

United Nations  
**GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-NINTH SESSION

Official Records



**2314th  
PLENARY MEETING**

Wednesday, 11 December 1974,  
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda item 20:

Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) . .

Page

1331

**President: Mr. Abdelaziz BOUTEFLIKA**  
(Algeria).

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Siclait (Haiti), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 20**

**Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*)**

1. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): When item 20 of the agenda was taken up for discussion in the plenary Assembly on Friday, 6 December, it must have come as a surprise to many of us that it should have been made the occasion for a searing indictment of majority rule, which since the birth of democracy has been regarded as its life force. It was ironical that the phenomenon of majority rule should have provoked a group of nations with an unrivalled record of successful exploitation of a built-in and automatic majority to release what I would describe as the diplomatic equivalent of a multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicle [MIRV] equipped with warheads of French, Belgian, West German and United Kingdom manufacture.

2. The targets at which those diplomatic warheads were directed were, to use the words of those participating in this combined operation, the tyranny of the majority, back-room manoeuvres intended to create an impression of unanimity where it does not exist—a most regrettable insinuation, I should add, and all the more so because it came from parties which have not been averse to organizing back-room manoeuvres themselves—questionable methods used during recent lobbying, the formation of a private club for the purpose of monopolizing action and the abuse of rules of procedure for political ends.

3. Had this indictment not come from such responsible members of the international community

it could have been dismissed as merely an outburst of hysteria. But the criticisms are so damaging and some of the language used so needlessly provocative that an answer is called for.

4. The champions of the democratic process, the defenders of the right of nations to vote on their resolutions, showed little or no respect for their avowed standards and principles when the draft resolutions on the Cambodian question and the Korean question came up for consideration.

5. My delegation realizes that we are replying to Member countries which we regard and treat as very close friends and whose policies we can understand even if we do not agree with them. But no country or group of countries can be denied the right to associate with any Members of their choice or among themselves in taking concerted action at the United Nations for the furtherance of policies and objectives which they share in common. If they fail to convert a dissident minority they will accept the consequences of their failure. There are private clubs, to which our critics belong, which are far better organized than ours. One such club counts among its most prominent members the group of countries which launched the campaign of criticism, condemnation and innuendo on 6 December in the plenary meeting against those whom they appear to regard as a misguided and irresponsible majority.

6. The most heinous crimes of the so-called tyrannical majority appear to be that many of them are small and poor and that they enjoy the support of the Communist bloc. But, as for the tyranny of the majority, if we were to examine the record of the United Nations during the first 25 years of its existence and to ask ourselves, with a proper respect for history and the truth, which majority it was that ruled the Assembly like a happy family over a quarter of a century, to deny to the People's Republic of China its lawful right of representation in the United Nations and to obstruct the attainment of universality, the finger would have to be pointed in a different direction.

7. What was the majority that used its power to prevent the voice of North Korea even being heard in the United Nations when its future was being discussed and the reunification and rehabilitation of that divided country were entrusted to a totally one-sided Commission—something far more outrageous than a one-sided resolution? Again the finger will point in the same direction.

8. The tyrannical majority was commanded then by those very nations that have participated in a seemingly spontaneous assault on the non-aligned group in the political sphere and, apparently, on the Group of 77 in the economic sphere.

9. We must bear in mind at all times that what is more important than the resolutions we adopt in this

Assembly is the manner in which we comport ourselves in promoting the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

10. How many members of the non-aligned group or of the Group of 77 have ever even given occasion to be accused of aggression, or of interference in the internal affairs of countries, or of attempts to subvert and overthrow Governments which did not support or promote their policies and their economic and political ambitions and interests?

11. On the other hand, is the record of our detractors and of those who leap to this rostrum to speak unctuously of the abyssal decline of the United Nations so free from blemish as to entitle them to berate us? Is their escutcheon so clean, is their conduct so irreproachable and are their pretensions to the role of defender of the faith so unquestionable as to justify them in adopting their holier-than-thou attitude? They do not have the moral right to cast the first stone.

12. It is understandable that Powers accustomed to command imperiously find it intolerable to comply gracefully. There was no need for a debate on this item to be punctuated with sermons on how the developing countries should behave. One representative, like the headmaster of the class, has uttered a stern warning, and the class must now transform itself into a silent and docile majority, accepting without qualification or question the device of consensus in the clear knowledge that consensus is a euphemism for a concealed veto that suits the interests and convenience of a minority, however small. If we are to abandon majority voting, we are left with the choice between consensus and inaction. If the only type of resolution that would be permissible is one that secures the support of States whose co-operation is vital to its implementation, we could dispense with our lengthy debates and appoint a drafting committee of certain major Powers, and those who are ever-ready to rally to their standard, to assume responsibility for drafting all our resolutions. That would be the new democracy to be sanctified by a new Charter.

13. It has been stated that many resolutions are adopted by majorities that represent only a small fraction of the people of the world, its wealth or its territory. The newspaper-reading public of New York and the United States might be excused for accepting such a statement as the correct version of the actual facts, however widely it may be at variance with the truth.

14. How small is a small fraction? Even if every resolution must be representative of a large fraction of the people of the world, of the wealth of the world and of the territory of this globe, are the majorities that include the 750 million of China, the nearly 700 million of the subcontinent comprising India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, the millions from other parts of Asia, including members of the countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations [ASEAN], the millions of black Africans and in some cases the not insubstantial millions from Latin America fractional?

15. Are the countries that comprise the membership of the non-aligned group representative of a fraction of the population of this world? They could be converted into a fraction only by the new arithmetic of industrial

and economic power which might make a million indigent Asians or Africans equal to 100,000 opulent Western Europeans.

16. Is there any single phrase in the Charter that suggests that gross national product and territorial extent should provide weightage in voting in this Organization as distinct from its financial affiliates, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund? From what doctrine does this novel theory derive even the semblance of validity, except the archaic doctrine wholly alien to the modern world and certainly repugnant to the principles of the Charter, the doctrine that might is right?

17. Yet another theory has been invented that the minority may in fact be a practical majority in terms of its capacity to support the Organization and implement its decisions. Some of those who speak of the capacity to implement the Assembly's decisions have proved themselves to be not unwilling to implement resolutions which they themselves have supported but ready to sacrifice principle for expediency and for financial profit on the least pretext. Contempt for United Nations resolutions is a worse form of brutality than disregard for the sensitive minority.

18. This Organization was not established in order to enthrone and consecrate wealth and industrial and military power. Every nation represented here could claim to have conscientiously discharged the obligations imposed on it by the Charter of the United Nations. Only reference to the records will show how genuine that claim is. No nation can be expected to ignore its national interests and its principles in deference to affluence and financial and economic superiority. We are not here to worship Mammon or to genuflect before Mars. If that is what is expected of us, the Organization has no right to survive. It deserves to sink into oblivion if the price of survival is acquiescence in its manipulation by, and its subservience to, the so-called practical majority.

19. The attitude of the so-called practical majority is like that of the schoolboy engaged in a game of marbles who, when he finds the game is not going in his favour, picks up his marbles and walks away in a huff. I may be guilty of plagiarism, as I believe that this simile has been used before, in which case my acknowledgements to its anonymous author.

20. Our credibility does not depend solely on our capacity to secure the implementation of our resolutions. If it did, it was undermined long ago, as there have been scores of resolutions which have been treated with indifference, if not contempt. Our credibility depends, on the other hand, on our performance, the extent to which we show ourselves ready and willing by deed, and not merely by word, to further the purposes and principles of the Charter, to abide by its resolutions and to redeem and retrieve past errors.

21. If there is such a thing as the tyranny of the majority or, to give it another description, the impractical minority, there is also its counterpart which is the despotism of the minority or the practical majority, to use an elegant euphemism. It is apparently through this so-called practical majority that the United Nations is expected to attain the Olympian heights which its founding fathers set as its ultimate goal and destiny.

22. We did not join this Organization to be either supinely submissive or aggressively assertive. We are undoubtedly passing through a period of transition. It is the mark of statesmanship to preserve one's balance and equanimity in such difficult times, to appeal to reason and employ persuasion instead of resorting to thinly veiled threats, to rely on tactful rapprochement rather than tactless reproof.

23. Sri Lanka is a member of both the non-aligned group and the Group of 77. It is a small nation dependent on the goodwill, friendship and support of all those who are disposed to helping it. We shall at all times be faithful to the Charter, placing our reliance on co-operation, compromise and moderation. We shall always be ready to be told when we are repudiating these standards or departing from them. We shall be ready with our answer. What we need is, really, a grand inquest encompassing the conduct of all nations and not merely confined to some recent trends.

24. If there have been some highly controversial developments of late that have taxed the patience and aroused the indignation of anyone, the course of prudence is to examine the circumstances that led to them and to determine the means of avoiding such situations in the future. In this context I should like to observe that the United Nations General Assembly should be regarded and respected as the supreme political organ of the international community and that, by agreement and understanding, its jurisdiction in the political sphere must be regarded as pre-eminent and exclusive. Specialized agencies should eschew politics and give their undivided attention to the technical questions that fall within their special competence and for the handling of which they were specially established.

25. The agenda item under discussion provides the most opportune moment for examining such problems and finding the proper answers that will help preserve equilibrium between numerical superiority and real power. This is not the time to indulge in mutual recrimination and my delegation, for its part, takes no pleasure in engaging in a controversy of this nature.

26. Let me now turn to the substance of the item that we are discussing. It was first introduced in 1972 and I must frankly confess that I viewed it with considerable scepticism. Whether it is the strengthening of international security, or the strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States, we are discussing the same problem—our own conduct. The most we do in the declarations we adopt, as in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], is to address fervent exhortations to ourselves to respect the Charter and to abide loyally by its provisions. This does not require long-winded resolutions or high-sounding declarations, because they are no substitute for action. Although we have been discussing the present agenda item for two years and the views of Member States were sought, only 14 Members have replied. And if one were to examine the substance of those replies, as contained in the Secretary-General's report [*A/9695*] of 16 October

1974, they deal with the following questions: increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations; using more fully the framework and means provided by the Charter to prevent tension, crisis and conflict; more active use of the machinery and possibilities of the Charter for preventing conflicts and encouraging the peaceful settlement of disputes; improvement of the functioning and effectiveness of the principal organs of the United Nations; effectiveness of the resolutions of the General Assembly and other United Nations organs; the fulfilment by all Member States of the obligations under the Charter and the implementation by them of the resolutions of the General Assembly and Security Council.

27. Most of the replies received read like philosophical disquisitions. The problems as summarized by the Secretary-General in his report, though phrased differently, do not contain a single new proposal which would help strengthen the role of the United Nations other than the obvious one that Members themselves should act in a manner which will permit the United Nations to be a more effective instrument in international relations. There was no need to have a special item inscribed on the agenda to remind ourselves of our obligations under the Charter and the need for fulfilment of these obligations.

28. If the United Nations is to serve as the centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of the common ends enumerated in Article 1 of the Charter, all its Members must co-operate to arrive at courses of action which will ensure progress, even with painful gradualness, towards those ends and their attainment.

29. We must adopt the methods of correction and prevention where they are required. Certain situations demand the adoption of punitive measures including complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of means of communication and the severance of diplomatic relations. Our common cause would be better served if, instead of indulging in philosophical dissertations, we concentrated our attention on the practical problems that face us and diligently sought a solution to them. We should be spending our time better if we acted in that manner and there are many such problems which many delegations have referred to in the course of this debate. They are right in expressing impatience with verbose resolutions and with solemn reminders of what we should do.

30. Economic inequalities and injustices are among the principal causes of international instability, unrest and tension, and they thereby constitute an abiding threat to international peace and security.

31. In the pursuit of its common ends, Members of the United Nations resort to various types of instruments such as resolutions, declarations, charters, covenants and treaties.

32. It is a truism to say that a better world can be constructed only on negotiation and compromise and not on confrontation. But too often we have had to be satisfied with much that falls short of the ideal means of giving expression to what has been described as "a more global opinion" as against the views of a numerical majority. Experience has shown, however, that the more general global opinion, which may also be described as a consensus, often results in a wishy-

washy resolution that leads us nowhere. It produces a feeling of euphoria, like a shot of LSD, but transports us from the world of reality to one of complacency and self-delusion. The sum total of such resolutions is agreement to do nothing and to remain in a state of inertia.

33. Driven to desperation and overcome by disillusionment and frustration, like-minded nations which are the victims of prevailing injustices and inequalities are forced to adopt resolutions and other instruments which they know have only a declaratory effect, but they do express the convictions of an overwhelming mass of humanity. Their voice has to be heard instead of being muffled in one way or another.

34. Among the replies that are contained in the Secretary-General's report [*ibid.*] there is only one which focuses attention on the real problems where the United Nations can and must play a more effective role, and that is the reply sent by Uganda. The rest, I regret to say, is a mass of verbiage and a congeries of self-evident propositions.

35. The representative of the United States was right in drawing attention to some of the principal areas in which the United Nations role could be more effective. They are the problems of population and food. There is also the need for the creation of a new international economic order. These require no treaties or covenants, but there is another serious question with which the United Nations has been grappling for some time now, and that is the formulation of a new international law of the sea. In these areas there is ample scope for constructive action. Simultaneously we must persevere in our efforts to deal with the problems that exist in critical areas of conflict such as the Middle East and, to a lesser degree, in divided nations whose peoples have not yet secured representation in this Organization.

36. There is the problem of general and complete disarmament and, at the heart of it, questions of strategic arms limitation and measures for the avoidance of the risk of nuclear war. The activities of the nations involved in the solution of these problems appear to us little more than an empty charade. Whether a world disarmament conference will accelerate progress towards real disarmament is yet to be seen, but it is foredoomed to failure if the countries that have the largest arsenals do not all participate. The climate of mutual confidence and trust does not yet appear to have been created, and that is an essential condition for any concrete and worthwhile achievement in regard to disarmament.

37. The eradication of poverty, disease and ignorance, and the improvement of the standards of living of the under-privileged and developing peoples of the world, as well as the extermination of all policies and practices that degrade the human personality are among the most urgent and important tasks of the United Nations.

38. The General Assembly has before it two draft resolutions on this item: draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4, submitted by Algeria and 47 other States, and that in document A/L.749, submitted by Australia and 12 other States. We have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting both these draft resolutions. We do find it strange, however, that having received the views,

suggestions and proposals of Member States regarding the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, we can go no further than transmitting them to the thirtieth session of the General Assembly for its consideration, as the draft resolution in document A/L.748 and Add.1-4 seeks to do. The other draft resolution, in document A/L.749, does, however, deal with a specific question of the greatest importance and one which has not yet been given the degree of attention it deserves. There at least an attempt is being made to repair this omission, and we hope that the Secretary-General's examination of the use hitherto made of the various facilities and machinery established for the peaceful settlement of international disputes will point the way to effective action in this regard. In the view of my delegation, however, the most serious omission of all is that the obvious step has not been taken—that of obtaining the views of the one person who is best placed to examine the problem objectively, dispassionately and free from the subjectivity that inhibits representatives of sovereign States. That person is the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Many members of his senior staff have vast experience in regard to the functioning of the United Nations and we should have done well specifically to have sought the benefit of their advice and their experience. The Secretary-General is entitled to proffer this advice without being expressly called upon to do so, but we should have been well-advised to make it clear that we relied more on him than on ourselves to suggest how the role of the United Nations could be strengthened.

39. Finally, if we really wish to make even a slight contribution towards increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations we should give its annual Assembly time to deal thoroughly and exhaustively with the most important issues and problems facing us, instead of adding to its already overburdened agenda items that have little practical value or purpose apart from providing us with an occasion for tedious repetition and the rediscovery of the obvious. We must place quality above quantity. We must also provide more time for consultations and negotiations within, and between, the various groups, especially where serious divergences exist, as envisaged in paragraph 5 of resolution 3073 (XXVIII). It is there that our critics, to whom I have replied today, are to some extent justified in their criticism, and I am not afraid to admit it.

40. Mr. ANWAR SANI (Indonesia): Indonesia belongs to that group of countries that attach a vital importance to the United Nations. We should like to see the role of the United Nations strengthened with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations among States. It was with this consideration in mind that my delegation joined the other sponsors in submitting draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4 for adoption by the General Assembly. My delegation would like to thank the delegation of Romania for the initiative it has taken. My Romanian colleague and friend, Mr. Datcu, has introduced the draft in a most lucid and eloquent manner; it is not necessary for me to repeat the arguments commending the draft for adoption by the Assembly.



41. My delegation was also a sponsor of a draft resolution submitted by the Philippines in the Sixth Committee to study the possibility of a review of the Charter.<sup>1</sup> We are of the view that the two efforts are complementary, both aiming at strengthening the Organization and increasing its effectiveness.

42. My delegation considers it advisable as a start to study the possible actions we can take, short of touching the Charter, in our efforts to improve the capability of the United Nations to cope effectively with the increasing number of important problems it has to face. An increase of the effectiveness of the Organization will at the same time strengthen its role in the sense that we desire. In this connexion, it would be useful to study the procedural aspects, our process of decision-making, the way we organize our work, and see whether they can be improved in order to increase the effectiveness of the Organization and thereby strengthen its role. We might profit by the ideas of bodies outside our Organization that have studied the possibility of strengthening the role of the United Nations by increasing its effectiveness through procedural and other reforms. I should like to mention the efforts made by the Stanley Foundation. In June this year, the Stanley Foundation organized a seminar attended by several representatives of Member countries of the United Nations on the decision-making processes of the Organization. The conclusions reached by the participants, which have recently been conveyed to the Secretary-General by the Chairman of the Conference, Mr. Maxwell Stanley, may well be worth studying. There are certainly other studies by other institutions outside the United Nations which may be helpful.

43. With regard to draft resolution A/L.749, sponsored by Australia and others, my delegation has no difficulty in supporting it, though we have some reservations on the reference to the International Court of Justice.

44. My delegation did not originally intend to join in the debate on the item now before us. We thought that we should not prolong the debate unnecessarily, as there appeared to exist a great measure of support for the two draft resolutions, A/L.748 and Add.1-4 and A/L.749. However, the remarks made during last Friday's debates [2307th and 2308th meetings] by certain delegations on the role of the so-called majority made my delegation change its mind. My delegation is glad that representatives of the so-called minority have openly expressed their apprehensions. It is better to have those apprehensions expressed openly before this Assembly than being murmured in the corridors. Here the matter can be discussed. Here we have a chance to clear the atmosphere through a frank exchange of views. Let me state at the outset that it is not so much the intention of my delegation to speak for the so-called majority. My colleagues from the third world who have spoken before me have stated the position of the so-called majority most eloquently and in clear language. What my delegation would like to do is to contribute to the defence of the United Nations, to which Indonesia, and many countries like us, attach very great importance, so that it will be a strong and efficient Organization, sufficiently adjusted to the changing conditions in the world to be able to cope with the problems, every day more

complex, every day more interwoven one with another, with which the world is confronted. They are called problems of global importance. It is said that they need a global solution through global efforts. As far as Indonesia is concerned, such efforts should be concentrated in the United Nations.

45. In the context of our exchange of views on this matter of the relationship between the so-called majority and the so-called minority, we must exercise a certain amount of self-restraint. The emergence of a different type of majority in the United Nations is a reflection of the change in the structure of its membership and of developments in the international world.

46. Though my delegation is not aware of the existence of a mechanical majority—I stress “mechanical majority”—in the sense that representatives of the so-called minority have tried to project to the Assembly and to which Indonesia, being a developing and non-aligned country, certainly is considered to belong, it would be well for us who are presumed, rightly or wrongly, to constitute that majority to ponder over the apprehensions expressed by the so-called minority. I use the expression “so-called” every time, having in mind what the representative of the United States said in his statement:

“... But the minority which is so offended may in fact be a practical majority, in terms of capacity to support this Organization and implement its decisions.” [2307th meeting, para. 112.]

47. My delegation does not think that we can speak of a mechanical majority, meaning that there is a majority that automatically votes together on issues before the Assembly. The outcome of the debates on the Khmer and Korean questions is sufficient proof that such a mechanical majority does not exist. A majority does, however, exist with regard to certain issues like decolonization, and to a certain extent issues like the Middle East and South Africa, which transcend the groupings, regional or ideological. A majority also exists on the issue of a new international economic order, consisting of developing countries who in the past have suffered from exploitation and who now want to see the rules of the game changed so as to safeguard their legitimate interests, and which can indeed be helpful towards narrowing the prosperity gap between the rich and the poor nations. We continue to hear the refrain that the rich are becoming richer and the poor are becoming poorer; we are lectured on the widening prosperity gap between the rich industrialized countries and the poor developing nations. But not very much is done effectively to stop the process, let alone to reverse it. It is only logical that the poor developing nations, who in the United Nations outnumber the rich developed States, would like the latter group to acknowledge their vital interest in establishing the basis for a new international economic order, which will be equitable and just, and help to narrow the prosperity gap between the rich and the poor nations.

48. In the more abstract sense as to the substance of the remarks on how a majority should behave, independently of whether they do or do not apply to actual developments as we see them today in the United Nations, those of us who are considered or consider ourselves as belonging to the so-called majority would do well to study them. We should not make

the same mistakes as were made in the past by today's so-called minority, who were then the majority and had in fact the capacity to implement the decisions of the United Nations, but apparently were not in a position to do very much.

49. On the other hand, the so-called minority needs to exercise some serious introspection and self-criticism. As I said, at one time this same so-called minority was itself a majority, a real majority, numerically as well as in terms of capacity to support this Organization and implement its decisions. What was their role during those years when they constituted the majority with regard to those problems with which we are still confronted today? What has been their role in the Middle East conflict? What have they done, all-powerful as they were, to make South Africa respect United Nations decisions? What has been their role in the process of decolonization? What have they effectively contributed to bridging the widening prosperity gap between themselves, as the rich industrialized States, and the poor developing nations they have exploited for hundreds of years? These are the questions which, in the first place, they should try to answer in all frankness to themselves before painting a picture in the way they did of the behaviour of the so-called mechanical majority which they claim exists today in the United Nations. Perhaps they will be able then to understand better why the so-called majority acts in the way it does and to exercise more restraint in reacting to the recent developments, which my delegation understands indeed cannot be expected to be to their liking.

50. Indonesia is a country which has a tradition of decision-making through a process of what we called *musyawarah* and *mufakat*, consultations and consensus. Most of our countries have at one stage or another known that method. But most of us have traded it for a decision-making process based upon the contention that half plus one should be right. In the Indonesian national process of decision-making, the majority has the obligation to try, in accordance with its responsibility to the entire people, to accommodate the minority as much as possible in order to reach a consensus; the process may be lengthy, cumbersome, sometimes exasperating; but we are much better off than during the period immediately after our independence when we experimented with the "half plus one is right" approach. Perhaps it is easier to do so in the national context, where the point of departure and concrete aims are firmly established in the constitution and the differences mainly concern the methods of achieving them. Indonesia has a tradition of respect for minority views, of trying to accommodate them as far as we can. Of course it is expected that the minority will also do their utmost to arrive at an accommodation with the majority. This is also the approach that governs the participation of the Indonesian delegation in the work of the United Nations. My delegation would not like to see the United Nations turn into an arena of confrontation between majority and minority, even if that minority does not in fact represent a practical majority, in terms of capacity to support this Organization and implement its decisions, as claimed by the representative of the United States. We do not see in the United Nations a factory to turn out resolutions, but a forum for the combined and concerted efforts of all the countries

in the world to find concrete solutions for concrete problems affecting the whole of mankind.

51. The United Nations as a useful institution can only survive if the so-called majority and the so-called minority do not consider each other as opponents and look at each other with suspicion, and if there is mutual trust and mutual confidence in the relationship between majority and minority and between the individual Members.

52. I say again that this opportunity to air our apprehensions and to have a frank exchange of views is most useful, if as a result we manage to clear the atmosphere, especially when the United Nations is confronted with complex problems of global importance and impact and when the maximum of goodwill and co-operation is needed to overcome them.

53. Mr. JAIPAL (India): My delegation had not intended to speak on this item, but the views expressed by some delegations have obliged us to react to them, not in a spirit of hostile confrontation and retaliation, but rather in the democratic spirit of free debate, in the hope that this will contribute to a better understanding of the majority's point of view and perspective.

54. To begin, it seems a little odd to us that we should be discussing the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations at a time when the United Nations is 138 Members strong. Is it seriously suggested that the numerical strength of the United Nations, never greater than now, is an attribute of weakness and impotence? I would suggest that an organization which is today more universal in its membership than ever before is a truer reflection of the world as it is and should be dealt with in a manner that is responsive to the majority's needs and aspirations.

55. While I do not agree with some of the opinions expressed here by certain delegations, I do agree with one particular statement of the representative of France, who said that a more and more interdependent world makes multilateral diplomacy more and more important. It is indeed the increasing interdependence of States that poses the challenges to the United Nations: the challenge that lies in the reconciliation of conflicting interests; the challenge that calls for the sacrifice of inherited privileges and advantages in favour of a more equitable distribution of the collective product; the challenge that demands the recognition of the important law of obligations as well as rights; and the ultimate challenge in the acknowledgement of the true nature of the world situation, which is the humiliation of racial discrimination, the indignity of human degradation, the resignation of the poor, the tragedy of those without any hope of relief, the burning anger of the deprived, the fear of those whose vested interests are threatened, and the cynicism of the rich, as well as their charity and compassion. Those things make up the totality of the United Nations as it is today.

56. Is it any wonder, then, that the imperatives of interdependence should assert themselves in the form of majority resolutions? Surely such resolutions deserve sympathetic understanding rather than strident threats of non-implementation.

57. The expression of hopes and aspirations is only the first step in the process of multilateral diplomacy.

To know the limits of collective action it is necessary, first of all, to know the scope and extent of collective aspirations; to reverse this order would be unnatural, unrealistic and impractical. I would therefore suggest that the multitude of resolutions that we adopt and the frequency of their reaffirmation are attempts to define and clarify both the needs and aims of the majority.

58. The fact that those resolutions are not mandatory in character and the fact that there may be practical limitations to their implementation are not in themselves enough to deter their adoption. If the criterion of unanimity were to be a prerequisite for the adoption of resolutions, the result would then be unending frustration. Let us look upon these majority resolutions as challenges and let us get down to the job of devising practical ways and means of progressively implementing them, in stages, to the extent possible.

59. The imposition of the rule of unanimity or consensus will make this Organization as slow and as timid as the most hesitant and reluctant among us. Paper consensus based on widely divergent interpretations and proliferation of majority resolutions are both signs of frustration in action.

60. It has been said by some delegations that the General Assembly must take care not to encroach upon the competence of the Security Council. That is true enough. But when the Security Council is stymied by the veto, or when the Security Council, despite its unanimous resolutions, is unable to act, is the General Assembly to remain a silent witness? What is wrong with the General Assembly expressing its views and adopting recommendations as an indication of the desires of the majority? Is not the United Nations intended to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations, according to the Charter? Surely in this laudable objective of harmonizing our actions the General Assembly and the Security Council may supplement each other's efforts.

61. Some delegations have questioned the propriety of certain decisions of this General Assembly in terms which imply the irresponsibility of the majority. Apparently they are referring to the exclusion from this Assembly of the representatives of South Africa and the granting of hearings and observer status to the Palestine Liberation Organization [PLO]. My delegation is surprised at the reactions to those two decisions. To be quite objective, is it not patently absurd for the General Assembly to reject the credentials of the representatives of South Africa year after year and yet allow them to participate in its sessions? If the rules of procedure are unclear as to how such a contingency should be dealt with, I suggest that the rules should be amended so as not to place the General Assembly in the ridiculous position of taking a decision but ignoring its logical consequence. Either the checking of credentials should be left to the Secretary-General as an administrative matter or, if it is to require the political decision of the General Assembly, then the consequences of the rejection of credentials should be squarely faced.

62. Now as to the question of the PLO, it seems perfectly sensible to decide to hear the views of an organization that is recognized as representing the Arab people of Palestine on the question of Palestine, which is after all at the heart of peace in the Middle East.

This decision is not without precedent. In 1948, the Jewish and Arab representatives of Palestine were both heard by this Organization in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. If I remember aright, the Jewish representative sat at the table of the Security Council, participated in the discussions and even proposed a whole series of amendments to the draft resolution on the future of Palestine.

63. Another matter that has surprised us is the curious question raised by some about the right of Israel to exist. I should have thought that as a Member State of this Organization Israel was entitled to exist as a State. And it does exist as such, and it has asserted its right to exist on four occasions in no uncertain terms. What is really in question is the right of the Arab people of Palestine to exist in a national State of their own and the recognition of their right to do so by Israel.

64. It has been said that procedural means are employed to secure majorities. My impression is that this is a well-established and respectable method in vogue in all freely elected democratic parliaments. Some delegations appear to be disturbed that this Assembly often takes refuge in verbosity. Is the alternative state of constipated silence less disturbing? The adoption of majority resolutions which are inoperable does not give us any political comfort; the only consolation of the majority is that it has had its say, and that is a very necessary democratic right. The minority of course has the right of dissent. But when one insists that there shall be unanimity or consensus, it is tantamount to allowing the minority to dictate the character and pace of progress and change.

65. This is not, of course, to minimize the importance and practical wisdom of negotiating agreed common courses of action. There is doubtless much virtue in such compromises. But one's faith in compromises is severely strained when one realizes that precious little has been done by the General Assembly to help the countries most seriously affected by the current economic crisis, or by the Security Council to liquidate the fruits of aggression in the Middle East.

66. Let the advocates of negotiated compromises address themselves to these two crucial problems of the day and implement the unanimously adopted resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. By doing so they will be strengthening the role of the United Nations. They have the resources, and the Charter provides the necessary competence for action. The so-called numerical minority has the power and the resources, but apparently it lacks the will to face the inevitable consequences of unanimous decisions. It is this same minority that 20 years ago had the additional advantage of a numerical majority.

67. I wish that this minority could comprehend the frustrations of a numerical majority that does not have either the power or the resources to fulfil even its modest aspirations. The minority, of course, has its rights and interests and is doubtless aware of its obligations to the majority. However, we should not think in terms of majorities and minorities in an Organization consisting of sovereign States with equal rights—an Organization whose powers of action are limited by the very sovereignty of its Members. One's expectations from this Organization must therefore be tailored

to its own limitations. And yet this Organization has to respond to the challenges of the concept of one world: the conservation and equitable distribution of its finite resources, the international division of labour and the distribution of its product. However, the responses of this Organization to these challenges so far have proved to be inadequate.

68. Our first order of priority is, therefore, to overcome the present crisis of confidence in this Organization by a unanimous reaffirmation of faith in it and in its Charter. The newly independent nations did not join the United Nations in order to liquidate it or to make it irrelevant. The attainment of political independence by them is not the end of the road; it is only the first stage of the march to the attainment of that minimum level of material welfare that is essential for a decent quality of life. This modest aim underlies the numerous resolutions adopted by the so-called mathematical majority. And this modest aim of the majority should not disturb the non-mathematical minority, which has had an earlier start in the business of utilizing the earth's resources in building its industrialized society.

69. What the majority in fact seeks is perhaps reflected in the words of my Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who stated recently:

"I wish for my people not riches or power but their basic necessities, so that they can have the opportunity to be human and to experience the fullness of life, to be not afraid of hardship or sorrow or danger but to meet them face to face as part of life. All our hopes cannot be fulfilled, and all our aspirations cannot be attained. But we can try, and if we succeed even in some small measure, it will be worth while."

In this modest sense, we consider that the United Nations is worth while.

70. Mr. HUANG Hua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to make a few observations on the question of the strengthening of the role of the United Nations, now under discussion in plenary meeting.

71. We have always held that in pursuance of the purposes of the United Nations Charter, the United Nations should play its due role in opposing aggression and interference, maintaining international peace and developing friendly relations and co-operation among nations. However, over a long period in the past, one or two super-Powers utilized the United Nations and did many things in contravention of the United Nations Charter and the will of the people of various countries. If the United Nations is to play its due role, it must conform to the trend of the world, act strictly in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, free itself from super-Power manipulation and control and truly reflect the just demands of the great number of its States Members and the people of the world.

72. However, at the plenary meeting of 6 December [2307th meeting], the United States representative hurled most unjustified accusations at the just actions taken by the third-world countries at the sixth special session of the General Assembly and the current session of the General Assembly. This is totally unreasonable. It is entirely proper for the represen-

tatives of third-world countries to give a well-founded and forceful rebuttal to those accusations.

73. The alleged accelerated and dangerous trend of the great majority of States, which the United States representative opposes, is in fact none other than the emergence and growth of the numerous third-world countries after the Second World War, as well as their increasingly important role in international affairs and within the United Nations.

74. One may see that after the end of the Second World War, many Asian, African and Latin American countries, which were long subjected to imperialist and colonialist oppression and enslavement and rendered totally powerless, obtained political independence one after another through their own struggles. In recent years, these countries have constantly strengthened their unity, supported and assisted each other and thus displayed their enormous power in their struggles to safeguard and consolidate their national independence, develop their national economies and regain the legitimate rights and interests they were long denied. They have become the main force in the current struggle against the policies of aggression and war pursued by colonialism, imperialism and, especially, the super-Powers. This is the mainstream in the development of the international situation in recent years and a hallmark of the present excellent international situation.

75. This excellent situation has also been reflected in the United Nations. In the short period of three years since the Chinese delegation joined in the work of the United Nations, we have personally witnessed that, at the General Assembly sessions and other international conferences sponsored by the United Nations, especially the sixth special session and the current session of the General Assembly, the numerous third-world countries, with soaring spirits and militant unity, have surmounted the innumerable obstacles placed by the super-Powers, upheld justice on a series of issues and thus made ever more important contributions to the struggle against colonialism, racism, zionism, imperialism and, particularly, super-Power hegemony. A great number of small and poor countries, which were looked down upon in the past, have now united themselves to challenge the arbitrary and truculent conduct of one or two super-Powers in the United Nations and have started to alter the situation in which the super-Powers could manipulate the United Nations and wilfully violate the United Nations Charter. This is by no means a "dangerous" trend, but instead a most healthy trend in current international affairs and within the United Nations. Together with the numerous third-world countries, the Chinese Government and people warmly acclaim and actively support this growing healthy trend. In our view, the awakening and strengthening of the third-world countries and their increasingly important role in international affairs and in the United Nations are indeed something fine, and definitely not something terrible. Those who describe it as terrible are none other than the one or two super-Powers that find it increasingly difficult to manipulate United Nations affairs at will as they did in the past.

76. The representative of one super-Power has asserted that in the United Nations "the rule of the majority" has become "the tyranny of the majority"



and that the United Nations should "meld and reflect the views of all" Member States. Playing the same tune on a different instrument, the other super-Power chanted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly this year that "the interests of all States must be taken into consideration", trying thereby to blackmail others. No one will forget that, over a long period, one or two super-Powers manipulated the United Nations to impose their will on others and did many evil acts in the name of the United Nations. Talking about tyranny, was this not precisely the tyranny of the minority, that is, the one or two super-Powers, over the majority of States Members? To put it bluntly, their true intent is none other than to continue to preserve the super-Power manipulation and privileged status in the United Nations. This is the "tyranny of the minority" in the true sense of the term. The talk about "taking the interests of all States into consideration", as trumpeted by the other super-Power, is even more deceptive. When these words are checked against the facts about that super-Power's vigorous opposition to the proposal on the establishment of a new international economic order at the sixth special session of the General Assembly, its adamant position of maritime hegemony at the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and its obdurate opposition to the just demand of the numerous third-world countries for a review of the United Nations Charter, does it not fully show that it wants to preserve its own hegemonic interests and privileged status in international affairs and within the United Nations at the expense of the national interests of the numerous third-world countries?

77. The super-Powers have also asserted that the Member States of the United Nations have different status and capabilities in international affairs and, therefore, different responsibilities. One may ask: is this not an open advocacy of super-Power privileges and big-Power hegemony and the power politics of the big bullying the small, the strong domineering over the weak and the rich oppressing the poor? If their demand is to be complied with, will not the history of the 1970s be turned back to the nineteenth century? It would be advisable for them to abandon their hegemonic tunes, and the sooner the better.

78. We have consistently held that all countries, big or small, should be equal. The affairs of any country should be managed by the people of the country concerned; world affairs should be managed by all countries; the affairs of the United Nations should be managed jointly by all the Member States of the Organization, and one or two super-Powers must not be allowed to manipulate international affairs and the United Nations in a wilful and arbitrary way.

79. The world is progressing amidst turbulence. Countries want independence, nations want liberation and the people want revolution—this has become the main trend of our time. The present world situation is excellent. The United Nations should adapt itself to the trend of our time and become an international organization which defends the sovereignty and independence of all countries, supports the just causes of various peoples and maintains international peace and security. China is ready to work with the numerous third-world countries and all the justice-upholding countries to make the United Nations truly capable

of playing a role in safeguarding international peace and promoting the cause of human progress.

80. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): It will be with reluctance that I shall say things I should have liked to be submerged in silence, for, after all, accusations and recriminations yield no fruitful results. However, I feel in duty bound, as someone who has seen what has been taking place in this Organization since its inception, not to keep my mouth shut. Therefore I do hope that any remarks I make from this rostrum will not be taken personally, inasmuch as we representatives here to a large extent do not necessarily voice opinions that emanate from our respective consciences.

81. How many times have I reminded my colleagues in this Assembly and in the Security Council that representatives have unfortunately been provided with tight jackets of instruction—always adding that, in order to make sure that the tight jackets of instruction match their behaviour in the Assembly or in the Security Council, they also wear the tight pants of procedure?

82. Suffice it to say that the ills from which the United Nations suffers do not emanate from the persons representing their respective Governments but from those who issue the orders, from those who are so preoccupied with the policies of their individual countries that they seem to have no time to watch the new trends in the world. They feel they can behave as they did before the First World War and even before the Second World War. Such policies, formulated by the politicians, by the leaders—or misleaders as they should sometimes be called—have boomeranged; they have backfired. Simply because the world has shrunk, people everywhere in the world are aware of what is going on, and this has nothing to do with technology or education. Man was endowed with a brain, with a mind, a discerning mind, and he can see and feel what is wrong and what is right.

83. It is that widespread awareness on the part of the peoples of the world that should convince the leaders—and more particularly the leaders of the major Powers—that there should be a new approach to international relations and especially to the work that is polarized here or, rather, the work we attempt to polarize in the United Nations.

84. The fault lies not with the representatives. The ills and ailments are those of the leaders who seem to be pursuing the same antiquated policies of power politics and spheres of influence which my good colleague from China prefers to call hegemony. Call it by whatever name you will, we are still suffering from the disharmony, the conflict of interests, existing between the major Powers, which seem to have forgotten that they cannot have it their own way, as their predecessors did in the past. Precisely because we do not have many worlds, the awareness of the peoples of the world, whether we like it or not, has made one world of this planet.

85. And now I come to the gist of the question, which is in the nomenclature that seems to be divisive instead of cohesive, let alone unifying.

86. We talk of the third world, which presupposes that there is a first world and a second world. Let us define what is the first world, what is the second

world and what is the third world. I prefer Saudi Arabia, and I myself as its representative, to belong to one world, the world of the United Nations. Now correct me if I am wrong.

87. Do we mean by the "first world" what our Chinese colleague called the super-Powers? And the "second world"—is it those who once wielded great power, who had empires yester-year, but are still strong enough to throw their weight in on one side or the other? And the third world, is it we, the developing countries, which seem to have a lot of human resources, a lot of natural resources, but perhaps not enough technology, not enough capital, or is something missing? Something is missing for those of us who are bereft of world power. There are those who exercise world power, and then there are the intermediary Powers who have tasted blood and can teach the super-Powers a few lessons, if they want to learn. And many of those belonging to the second world have shown poise lately, and moderation. What if the first world, those belonging to the first world, or the first conglomeration, and the second, connive and conspire, not because of malice but to serve their petty national interests? What if they connived, and the so-called third world tried year in, year out, to voice its displeasure, its disapprobation, for being neglected, with no one heeding it? Is it any wonder that the countries of the so-called third world should come together?

88. And how can they express their displeasure or their disapprobation? By sending their fleets? By exercising gunboat diplomacy? By proffering aid blindly or, in other words, bribing and corrupting certain countries to line up with them? Do you want to deny them the right to articulate their displeasure, their disapprobation, here in the United Nations?

89. I think that we should go to the genesis of the problem. I was tempted to bring with me a few books and to read chapter and verse here. But I left them at the desk, because I was afraid that my speech would be in the nature of recriminations, throwing accusations, which would be tantamount to sprinkling salt on raw wounds. And far be it from me to do so, because then I would be defeating the purposes of the United Nations, to harmonize our interests, and instead playing a divisive role, breaking us up into camps, with rigid attitudes: if you are not with me, you are against me. That would be the attitude.

90. I could be with you on certain issues and against you on certain issues. What is wrong with that? But I want our colleagues who really exercise world power to understand that the chickens have come back to roost. Despite our warnings at Lake Success, during the first year that we started work in this host country, that the purposes and principles of the Charter should be observed, that the right of self-determination should not be cast by the wayside, they did exactly the opposite, and did so on the assumption that we do not exercise enough power and that it would be safe to play the wanton with our goals, which, as often as not, we tried to achieve because we had equitable cases to bring before the Assembly or the Security Council.

91. Mr. Scali may have been doing some journalistic work in 1945 and 1947, but had he been an Arab or an Asian or an African at Lake Success, and then at Headquarters here, which we occupied in 1952, I am

sure he would have taken account of what had happened, because the major Powers—who were rightly called super-Powers by our Chinese colleague—did whatever they wanted and we had no voice, except perhaps to babble our statements without any effect.

92. So if our colleague and dear friend Mr. Scali had taken into account the fact that those major Powers erred and blundered and committed great mistakes, and if he had told us now, in 1974: "We did commit mistakes; we measured international affairs by the antiquated yardstick of yore; we were wrong, and some of you on certain questions may be wrong"—not surely wrong, because our position as a so-called third world is open to scrutiny, as to whether or not we were ultimately wrong—if he had told us: "We were wrong and maybe you are wrong on certain issues, and two wrongs do not make a right", his speech would not have elicited a lot of rebuttals from this rostrum.

93. But I am afraid that those behind Mr. Scali—and I say this in fairness to him and to those who are behind him—must have seen to it that he would button up his jacket and look only down one road, to demolish the effectiveness that the so-called third world has this year attained.

94. Now let us talk frankly. How can I do otherwise than talk frankly? This does not apply only to the country our friend Mr. Scali represents; my remarks apply to every country, including the one I represent. How true was Mr. Huang's statement in alluding to what he called manipulations. We all have to manipulate—it comes from the word for hand—but sometimes you manipulate to create something good and sometimes you manipulate to create something ugly or evil. It depends how you manipulate. How could the so-called third world manipulate except by banding together and raising its voice in protest at what had been done to it? I could not do better than say what the representative of Mauritius, the representative of Sri Lanka and the representative of Indonesia said today, but why repeat? But I am going to say how the manipulation was carried out by the major Powers.

95. There is manipulation by persuasion and convincing. A person, through repetition, may finally end up by being persuaded or convinced. And there is manipulation by what can best be described by an Americanism—arm-twisting. And there can be manipulation through secret agencies. There are all kinds of manipulation. I am not giving away a secret when I say that in the early days of this Organization I warned many colleagues not to be manipulated by strangers of easy virtue in the lounge here. We found that many were working for certain States. Representatives are human. There are all kinds of manipulations, but why should we catalogue them?

96. We cannot go on like this. Inadvertently Mr. Scali stirred up a hornet's nest, but in the early days of the United Nations the hornets of the so-called major Powers and those who went along with them stung us without our stirring them up; they stung us anyway.

97. Our good friend Mr. Scali said they were deeply concerned over the growing tendency of this Organization to adopt one-sided, unrealistic resolutions that cannot be implemented. Whether they are unrealistic or one-sided is disputable, but that they

cannot be implemented is right. We exercise no world power. But eventually, through their awareness, the peoples of the world will bring pressure to bear on their respective Governments, as happened in this country as regards the conflict in Viet Nam and perhaps in the Soviet Union regarding certain projects in Eastern Europe, military or otherwise. They later acted with restraint; there was more awareness. I do not know much about what happens in China. Our colleague Mr. Huang assures us it is not a super-Power, but it is on the road to becoming a super-Power. I do not know whether or not it will follow the same pattern. I hope it will not. We hope that, China being an ancient Asian State with a revered culture going back 6,000 years, the wisdom of China will prevail and it will not imitate those young children of power. Children of power—you Europeans start with the Renaissance, only 300 or 400 years, and you, our American friends, you are still babies sucking the thumb; you are not even 200 years old. You take that posture, as our friends the British did when they had the Empire, of being "holier than thou". The British Empire over which the sun never set: it sets over many parts which are not the British Empire now. They were "holier than thou" and out of one corner of their mouth they talk about democracy and the democratic way of life—I cannot do it with an English accent, I am doing it with an American accent. They talk about the American way of life or the British way of life and the so-called way of life of everybody who is strong, and then serve their petty national interests. And in the United Nations they work through manipulations, through foreign aid, through arm-twisting, through persuasion, through conviction. I am not going to enumerate all the methods that are resorted to. We cannot go on like that. The League of Nations foundered because they used the same methods, and had it not been for those diabolical weapons of mass destruction we should have had a third world war. How right were those who coined the phrase "the deterrence of fear". That is what is maintaining the *status quo*, but any miscalculation might plunge us into a holocaust.

98. The major Powers, speaking in the spirit of "holier than thou", wanted to make anything they said appear as if it were the absolute truth, and we told them time and again that there were no absolute truths.

99. And then our friend Mr. Scali mentions "the tyranny of the majority". How can there be tyranny of the majority when that majority cannot wield or exercise world power? What about the minority that can wield world power? What if its members are semi-tyrants? God help us that they should be tyrants. Take the tyranny of the majority—it is euphemistic—of the so-called third world. What can they do? Of course, I could tell them what to do if in future we should find that we have to resort to certain methods that, in self-defence, would not be tyrannical but effective. But that is not the subject today.

100. The "numerical majority" was referred to time and again. But what do numerals count for? Take the currencies today. The sums of \$1,000, 1,000 francs or £1,000 before the world went off the gold standard were small fortunes. But what do these sums represent today? In terms of 1914, \$1,000 is today worth but

\$80. Purchasing power; numerical majority. The numerical majority is not such a bugbear. The numerical majority has only moral weight. But you my good friend Mr. Scali, and the Russians and, to a lesser degree, the Chinese and those who follow you are the ones who wield world power, not us. You are the ones—individually and collectively. And God help us if the three of you should put your heads together and find a common denominator through consensus. Then we should be lost, finished. But we are not finished; your peoples will restrain you, because you cannot go on like this, underwriting conflicts abroad. You and the Russians constitute hardly 13 per cent of the world's population. Try to police the world and a hue and cry will arise from your respective countries: "Why should we go and involve ourselves in the so-called democratic rule of a region 10,000 or 15,000 miles from our shores?" That was not said by Baroody but by your young men, by the new generation in which we all place our hopes—not only by your new generation but by the generations of all the countries of the United Nations.

101. I was amazed to hear how such a learned man like my good friend Mr. Scali could say, referring to the so-called third-world resolutions: "These resolutions are sometimes adopted by Assembly majorities which represent only a small fraction of the people of the world, its wealth or its territory." [*Ibid.*, para. 108.] Is wealth the yardstick for wisdom? I have seen many wealthy people in my life. They were the most asinine, lacking in wisdom, because they got drunk with their wealth. I hobnobbed with them. They were pathetic. They became snobs. I heard a story about one of them. I do not know whether it is allegorical or factual, but the moral is there. In France, one of those wealthy people who had never read a book—but he was wealthy and he hobnobbed—was asked tongue in cheek: "How do you like Zola?" He replied: "I prefer Gorgonzola." He thought that Zola was a cheese. But he was wealthy. So, my good friends, if you have wealth, we are not impressed by the fortunes of the Rockefellers and a few others. I knew H. L. Hunt. He died recently. He was a very simple man. He once invited me to lunch, and instead of talking about something of common interest he spent half his time telling me how when he was a kid he liked raisin bread and he would go to the grocer and buy a loaf of bread and he did so himself even then. He was a very simple-minded, good, skilful man in making money. We have seen many wealthy men in our area. We call many of them nincompoops; they know nothing. But they can be mischievous if they should get into politics. Then government becomes government by subscription and by contribution, as is happening in many parts of the world nowadays. This is why we are told that wealth and power are interchangeable, which is true.

102. Now, let us get to the powerful. The powerful are sometimes worse than the wealthy who get drunk with power. I would refer you to Lord Acton: "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely". We have seen it everywhere. So, are you the major Powers preaching to the United Nations on wealth and power or on morality and on the Preamble and the purposes and principles of the Charter, in the drafting of which you played such a very substantial role in San Francisco?

103. In the same sentence, my good friend Mr. Scali said that the so-called third world—but he did not say “so-called”—constituted “a small fraction of the people of the world”. Good Lord, look at India, Pakistan, Bangladesh. Take the Arab world. Are we a small fraction of the people of the world? I do not know if China is a member of the third world; but it does champion its cause. But even excluding the 800 million people of China, are we a small fraction of the people of the world? Do we have to have computers and technology? You mentioned one person as being equal to 100 persons. What kind of arithmetic is this?

104. But let me say something to you the major Powers: the so-called third world is not a small fraction of the people of the world. Its wealth is much more immense than the conglomerate wealth of the major Powers, whose components are the Soviet Union and the United States of America. And our territory is much larger. I wondered how an intelligent man like my good friend Mr. Scali could make such a statement, unless it was provided to him by his Government.

105. Now, I come to his Government. He said:

“Far more serious . . . they encourage disrespect for the Charter and for the traditions of our Organization.” [*Ibid.*, para. 113.]

106. We have been clamouring time and again, since 1945, that after the Second World War the colonial peoples should exercise their right to self-determination. With what result? The military victors—who were defeated economically, as we saw later—partitioned Germany, partitioned Korea, partitioned Palestine. They followed the same old antiquated patterns of their predecessors of the days of the League of Nations. Did we do anything in disrespect of the Charter and the traditions of our Organization, or was it the major Powers who were serving their petty national interests?

107. And then, to bring UNESCO, of all agencies, into the speech of my good friend, Mr. Scali, about which there is a big fanfare in the press. Year in, year out, we have been telling the whole world that Jerusalem happens to be the Holy City for three faiths; and that only the Zionists had the right to wantonly, and sometimes arrogantly, take it upon their own responsibility to change Jerusalem. And we protested. Did anybody listen to us? And now, because UNESCO sounded a warning to Israel that it should not tamper with Jerusalem, and a vote was taken which was not in its favour, you bring that to our attention, my good friend from the United States?

108. You mentioned that Congress is losing patience with us. But my aides just gave me a note as to what Congress does. We do not deal with Congress. We deal with the Government of the United States. We do not deal with the legislative bodies of any country represented here. But what do they do? There are three musketeers in Alexandre Dumas. Here, there are four musketeers—Mr. Henry Jackson, a Senator from Oregon, I think; Mr. Ribicoff from Connecticut; Mr. Clifford Case from New Jersey; and our good friend Senator Javits from New York City. They bring 71 Senators with them to write to the President of this great country a letter trying to warn the Government to see to it that no one does anything to weaken Israel. This is the gist of it. Well, that is their business.

Their policy is predicated on help to Israel; Israel seems to be a very important State around which American policy revolves, for the security of the United States. The security of the United States? Israel is 7,000 miles away from the shores of the United States.

109. But this is not the point. And that the PLO is dangerous—I am paraphrasing. That is their privilege; that is their right; we should never interfere in the internal affairs of any State, including a major Power, the United States. But Mr. Scali wanted to intimate in his speech to us that Congress will be fed up with us here, the United Nations, so we had better beware.

110. We are not beholden to any congress or to any senate. And it seems that they do whatever they want and can get away with it in so far as some of our problems are concerned. I mentioned only two or three. What about the boycott of South Africa, or the question of chrome from Southern Rhodesia, in the Security Council? In fairness to the Government of the United States, it supported the boycott of Southern Rhodesia. But Congress said “No”. With whom are we dealing, with Congress or with the Government of the United States? We are not here to educate the Congress of the United States. They have their petty personal interests of getting votes, and they know that a certain segment of the population here—a small minority—has a stranglehold over their mass media. That is their business. Many of us are maligned here in this host country. Is this in the spirit of the Charter? They talk of freedom of speech. Licence is not freedom of speech but a lack of a sense of propriety. But who are we to criticize the legislature of a major Government? “It is dangerous. Don’t do it, Baroody.” Baroody will do it until doomsday if he thinks that we have a right to express ourselves on such irregularities.

111. The only victories with meaning are those which are victories for us all. This should be graven in golden letters and placed on a plaque as we enter this General Assembly, and signed “Scali”. I subscribe to that. But how are we going to achieve those victories for us all?

112. In fairness to the United States, they were voting for my draft resolution, which was against precipitous action on the review of the Charter. There was a paragraph there: Considering that we should endeavour to judge controversial issues on their merit rather than on groupings or what Vyshinsky called the mechanical vote. Then we will achieve the common victories which I am sure Mr. Scali as a person would like to see achieved in the United Nations. To look only at our petty national interests is no absolute solution, and we must look beyond them, as much as is humanly possible. Therefore I would say that Mr. Scali meant well, but his approach was perhaps a little off tangent—if I may say so—not because of his person but because of those in every country who issue the orders; and that does not apply only to him; it applies to most of us.

113. Shall we go on, and on, and on? Adducing arguments that in the long run people will tire of, in spite of the fact that they may be valid? No, we should not, and this is why I stop, although I still have a lot of ammunition, but ammunition that makes noise and does not kill people, ammunition that is like fireworks,



shedding some light, perhaps, on certain hidden truths.

114. I end my statement with what I started by saying: two wrongs do not constitute a right. Some major Powers and their followers, or those who are of the same persuasion, thought that they had had enough during this session. They had had enough in one session; we have had enough for 27 or 28 sessions and, since that country goes by weight and by height, 28 years of having had enough is far greater than one year.

115. But we will forget the past if the major Powers will promise us that they will judge issues, as far as it is humanly possible for them, on their merit; that they will exercise more fair play; that they will not drift into a situation where the work of the United Nations may become schizophrenic; that they will make it easy for us to not act always collectively, blindly; that they will make it easier for themselves to establish concord and harmony amongst all groups; that they will see to it that the resolutions of the United Nations based on justice are fulfilled and implemented, because they hold the power in their hands; that they will see to it that they do not treat us like snobs of power because it is really derisive to be snobs; and that they will come to the realization that their people are human like us, that we are *homo sapiens*, brothers under the skin.

116. Otherwise, if they continue to pursue those antiquated policies, I sound a solemn warning: this United Nations, for which there is no alternative, will finally be eroded and in the long run will totter and fall.

117. Let us make it work. Let us forget the past. Let us turn a new leaf. Let us be dedicated to the ideals of the Charter. Let us be true to ourselves, and peace, concord and harmony will reign amongst us.

118. Mr. ALARCÓN (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Since last Friday, the item now before the Assembly has for many delegations acquired additional importance because of its surprising utilization on that day in a campaign against this Assembly. That campaign has been launched during this session by those who yearn for the vanished past when they were able to impose their capricious will upon this Organization and who are seized with despair in the face of the clear and inevitable advances achieved by the progressive forces within the United Nations.

119. Our Organization is now the target of a hostile campaign characterized by untruthfulness, irresponsibility and demagogy. Its image has been distorted; falsehoods and prejudices are being brought into play; chauvinist and racist policies are being used.

120. The situation, in our view, is grave because the chief sponsor of this campaign is the Government of the United States, a founding Member of this Organization and a permanent member of its Security Council, a great world Power endowed with special privileges. It was therefore to have been hoped that it would have displayed a higher degree of responsibility and seriousness.

121. There is no need to point out that this is also the host country of the United Nations, but it is worth emphasizing the fact that the present behaviour of

United States authorities and their unjustified attacks on the United Nations constitute a serious violation of the duties the United States has assumed as the host country of the United Nations. The behaviour of the authorities in Washington clearly indicates that, far from striving to carry out their duty of improving relations between the United Nations and the community in which the Organization is established, they are waging a deliberate, intensive, wide-ranging campaign to poison those relations, to increase hostility towards the United Nations and to foster ignorance and distrust among the North American people. This can only aggravate existing tensions in this regard, which have made the City of New York a particularly inappropriate environment for our Organization to work in.

122. The statement of the Ambassador of the United States the other day, at the 2307th meeting, was surprising in that he did not conclude it by proposing that the United Nations perhaps might be transferred to another country, but we are sure that the Member States will do so in due course. We believe, indeed, that one of the most effective measures to be adopted to strengthen the role of the United Nations would be to take its Headquarters out of the territory of the United States. There are many countries with different social systems and different ideologies on any continent which would be able to offer the Organization an atmosphere of moderation, respect and legality, which does not exist at its present Headquarters.

123. I should like to refer to some of the arguments used in this campaign against the United Nations, which are directly connected with the fact that the United States is the site for the Headquarters of the Organization. One of the arguments used last Friday to counter the rule of the majority within the United Nations alludes to the expenditures within our Organization. On other occasions we have been able to demonstrate some figures in this connexion. We should like it to be reflected in the record of this debate that, in consonance with decisions taken by the General Assembly—even though with our own negative vote—the United States is the only Member State which is paying a share lower than what would correspond to its gross national product and, moreover, it is the only State receiving direct economic benefits of considerable size because the Headquarters of the United Nations is located in New York. Therefore it would be wise for those in the United States who promote hatred against our Organization to be more careful in claiming to be its major financial supporter, since—although they do not agree with the decisions approved by the United Nations—the United Nations has never ceased to be good business for New York as a city and for the United States as a country.

124. In one of his sharp comments, the representative of the United States also referred to the so-called unilateral action taken by the majority of the Members of the Organization. In defiance of good judgement, he spoke from this rostrum of "the tyranny of the majority". This matter should be considered with some care, and my delegation is pleased to note that other speakers have done so in statements made before my own. I should merely like to add a few brief comments in this connexion.

125. Indeed, the speakers on Friday do not have such a high esteem for the criteria of the minorities; at least, they did not give any demonstration of that when, in the past, within this Assembly, comfortable margins could be concocted in order to ensure adoption of resolutions that were to their liking and benefited them. The problem is that some States, led by the United States, would like to resist the unavoidable changes occurring in the international arena, which are transforming the world and which are now inevitably beginning to be reflected in the United Nations as well. Were they not those who supported the partition of Palestine against the opposition of all the Arab countries and the very people concerned? Did they then consider the inadvisability of adopting what they now call "extreme and unilateral" resolutions? Were they concerned at that time? Did they have any scruples with regard to the opinions of those who in 1947 formed a minority within the General Assembly?

126. Have they perhaps forgotten the war imposed upon the Korean people in 1950 and the unscrupulous manipulation of the United Nations by the United States and its accomplices in that adventure, the consequences of which are still being borne by that country? Was it not the United States and its allies which hastened to condemn a people, whose views were not even heard, and unleashed upon them hundreds of thousands of soldiers and tons of bombs and shrapnel? Was it not indeed the United States which, in flagrant violation of the Charter, wrenched this matter out of the hands of the Security Council and brought it to the Assembly, specifically to avoid the minority opposition in the Council and to impose the war of aggression by sheltering themselves behind the majority which they were then able to count upon within the Assembly? Where in those years was their eagerness for moderation and prudence, where then was their so-called respect for minorities?

127. In fact, behind the rhetoric unleashed on Friday, we can see a design which should elicit the strongest rejection on the part of all of the progressive forces within this Assembly. Last Friday we witnessed an attempt to impose a waning superiority upon this United Nations, waning because it ignores the will of the majority of its Members and the march of history.

128. For this Organization, the date of 6 December 1974 will remain a milestone, marking the moment when colonialism and racism attempted to make a declaration of war and revenge in the same room in which, 15 years ago, they were condemned without appeal. This message could not be any clearer. The retrograde forces of colonialism and imperialism are combining to threaten the Assembly, attempting to organize the extortion of the third world and to impose their will upon the majority of Member States.

129. My delegation is convinced that this attempt will be in vain and that the overwhelming majority of Members of this Organization will continue in the future to attempt to fulfil the purposes and principles of the Charter, and to attempt to ensure that our Organization will each day more fully reflect changes in the world, because this is the only way it can truly be strengthened, to enable it to play a positive role in the present international situation and to play its own part in contemporary history.

130. To this end, the Member States should take appropriate steps to complete the process of decolonization, to promote the new international economic order and to consolidate the progress achieved in international *détente* and co-operation. Such a programme would be in the common interest not only of the vast majority of the Members of this Organization but also of the overwhelming majority of mankind. It could be carried out by strengthening the unity that exists among Socialist States, non-aligned countries and all others interested in promoting true international co-operation. That group of States whose concerted action has made possible important victories this year is the new majority that must be preserved and strengthened. My delegation is sure that the unity and cohesion of the new majority in our Organization will grow in strength and expand in the future.

131. If some time ago Thomas Jefferson could say of this country "I tremble for my country when I think that God is just", it is certain that those in the United States Government of today, should they persist in ignoring the will of the peoples of the world and in running counter to history, have reason to tremble all the more, because the peoples of the world will not falter in their fight to make justice hold sway throughout the world.

132. Mr. GHORRA (Lebanon) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The delegation of Lebanon is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4. We have taken this initiative for three basic reasons.

133. First, Lebanon is one of the founding Members of the United Nations and participated in the drafting of its Charter. Lebanon would therefore like to consolidate the role of the Organization with regard to peace, security and international co-operation.

134. Secondly, the United Nations is, without any doubt, facing a moral crisis with regard to world public opinion. We see with great concern certain behaviour in the Security Council and in the General Assembly which is weakening the effectiveness of the United Nations and impairing peoples' confidence in this august body. Some delegations would like to have the Charter revised, so as to eliminate any obstacles to implementing its principles and to enable the Organization to play the role incumbent upon it with regard to international peace and security.

135. Thirdly, the initiative taken by the delegation of Romania two years ago, when it proposed that this question be studied, is a praiseworthy one. It should be viewed positively as we attempt to strengthen the United Nations and its role.

136. The draft resolution of which we are a sponsor is balanced and moderate and should elicit no controversy or opposition; on the contrary, it combines the desires of all groups and all States with regard to the study of measures that can make the United Nations effective and enable it to achieve the aims and purposes of the Charter.

137. We also consider the draft resolution submitted by Australia and other countries in the same light.

138. We had hoped that the General Assembly would adopt our draft resolution without becoming involved in lengthy discussions. But some Western Powers have raised a political controversy under this

item with regard to the rule of the majority and have questioned its behaviour and objectives. While this question has been raised in an unfortunate way as far as the motives behind it are concerned, I believe, none the less, that it is useful; a frank discussion of the problem, without violent words or violent attitudes, will prove useful, since the problem will thus be placed in its true context, illusions will be dispelled and any propaganda halted that would not be in the interests of the United Nations and might impair the prestige of the Organization among some government circles, in Western countries in particular.

139. We hope that this frank discussion will contribute to a rapprochement rather than widen the gap between what has been called the "tyranny of the majority" and the "powerless" minority and that it will put an end to tyranny and to the illusion of a lack of power. Our efforts are therefore designed to promote the interests of the United Nations and of mankind as a whole.

140. I shall not refer to all the points raised by some speakers last week because many representatives today have already analysed and responded to them. But I should like, none the less, to touch on the following points.

141. First, the two draft resolutions that have been submitted under the item are useful and will doubtless achieve positive results. We hope that those results will be realistic. But, together with many others, we believe that the Charter does hold within it the means to place the United Nations in a position to play a more effective role in the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, to discourage aggression and to impose sanctions on the aggressors. The right of veto, however, which is exploited by some countries, does indeed hinder the adoption of effective measures in the Security Council that would make it possible for the United Nations effectively to play its role. Lebanon has frequently been asked: What is the use of resolutions adopted by the Security Council that condemn or warn Israel when Israel continues to violate Lebanon's sovereignty and to jeopardize its territorial integrity? Indeed that problem is quite well known, and it is most unfortunate because it impedes the adoption of measures leading to the maintenance and consolidation of peace. What is important is not texts; they exist and there are enough of them. What is lacking in this Organization is the will to impose sanctions on the aggressor.

142. International peace and security cannot be strengthened unless we decide to implement the provisions of the Charter objectively, equitably and justly, and force all aggressors to respect the Charter as well as the resolutions adopted by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

143. Secondly, we believe that this discussion must be placed in its true context. It is unfortunate that a propaganda campaign against the majority is accompanying the discussion of this problem. That propaganda campaign is waged by some of the communications media. It has been instigated by the Zionist alliance and is designed to weaken our Organization, for the West should support the just causes of the third world. This propaganda campaign is designed also to impair the relations of the West with the Arab coun-

tries, and particularly the relations of the United States with those countries.

144. Thirdly, I very much doubt that this whole question would have been raised if decisions had not been taken against South Africa and in favour of the Palestinian people and their fundamental rights. I would go even further and say that if the question of Palestine had not been considered here and if resolutions had not been adopted under that item, this propaganda campaign directed against what is called the "Communist-Arab alliance" and its domination of the United Nations would not have been waged. Furthermore, we would not have been studying this item in such a hasty way.

145. Fourthly, the "tyranny of the majority" has been referred to. We should ask those who drew up the rules of the game to accept the results of action under those rules in a sportsmanlike way.

146. References were made to what took place in the General Assembly in 1947, when the resolution on the partition of Palestine was adopted. We the members of the Arab delegations—and I was a member of the Lebanese delegation at that time—lived through some dark days at Flushing Meadows, when the full weight of the then majority, consisting in particular of the great Powers, was brought to bear against the Arab peoples, and particularly the Arab people of Palestine, and when all kinds of pressures were used during the procedural discussions in order to postpone the voting and secure a majority for the decision on partition. At that time we were in the minority of a few small, weak countries. We very well remember the support given to Israel by the great Powers at that time. It is true that they have since changed their positions and have adopted more constructive, more positive attitudes.

147. If after 27 years the General Assembly, in an atmosphere of freedom and objectivity and without the least pressure, has at last recognized the fundamental rights of the Palestinian people, all it has done is recover part of the respectability it lost on 29 November 1947.

148. Fifthly, it must not be forgotten that we here represent almost all the countries of the world. Our delegations are acting in a serious and responsible way, carrying out the instructions of our respective Governments, which know what they want, which know too how to take decisions in accordance with their constitutional procedures. Our positions and our actions here are therefore no less responsible and no less serious than they would be in any parliament of the world.

149. Sixthly, some maintain that world opinion is hostile to the United Nations. What public opinion is being referred to? The countries of the majority express the views of opinion in their countries—and they make up the majority of the countries of the world. If what is being referred to is United States public opinion, then let us look for the true attitude of that public opinion towards the United Nations. The Lebanese delegation has the highest regard for the American people. We are sure that they are moved by the most noble objectives and the most humanitarian aspirations, by a spirit of justice and fairness. However, the problems under discussion directly concern

not American public opinion but, rather, the forces that claim to speak on its behalf and to express its views.

150. Last July, the Harris Institute conducted a poll on the United Nations. According to the results of that poll, 76 per cent of those questioned felt that the United Nations was a worthwhile Organization. Of the persons questioned, 73 per cent felt that the United Nations was an open and honest forum for discussions among States and that it was very useful for countries to be able to meet at the United Nations to discuss problems that could give rise to disputes among them. Furthermore, 63 per cent felt—as against 18 per cent holding the contrary opinion—that a global approach was needed to the present problems of the world and that only the United Nations and its agencies were capable of taking such an approach. Accordingly, they said that they supported the work of the United Nations and would not wish to see the Organization weakened in any way. The only criticism levelled at the United Nations was that there was too much talk there and too little action—in other words, that many of our resolutions are not being implemented. Two main accusations were levelled at the United Nations, but they were rejected by those polled. Most of those polled—39 per cent as against 18 per cent, with 33 per cent stating that they had no opinion—rejected the thesis that the United Nations supported the Arabs and was hostile to Israel, whereas Israel has accused the United Nations of being unfair to it. And 57 per cent, as against 20 per cent, rejected the view that, in general, the United Nations has acted in a way contrary to the interests of the United States.

151. We must bear in mind that the United Nations does more than merely implement the aims of resolutions recorded in documents. Nor is it merely an administrative mechanism housed in a glass and concrete building. It is much more. It is an effective and dynamic Organization, for yesterday's majority no longer exists, just as the majority of today or tomorrow will not last for ever. But what will survive is open and reasonable dealing which serves the cause of mankind as a whole and the interests of all peoples, for we all accept that the United Nations, despite its failings, is the best institution ever established to serve the international community. We should act so that it remains a source of vitality, dynamism and activity in all areas to solve the problems of mankind in its search for the realization of its aspirations and the fulfilment of its needs.

152. Never in the past have we relied as we do today on this Organization and its constituent bodies, and on conferences organized under its aegis, to study the problems common to mankind and to seek the right solutions. In the past, war was often used as a means of solving problems. Now the United Nations is a forum where we can speak to each other and seek solutions that will bring us closer instead of dividing us. If we reduce the United Nations to nothing, if we damage its prestige, then there will be an end to the hopes which small countries and the peoples of the world placed in an international system capable of fulfilling the aspirations of those peoples for a just and equitable future. Certain well-armed great Powers might perhaps be able to do without the United Nations and safeguard their own security, but the small coun-

tries and the developing countries need the United Nations to safeguard their independence and their sovereignty, to develop their economies and to ensure their social progress.

153. But the major Powers cannot either live outside the present-day world or establish their hegemony over it. The era of hegemony has gone for ever and the policy of *diktat* no longer exists. The only viable policy is based on justice; it is a policy responsive to the needs and aspirations of the overwhelming majority of people and States, operating in the context of international co-operation and interdependence.

154. There is one fact which must be recognized: the emergence of new forces in the world, above all the third world. It would be wise and judicious to carry on with the dialogue instead of overlooking this new force. There should be increased dialogue and dealings between that force and those that dominated the world in the past.

155. The participation of the countries of the third world in our Organization, after they had cast off the yoke of colonialism and exploitation, has fulfilled one essential aim of the Charter, the universality of this Organization, which was so earnestly desired by its founders. That universality can be achieved, not so much through the number of Member States, but rather because we have here a meeting place of the cultures, aspirations and the needs of all countries and all peoples, which makes the United Nations a true reflection of the world in which we live. The Organization becomes stronger and more complete each time a new country joins it, and each time that it makes more vigorous efforts to resolve the problems of the world as a whole.

156. Consequently, the United Nations does not serve any particular group; it is a universal organization whose aim is to serve man wherever he may be and to solve all his problems. In the United Nations, all spiritual, intellectual and material forces should merge their efforts to work for peace and prosperity, to reinforce and ensure respect for the principles of the Charter and to see that they are applied, because this will serve the essential interests of each of our countries.

157. The world is now faced with political crises and acute economic difficulties. We are also threatened by famine, underdevelopment and the deterioration of our environment. We must, therefore, solve these problems on the basis of dialogue and co-operation. That is the course on which we should embark.

158. Mr. N'DESSABEKA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Having associated itself since 1971 with the initiative of Romania, which stressed the need to strengthen the role of the United Nations in contemporary international relations, the People's Republic of the Congo desired to reiterate its attachment to the Organization which, despite often justifiable criticisms, remains the appropriate context for solving problems of world interest.

159. Ever since its accession to independence and international sovereignty, the Congo has supported the United Nations with faith and conviction, as the ideal forum for the successful discussion of the problems of peace, security and co-operation for the well-being of the peoples on our planet. Our contribution to this debate must be viewed in that context.



160. From this rostrum, some have described as verbosity our will to reinforce the role of the United Nations in the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation between all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States. I shall shun all polemics, which would only render barren a debate that we all wish to be constructive, but I might remind Members that the "mechanical majority", today decried because it favours the countries of the third world, was once, in this same Hall, the main weapon of the Western Powers, in the dawn of independence, when voting was still largely based on attachments to former masters.

161. The countries of the third world, having become aware of the similarity of their situations and, hence, of their solidarity, now wish to express collectively their legitimate claims, which, in the final analysis, are directed to making international relations healthier by ridding them of the vestiges of colonialism. My delegation really finds nothing in this that could cause concern to anyone except those who wish to retain their acquired rights. Playing to the gallery in speeches about interdependence and community of interests, while their only concern is to protect narrow national interests which are outdated by the complexity of contemporary international relations, those Powers are now hiding behind an alleged demagoguery of the countries of the third world in order to mask their refusal to accept change.

162. We fear the problems that demand remedies, but we believe in the power of words; we place our hope in the ideals which led to the creation of our Organization. That means that we are neither disappointed nor discouraged by the resolutions that are repeated year after year and are always ineffective, and that, according to the specious reasoning of certain speakers, are typical of our Organization.

163. Our concern for negotiation is equalled only by our wish to stay away from the political tourneys of those Powers that wish to control the United Nations. In order to illustrate this thought, suffice it to recall a recent event that reflected the differences in attitude of either side towards our Organization. At the beginning of this year, after what is customarily called the energy crisis, when the President of Algeria, Mr. Houari Boumediène, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, called for a special session of our Assembly to debate this problem of world interest,<sup>2</sup> 13 Western countries, seeking confrontation, decided to meet in Washington to constitute "a holy alliance of consumers". On that occasion there was sufficient proof that the countries of the third world had full confidence in our Organization, which remains the only world forum capable of offering everyone a chance to contribute to the solution of problems of common interest.

164. The third world has refused and will continue to refuse confrontation, preferring joint solutions which, because they are global and are the result of a large measure of agreement, are our best guarantee.

165. The third world has refused and will continue to refuse confrontation, by faithfully acting in accordance with the principle that major problems require major solutions. Confronted every day with even greater problems, we have always advocated the largest possible participation of all in efforts made

within the United Nations. That was the case with regard to the thorny problems of the law of the sea, of population and of food. It is only in the context of such participation and if we act courageously and selflessly that we shall be able to achieve the noble ideals embodied in our Charter—namely, peace and security, the well-being of all peoples and respect for the independence and sovereignty of each State. Only within that framework and by respecting jointly adopted measures shall we succeed in fighting the evils of misery, underdevelopment, racial discrimination, *apartheid*, imperialism, colonialism and the exploitation of man by man.

166. So long as those measures remain dead letters, so long as certain countries, and those not the smallest, continue to trample under foot resolutions adopted by wide consensus, we should not be surprised that at each session we make the same claims, at the risk of attaching too much importance to the world of words and displeasing those who are allergic to it.

167. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): The debate the Assembly is today devoting to a question of vital importance for the future of our Organization has been diverted towards a controversy as unforeseeable as it was premature. For we had reached a point at which it was simply a question of gathering and studying the opinions of Member States on the appropriate way of strengthening the role of the United Nations, since such strengthening had over the years become a more and more obvious need and an almost indispensable condition of the fulfilment of the fundamental objectives laid down in the Charter.

168. In the opinion of my delegation and of those delegations that have sponsored the draft resolution in document A/L.748 and Add.1-4, since a consensus had been reached on the need to strengthen the role of our Organization, what we had to do was to progress towards that objective by setting in motion a process of collective reflection. By that means all Member States could, by making a concerted effort at objective and sincere reform, identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Organization, propose sectoral or global solutions and, finally, adopt those ways and means that would lead to the result so eagerly sought—namely, that of providing the Organization with the moral and material conditions that would enable it more effectively to play the role assigned to it under the Charter, which the entire world expects of it.

169. What will those ways and means be? Will they involve a better utilization of the existing organs of the United Nations, or will they involve the creation or organic strengthening of certain of its institutions? Will they involve doing away with some bodies or merging them one with another? Will they involve enlarging the terms of reference of certain fundamental political bodies? Will it be possible to envisage a new conception of the Organization by totally rethinking its role and by conferring upon it means more adapted to the evolution of the world situation, particularly since the 1960s? In addition to those possible internal actions, would it be necessary to undertake some external actions? In that case, what would be their nature and scope?

170. Those are all questions on which our attention should be focused—and first and foremost, we must consider the definition of the role of the General As-

sembly in regard to that of the Security Council, not forgetting the Economic and Social Council, in view of the changes that have occurred in the world since 1945.

171. In view of the turn the debate has taken, it might perhaps be useful briefly to recall the political conditions under which our Organization came into being. It was, in fact, during the most difficult moments of the Second World War that the concept of an organized and lasting peace, based not only on an idealistic vision of peace but also on a desire to put it into effect, led to its gradual maturation in stages marked by the Inter-Allied Declaration, of 12 June 1941, signed at St. James's Palace, London, the Atlantic Charter, of 14 August 1941, the Declaration of United Nations, signed on 1 January 1942, and finally, in 1945, the San Francisco Conference, which took place after certain details had been worked out at the allied conferences in Moscow in October 1943, in Teheran in December 1943, in Washington in October 1944 and in Yalta in February 1945.

172. It therefore becomes quite understandable, in the context of the world of that time, when four or five countries, with the help of some others, were bearing the entire brunt of defending the right to survival of all mankind, that the notion of universal peace should be linked to the alliance of those four or five countries and even conditioned by their solidarity, thus conferring upon them, as it were, a sort of mission which could be accomplished only through their unanimous and concerted aid. From it emerged the postulate, which is clear in the Charter, that any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security is exclusively within the purview of the five main allies of the Second World War, and it is in the Security Council that that exclusivity appears in its clearest form.

173. The system of essential unanimity governing the functioning of the Security Council later revealed—because of the inevitable right of veto it implies—all its shortcomings.

174. In effect, when they drew up the Charter, the five big Powers, still traumatized by the conflagration of the Second World War, saw things from the wrong standpoint, as is quite evident today, and seem to have taken into account only what they had in common, namely, their desire to avoid a renewal of so much suffering for mankind.

175. Everything was done as if they had not foreseen that, with the passing of the storm, the differences separating them ideologically would eventually surface and divide them into two different blocs which, in the atmosphere of the cold war, soon blocked all action and all important initiatives in the Security Council by the use of the right of veto.

176. But those who promoted the Charter did not simply think of a military peace; they were thinking also of a deeper peace, a political, social and economic peace, as defined by paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 1 of the Charter. And it is the bringing about of this peace, founded on harmony, on respect for ideological, social, economic and political systems, which is part and parcel of the duties of other bodies of the United Nations, particularly the General Assembly, on whose

role certain speakers have expressed a rather surprising judgement.

177. A more thorough study of the role of the General Assembly might have demonstrated to those speakers the positive and dynamic contribution it has made in seeking for solutions to its problems, which the Security Council has often not been in a position to settle. In effect, because of their active participation, the nations of the world, great, medium-sized and small, have been able, because of the General Assembly, to make their voices heard and to reinforce a new conception of universal peace—a social peace, with human dimensions, whose destinies are beyond the threat of the veto.

178. Thanks to the fact that from year to year it has been enriched by the admission of new Members, thanks to the respect of the majority system, the General Assembly has, as days have passed and as events have occurred, succeeded not only in introducing new ideas but in involving in its dynamic actions a Security Council which has frequently been rooted in a sterile and outmoded conservatism. I shall simply refer as an example to the dynamic action of the General Assembly in holding its special sessions, convened because of serious situations that the Security Council was incapable of settling and thanks to which tensions have been eased and a worsening of the situation avoided.

179. Let us not forget that, thanks to its perseverance, the General Assembly has been able to develop the concept of the need for decolonization, which the Security Council even refused to consider during the initial years by sheltering behind Articles 2 and 7 of the Charter and by considering that colonial problems were a part of the internal policies of the colonizing countries. It is thanks to the General Assembly that the Security Council has realized that the perpetuation of colonial occupation constituted a flouting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and a threat to international peace. It is because of this that the Security Council adopted the concept that maintenance of peace is quite inseparable from harmonious co-operation between peoples; and that the specialized agencies of the United Nations are at present playing a considerable role, to which we pay homage, in improving the quality of life universally by carrying out a continuous struggle against ignorance, disease and hunger throughout the world.

180. Thus, a few months short of its thirtieth anniversary, with a membership of 138 Member States, we can see that the balance between the two bodies of the United Nations should be reviewed. On the one hand, we are faced by a General Assembly which is almost universal, which is representative, vigorous and innovating, democratic and egalitarian, but whose decisions are not binding. On the other hand, we have a Security Council dominated by its internal contradictions, which has been made largely obsolete by its constitution and which has been petrified in a negative immobilism, the most recent example of which was its verdict on the question of South Africa. However, Article 24 of the Charter makes it quite clear that, in exercising its duties of maintaining peace and security, the Security Council acts on behalf of the Member States of the Organization.

181. Despite the desire of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4, it appears that a controversy has started. Therefore, we should like briefly to give our view about this latent but clear disagreement that appears to exist between the two main organs of our Organization.

182. First, there is a lack of clarity in defining the power of these two bodies with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security, a concept which should be interpreted broadly and not in the sense of the strictly military peace of the morrow of the Second World War, in that the idea of peace as we understand it today covers a number of concepts, including the struggle against racism and racial discrimination, the right to self-determination, the right to independence, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, economic interdependence, peaceful coexistence, and so on and so forth.

183. To this lack of clarity in defining competence with regard to the maintenance of peace and security, which is aggravated by the different opinions people have about the meaning of peace itself, there has now been added a veritable obstructive action, often systematic, that is being carried out by the supporters of the exclusive privileges of the Security Council, for fear of what they regard as inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of the Council.

184. That is why my delegation believes that, however fundamental and paramount it may be, the competence of the Security Council with regard to peace and security should no longer be exclusive of at least a complementary competence of the General Assembly in this connexion, which suggests that the two main bodies of our Organization must no longer coexist in parallel fashion, closed to any mutual contact, and must no longer think of themselves in terms of confrontation, but must instead seek to find, by means of patient consultation, the best way to make it possible for them to collaborate harmoniously and to work together and in step.

185. But how can we bring into being such a system of intercommunication between these two bodies if one of them refuses to take into consideration the recommendations of the other, even though they are transmitted to it by decision of an overwhelming majority of that other body's members?

186. Here, I should like to take up one of the points to which certain speakers have referred in a rather surprising reaction caused by the fact that their position regarding today's grave problems is becoming more and more isolated. Things have gone so far that an attempt has been made to add something new to political terminology, namely, the dictatorship of the majority, without thinking about the autonomy which is fundamental in these terms, and without trying to analyse at least the significance of the phenomenon of the majority, which exists at the present day in our Organization.

187. Wishing to avoid an academic argument about the significance of this concept, I shall keep to one single question. What majority are the speakers referring to? Are they speaking about fleeting, haphazard majorities in a particular debate limited in time and space, majorities which are consequently precarious and have no common link other than settle-

ment of a specific point such as an election, the recognition of a régime, the vote on a point of order, the solution of a political or economic problem concerning a particular country or a particular region? Or are they referring to that constant majority which is growing from day to day and which is bound by the same faith in the immutable principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, by common respect for the ideals of liberty, equality and co-operation, which has affirmed its active solidarity and capacity to form a common front when it is a question of forcefully condemning those things which threaten freedom and peace in South Africa, in Palestine, in Southern Rhodesia, when it is a question of recalling the principle that peoples should be able to control their natural resources, and when it is a question of conferring a new dimension on relations among States by promoting active solidarity among nations?

188. It seems unfortunate, and I should be very pleased to be able to say the contrary, that it is this massive and homogeneous majority, rallying round the fundamental principles of our Charter, which certain speakers have been accusing. They are mistaken, they are very mistaken, because, in putting that majority on trial, they are really putting on trial the fundamental principles that inspire that majority: fundamental principles without which the world of today would be nothing but disorder and injustice.

189. To the same extent that they swam against the current in the last century and at the beginning of this century, to be finally carried along by the irresistible dynamic of the new ideas, they should now avoid always lagging behind, following at a distance and unwillingly the new solutions proposed by our Assembly, which nevertheless represent the only right way of abolishing the evils that still threaten international peace and security, such as zionism, racism, racial discrimination, and economic and social imbalance between nations.

190. I cannot refrain from asking those who denigrate the majority system, and refer to it as a dictatorship, how they would describe the attitude of a tiny minority which, because of political affinities and interests, and thanks to a privilege for which there is less and less reason, blocks and impedes the almost universal demand for the temporary exclusion of a Member that has seriously and repeatedly contravened the fundamental principles of our Charter. I refer to South Africa.

191. These are the sources of the ills from which our Organization is suffering. That is why there is a danger of the disruption of the dialogue between a third world which has become aware of its existence, which is organizing itself and which aspires to achieve at last a worthwhile life after centuries of obscurity, privation and exploitation, and a group of countries which, seeking new avenues after the period of colonization, hesitates and finally acts inappropriately or takes refuge in inaction, sometimes invoking the pressures of public opinion which, however, only wishes to be correctly informed.

192. In connexion with public opinion, which one speaker referred to by way of warning, I should like to ask the following question: Is there a hierarchy in the public opinion of different nations? If there is, could the criteria be defined for me? Is it classified

according to military or economic power, geographic dimensions or demographic expansion, the standard of living or the socio-political system, energy resources, or simply a glorious past, ancient or recent?

193. Similarly, should international public opinion bow to the demands of the public opinion of one or more nations? Pushing this argument to its logical conclusion, should we also grant a right of veto to the public opinion of the permanent members of the Security Council? Should the public opinion of a given country censure the decisions taken by the representatives of 100 countries on any given question, such as the question of Palestine, for example? If that were so, it would add to the tyranny of the veto of the minority in the Security Council that of the preponderance of the public opinion of three or four countries over the public opinion of 130 nations.

194. Is this really the spirit of the Charter? Is this really the proper approach? Adlai Stevenson, a great statesman who gave an unforgettable dimension to his mission in the United Nations, said in one of his statements, and I quote from the biography by Herbert Muller:

“The United Nations was not and should never be an arm of the United States; it was a truly international organization which could be truly effective only if it was not dominated by us . . . Stevenson concluded:

“ ‘There is contention in all this; . . . there is danger that the fearful and the insecure will want to withdraw from the free interplay of conflicting ideas and concepts and terminology, especially if, now and again, things do not go exactly the way we would like them to.

“ ‘Yes it is we who do best in the open forum, for this is our natural habitat. And if we have the nerve to go ahead, if we have the stomach for the test of the open society, if we have the courage to build even that which is not perfect from our point of view, I can foresee nothing but a more meaningful dialogue coming out of it, a gradual erosion of tension, and finally the predominance of a set of ideas which are better. . . .’ ”<sup>3</sup>

It was in this spirit that Stevenson often repeated his warning against the idea of always being right: “We judge ourselves by our motives, others by their actions”.

195. If I may be allowed to speak on behalf of the public opinion of Tunisia, I can assure this Assembly that public opinion there, together with that of more than 100 countries of the world, is satisfied with what has been done by the United Nations and with its decisions concerning, in particular, the condemnation of South Africa and the recognition of the PLO, and our people hope that this Organization will continue on this course with still more vigour and decisiveness.

196. As for the public opinion of certain countries, which has been referred to here as disagreeing with the decisions taken by the Organization, it should not be the subject of any concern in view of the national information media they have at their disposal. The Tunisian delegation considers that there should be wider dissemination of information about the activities of our Organization, and that accordingly there must be a review of the whole structure of the

information services of the United Nations throughout the world and a completely fresh approach to those services, in view of the warnings we have heard in recent days. Thus the Tunisian delegation believes it would be useful to consider the inclusion in the provisional agenda of the thirtieth session of the General Assembly of an item entitled “Information policy of the United Nations in terms of its objectives and its activities”.

197. I should like to conclude by reverting to the strengthening of the role of our Organization with quotations from two more great United Nations figures. In the introduction to his report on the work of the Organization to the Assembly at its twenty-first session, U Thant gave a very fair appreciation of the causes of the present weakness of the Organization. He said:

“ . . . the powerful nations have not . . . shown themselves able to rise above the suspicions, fears and mistrust that spring from their different ideologies and from their different conceptions of the best interests of the rest of the world . . . ”<sup>4</sup>

And a former President of the General Assembly, the sixteenth, the late Mongi Slim, was already considering the question of revision of the Charter. In a lecture he gave to the twentieth Congress of the World Federation of United Nations Associations, he said:

“It is desirable that this revision of the composition of the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council be a way of opening new perspectives for the future in order to make it possible to fill the gaps or correct the weaknesses in the system which practice has brought to light, while respecting the inviolability of the fundamental principles established by the Charter and the general framework of its structures.”

198. Finally, there could be no better conclusion to this subject than this extract from a message addressed to the United Nations on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary by the President of the Republic of Tunisia. After analysing briefly the problems facing our Organization, Mr. Habib Bourguiba went on to say:

“The most important and most immediate of [these problems] is how to restore the authority and prestige of our Organization while fully recognizing the responsibilities entrusted to it by the Charter and giving it the means to shoulder them. The world has undoubtedly changed a great deal in the past twenty-five years. So has the Organization. Hence the necessity to make adjustments that will take into account those changes and, in particular, the new forces of peace and progress liberated by decolonization.”<sup>5</sup>

199. It is in this constructive and sincere spirit, aimed only at strengthening the prestige and the role of the United Nations, that the Tunisian delegation has submitted, with the other sponsors and, in particular, the delegation of Romania, to which we should like to pay a tribute, draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4 for the careful and calm consideration of all the Members of our Organization.

200. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): What binds us together is by far stronger than what keeps us apart. Yet, listening to the concerted verbal bazaar on Friday,



6 December [2307th and 2308th meetings], I felt that the plenary Assembly was discussing a new item under the title "The harmonization of the efforts of a self-invented minority with regard to its onslaught on the imaginary majority". I was justified in having that impression. The onslaught of Friday last was, in our view, an inarticulate performance mixed with tasteless ingredients. We say this in sorrow rather than in anger.

201. My delegation would like to express its support to the delegation of Romania for having played a leading part in strengthening the role of the United Nations. My delegation would also like to express its indignation at the barrage of unfortunate verbosity to which the United Nations was subjected in the statements made earlier in the course of the debate on this item.

202. We in Kuwait unswervingly back this Organization. It is in the interest of every State and every people to see the United Nations strengthened and its prestige enhanced. But, frankly, my delegation felt hurt listening to sanctimonious speeches from certain countries about the disregard of what was called the majority for the interests of what was called the minority. In our view, there is no minority or majority in the United Nations. There is only one Charter. It belongs to all; it is the only yardstick by which we can measure the loyalty of various countries to this Organization. It is not an invention. It was the basis conceived and created by the progenitors of this Organization.

203. Of course, anybody—any nation, any State—that violates the sanctions imposed on Southern Rhodesia or enjoys a Roman holiday in the sale of arms to the racist minority in South Africa or invests in Namibia for the benefit of the rebellious occupying Power is indeed acting in contravention of the Charter. It is a truism of the United Nations Charter and applies to all States. That was the verdict of the competent committees that deliberated on such matters. This is not an invention of my delegation. In this respect there exists a display of the tyranny of violation rather than an adherence to the United Nations Charter in letter and in spirit. In our view, the tyranny of violation is far more obnoxious than the tyranny of the majority.

204. My delegation submits that the Charter needs neither a majority nor a minority to defend it. It needs the support of all. Some delegations complained that no heed was paid to them in the course of negotiations and that their views were not seriously considered. That might be true. However, what is wrong in this process is, in our view, not necessarily the lack of consultations but, rather, the unwillingness of some to accept the new realities that now characterize the world. Some still maintain outmoded policies.

205. The defect, therefore, does not lie in the attempt of the many to dominate this body. It certainly lies in the policies of some Governments that are in the habit of being late discoverers of their own mistakes.

206. We were reproached when we boycotted Salazar's Portugal. We did so because we believed that it was the only way to debunk and unmask its mischievous policy in Africa. Some did not approve of that, and yet, when the winds of change swept Portugal, they rushed to the side of logic in granting—rather belatedly—recognition to Guinea-Bissau. Fair enough; yet, let us ask ourselves, in serenity and not

in exasperation, whether it is in the spirit of the Charter to support South Africa, or to sell arms to Pretoria, or to invest in Namibia, or to disregard the sanctions on Southern Rhodesia. The answer, in our view, is "No"; it is not in the spirit of the Charter.

207. Furthermore, we believe that those who supply arms to Israel, despite its defiance of the Charter and its disregard of United Nations resolutions, are wrong.

208. No doubt, there is something wrong with this Organization. Let us identify it. We should not behave like the proverbial ostrich. Let us not invoke self-righteousness for, after all, there is no one who is without blemish.

209. On our side, there is no conspicuous departure from the Charter. We do not prop up colonial rule. We do not cast merciless vetoes in the Security Council, simply because we have no vetoes. In fact, the Security Council, which is the main organ of the United Nations, is still dominated by those who admonished us the other day.

210. What should be rectified, in our view, are the policies of certain Governments which are still lagging behind in their comprehension of the changes the world has witnessed. Because of these policies, certain Governments pose, again in our view, as the stalwarts of resistance to fairness. We feel, naturally, offended by the gratuitous preachings of these Governments on how the United Nations should be conducted.

211. The world has changed. Peoples that were subservient to colonial masters are now free. Leaders who were either in the underground resistance or languishing in jail are now the skippers of their own nations. Some fighters who were jailed yesterday determine at this very moment the fate of the bulk of the world's population. Colonialism has crumbled and new States have emerged. In the process of decolonization, which has been inevitable, colonized territories have become free nations. These free nations are conscious of their duty to respect and obey the Charter. We praise their adherence and ours to the dictates of the United Nations Charter. We say, frankly, what was done to the Palestinians is wrong; what is going on in South Africa is obnoxious; what is happening in Southern Rhodesia is evil. These stances are in accord with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. If certain States do not accept that and consequently malign us as an inconsiderate majority, we do not question their prerogative to be wrong. Every State has the right to be wrong and we do not question the right of States to be wrong.

212. For 20 years the Western Powers dominated this Organization. It was during their supremacy that the most ill-advised decisions were taken. The partition of Palestine was illegal and carried out in contravention of the United Nations Charter. The problem of Korea, in which the United Nations flag was abused and defiled, arose in the early 1950s, when the United States bestrode this building like an uncontested old Egyptian pharaoh. It is fortuitous that the question of Korea was recently discussed, with its lamentable ramifications, in the First Committee. These countries that complain today of the monopoly of the majority are the same countries which cocked a snook at the rights of the peoples to self-determination and independence when it served their interests to do so. We have

not resorted to manipulation or arm-twisting. We have neither invoked the tactics of blandishment nor employed economic or political pressure. Our only weapon is the Charter. The more we adhere to it, the better this Organization becomes.

213. We object ferociously to self-righteousness. Everybody has a skeleton in his closet. Some countries should not be forgetful of their history. The sanctimonious pontification of some of them on the rights of all States evokes puzzlement rather than compassion. The developing countries do not want to be trapped any more. They have acted in a manner that ensures justice and equity for their cause. They have neither the interest nor the desire to trigger a confrontation with any group.

214. Rarely, if ever, has the world been more aware of the necessity for interdependence. The scarcity of food, with the glaring signals of a large-scale famine, the drastic changes in the redistribution of wealth, the depletable nature of energy resources, are sufficient factors to bring us closer rather than cut us asunder. I agree with many speakers that negotiations and consultations among all countries of various views should take place with a view to reaching a basis for co-operation. The views of what is called in this debate "the minority" are important and essential for the implementation of any resolution. But in all fairness, sometimes such views are too unaccommodating to accept. They are either in conflict with the interests of the emerging nations or foreign to the present reality.

215. The record of the United States, for example, provides a good example of the impossibility of building a bridge between the views of the third world and the complaining minority. On 6 December, the Special Political Committee voted on a draft resolution on the rights of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and property.<sup>6</sup> Some of the Western Powers voted for it and we are grateful to them. Some abstained and we are equally grateful. The United States voted "No". I must note that that draft resolution was predicated on a resolution adopted almost unanimously in 1948. The draft resolution the United States voted against, in our view, is innocuous, harmless, constructive and very generous for the cause of peace. This is an example of how the area of accommodation is sometimes so limited that the acceptance of immoderate views would mean forgoing principles of vital importance.

216. The United Nations is not the property of any group. It belongs to man wherever he may be. The strengthening of its role for the preservation of peace is the responsibility of all States. This implies an adjustment on the part of the masters of yesterday to the reality of the present. It also means the display of genuine attempts by the majority for more understanding and co-operation with the numerically disadvantaged provided that the views of the minority are in line with the United Nations Charter and in conformity with previous resolutions. But if we go beyond that, the Organization might then be converted into an arena in which the reluctant few would dominate the willing majority. There must be room for compromise that reflects the principles inherent in the Charter.

217. I come from a country which is small in size and population but very powerful in economic capabilities. Indeed, it is an example of the new realities of the day. We need a strong United Nations. We believe in its achievements as well as in its potential for the future. We have no army, no military arsenal, but we have an immeasurable faith in the United Nations. Its achievements in peace-keeping operations are praiseworthy. It reflects world public opinion whether we like it or not. When the South African delegation was recently ousted from this Assembly, it was not a decision by a majority but rather compliance with the wishes of the world at large. That decision was an honest translation of the urgings of the vast number of nations and not an arbitrary application of rules or procedures as some representatives try to interpret it.

218. The United Nations today reflects the will of Member States. It is within the power of these Member States to make it effective. The more Member States support it, the better it becomes. It needs the small and the powerful. A United Nations manipulated by the powerful is not the organization we crave for; similarly a United Nations dominated by the majority is not the one conceived by its founders. We support a United Nations of the Charter, one which encompasses the big and the small, the frail and the powerful, in joint efforts for the promotion of peace and the welfare of man. If all States devote themselves to the realization of the purposes and principles of the Charter, then there will be no minority or majority, but a confluence of endeavours designed to serve the cause of peace.

219. Kuwait adheres to the principle of settling disputes by peaceful means. My country likewise believes in the usefulness of the International Court of Justice. The potentials of the United Nations which have not been thus far tapped should be explored for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

220. My country lends its support to every effort aimed at the strengthening of the role of the United Nations in settling disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the provisions of the Charter. Moreover, my country is of the view that only faithful obedience to the fundamental principles of the Charter will save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. It is incumbent upon all countries to observe this truism; otherwise all of us will sink into the mire of destruction.

221. What was called the majority has no ambition or designs to dominate. Neither has it the inclination to capitulate. Our only hope is to co-operate. There is no need for the unleashing of battles with an imaginary opponent. We should not be trapped into the hallucinations of the famous Don Quixote in Cervantes' memorable book. He was the man who fought a non-existent enemy. Let us stop this ignoble attempt to dance on each other's corpses. Otherwise, history will not forgive us. For history needs no prompters. It records quietly what is virtuous and what is abominable.

222. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security is based on several principles to which speakers that have preceded me have referred. I shall confine

myself in my statement to trying to throw some light on certain aspects of the question now under discussion.

223. It is true that the first principle on which the strengthening of the role of the United Nations is based is respect for the Charter as we have it today and as we conceive it to be. Numerous delegations find that the Charter, which has now reached its thirtieth year, is a document that should be revised in order to take into account the changes that have taken place in the course of a whole generation and to reflect the new structure of the United Nations. Despite the fact that we appreciate those trends, at the present stage we cannot but support our main goal, namely, respect for the Charter such as it is and for its purposes and principles.

224. The second principle is the indivisibility of the Charter. By this I mean that the Charter should be accepted or rejected as an indivisible whole. We cannot accept certain parts and reject others.

225. The third principle is the spirit of the Charter's continuity. We cannot block one part of the Charter during a certain period of time, or apply it in an arbitrary fashion so that its provisions are applicable to one given question and not to another, when both are analogous in form and substance; nor can we apply it to only one part of a question and not to another, when we are dealing with one single question.

226. It is our duty to safeguard and support the authority of the General Assembly as an instrument of co-operation and a forum where all problems relating to international peace and security are discussed. But we should also support what has been defined in Article 14 of the Charter, namely, the right of the Assembly to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

227. If we interpret this Article, we find that it is a right of the General Assembly to make recommendations concerning given questions, in particular those which relate to violations of the Charter, in order to give the General Assembly an opportunity to hear the views of its Members and so that it may democratically express itself. That is why debate has been provided for, with rights of reply and certain restrictions which regulate and organize the work and render it more useful and effective; and so that any discussion may lead to an expression of international will the Charter has also established the vote, and certainly the result of the vote is the expression of the will of the international community. Therefore there is a judgement, a decision, but there are also divergent views. It also provides that there is a majority and a minority with regard to any subject, independently of whoever may put it forward or present it. All of this reflects a democratic phenomenon, which characterizes our Organization with regard to dialogue and which also constitutes the essence of our work and enables our Assembly to express an international position vis-à-vis problems under discussion.

228. In the face of this notion, which we find in the spirit and the letter of the Charter, any argument or

contention or interpretation on any given method that should be followed by the Assembly in its proceedings would go beyond the framework of the Charter. That is the argument which has been supported and which we have heard on the part of certain Western delegations, in particular that of the United States, which said that the General Assembly has but two alternatives: either to represent a numerical majority or else to express a global view. This thesis is a restriction that should be rejected. The General Assembly, in its present structure and at this time, does not represent a numerical majority, does not represent aggregates or computers or simple buttons that are pressed or hands that are raised. This is a forum where the interests of peoples meet, civilizations, nations, cultures, and everything that nations have as ideals and lessons of their own history.

229. With regard to the vote that was criticized by some delegations, it was the result of certain positions taken with regard to certain problems, and it was also the expression of the will of the international community. Nobody ignores—and it is regrettable to have to say this—the fact that some resolutions of the General Assembly are never implemented. Some of those resolutions sometimes are of capital importance to the fate of a people or to a problem of serious tension, or other problems that threaten international peace and security. More than once it has been said that whenever the General Assembly adopts a resolution that cannot be implemented, it reduces its own credibility. It has also been said that the non-applicability of those decisions stems from the fact that a minority is opposed to those decisions, that it deems them to be biased or unfair or else that those decisions were taken by a majority representing only a very minor part of the peoples of the world in terms of resources or area that does not take into account the feelings of the minority.

230. The advocates of that contention support it by saying that States are not equal with regard to their numerical importance or their territory or their resources. Also, they have different capabilities and potentials and different responsibilities.

231. Whereas we respect the views of all States, regardless of the size of their population or the area they cover or the wealth they have, we must always turn to the Charter in order to be able to judge such a statement, which touches so deeply upon sovereignty and equality among peoples, principles more than once supported by the Charter.

232. The Charter has clearly determined responsibility. It gave five States, as well as others, certain responsibilities in a given place—and I am referring to the Security Council. We appreciate the full value of their contribution to the safeguarding of international security, but here we are in a different forum. We are in the General Assembly, and the views we have heard in connexion with a distinction to be drawn between responsibilities according to the size of the population of nations or their wealth, have been stated from this rostrum.

233. The Charter has conferred upon all members of the General Assembly identical responsibilities, without distinction because of the size of the population, geographic area or wealth. That is why it gave each Member State a single vote, thus defining that

there is a majority and a minority. The Charter did not speak of a qualitative majority, but in the framework of the General Assembly everything is submitted to the will of the international community and not to the will of the major Powers.

234. On hearing this new assessment of the importance of States within the General Assembly on the basis of the size of their population, their wealth or their territory we are compelled to look back to three years ago when the doors of the United Nations were still closed to a people—as a matter of fact, numerically the greatest people of the world—the people of China, one of the major Powers. The United States had, for many, many years and in defiance of the will of the international community, restricted the representation of China to a hired Government of a small isolated island by treating it as a major Power with the right of veto and a voice in determining matters relating to international peace and security. And, despite that flagrant historical contradiction which that great Power forced the United Nations to adopt, that unfortunate situation persisted for many years—until the day when the people of China, by its struggle, forced open the doors of the United Nations and took its place there.

235. I wonder why until three years ago the United Nations continued to overlook the largest population in the world, more than 800 million people, which occupies an enormous portion of the earth's surface and has such tremendous wealth and potential? Why, in view of that population, area and wealth was the question not raised? Because of a small island with only 14 million people, with a hired Government in charge of it? Why is it raised today in such a provocative way?

236. Those who today blame the United Nations for taking decisions on the basis of a majority representing only a very small part of the peoples of the world, its wealth or land area should recall the recent past of this Organization. Since a great Power, the United States, and a small number of satellite countries imposed their will and tyranny to force the United Nations to take decisions in accordance with the desires of that great Power or that small group of States, it follows that at a certain point in history the United Nations took decisions which ran counter to the spirit of the Charter, its purposes and principles, as well as to the interests of peoples. Those decisions made it possible for new forms of neo-colonialism to grow up and become rampant, and the colonized peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America were only able to throw off the yoke of imperialism by means of revolutions, which resulted in the loss of many human lives. Millions fell victims in those struggles. But if the Powers that then dominated the United Nations had respected its Charter, if they had implemented its principles and had been faithful to its spirit, it would have been possible to abolish imperialism, racial segregation and *apartheid*.

237. Every year we have discussed these problems without taking any decisions that would have made it possible to speed up the implementation of the purposes and principles of the Charter. And when today the United Nations attempts to apply those purposes and principles it is those same forces that intervene to talk about a "mechanical majority"

and tell us that attention must be paid to wealth and the surface area of countries.

238. I should like to quote one example to show how the argument put forward by these Western countries is invalid. In 1947 the United Nations adopted a resolution on Palestine which was incompatible with the principle of self-determination. That resolution was adopted by only a very small majority. I do not wish to go into the various manœuvres engaged in by the great Powers in the corridors of this Organization; I do not wish to go into the formidable pressures it exerted on certain capitals to obtain that majority. But that resolution was finally adopted by the General Assembly and it was only in the form of a recommendation. It is none the less true that that resolution led to the exile of the people of Palestine and to their becoming displaced persons. And today, after more than a quarter of a century, with that people experiencing the bitterness and suffering of exile, when this Assembly tries to restore to the Palestinian people its inalienable rights in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations by a majority of 89 votes to 8 [see resolution 3236 (XXIX)] this Assembly is apparently being accused of simply conveying the opinions of a "numerical majority", which represents only a small majority of the peoples, the wealth and the land area of the world.

239. We have also been told that the resolution the Assembly adopted runs counter to the feelings of the minority, though if we look at the statistics we will see that those countries, by their wealth and their size, actually represent a majority. Those allegations are therefore false and not in accordance with reality.

240. I do not wish to cite other examples nor do I wish to rehearse the entire history of the United Nations, from the time it experienced the tyranny of a powerful minority up to the present stage, which is marked by co-operation and understanding among nations on the basis of the principles of the Charter and its prime goals.

241. The Organization reached this stage after the period of the 1960s and the early 1970s when the world eventually managed to throw off foreign economic domination and was able to embark upon a period of economic and social development on the basis of equality and respect for the right of peoples to make use of their natural resources.

242. A new order was established and our Organization adapted itself to this radical transformation—a new economic, political and social transformation—by widening its base until it included most of the peoples of the world and could realize the principles of universality. New forces emerged, new political, economic and social tendencies saw the light. Their aim was to apply the principles of the Charter, and that created a new balance. It is both normal and necessary that the United Nations should reflect those new trends and new forces because our Organization expresses the true world situation and no force, regardless of its power, can prevent the world Organization from expressing this international reality.

243. The United Nations is, at present, acting in accordance with the principles of the Charter and attempting to implement its objectives. It expresses the aspirations of all peoples for peace, security and co-



operation. Far from being the appurtenance of one country or group of countries, it belongs to all mankind and it must face the problems confronting all mankind and resolve them in the spirit of co-operation and understanding and not in one of confrontation in keeping with a bloc policy.

244. Mr. KAUFMANN (Netherlands): The Netherlands delegation had not intended to participate in this debate. However, in view of the turn the debate has taken, I wish to put our views on record.

245. My delegation wishes first to express its sincere appreciation to the delegations of Romania and Australia. The Netherlands is a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.749, and we shall gladly support draft resolution A/L.748 and Add.1-4.

246. The usefulness of the United Nations, its power to take constructive action, both on political and on economic questions, is directly related to the possibility enjoyed by all Member States of the United Nations of co-operating in the implementation of decisions. Democratic principles, to which my country is traditionally strongly devoted, require that a minority abide by the wishes of a majority, provided that the political system and also group and individual traditions ensure that the minority can accept the majority decision. In the present state of the United Nations, composed as it is of sovereign nations, each with its own political system, type of government, ideals and constraints, United Nations decisions have primarily a moral weight. Legally binding texts can emerge only in respect of those States which accept such a juridical status. Of course, certain decisions arrived at by a majority overruling a minority may exercise a certain amount of moral pressure on the dissenting minority. The latter may thereby be induced to modify their points of view. However, such majority decisions, if imposed in delicate matters without real negotiation may have a counterproductive effect on the likelihood that the minority will change its position. In such cases any majority—I repeat: any majority—would do well to reflect on the wisdom of allowing itself to be guided by the relative ease with which some decision or recommendation can be adopted.

247. Of course it is important—and I should like to stress this—to differentiate between various types of decisions. As my delegation sees it, a difference should be made between, firstly, decisions or recommendations on activities by the United Nations as an organization, including activities of the Secretariat; secondly, decisions or recommendations on relatively secondary matters, of which there are many examples; and, thirdly, recommendations on fundamental political issues, such as those dealt with in Chapters VI and VII of the Charter, or decisions dealing with basic international economic policy matters.

248. It is obvious that in relation to the third category—that is, the category of fundamental political issues—decisions or recommendations not based on a negotiated compromise can be dangerously counter-effective.

249. With the present United Nations membership of 138, the various groups play an essential role in decision-making in the Organization. As other speakers have already stressed—for example, the representative of Sweden—this is in itself a sound phenomenon.

Yet we must all constantly try to avoid the danger that relatively rigid group positions, combined with a lack of time for negotiating, thwart the otherwise real possibilities for sound and viable compromise solutions.

250. My delegation wishes to recall that throughout the history of the United Nations the Netherlands has frequently sided on questions of economic development with developing nations. As early as 1955, the Netherlands—at that time practically alone among the developed countries—urged, with developing nations, the establishment of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, the so-called SUNFED.<sup>7</sup> At the recent sixth special session of the Assembly our attitude was one of welcoming the objectives of the Declaration and the Programme of Action on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order [*resolutions 3201 (S-VI) and 3202 (S-VI)*]. Thus the Netherlands believes that it has demonstrated that it associates itself, by words and by deeds, with the motives and ideals of developing nations. Yet my Government feels strongly that the generally recognized interdependence between various problems and between nations now requires that the emphasis should be on negotiated results.

251. All countries, rich and poor, energy-exporting and energy-importing, old or newly independent, are confronted with problems of unprecedented magnitude, problems which can be solved only through multilateral co-operation.

252. I wish to recall at this point certain comments made by the Netherlands Minister for Development Co-operation, Mr. Pronk, in his statement to the Second Committee on 26 October last year:

“... the crisis in international relations seriously affects the multilateral system for co-operation. On the one hand, the major Powers increasingly reach bilateral agreements, bypassing the existing multilateral framework. On the other hand, the developing countries increasingly have to take recourse to confrontation, leading to polarization as a result of the lack of political will of the developed countries to co-operate towards solutions. We are increasingly faced with the danger of the paralysis of the multilateral system, damaging communication between the developing and the industrialized countries . . . Only by joint efforts, only in a multilateral framework can we hope to succeed. That framework is the United Nations. We have nothing else and we must, therefore, jointly ensure its continued effectiveness.”<sup>8</sup>

253. In the light of that, we believe that the crucially important seventh special session of the Assembly should be prepared for through intensive consultations and negotiations. The preparation of the decisions on the Second United Nations Development Decade could serve as a good precedent in this case.

254. If the General Assembly and other United Nations organs are to be geared more to consultations and negotiations, arrangements should be made to render them more effective. The possibility of limiting the time of speeches in general debates should be seriously envisaged as one auxiliary device to make more time available for consultations and negotiations. Decisive, however, is the willingness to engage in such

consultations and negotiations, to have real dialogues, and so to arrive at conclusions which command general support.

255. My delegation can agree with the statement by the representative of Jordan in this debate on 6 December that those who no longer command a majority should not translate resentment of change into disillusionment and the downgrading of the United Nations. The new majority of developing nations must not, through over-eager or impatient conduct, provide justification for the hostility of forces that are either anachronistic or inimical to the United Nations [2308th meeting, para. 55].

256. I also wish to quote from the introduction to the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization, in which he stated:

"The complementary action of bilateral diplomacy and multilateral techniques in the maintenance of peace, the interrelationship between political stability and economic and social justice and equity, and the necessity for a global approach to many problems by making the optimum use of the resources, information and expertise available, are examples of basic contemporary requirements which call for a new and imaginative development of the capacity of the United Nations system." [A/9601/Add.1, sect. III, p. 2.]

257. In his *In Praise of Folly*, the sixteenth century Dutch philosopher Erasmus poses the question whether those who dwell in Plato's famous cavern, seeing only the shadows of things in the real world, are perhaps happier than those who go outside into that real world. Do we not all share the view that the United Nations, its methods, its systems, its ideals, should remain strongly intertwined with the real world? I therefore want to end by repeating what the Netherlands Foreign Minister, Mr. van der Stoep, said in his statement during the general debate on 2 October last:

"The United Nations offers such a system in the unique collection of instruments for international negotiation and co-operation. Let us use those instruments. Let us devote more time to consultation and negotiation in the United Nations. We have it in our power to guarantee that future generations will not criticize our era as one in which a maximum of opportunities to better the lot of mankind was wasted by a minimum of goodwill and co-operation. Let us seize those opportunities." [2252nd meeting, para. 84.]

258. Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): The item on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security acquires greater significance this year in the light of recent events in the international field. The effectiveness of the United Nations has shown signs of a considerable and disquieting decline in the present year, and we refer particularly to the Security Council.

259. The primary, most essential and pre-eminent role of the United Nations is the maintenance of international peace and security. That is what is needed for our world at any time, but particularly today. For on that premise the whole edifice of the United Nations stands or falls. We should like to remind the Assembly that the Charter of the United Nations

makes it clear that the essential purpose of the United Nations is to preserve international peace and security and to avoid war. After the Second World War, the pre-eminent question in the minds of nations at that time was how to avoid a war that, by reason of new technological methods, had become a most destructive war, affecting civilian populations and towns and villages everywhere.

260. Therefore, the aim of the Charter, as it says in its preamble is

"... to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind,"

and then it says:

"And for these ends

"to practice tolerance and live together in peace ... and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security."

261. In Article 1, it says again:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes . . ."

262. Those, of course, are the requirements of the Charter and the Charter provided for the effective implementation of its resolutions. The drafters, the founding fathers, of the Charter did not think that they should rely on the good will or the political will of nations as we see it today. What is lacking in the United Nations is the political will. But no nation or States relies on the good will of its citizens not to violate the law. That would be inconceivable. They have the instruments for enforcing the law, and for punishing recalcitrant citizens who wish to violate the law, from murder down to the smallest crime or misdemeanours.

263. The Charter of the United Nations had the practical and reasonable means to provide for that implementation. It did not lay down purposes and principles alone but provided for the implementation of the Security Council resolutions. It has to be remembered that General Assembly resolutions have no means of implementation because the General Assembly is not thought to be as vitally important as the Security Council on which the Charter rests and the United Nations stands or falls.

264. In the implementation of Security Council resolutions for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security, Article 39 says that:

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations . . ."

Nothing is more reasonable and practical than that. Article 41 goes on to say:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions . . ."

It would not have given Article 39, or Article 1 of the Charter without providing for means to maintain international peace and security. It then goes further and says in Article 42 that if it should be considered by the Security Council

“... that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

265. From the very start the Charter was not complied with. It was not complied with because we entered into the differences of the cold war. How many times have we seen an ineffective Security Council because it could not arrive at an agreed resolution? Therefore, we have had to resort to many other contrivances to patch up the situation and also to patch up situations where Security Council resolutions remain ineffective. But one cannot go on always patching up things and violating the Charter in its primary requirement of implementing the resolutions of the Security Council. Therefore a situation of frustration has been created in the world. What we see today, actions that may verge on the extreme, is but the result of frustrations from the non-implementation of the Charter and the non-implementation of Security Council resolutions in particular.

266. Turning now to General Assembly resolutions, there are, as I have said, no special provisions for their implementation, but the moral authority of resolutions representing world public opinion gives them, or should give them, their own effective power; in that respect it has pertinently been pointed out by previous speakers in this Assembly that resolutions of the General Assembly adopted by a majority which may be thought to be verging on extremism had better be avoided since in view of their nature they cannot or may not be implemented. And such non-implementation of resolutions by leaving them unenforced, it was pointed out in those statements, destroys the authority of the United Nations and encourages disrespect for the Charter. We have heard that stated in this Hall, and it has also been pointed out that the United Nations Charter was designed to ensure that decisions, once adopted, could and should be enforced, and thus the possibility of living up to the Charter is presented. It is, it has been said, a matter of solemn moral and political obligation that the resolutions and decisions of the United Nations be implemented and respected.

267. We fully agree with those views, and we think they were pertinently expressed. It is a matter of opinion to what extent a majority decision is such that it should or should not be taken. But in the case of unanimous decisions, whether of the Security Council or of the General Assembly, there is no question of opinion. They should be implemented. And it is the duty of those who have, as we have heard here, the power to implement or not to implement resolutions to see to it that unanimous decisions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly are implemented.

268. This is really a matter that goes to the very roots of the United Nations, because if the vital decisions of the Security Council affecting international security are not implemented and remain a dead letter where is the credibility of the United Nations, and what is

its *raison d'être*? It was brought here to preserve the world from acts of aggression that are the cause of the whole deterioration of the world situation. If there were no international security through the United Nations, what would happen? Each State would have to look after its own defence, by joining one or another military bloc of Powers, which would mean there would be no non-alignment in the world and no third world; the world would be divided into two opposing camps ready to spring at each other. Or the smaller nations would have to think of their own defence and devote more and more of their funds to their own military requirements.

269. We heard that said by the President of a neutral European country, one very much respected. He said that after the tragedy in Cyprus it was certain there was no international security; there were no longer any illusions. While, he said, he agreed with those who had expressed the idea that a neutral country need not have a strong military force, yet after what had happened his country had seen that it must have a stronger force.

270. Obviously those States that have not expressed similar sentiments because they have not had the same occasion must have had the same reaction. Therefore, a situation of such United Nations abdication in the implementation of the unanimous resolutions of the Security Council in a case of aggression that had continued for weeks on end and in the destruction of a State is a matter of grave concern to those who want to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the world.

271. If that is of no concern, what is of concern? What in fact could be of graver concern? We observe the situation in the Middle East, which has in recent months been moving towards a deterioration, and it is not unlikely that nuclear weapons, “mininukes”, will be used. We do not know how the situation will escalate. Therefore we are accelerating the process towards further and further moral degradation, involving unpredictable consequences for the world.

272. When a situation deteriorates, it does so rapidly, and it is not unlikely that the world will suddenly find itself in a situation that was not anticipated.

273. That is what I wanted to emphasize. What is most needed for the strengthening of the role of the United Nations is the implementation of its resolutions. And from all the statements that have been made I believe everyone agrees on that. But let us see that that agreement is expressed in practical terms. Indeed, the title of this item is “Strengthening of the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, the development of co-operation among all nations and the promotion of the rules of international law in relations between States”. If Security Council resolutions are not implemented, there can be no legal order, no international order, no international law and no development, because the money that would otherwise be spent on development will go in another direction. In addition, the other problems facing the world will deteriorate further. The arms race will continue, costing billions and billions, and every other global problem that has arisen since the Charter was signed will deteriorate further.

274. I believe we must realize that the subject of the role of the United Nations is paramount and central. And, while there is time, it is our duty to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the world. It is within our power. And by that I mean it is within the power of those who have the power in the United Nations to strengthen the role of the Organization. In that connexion, I should like to mention that the peace-keeping functions of the United Nations and the settlement of disputes are also lacking. The Charter provides the means for settling disputes in its Article 33. It mentions mediation, arbitration, negotiation, enquiry and so on. But no list can remain just a list, a framework lacking modalities. We must have the modalities in each case, facilitating the peaceful settlement of disputes. My delegation proposed a draft resolution to that end in the First Committee—I believe it was two years ago—but it was not discussed at that time because the climate was not propitious for the establishment of a committee to provide the modalities. I hope that in due course that may be achieved, as one of the many ways of ensuring the peaceful settlement of disputes—parallel, of course, with the implementation of Security Council resolutions.

275. Therefore, a method of strengthening the Organization under the Charter is to ensure the implementation of Security Council resolutions through some form of sanctions as provided in the Charter. If what is provided in the Charter is not such as could be practically applied, then the Committee that is now to review the Charter, either to try and amend it or see what can be done about it, should primarily see to it that provisions for implementation are either enforced or amended in such a way that they may achieve their purpose of implementing the resolutions of the Security Council.

276. Mr. GARCÍA ROBLES (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): For the first time since the subject we are now considering was included in the agenda of the General Assembly some two years ago, the discussions on this item have lost some of the calm that the delegation of Romania, the author of the initiative, had always tried to maintain in discussions on this subject, and in fact has succeeded in doing, through the submission of carefully negotiated draft resolutions.

277. The responsibility for the change rests with those who spoke here last Friday, particularly one delegation whose representative spoke in a dogmatic and cutting tone resembling that of a teacher rebuking a group of unruly pupils. The United Nations is not a school, or even a university, and as the representatives of the Member States still wish to believe that the Organization is "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members", the reaction that we have been witnessing today is very understandable.

278. My delegation thinks it is its duty to reiterate at this time what it has more than once said in the past concerning what might be the most effective means for strengthening the role of the United Nations with regard to the maintenance and consolidation of international peace and security, and with regard to the other goals included under this item.

279. Such procedures can in the final analysis be summed up in one: namely, the faithful observance

of the principles enunciated in the Preamble and in Chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations, which the San Francisco Conference solemnly declared in 1945 to constitute—and I quote—"the regulating norms according to which the Organization and its members shall do their duty and endeavour to achieve the common ends", adding, with great foresight and with full reason, that they "constitute in practice the test for effectiveness of the Organization . . .".<sup>9</sup>

280. An examination, in the light of these principles, of the evolution of international relations in the last three decades inevitably leads us to the conclusion that the uneasy peace, the shaky security and the serious economic crisis now prevailing are due to the fact that we have not acted in keeping with the principles of the Charter, which were to be the supreme standards governing the international conduct of the United Nations Members. And if we take our analysis further, we will undoubtedly reach the conclusion that, although perhaps no State can adopt the Pharisaical attitude of claiming to be utterly blameless in this regard, through either its acts of commission or omission, the primary responsibility for the present situation that is of such concern to us lies with the major Powers, which to varying degrees have ignored the obligations imposed on them by the Charter and accepted by them when they signed and ratified it.

281. In particular, the principles of the sovereign equality of all States, the prohibition of the threat or use of force, non-intervention and the right of self-determination, have often been a dead letter as far as the permanent members of the Security Council are concerned, like their commitment to contribute towards the strengthening and the maintenance of international peace and security "with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources", to quote Article 26 of the Charter.

282. In the statement I delivered some five years ago in the First Committee, on 22 October 1969, on the item entitled "The strengthening of international security", I explained the reasons for our continuing belief that the responsibility of the major Powers should be described as the primary responsibility. And I did so in words which I think it very relevant to quote now:

"The reason is first that since their resources, both economic and military, are infinitely superior to those of most Members, so likewise is their capacity to act to maintain and consolidate international peace and security. As was explained on the eve of the San Francisco Conference by one of the draftsmen of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that were to serve as a basis for the wording of the Charter, the system that was to be embodied in the Charter places the direct responsibility for international security on the shoulders of the nations most capable of bearing it.

"This is obviously the only possible justification for the privileged status granted under the Charter to the permanent members of the Security Council; and my country made this clear in 1945, as is shown in the records of the appropriate Committee of the Conference. We requested—I myself had the privilege of submitting the request—that the following statement be included in the record:



“The Mexican delegation, in voting for the text of the Article relating to composition of the Security Council as approved by its Committee I, wishes to point out that it does so because it considers this text to be an implicit application . . . of the legal principle of correlation between powers and duties which safeguards the basic principle of equal rights of all States.

“The Mexican delegation interprets this Article as the granting of broader rights to those States therein named to hold permanent seats on the Security Council, principally for the reason that those are the States whose responsibility for the maintenance of peace . . . ‘is greater in the international community’ . . . .”

“The permanent members of the Security Council have used—and let us admit it, have at times abused—the broader rights granted to them under the voting procedures of the Council itself and various other provisions of the Charter. But they have certainly not likewise measured up to their broader responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security.

“This responsibility of the great Powers is also a primary responsibility in respect both of their failure to act and of such of their actions as have involved overt or covert violations—some very serious—of the principles of the Charter. This has had a sinister influence, since there are medium-sized and small States which have no doubt begun to wonder why they should not regard themselves as entitled to follow that example. In some cases apparently they have decided that they were so entitled, which is hardly surprising, since the action of the great Powers in international life has effects similar to those which in the days of absolute monarchy the accession of a dissolute sovereign to the throne had on the morale of the nation, carrying along with him first his court and later a large section of the populace . . . ”<sup>10</sup>

That is what I said five years ago and it seems to me to have retained all its relevance.

283. Consequently we believe that before criticizing the General Assembly sharply we should consider whether the real or imaginary excesses—and we believe that in the majority of cases they fall into the second category—which the Assembly has committed are not due, in whole or in part, to the behaviour of some of the permanent members of the Security Council, which is not in keeping with the Charter.

284. To explain why we ask ourselves this, my delegation would like to remind the Assembly of a recent incident: the triple veto with which the Council responded to General Assembly resolution 3207 (XXIX), adopted on 30 September 1974, in which this body, the most representative of the world community, called upon the Council

“... to review the relationship between the United Nations and South Africa in the light of the constant violation by South Africa of the principles of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”

285. Perhaps it could be said that the expulsion of South Africa from the Organization, which some

States suggested in the draft resolution submitted to the Council,<sup>11</sup> was not only not the most suitable means of achieving the aim pursued but might have been counter-productive. My delegation, as we declared in 1969 and reiterated in 1970, agrees with this thesis. However, this in no way justifies the behaviour of the three permanent members in question for, while many objections could be raised to expulsion, the other analogous sanction foreseen in Article 5 of the Charter—namely, suspension from the exercise by South Africa of the rights and privileges inherent in its position as a Member—a sanction which Mexico expressly suggested in the two years I have just mentioned and moreover reiterated from this very rostrum on 30 September last [2248th meeting, paras. 128-134], not only would have been fully justified but has long become imperative and urgent. If the members that vetoed expulsion had wished to discharge their duty they themselves should have suggested such a sanction as an intermediate measure.

286. We regret that this was not the case and we hope that, if it is really desired to strengthen the role of the United Nations so as to achieve the fundamental goals set out in its Charter, all the Members of the Organization, both medium-sized and small States, but in particular the big States, will show their willingness to fulfil “in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance” with the Charter itself.

287. In conclusion, we should like to emphasize that the Charter does not foresee, as far as the voting procedure of the General Assembly laid down in Article 18 is concerned, any limitation other than that its decisions on important questions shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority of Members present and voting.

288. As regards the so-called “Yalta formula”, concerning the adoption of decisions by the Security Council, however, it is extremely relevant to recall that, in the joint statement of the sponsoring Governments of the San Francisco Conference, on 8 June 1945, in reply to the numerous questions put to them on the matter of the veto, they defined their general stand by asserting emphatically that—and here I shall again quote the words used in the joint declaration—

“It is not to be assumed, however, that the permanent members . . . would use their ‘veto’ power wilfully to obstruct the operation of the Council.”<sup>12</sup>

289. Those were the very words used by the sponsoring Powers, in other words, the Powers that are now the permanent members of the Security Council.

290. In view of the foregoing, it seems to us that if we assess the activities of the Assembly and the Council, particularly as regards cases such as that of South Africa, to which I alluded a few moments ago, we should not refer to the so-called “tyranny of the majority” but rather to the intolerable “paralysing dictatorship of a minority” that has so often prevented the United Nations from acting in keeping with the principles of the Charter.

291. Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation had intended when the item on the strengthening of the role of the United Nations was discussed, to explain our country’s attitude towards draft resolutions A/L.748 and Add.1-4 and A/L.749, particularly after the represen-

tatives of Romania and Australia had introduced them to the General Assembly. But the progress of the debate, as we witnessed last week, has compelled us to make a statement.

292. While the question is important, those who preceded me in speaking on this question do not leave me much to say for fear of repeating what they have already said.

293. The attitude of my delegation to the Romanian draft resolution [A/L.748 and Add.1-4] has led us to join the sponsors. We shall also support the Australian draft resolution [A/L.749]. This action stems from Egypt's belief and trust that the role of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security and achieving the peaceful settlement of international disputes is an integral part of that objective and would strengthen its role in fulfilling its responsibilities.

294. I shall now deal with the question as a whole by giving a brief explanation of Egypt's point of view on the debate initiated last week by some major Powers regarding the progress of the Organization under the domination of the majority, which, in their view, would run counter to its effectiveness and its development in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.

295. We are surprised at the voices that have recently been raised in this Hall, criticizing the United Nations and the voting procedure of the General Assembly and accusing the international Organization of being swayed by the majority, whom they even tried to portray as becoming tyrannical. We are further astonished by some of the information media of those critics, information media that are under their control, which have gone even further in trying to attack the United Nations and to undermine it. I wonder in whose interests they tried to undermine the world Organization. Is it to serve the objective we all seek, namely, an interdependent international community, which was inspired by our Charter? Is it to serve peace based on justice and all its aspects—political, social and economic equity? Or are these critics trying to distort the world Organization and frustrate its efforts to establish peace, and thus endeavour to put this Organization under the rule of the minority? Would the domination of the minority be the only thing that would satisfy these critics?

296. The dangerous consequences that the raising of these objections may entail make it all the more important that we should stand against them and refute them by reason and logic. Perhaps their authors will then appreciate the danger inherent in what they are advocating. Perhaps they will then appreciate the importance of the United Nations and the success of its mission in implementing the resolutions that it adopts.

297. Whatever the claims and the motives of these voices, they have no justification whatsoever if their aim was to undermine the world Organization.

298. The United Nations Charter reflects the free will of the world's peoples. In accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter, the work of the Organization is to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations to maintain international peace and security, and to develop and strengthen the principle of equality among all nations, and to enhance

international co-operation in economic, cultural and humanitarian affairs. Human rights and fundamental freedoms should also be strengthened without any discrimination on the basis of race, language, creed or sex.

299. The main objective is to maintain international peace and security. That is why various points of view have been put forward to achieve this fundamental goal.

300. All these objectives have been formulated in our Charter. They have been embodied in the Charter for 29 years. During the 29 years there have been many changes and variables, which impel us to test the role of the United Nations in the light of its Charter and the progress of its work in a world that has witnessed far-reaching changes. The United Nations was based on the principles of democracy and the shouldering of responsibilities according to the capabilities of the Member States. This is evident when we take a look at the composition of the Organization and its organs, whether it be the Security Council or the General Assembly.

301. The greatest change the international community has witnessed has been reflected in the membership of the United Nations. The new-born babe of 1945 has grown up and developed to become an organization that is eliminating the frontiers between the States of the world. And the logical and natural consequence is that some look at this palpable and tangible variable as the sole and main reason for the ineffectiveness of the Organization and the adoption of resolutions which do not take the interests of the minority into consideration. It is blamed for all the shortcomings of the Organization and the rigidity in its evolution, as if the only disease that has afflicted the body politic was the independence of that growing number of small States after they had struggled for years in order to ultimately obtain a birth certificate. Despite the fact that these States existed as a separate entity, the international colonial Powers did not recognize that fact.

302. While the right to independence was denied to the States for quite a long time, today we see a new logic which tries to deny the practice of democracy by those States, this spirit of democracy in which the United Nations was established. What used to be called, in the past, an under-developed territory, or a politically undeveloped society, is being called today at the United Nations the "tyrannical States".

303. Let us now go back to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. These provisions have established organs for which terms of reference have been specified. And without any prejudice to the past, we find that the provisions of the Charter in so far as the principal goals of the Organization are concerned—nay, even the substance of its work—rest on the maintenance of international peace and security. So far, all these provisions have remained a dead letter or simply a scrap of paper. And the smaller States have nothing to do with it. Who is to be blamed for not implementing Chapter VII of the Charter? Who is to be blamed for not implementing Chapter VI of the Charter, relating to the peaceful settlement of disputes? Who has the right of decision at the Security Council? These are things which were not dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Charter by the States that have the responsibility and the resources. They

did not consider these things seriously. As the Australian representative said [2307th meeting, para. 36], the hitherto untapped provisions of the Charter should be looked at again in order to resolve international conflicts peacefully. Are not the cold war and the political groupings under the umbrella of alliances one of the principal reasons which have rendered the United Nations a marginal institution?

304. The States which make up the majority today in the General Assembly believe that their interests can only be safeguarded within the framework of this Organization. And it is in this conviction that this majority acts. But this certainly does not mean that their action is not founded on any legal basis or lies outside the institutional framework. In fact, they abide by the provisions of the Charter and are not at all content with lip-service to the Charter. We need not bring in evidence of this fact.

305. All of us know that the Charter is an international institution, that it is an integral constitution as elaborated in the Preamble and in Article 1. From this point of departure we move from the principle to the application. Was not the majority relying upon the Charter, was it not acting within the framework of the United Nations when the Organization called for the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the establishment of the right to self-determination, and the implementation of human rights? Did not this majority base itself on the Charter and work within the framework of the United Nations when it called for the establishment of new economic organs and bodies which would consider the interests of the developing countries, after the Bretton Woods Agreement had failed to give any consideration to that question? Did it not seek a remedy to this crisis between 1944 and 1964, and when institutions such as UNCTAD and UNIDO were established? The numerical majority did not seek to enforce any resolution except within the framework of reconciling their interests, at a time when the rich minority, at Bretton Woods, acted in accordance with the principle of weighted voting, where he who pays the piper calls the tune.

306. Has not the policy of racial discrimination been a threat to international peace and security and, consequently, was it not necessary to condemn it? Has not the call for the application of economic sanctions been in accordance with Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter? Was not this numerical majority the reason for blocking the loopholes caused by the refusal of the minority to implement the provisions of the Charter? And I mean by this the role it has played in peace-keeping operations when the international political climate was not such as to induce the five major Powers on the Security Council to live up to their responsibilities.

307. Now we come to the latest examples that we are still experiencing. Has the majority, with its tyranny, been the reason for the continued occupation of the Arab territories for a number of years and for the fact that the Palestinian people have been denied the right to self-determination, to resettlement and to a return to their homeland? Is not occupation by force and the denial of the right to self-determination mentioned in the Charter, and is not the United Nations the organization that should adopt resolutions in this regard? Are not the specialized agencies part of the

United Nations system, which should co-ordinate the work of the system with the parent Organization and consolidate it? Is it their fault if this system does not work harmoniously and in unison? Have we forgotten that the philosophy of UNESCO is based on the fact that war begins in the mind and that consequently man must learn by reflecting how to renounce war? Is not the aim of all these specialized agencies to establish peace regardless of political considerations?

308. As far as the process of decision-making by the General Assembly is concerned—and we, as a Member of the United Nations, know that it is a fact—we see that decisions pass through a number of stages among various States that come from different backgrounds and that they do not stem from one source, and if a small minority does not approve of a resolution this does not necessarily mean that the “tyrannical” majority is mistaken. The only arbiter is the Charter, law and justice. It is not in the interest of world peace that we should allow the aggressor to enjoy the fruits of his aggression. Quite a number of lawful principles, if applied without taking into consideration the principle of justice, would become tyrannical and undermine law and justice. An example of this fact is that no right is acquired by the commission of a crime.

309. If I have dealt with some positive positions adopted by the majority I am only giving evidence of the seriousness and objectivity of this majority. As we have witnessed throughout the course of this session, there has been, in particular, a feeling of satisfaction with and encouragement for the policies of the new Portuguese Government towards the Portuguese colonies in Africa. To be objective and to bring our Organization nearer to the international realities and environment is the surest way to render it effective. But rejection and making scapegoats of countries are a way to undermine the international Organization and to destroy the results for which humanity has struggled for years. If we call upon the numerical majority to exercise self-restraint and to adopt a responsible attitude, the mighty minority must in turn understand the international changes that have come about and respect the will of the international community. They should not resort to threats or menaces or challenges. Respect for the United Nations Charter is an international commitment and sacrosanct and it is essential to abide by it.

310. In conclusion I should like to explain my delegation's view to the international community on how political activity should be carried on at the international level. We consider that our ultimate goal is to set up an international community for the organization of which the United Nations would be responsible, and not a society of States which would consider the United Nations as an accessory in the implementation of policies based on self-interest without taking into consideration all the interests of the world community. We believe that the way to achieve this is by negotiation and not by confrontation, and that our objective should be the satisfaction of the interests of the greatest possible number and not the lowest possible degree of agreement in order to achieve co-operation. Otherwise we will be jeopardizing all our achievements, though they be few and modest. This attitude is based on mutual understanding through fruitful negotiation rather than on divergence

and confrontation. As Egypt has so often declared, it is one of the principles which motivated quite a number of the developing countries before the sixth special session and was the theme of that group of States throughout the special session, despite the difficulties and hardships with which we were faced and which we all know. The third-world countries have proved often, particularly in many cases that have been dealt with in this Organization, that they are open to constructive dialogue and mutual understanding on the basis of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. However, they will continue resolutely to condemn and to object to and to stand up to any who may violate the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the resolutions adopted by the Organization.

*The meeting rose at 9.10 p.m.*

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Annexes*, agenda item 89, document A/8798.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, *Sixth Special Session, Annexes*, agenda item 7, document A/9541.

<sup>3</sup> Herbert J. Muller, *Adlai Stevenson: A Study in Values* (New York, Harper and Row, 1967).

<sup>4</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1A (A/6301/Add.1)*, sect. 1, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 1874th meeting, para. 3.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, *Twenty-ninth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 38, document A/9959, para. 19.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, *Tenth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 24, document A/3065, paras. 7-15.

<sup>8</sup> For a summary of this statement, see *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Second Committee*, 1540th meeting, para. 5.

<sup>9</sup> *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, I/6 (vol. VI, p. 17).

<sup>10</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, First Committee*, 1661st meeting, paras. 114-117.

<sup>11</sup> *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-ninth Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1974*, document S/11543.

<sup>12</sup> *Documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization*, III/1/37 (1) (vol. XI, p. 713).