide for peace-keeping operations. Therefore we shall vote for that draft resolution.

36. As things stand now, consideration of the question of peace-keeping operations has reached a deadlock—a painful fact confirmed by the report of the Committee of Thirty-Three. The only course open to us now is, in the words of the Secretary-General, either to "... pursue and develop the possibilities of United Nations peace-keeping as a rational and civilized method of seeking to mitigate conflict while basic solutions are sought" [see A/6701/Add.1, para. 35] or to resign ourselves to the complexity of the situation and decide that the United Nations has no useful active role to play in maintaining peace. It is high time we made the choice, if indeed that were conceivable. For our part, it is obvious that my delegation is all for pursuing and developing the possibilities of the Organization as a peace-maker. The primary obstacle to the solution of this question is political rather than financial or constitutional. I believe that given the good will and understanding of all Member States, our Organization can be increasingly developed and strengthened as an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace and security.

37. Mr. TARDOS (Hungary): It is my impression that a good many representatives here agree that this year the General Assembly will be able to make no headway towards the solution of the manifold problems of peace-keeping. The best way would therefore seem to be to request the Special Committee once more to continue its efforts to work out proposals to be submitted to the Security Council. In the light of the discussion here, however, I feel bound to summarize my delegation's opinion on the subject.

38. As a first observation I have to state that the problems of peace-keeping, and especially the financing of peace-keeping, are in a sense artificial issues. They are the products of a continuous endeavour to disregard the provisions of the Charter; but the further we go from the Charter the more difficult it is to find the way back to the paved road. A good proportion of the proposals here, born of the search for a way out, do not help at all, because their authors refuse to admit that the actions which led to the so-called financial crisis of the United Nations, giving occasion for a general review of United Nations peace-keeping operations, were carried out in violation of the Charter.

39. My second remark is that further violations of the Charter cannot undo the wrong done by former violations. There is no need to elaborate on the fact that

the present state of world affairs does not make it possible to rewrite the Charter. All those who want to keep the United Nations alive have to promote a return to the provisions of the Charter. The only way of making the United Nations an effective instrument for maintaining peace and security is to recognize and observe as a fundamental principle that the United Nations should not be used for the purpose of the narrow power interests of a Member State or group of States.

40. Hitherto the United Nations has been utilized, to different degrees, in the interests of the imperialist Powers, mainly the United States. For the sake of maintaining the United Nations as it should be, that practice should be stopped. Therefore, the proposals submitted should promote the implementation of the Charter provisions concerning peace and security and should not be considered a substitute for those provisions. Such a positive proposal is, for instance, that which recommends the conclusion of agreements between Member States and the Security Council on providing military contingents for peace-keeping, or the other ideas contained in different memoranda and statements of the Soviet Union and other socialist States.

41. As a third point, let me put the question: what actions and decisions have created financial problems for the United Nations? The first major "peace-keeping operation"—and I use quotation marks—was not the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) but the use of the United Nations flag by the United States and its allies in the Korean War. At that time the United States was afraid to go to the trouble of asking the United Nations membership to contribute to the costs of its intervention. That is why the financial side of that "United Nations peace-keeping operation" constituted no problem for the Organization.

42. As far as the nature of that illegal action is concerned, it is sufficient to recall that the United States occupied almost the whole territory of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and wished to start an attack, under the United Nations flag, against China too. It did not stop at the border of the South Korea which it pretended to defend but continued fighting until it was forced to realize the hopelessness of its situation. That behaviour by the United States is very far from the concept of United Nations peace-keeping expressed in this debate. It is shameful indeed that the other day the General Assembly failed to decide at least to deny the United States occupation force in Korea the use of the United Nations flag.

43. In the case of the 1956 Suez aggression, United Nations forces had to be used against the Western Powers, not against a socialist country, so that was not an East-West issue. Nobody could be sure at that time that the withdrawal of the forces of the aggressors would go smoothly. Czechoslovakia and Romania were among the first to offer contingents for the purpose of UNEF, and that also was an alarming element for the Western Powers. So some people with inventive minds around the late Dag Hammarskjöld, worked out a financial formula according to which the soldiers would receive full board and a daily allowance and the contributing Governments would be

reimbursed for all the extra expenses that they considered reimbursable. By the way, it is interesting to analyse how, in order to overcome the reluctance of certain Governments to take part in UNEF, that formula was refined between November and December 1956. At the same time there came the idea of "collective financial responsibility" of Member States for the maintenance of peace and security. I emphasize "financial responsibility", because that was the magic formula behind which the political responsibility of the aggressors was really—and almost successfully—hidden. It is true that all Member States are individually and collectively responsible for the maintenance of peace, but it is not true that they should be financially responsible for the aggressive acts of other States.

44. Thus the answer to the question I put a few moments ago is very simple: the financial crisis of the United Nations was caused by the fact that the Charter provisions were disregarded and the Security Council was by-passed in initiating and conducting peace-keeping operations and in selecting the participating units, and that people in the Secretariat of Dag Hammarskjöld had invented a new financing formula. And, let me add, the selection of national units for a peace-keeping operation should be, as provided by the Charter, a task for the Security Council and not for the bureaucracy of the Secretariat.

45. "United Nations peace-keeping" in the case of the United Nations operation in the Congo (ONUC) was handled according to the UNEF formula, with the difference that it served mainly the interests of the United States. There is no need to quote from the Congressional Record, where representatives of the United States Government testified that the United Nations intervention had saved the United States from intervening in the Congo and that the United Nations action had been considerably cheaper for the United States than an action of its own, not to mention the political repercussions of such action. It is no wonder that about thirty Governments felt no obligation to contribute to the financing of such a United Nations operation. Therefore the misuse of ONUC only aggravated the financial difficulties of the Organization.

46. My fourth argument is also well known, namely, that the problems of peace-keeping, or the financial problems of the United Nations, are absolutely political issues; therefore, in order to solve the whole complex of questions we shall have to settle the political controversies, and the talk about financial modalities, however important they may be, should come last. We may well have reached a wonderful agreement on the distribution of the expenses of peace-keeping, but it will remain an agreement on paper if a new United Nations action is going to favour the interests of a small group of States, instead of promoting world peace.

47. There are other instances where no agreement can be reached on the basic issue of whether there is any need for United Nations action. In other cases views are conflicting on the type of United Nations peace-keeping to be applied, and so on. What can be done in those cases with an agreed formula for distributing the expenses? Nothing at all.

48. To emphasize the priority of the political aspects of the issue, let me point to the fact that in July this year the General Assembly failed to brand the Israel occupation of Arab lands as aggression; it did not find it necessary to request the Security Council to initiate United Nations action in order to oust the Israelis from the occupied territories. Those who insist that the deadlock in peace-keeping should be removed by legalizing the violations of the Charter, those who offer a formula for distributing the expenses as the most essential feature of peace-keeping, are not moved at all by the fact that the Israel forces have for six months been occupying Arab territories without displaying any intention of withdrawing.

49. Fifthly, I have to declare that my Government does not feel financially responsible for the indebtedness of the United Nations resulting from its so-called peace-keeping operation, that is ONUC and UNEF, and does not consider itself in debt concerning the financing of those operations. It is very unfortunate to mention, in connexion with peace-keeping, the problem of voluntary contributions to liquidate the deficit of the United Nations. But since the issue has been raised, I feel authorized to state that my Government is ready to make a contribution to liquidate that deficit in case the United States, too, feels bound by the well-known consensus reached in the Committee of Thirty-Three on 31 August 1965.^{5/}

50. Now, I should like to comment briefly upon draft resolution A/SPC/L.148. First, my delegation does not recognize "the urgent necessity" to adopt "even on an interim basis" such a system for financing future peace-keeping operations which is proposed in the draft, because it is against the Charter. Furthermore, the existence of a financing formula can be used to justify the initiation of new unlawful United Nations actions. But in case of a lawfully authorized action, the financial side cannot constitute a real problem for the implementation of a peace-keeping action.

51. Secondly, the authors of the draft use the expression "economically developed Member States". In connexion with the financing of UNEF and ONUC, the distinction between economically developed and less developed countries was based on geography rather than economics. It would be prudent to use scientifically justified terms in a draft resolution intended to create a lasting settlement for the financing of peace-keeping operations.

52. Thirdly, I should like to know whether the sponsors of the draft resolution thought seriously about what they propose in sub-paragraph a (iii) of the operative paragraph. How can they imagine that a system could be adopted where the permanent members of the Security Council would be entitled not to contribute to a given peace-keeping action, while the other Member States mentioned in sub-paragraph a (ii) would have to pay not only their own assessed share but a part of the amount assessed on the permanent members of the Security Council, if these refused to pay? I doubt whether we could institutionalize such a violation of the sovereignty of Member States. I

also doubt whether the permanent members of the Security Council would accept such a privilege. And they clearly indicated in our debate that they would not accept such a system. I have to say that this proposal, like the whole draft resolution, is unacceptable to my delegation; we consider it a gross violation of the Charter and an attempt to rewrite the Charter.

53. Finally, my delegation agrees with those who expressed the view that the solution of this manifold problem requires time, patience and reconsideration of former attitudes. Therefore, my delegation is prepared to support draft resolution A/SPC/L.150 which, *inter alia*, requests the Committee of Thirty-Three to continue its work.

54. Mr. PIÑERA (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Once again we find ourselves looking at the problem of peace-keeping operations which, because of the complex nature of its various aspects and because of its overriding importance for the future of the United Nations, has become perhaps the most important item on the agenda of successive sessions of the General Assembly.

55. May I remind the Committee of the words of the Secretary-General in his Introduction to the Annual Report on the Work of the Organization:

"The lack of progress in the establishment of a more durable framework for peace-keeping operations, with agreed and authorized guide-lines and ground rules for setting them up, conducting and financing them, undoubtedly diminishes the confidence with which the United Nations can face the probable conflict situations of the future. It is not to the credit of the United Nations that after nineteen years of peace-keeping efforts each operation has still to be improvised for lack of measures of a general preparatory nature by the appropriate organs." [A/6701/Add.1, para. 30.]

56. I do not think I should take up the Committee's time to repeat the views that my country holds on the constitutional, financial and organizational aspects of those operations. My delegation has explained its views in detail in various statements made in the past few years. Even last year, we participated actively in a joint effort with Argentina, Canada, Iran, Italy, Nigeria and Norway in efforts designed to ensure that the Assembly would adopt a draft resolution^{6/} that contained certain provisions on those aspects which, in the opinion of the sponsors of that text, could constitute elements that were acceptable, if not to all, at any rate to a great majority of Members, and which would enable the United Nations to make some progress towards being able to carry out peace-keeping operations effectively.

57. That draft resolution dealt very briefly with the constitutional aspects, in recognition of the fact that it is in that field that the most serious divergencies between Member States lie. It merely confined itself to recognizing the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security and the right of the General As-

^{5/} Ibid., Nineteenth Session, Annexes, annex No. 21, document A/5916, para. 2.

^{6/} Ibid., Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 33, document A/6603, para. 6.

sembly to discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security and to make recommendations on those matters, particularly if the Security Council was not in a position to take a decision. We suggested as practical measures to emphasize and strengthen the effectiveness of future peace-keeping operations, and while there was no identity of views among Member States on the constitutional problems, that the various possible ways of financing those operations and also the way in which the costs of a specific operation could be apportioned when they had to be shared among Member States should be examined. An important aspect of the latter problem lay in the limitation of the financial participation of the developing countries to 5 per cent of the total of such costs.

58. With respect to organizational questions, we invited Member States to send in to the United Nations information about the type of military or civil forces or services that they could provide, if they decided to do so, in response to a request for their participation in duly authorized United Nations peace-keeping operations. Further, we recommended that the Security Council should authorize a study of how to improve preparations for voluntary peace-keeping operations. We also recommended that, as a general practice, the Secretary-General should obtain an estimate of the financial implications of a recommendation or decision concerning measures designed to maintain or to restore international peace and security. He was also asked to explore the prospects for negotiating agreements with Member States to make available to the Security Council armed forces, aid and facilities in conformity with Article 43, and also taking into account Article 47, paragraph 2, of the Charter.

59. As the Committee knows, that resolution was adopted in the Special Political Committee, but the General Assembly did not take any decision on the substance of the resolution and referred it to the Committee of Thirty-Three as one more element of judgment in the development of its work. It was discouraging for my delegation to note that the majority of the Assembly was not prepared for the time being to accept the idea of moderate progress in this field, which was inherent in the draft that we had sponsored.

60. This fact, as well as the subsequent development of the work of the Committee of Thirty-Three in the course of 1967, and the resolution [2249 (S-V)] adopted at the fifth special session of the General Assembly, have enabled us today to see that there is in fact a preponderant trend in the Assembly in favour of dealing with the problem of peace-keeping operations on the basis of unanimity, although that means a postponement, for an unforeseeable period of time, of the establishment of guide-lines that would give more solid foundation for the preparation, development and financing of such operations. We understand that this feeling has been fostered by the lessons that many countries, particularly the non-aligned countries, have drawn from the exceedingly grave crisis that occurred at the nineteenth session of the General Assembly in 1964, and we cannot fail to appreciate the understandable fear with which such delegations contemplate a possible resumption of that crisis that

might result from any effort to reconstruct the edifice of peace-keeping operations out of the ineffective decisions which, though adopted by a majority, had been opposed by certain great Powers.

61. The Chilean delegation remains convinced that the opinions it has expressed on various occasions before the General Assembly are sound and that it was reasonable to provide for moderate progress in this field, as was suggested in the Canadian proposal ^{7/} last year. It is, however, prepared temporarily to accept in a democratic and conciliatory spirit, the viewpoint of progress through virtual unanimity inherent in the concept of the non-aligned countries and in the work of the Committee of Thirty-Three. We believe that the necessary time should be allowed to try out this approach and shall, therefore, refrain, for the time being, from submitting or sponsoring suggestions that might deviate from it. But what we wish to do is to express our fervent hope that the Committee of Thirty-Three can make progress in its work in accordance with its mandate which was renewed at the fifth special session of the General Assembly, and which certainly will be renewed again at the present regular session.

62. The Chairman of that Committee, Mr. Cuevas Cancino, in his most interesting and clear statement on 24 November of this year [570th meeting] correctly pointed out that although the Committee's work has not as yet yielded any tangible result, it has explored many interesting ideas that could lead to progress in this field. Perhaps at present one of the ideas—namely, that of making progress in the meantime in a matter on which there is no disagreement, namely the ability of the Security Council to decide, organize and mount peace-keeping operations—may present a promising way out of the present stagnation. However, that must be done without prejudice to the positions of principle of those who believe that it is the Assembly that is competent in these matters.

63. Moreover, my delegation would be happy if the Assembly could come to some agreement to carry out the suggestion made by the Secretary-General, in the Introduction to his Annual Report, that he should be authorized to:

"... study such questions as the standardization of training and equipment for standby forces, the relationship of the United Nations to Governments providing such forces, and the constitutional and financial aspects of employing them." [A/6701/Add.1, para. 31.]

We agree with the Secretary-General that "such a study would give some impetus to the development of the peace-keeping concept and technique and would provide useful practical ideas". [*Ibid.*]

64. I cannot conclude this statement without adding the voice of my delegation to that of the other delegations that have expressed, in the course of this debate, their deep disappointment at the failure of States to make voluntary contributions for the purpose of resolving the difficult financial situation of the Organization. The idea of these contributions, the nature of which is defined in a way which in no wise

^{7/} *Ibid.*, para. 6.

affects positions of principle, was an important factor in the solution to the crisis that confronted the nineteenth session of the General Assembly. They are indispensable for a solution to the financial situation of the United Nations, and therefore should not be held back any longer.

65. The delegation of Chile will examine the various draft resolutions that have been or will be submitted to this Committee and will pronounce itself on them on the basis of the criteria that I have set forth in this statement.

Organization of the Committee's work

66. The CHAIRMAN (translated from Spanish): As the Committee will have noted, two meetings have been listed for Monday, one in the morning and one in the afternoon, and two meetings are also scheduled for Tuesday. If necessary, we shall hold night meetings next week. I would therefore appeal to my colleagues who have put down their names on the list of speakers to be prepared to speak either in the morning of the afternoon of the days for which their names are entered, so that no changes need be made in the order of the speakers.

67. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee, who will give you some information about the Committee on Conferences.

68. Mr. CHAI (Secretary of the Committee): At the 570th meeting of the Committee, on 24 November, the representative of Lebanon made an inquiry as to whether the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations could be provided with Secretariat services

during the period January to July 1968, in order to meet the time-table foreseen in draft resolution A/SPC/L.150, should that draft resolution be adopted. The question was referred to the Committee on Conferences by the Chairman of our Committee, and the reply from the Chairman of the Committee on Conferences has now been received. The letter reads as follows:

"The Committee on Conferences, established under resolution 2239 (XXI), has examined draft resolution A/SPC/L.150, paragraph 1, which 'Requests the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue the work assigned to it by the General Assembly in operative paragraph 2 of resolution 2249 (S-V)', and paragraph 3, which 'Requests further the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to prepare its report for the twenty-third regular session of the General Assembly by 1 July 1968'.

"The Committee on Conferences has decided to recommend that if this resolution is approved, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations be convened at Headquarters for the periods 5-23 February, 4-29 March, 22 April-3 May.

"However, the Committee can foresee no difficulty in servicing meetings of the Special Committee during the period 19-28 June, when it might wish to finalize its report to the General Assembly."

The letter is signed by Brian J. Lynch, Chairman of the Committee on Conferences.

The meeting rose at 12.20 p.m.