



CONTENTS

	Page
<i>Agenda item 8:</i>	
<i>Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects</i>	
<i>Report of the Special Political Committee. . .</i>	1

President: Mr. Abdul Rahman PAZHAWAK (Afghanistan).

AGENDA ITEM 8

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE ^{1/}

1. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will begin its consideration of the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects". The report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has been circulated [A/6654].

Mr. Abdel-Hamid (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, presented the report of that Committee and then spoke as follows:

2. Mr. ABDEL-HAMID (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations: Members will recall that, at its twenty-first session, the General Assembly had on its agenda the item entitled "Comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects". After a detailed debate, the Special Political Committee, to which this item had been allocated, submitted its report.

3. The report contained three draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee. However, the General Assembly did not pronounce itself on any of those draft resolutions. Instead the Assembly decided, by resolution 2220 (XXI), to refer the report of the Special Political Committee to the fifth special session of the General Assembly. By the same resolution, the Assembly also requested the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to continue the review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations and to report to the General Assembly at this special session. The report which I have the honour to submit is in pursuance of that decision.

4. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations had a busy session during the last three months.

The meetings began on a positive note, due largely to the initiative taken by a number of its members from non-aligned countries, in proposing through a memorandum that the work of the Special Committee could best be organized by the establishment of two working groups, Group A and Group B, in addition to the Committee itself, the two working groups to deal with the study of the various methods of financing peace-keeping operations and with the study of matters related to the facilities, services and personnel which Member States might voluntarily provide for a United Nations peace-keeping operation. That joint memorandum of the non-aligned countries, members of the Special Committee, is appended as annex I to the report.

5. The two working groups held a total of ten meetings. The meetings were constructive and businesslike and clearly reflected the desire of the members of the Committee to make sincere efforts to achieve progress in what is admittedly an extremely difficult and complex area. Several useful and practical suggestions were made, and these are contained in the views summarized in the body of the report of the Special Committee.

6. I now come to the recommendation of the Special Committee to the General Assembly. In paragraph 153 of its report, the Special Committee has recommended to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution.

7. Operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution would have the General Assembly renew its appeal "to all Member States and in particular to the highly developed countries to make voluntary contributions to overcome the continuing financial difficulties of the Organization".

8. Operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution requests the Special Committee to continue its work and to study the various suggestions made during the Committee's last session, in particular those relating to the questions of financing future peace-keeping operations and of facilities, services and personnel which Member States might voluntarily provide in accordance with the Charter for United Nations peace-keeping operations.

9. Operative paragraph 3 asks the Special Committee to report on the progress of its work to the General Assembly at its twenty-second session.

10. Members are aware that, during the past few weeks, very intensive consultations have been conducted by the members of the Special Committee and the offices to reach agreement on substantive conclusions which the Committee could include in its report to the General Assembly. A large part of those consultations was based on a five-point draft prepared by several of the non-aligned delegations, members of the Special Committee. This five-point draft, which

^{1/} Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Annexes, agenda item 33, document A/6603.

now appears as annex V to the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, sought to list the points on which there appeared to be a possibility for a general consensus. It was not, however, possible to reach agreement, due largely to the shortness of time at the Committee's disposal.

11. Although the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee might appear to be mainly procedural in character, it clearly reflects the general feeling among the members of the Special Committee that, given more time, it should be possible for the Committee to make significant progress at least in certain areas falling within its mandate.

12. The PRESIDENT: In view of the terms of General Assembly resolution 2220 (XXI), it would appear that the draft resolutions in both the report of the Special Political Committee to the twenty-first session and the report of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations to the present session are before the Assembly. However, since the draft resolution recommended by the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations was adopted subsequent to the draft resolutions contained in the report of the Special Political Committee, the Assembly may or may not wish to vote at this stage on the three draft resolutions as set out in the report of the Special Political Committee.

13. Therefore, I thought I should bring this to the attention of the General Assembly at the outset, and, in the absence of any objection, to suggest on the basis of a general consensus that the Assembly may defer a decision on the draft resolutions submitted by the Special Political Committee and take a decision on the recommendation of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

It was so decided.

14. Before I give the floor to the first speaker, the Chairman of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, I should like to announce that the list of speakers on this item will be closed at 1 o'clock this afternoon. This will enable us to organize our work and to conclude the consideration of the item during the afternoon meeting or, if necessary, during the night meeting.

15. Tomorrow morning we shall consider agenda item 9 entitled "Question of the postponement to 1968 of the United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Peaceful Uses of Outer Space". I shall therefore close the list of speakers for agenda item 9 at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

16. Mr. CUEVAS CANCINO (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): The Rapporteur of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has introduced the fourth report of that Committee [A/6654], which is thus beginning its third year of work. This is a fairly long period of time, and the draft resolution now before the General Assembly raises the question of continuing the Committee's mandate.

17. The Special Committee has submitted to the General Assembly a recommendation [*ibid.*, para. 152], essentially procedural in nature, under which the Special Committee would continue to examine the various aspects of the complex problem of peace-keeping—organic, financial and constitutional. I am inclined to

emphasize that the problem has to be considered as a whole and not piecemeal; otherwise this complex matter might lose some of its coherence.

18. The Special Committee has wisely adopted the principle of unanimity in its decisions. The problem is simply and solely one of fundamental importance in international life, namely peace-keeping and restraint in the use of armed forces on the part of all States in order to work towards coexistence; it is simply and solely the basic aim of those who founded the Organization.

19. I feel that the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has made progress in its report. The work done is of a very high level; many of the concepts introduce new elements hardly even outlined up to now, while others reflect attitudes likely to bear fruit, if not now, then in the future. Nevertheless I do not think it rash to say that this question should be viewed in terms of slow but steady progress, and not of sudden and violent developments. Here there is a real conflict between two interpretations of the actual Charter of the Organization. Some countries regard the Charter as a multilateral treaty making law and embodying many obligations which in themselves constitute a source of new legal concepts, but nevertheless a treaty which must not in any circumstances depart from the basis upon which it was negotiated. Other countries view it from a more flexible point of view, as an unwritten constitutional document whereby the General Assembly can play a part more like that of a national parliament. These two interpretations should not conflict with each other but should be directed towards the essential goal of unanimity. Neither should take precedence; otherwise the foundations on which the Organization is built might be shaken.

20. It is not only the past work of the Special Committee that justifies the renewal of its mandate, but also the prospects offered by the continuation of its work. In my opinion, the Special Committee, through careful soundings, could invigorate and breathe life into certain concepts which are only hinted at in the Charter and have not yet begun to play the vital role intended for them. For example, at the last session we saw the possibility of asking the Security Council to apply the conventions and agreements mentioned in Article 43 of the Charter and thus, within the framework envisaged in the Charter, to prepare States to contribute towards peace-keeping. I have used this example rather than others which were also mentioned because it would seem that there is no controversy in this instance.

21. Moreover, the competence and effectiveness of the principal organs of the United Nations is a matter that the Committee has studied with great care. Provision was made for close co-operation, but as far as the concept of harmony within the Charter is concerned, twenty years of operation have perhaps brought out the differences rather than the common ground.

22. I feel that if the Special Committee were to continue its work it could provide the proper sense of continuity, for the concept at issue is one which has been discussed since the Organization was established.

Majority views cannot be imposed in regard to problems like this. We must gradually produce common ideas and avoid simple majority decisions, which entail great danger.

23. I believe that if the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations did not exist, it would have to be created, since it is vital to the basic and harmonious progress of the United Nations. It should help to avoid problems which will undoubtedly arise if hasty majority decisions are taken concerning matters which by their nature are of universal importance, and I do not think it is mere coincidence that the Special Committee came into being at a time when the Organization found itself in a serious and awkward impasse.

24. The only solution, therefore, is to continue reviewing the basic problems of peace-keeping which intrinsically affect the very essence of the Organization and, through careful and accurate analysis, to lay down new goals for putting into practice the principles of the Charter.

25. The Special Committee is the organ best equipped to translate into reality the various possible courses of action which today seem most useful for the Organization and can therefore contribute to the maintenance of peace throughout the world. Hence it seems to me that the General Assembly should consider time as a secondary factor. The problems we are now discussing have existed ever since the Organization came into being, and the important point is that the United Nations must not be weakened, that no doubt must be cast on the inherent excellence and cohesion of the principal organs set up at San Francisco for the maintenance of peace and the harmonious development of the world.

26. As representatives are aware, the Committee of Thirty-three was created during the nineteenth session of the General Assembly by resolution 2006 (XIX), but it is possible and desirable that the Committee should be strengthened by the association of other countries which without being members would take part in its work.

27. I believe I am expressing the general opinion of the Special Committee when I say here that if other States participated, it might give our work more flexibility and perhaps even greater precision. This would be particularly welcomed by many delegations.

28. In view of the Rapporteur's lengthy report, I do not think I need go into the details of our work at the last session. The General Assembly has before it a report of some substance, and I believe that the idea of continuity reflected in the draft resolution expresses very well the way we feel, namely, that our work is far from concluded.

29. However, a further appeal is in order, principally to the developed States, for voluntary contributions to wipe out the Organization's long-standing debts under this head, thus bringing to an end another perhaps somewhat protracted chapter in our history and enabling the Special Committee and the Assembly to devote themselves to more positive aspects of peace-keeping. For I believe that the work of the Special Committee, if it could crystallize certain constitutional and organic points, and by organic I mean embracing future financing, might prove extremely beneficial.

30. Mr. President, as you yourself mentioned, the General Assembly also has before it the report of the Special Political Committee submitted last year. The report was not actually sent to the Committee of Thirty-three, and you suggested that the Assembly should defer consideration of the draft resolutions contained in it for the time being. I believe—and hope I am expressing the general feeling—that the best course would be for the General Assembly to decide to transmit the report, with the draft resolutions it contains, to the Special Committee, which would study it and take it into account in its subsequent work. In that way we could in due course give this delicate and complex question our full attention, which might enable us ultimately to reach a solution to the problem.

31. Mr. GOLDBERG (United States of America): The problem of United Nations peace-keeping operations has come before the General Assembly at the very moment when international developments have brought this subject to the forefront of world attention and concern. We would have to have our heads buried in the sand not to be aware of the connexion between the question which we are debating here and the concrete and immediate realities in the Middle East.

32. The United States does not wish to say anything here today which would interfere with the Secretary-General's efforts to pacify the situation in the Middle East. The most that any of us can constructively do at this moment is to wish him Godspeed and every success in the critical mission on which he is about to embark.

33. In this situation, and in light of the fact that we are dealing with a procedural draft resolution, I do not believe that it would contribute to progress for me to make an extensive statement on the substance of this question. The Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations has proposed a draft resolution [A/6656, para. 153] under which the General Assembly would ask the Special Committee to continue its work and report to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly in the autumn. Although, in all candour, we would have preferred substantive action on this question at the twenty-first session, or indeed at this special session, we nevertheless stated in the Special Committee that we would acquiesce in this draft resolution. I pledge the best efforts of my Government in the Committee's efforts to reach agreement.

34. Peace-keeping lies at the very heart of the responsibilities of the United Nations under the Charter. Whatever the import of the events of recent days, it is necessary to remember that we are dealing here with a problem which is not transitory. It will be with us for many years and perhaps generations to come. We heartily agree with the Secretary-General when, in the concluding passage of his report to this Assembly last Friday, he appealed to the Members to

"intensify their efforts both for the maintenance of peace in this particular situation and for the improvement of the capacity of the Organization to maintain peace".^{2/}

^{2/} *Ibid.*, Fifth Emergency Special Session, Annexes, agenda item 5, document A/6730, para. 14.

It is in the spirit of that appeal that I make this statement.

35. At the very outset I should like to take this occasion to pay tribute to Ambassador Cuevas Cancino of Mexico and Ambassador Jakobson of Finland for their commendable performance as Chairmen of the two Committees whose reports are before us. This appreciation extends also to the able officers and secretariats serving those Committees.

36. The position of the United States on the principles involved in United Nations peace-keeping were set forth by me only two months ago in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations.

37. Broadly speaking, they are as follows: the capacity of the United Nations to deploy peace-keeping forces promptly in an emergency must be preserved. To support this capacity, viable and equitable financing arrangements must be agreed upon and faithfully implemented. Any United Nations peace-keeping operation, like any other complex operation, requires a single executive. That executive should be the Secretary-General. He should, of course, operate within the scope of his authority, remaining fully responsible to the authorizing body and consulting with Members on his conduct of peace-keeping operations. No single country, however powerful, can or should be permitted to frustrate by the veto a peace-keeping operation of the United Nations properly initiated by an appropriate organ of the United Nations.

38. My Government has not changed its belief that these principles are sound and that they express the true meaning of the Charter. Indeed, the history of this question shows that this belief is shared by the vast majority of Members. We are aware, of course, that some Members differ with us in varying degrees. It is certainly not my intention today to prolong the constitutional debate. For we have never regarded this question in any of its aspects, legal, financial or otherwise, as an issue in the so-called cold war. We have never looked upon it as a confrontation between the major Powers. On the contrary, we believe that the major Powers, regardless of ideology, share a basic interest in the promotion of peace and security among all nations, large and small. And we believe that the United Nations peace-keeping activities are vitally important to that end.

39. I do not hesitate to emphasize the interest of the great Powers in this matter. The view is sometimes stated that the smaller Powers, because they are more vulnerable, are the real beneficiaries of United Nations peace-keeping, whereas the great Powers "can take care of themselves". My country does not accept this view. Nobody questions the vital interests of the smaller Powers in this activity; indeed, they have manifested that interest time and time again by their votes and their contributions. But neither should anyone suppose that the United Nations peace-keeping operations do not serve the basic interests of all of the great Powers also.

40. We live in a fast-changing and fast-shrinking world in which obsolete habits of thought can be suicidal. Great Powers should not alone be responsible for policing trouble spots, settling quarrels and protecting weaker nations. But if the United Nations

cannot perform this task, what is the alternative? For all Members, large and small alike, have obligations to uphold the law of the Charter and to help each other to maintain their integrity and independence. It is far better for nations to discharge those obligations collectively rather than individually. That is the root of the whole matter of peace-keeping.

41. Surely the era is long past when the world community could afford to ignore, or to be indifferent to, wars between small Powers, for bitter experience has taught us how infectious they can be. All such conflicts carry within them the danger of confrontations into which the great Powers themselves could be drawn and whose destruction would rain impartially on great and small Powers alike.

42. My country and the other major Powers therefore share with all countries a vital interest in maintaining and fostering an impartial instrument of stability, an instrument which, when danger and discord arise, as regrettably they inevitably must, can intervene not for power but for peace. This interest has nothing to do with ideology. It has everything to do with human survival.

43. The impartial international instrument we need already exists. It is the United Nations. Its capacity to serve effectively has been demonstrated in some of the most dangerous situations of our time. In those instances where it has succeeded, it has repaid its cost a thousandfold. In those instances in which it fails—and we must emphasize this, particularly today—our response should not be despair or repudiation, but a resolve to strengthen its effectiveness and to make it succeed. As my illustrious predecessor, Adlai Stevenson, warned: "Let none of us mock its weakness, for when we do we are mocking ourselves."

44. In this connexion, much has been said in favour of fidelity to the limitations laid down in the Charter. My country yields to none in this regard—although there are differences as to what the limitations are. But the Charter does not consist exclusively of limitations. It also confers positive responsibilities to act for peace. Those responsibilities rest on the organs of the United Nations; they also rest on us, the Member States. Each Member, in a manner commensurate with its power, must bear those responsibilities.

45. In this spirit we of the United States pledge anew our desire to see the peace-keeping question resolved and our readiness to work with all others to this end. We wish to respond flexibly to any initiative whose purpose is to ensure the future of the United Nations as a keeper of the peace—to ensure that every part of its peace-making and peace-keeping machinery is kept in working order and improved. Progress to this end cannot be made by unrequited concessions from one side. But where a spirit of accommodation is apparent, my Government will respond.

46. And we shall display the same responsive and responsible attitude also on the collateral question of the United Nations financial deficit. As all Members here well know, the United States over the years has been very forthcoming on this question. Throughout the years we have made large voluntary contributions, over our assessments, to United Nations peace-keeping. We also took a major initiative two years ago,

as I well remember, which was reflected in the consensus of the General Assembly on 1 September 1965, [1331st meeting] in order to break the deadlock over Article 19.

47. I am content to rest on the record of our performance and to leave it to the judgement of the Members whether others have fulfilled their obligations under the consensus.

48. We look forward to the day, which we trust is not far distant, when all Members will see their interests in the same light and will support a vigorous United Nations peace-keeping role as readily as fellow townsmen in all our countries, whatever their differences, support an efficient police force. That day, regrettably, is not yet, but we must not cease to work for its arrival.

49. Some will argue, and do argue, that it is unrealistic, in view of disappointments, to continue to believe in a world of law and order in which the responsibility for keeping the peace is shared collectively. I do not suggest that the road towards such an international order is easy or assured of success. It would be foolish for me to do so in the light of current events. But I do suggest that we are even less assured of success if we continue to rely on the so-called *Realpolitik*, which has been the tradition during many centuries of international affairs. There is nothing less realistic than *Realpolitik*. It has brought tragic wars, the loss of many millions of lives and no security for either the strong or the weak.

50. Surely in this great world Organization, where the tremors of international upheaval from every quarter of the globe are recorded every day—as indeed they are today—it is not too soon for all Members, large and small, to measure their response to the dangers that surround us. This is no time to make legalistic or ingenious calculations of the least that we can be required to do by the letter of the Charter. It is rather a time for us to see how much we can do, under the Charter, to advance the cause of peace. Such is our common unfinished task, for the completion of which the United States pledges its unceasing co-operation.

51. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): Al-Mutanabi—the famous Arab poet who lived a few centuries ago, when Europe was still in the Dark Ages and Red Indians still ruled the new hemisphere—had he been alive and with us today, would have recited two lines of his poetry which eloquently highlight the whys and wherefores of the predicament that is confronting us today on the question of peace-keeping operations. I shall recite these two lines in the original Arabic and attempt to paraphrase them in English for the benefit of my colleagues. The first line reads:

"The sword is more truthful than the written word in deciding the outcome, by setting with its sharp edge the limit between the serious deed and the playful act."

52. Applying this verse to modern times, we deduce from it that nuclear armament is more effective than pious United Nations resolutions in setting the limits between what the nuclear Powers decide and what the small Powers devoutly desire. The second line reads:

"Should you see a lion bare his fangs, do not for a moment think that the lion is smiling."

53. Let us take the facts. More and more, our resolutions preach what we cannot practise or implement. When we come to the attitude of the nuclear Powers, we find that each one of them, still adamant in its stand vis-à-vis the other nuclear Powers, despises the soft words they address to us, the small nations, and the accompanying broad smile that lightens their faces. Whenever they act like this, we should recall the lion cited in the verse of Al-Mutanabi.

54. The question of peace-keeping operations, opened for discussion during the fifth special session has, as everyone knows, three major aspects: the juridical, the political and the financial. Although each of these aspects is in principle of equal importance, I believe that everybody concurs in considering the political aspect as presenting the main difficulty, which unfortunately has not so far lent itself to a satisfactory solution. Juridically, no one can contest in this Assembly the fact that the prerogative of peace-keeping rests primarily, and I dare say exclusively, with the Security Council, in accordance with the explicit provisions of the United Nations Charter. Anyone who claims the contrary has failed to interpret the Charter correctly. The residual power of the Assembly pertaining to peace-keeping operations does not go beyond the right to make recommendations to the Security Council in two circumstances: first, when the Council for some reason fails to initiate any action in a situation which the Assembly considers likely to endanger international peace and security; and second, in the event that the Security Council is paralysed because one of its permanent members exercises the veto. In these circumstances the Council may request the General Assembly to pronounce itself on a given situation. Juridically speaking, whatever its recommendations may be, the Assembly cannot itself in any way initiate any peace-keeping operations unless, of course, the Council concurs.

55. These are the facts. These are the facts that stem from the Charter and they cannot be altered unless the permanent members of the Security Council unanimously decided to amend the Charter. Anyone scrutinizing the provisions of Article 24 and Article 25 of the Charter will come to the conclusion that these two Articles constitute, so to speak, a pact among the Members of the United Nations. If the five permanent members of the Security Council, and, in particular, the two great Powers, laboured in continuous harmony towards achieving unanimity on items inscribed on the agenda of the Council, we should not be discussing the question of peace-keeping operations in the Assembly or elsewhere. However, the lack of concurrence, and quite often the wide divergencies, on certain issues in the Council, especially between the two great Powers, bring us to the political aspect of peace-keeping operations. Hence, the whole crux of the question before us resides in the co-operation, or lack of it, in the Council between these two Powers.

56. After having watched the deliberations in the Security Council on major disputes for over twenty years, I believe I am entitled to express my views, without allowing myself to be carried away by wishful thinking and high expectations, as has been the case

with a number of my colleagues who think that the problem could be solved through intensified efforts prompted by good intentions. Good intentions are not wanting and could always be discerned in previous Assemblies and in this one as well; and there has been no lack of diligence, either, in exploring all kinds of remedies, unfortunately with no palpable results. Why should this be so? Any student of history can furnish us with the answer. Those who are in a position to exercise tremendous power, as happens to be the case with the two—if I may call them so—super-state Members of this Organization, are often not quite amenable to reason on anything which may remotely affect their respective national interests.

57. I was indeed amused when the President of the General Assembly at its nineteenth session appointed a Special Committee to deal with the question of peace-keeping operations. Later, when he asked me, I made it quite clear to him that if the two great Powers did not come to a clear understanding on the application of peace-keeping machinery, the outcome would be a waste of time and effort. When I was asked what number should constitute such a committee, I suggested seven or nine, with about half of its members to act informally as conciliators between the two major Powers. Furthermore, I suggested that negotiations with the great Powers should not be publicized, nor should the meetings of the committee even be listed in the *Journal* of the United Nations. Regrettably, a diametrically different procedure was adopted. The committee was publicized, even before it was constituted; so much so that after the appointment of fifteen or eighteen members, a good number of our colleagues thought it would be glamorous to jump on the bandwagon, and expressed their desire not to be excluded from the honour of serving on the committee, whose number ultimately swelled to thirty-three, chosen on a so-called equitable basis. And to what effect? To the effect that some of them veered towards one major Power and others towards the other major Power, with a few members neither attached to nor divorced from either. This third category later found itself buffeted, so to speak, between the tempestuous wind and the stormy ocean, whilst other members were shuttling from one great Power to the other, with no likelihood of working out any practical proposal. Is it then hard to understand why we have so many proposals?

58. With all due respect to the members of the Committee of the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, and many of them are dear friends—this Committee which has been most assiduous in proffering various views, as is evident from its voluminous report on the subject—we find the two super-Powers still adamant in the respective positions they have taken on the question of peace-keeping operations since they clashed on the interpretation of Article 19 during the nineteenth session of the General Assembly. One might ask: Why should there be such an impasse? A little while ago I mentioned that any student of history might be able to draw a parallel between what happened in the past and what is taking place in our present era. It therefore behoves us to analyse the behaviour of great Powers throughout the ages.

59. What was the case in the past is still true today. Great Powers predicate their policies vis-à-vis each other upon the basis of balance of power and, concomitantly, of partitioning the world into spheres of influence. Ever since the rise of nationalism in Europe, the system of balance of power has been adopted for the regulation of external affairs among States. And rampant nationalism today still supersedes ideologies in shaping the policies of States. In order to maintain a balance of power, each State is constantly on the alert to make sure that it may not become so weak as to invite encroachment upon it by another State. Hence an equilibrium has to be maintained by a State which is quite frequently imbued with fear that it is being emulated in power by another State—singly or in alliance with other States.

60. Those are the facts. It has always been like that, unfortunately. This fear itself is at the root of feverish efforts to accelerate armaments and gear national industry to a state of preparedness in the event of emergency. Other measures are adopted—always in the name of self-defence—for enlisting friends by economic inducements, such as trade or financial aid. To maintain this equilibrium between States, it is necessary that the increase in armaments be accomplished with the utmost secrecy. Hence the network of spies and multifarious activities of intelligence services abroad become understandable.

61. Clandestinely, each Power endeavours to ascertain what a rival Power is doing in the field of armaments. Once in a while saboteurs and agents provocateurs are dispatched by one State to create diversions calculated to undermine the power of another State. In all cases, as mentioned, those actions are motivated by fear and suspicion—while we here in the United Nations deliberate on peace-keeping operations. It therefore stands to reason that whatever a State does surreptitiously to maintain its supremacy, its force conflicts with the interests of a rival State which is trying to do the same.

62. But the great Powers use other than covert means to attain their ends. In fairness to the great Powers, I must say that the medium and small Powers ape them. The great Powers set the pattern for the behaviour of the smaller Powers. You find those Powers vying with each other for the favour of lesser Powers, to enlist them in their respective camps. New inducements are constantly being offered to small States in the form of all sorts of grants, and quite often by supplying them with arms, sometimes gratis and sometimes under long-term payment. Of course, all this is not done for the beauty of one's eyes. Rather it is done on the basis of "Scratch my back and I will scratch yours". And it seems that the backs are always itching these days.

63. Is it any wonder that each of the great Powers has its clients even in this General Assembly? You have only to watch the voting on certain issues to see how well defined the cleavage is. Someone might ask, what about the non-aligned Powers? Let us be frank. Most non-aligned Powers—most, not all—forget all about their neutrality when they can profitably align their interests with one of the two major Powers—and sometimes, alternately with both Powers. We see it happening every day. The chameleon has nothing on

man. The poor chameleon nakedly changes its colour, but man—I had better keep silent, out of respect for our species of homo sapiens; yes, homo sapiens, whose reasoning quite often lags far behind his rationalization, with the result that, not infrequently, we find him sacrificing justice on the altar of expediency.

64. But we have lately witnessed a new development. Outside the United Nations a third force has emerged on the mainland of eastern Asia. Since then, major Powers have even concurred to extend aid simultaneously to some of the so-called non-aligned Powers—not alternately, but simultaneously. That phenomenon was unheard of a few years ago, in my early days with the United Nations, when the great Powers were at loggerheads with each other. Today there is a gentleman's agreement about more or less defined spheres of political influence. That does not mean that suspicion does not still lurk between the major Powers—and the small Powers for that matter. But present suspicions are a far cry from those which prevailed a decade or so ago. To put it bluntly, the emergence of Communist China as a great force in Asia brought the two major Powers much closer, for each of them probably fears that Chinese expansionism may, one of these days, threaten its respective interests in Asia, the mother of continents, with almost half the world's population.

65. Consequently, the present world situation reduces the application of peace-keeping operations only to the small States of this Organization, whose Governments may bicker with one another over real or imagined grievances. Can anyone tell me how the question of peace-keeping operations would have any significance whatsoever if, God forbid, there should be a conflict between the two major Powers, or if one of those major Powers took the law into its own hands against a lesser Power?

66. In the first case we would very likely have a third world war. In the second case, only if the stakes are high for the major Powers does the danger of a world conflagration remain a possibility. But if one of the two major Powers does not think that it is worthwhile—and mark my words here—clashing with another rival major Power in the latter's conflict with a minor State, can we in all honesty assume that a United Nations force would be mobilized? I doubt it. I doubt it because it is most unlikely. Therefore, the object of deploying any given United Nations force is mainly to control the small nations which, for some reason, might jump at each others' throats. In such a case the two major Powers, if they concur on a given issue, become the arbiters between the two fighting Powers, regardless of whether the settlement of a dispute is just or unjust. Needless to say, concurrence by the two great Powers, whether in the Security Council or in the General Assembly, need not provide a just or wise solution.

67. Of course, there is usually no dearth of those who extol whatever decisions on peace-keeping the great Powers take. Quite often expediency overrides any legitimate objection for the sake of preserving peace. But such a brand of peace is in dire contravention with what the Charter prescribes indivisibly:

peace with justice; not the peace of the grave; not the peace of coercion; not the peace of the fait accompli.

68. Therefore, there is no assurance, as I see things, that even the concurrence of the two major Powers for the deployment of United Nations forces may be the solution to the issue preoccupying us in this and other sessions of the Assembly. Someone might ask, what is the alternative to United Nations peace-keeping operations—since, after all, we are committed in the United Nations to preserve the peace and to save humanity from the scourge of war?

69. The situation is not altogether hopeless provided the politicians—not the diplomats—who run the affairs in our respective countries extricate themselves from the antiquated methods of the past. In the past, politicians were compelled to resort to deceit and duplicity—sometimes with decorum, sometimes brashly—to attain their ends, for whatever they considered the national interests of their respective countries.

70. We can no longer afford such a policy. It backfired. It has plunged the world into many conflicts since the Congress of Vienna. The exigencies of the present world situation, fraught as it is with ominous dangers which may threaten the survival of the human species, call for a new brand of men at the helm. And let us hope that our respective countries will produce such men who, in the exercise of their high authority, will rise above baneful international rivalries. The pattern of conducting external relations among States should be altered in such a way as to raise the politician to the rank of a real statesman who would consider it beneath his dignity, or beneath the dignity of the nation he represents, to engage in dishonourable acts towards the Government or people of another country.

71. The League of Nations—and I observed its activities in the late twenties and in the thirties—was established about half a century ago for the purpose of transcending the system of the balance of power and for eschewing secret pacts and spheres of influence. The purpose of the League of Nations was like our purpose today, namely, to resolve differences amicably and on a just basis. The League of Nations foundered because outside its halls alliances continued to be made for maintaining the balance of power and all it involved. In those days, strong Powers lorded themselves over the weak amongst the defeated nations as well as the indigenous people of colonial territories—a number of which, incidentally, were baptized as mandates at the Versailles Conference, of which South West Africa is a legacy.

72. The great Powers of that era fooled no one but themselves; and their policies, allegedly formulated to maintain world peace, backfired and plunged the world into the Second World War. If we do not watch out, and if we follow the same pattern of international behaviour, peace-keeping operations or no peace-keeping operations, the United Nations will meet with the same fate. Let us be frank. We have been talking for twenty years here and the situation gets worse.

73. However, I must state that peace-keeping operations are linked with the question of armaments. There is always the temptation for the aggrieved as well as for the ambitious State to resort to force

whenever it feels that it is adequately armed. The danger is compounded when the State in question happens to be a great Power. Can anyone in this Hall tell me how any peace-keeping operation would have a chance to function if a great Power believed itself aggrieved or became over-ambitious?

74. Let us wake up, especially we young countries here, and open our eyes to the naked truth. We should not beguile ourselves with further futile deliberations, whether in the Special Committee or in the General Assembly. We should not think that by improvising all kinds of imaginable solutions we may finally discover the magic wand for bringing peace by the touch of the hand. In so doing we would only be treating the symptoms instead of finding ways and means for preventing the disease. Peace must first be inculcated in the mind of the child in his formative years at home, instead of giving him military toys and soldiers to play with. Those toys are indicative of the warped mentality of the nineteenth century when a child was told that he should be proud to become a soldier to defend his country. Later, the child should be conditioned to peace by the laborious process of his school education. And subsequently, during the rest of his adult life, peace, peace, peace, should remain before him.

75. Look at the mass media of information today, visual and auditory. In almost every country that has been affected by modern trends, violence and sex have been glorified—violence and sex which condition the minds of the young to pugnacity and promiscuity—and you want peace. Listen to the rumbling of martial drums and watch the unfurling of national flags. Listen to the thud of warriors' boots, marching, marching, marching, to the battlefields, to kill or be killed—and we talk of peace. Other warriors are riding in the skies and raining death on people discriminately or indiscriminately in many parts of the world, while sanctimonious politicians back home dub these warriors liberators and freedom fighters—and we diplomats, helpless as we are, keep speaking of peace-keeping operations in this Assembly.

76. I think we have had enough of words. What we need is good will among men. What we need is a change of heart, until, let us hope, a new generation arises which has been genuinely prepared for peace. Instead of panicking and drafting young men to wage war, I venture to visualize an interim solution which might seem radical and possibly quite novel to this Assembly. Nevertheless I believe that such a solution could be fulfilled if we here at the United Nations took it upon ourselves to publicize it among all peoples of the world—for, after all, this is an open forum. If we cannot settle our own problems among ourselves, perhaps the peoples of the world will take note of what is being done to their detriment.

77. First of all, if we could only legislate on the international level that no one under the age of thirty-five should be conscripted to make war, do you know the significance of such a law, if universally passed by all nations of the world? We only have to take a glimpse at history to see it revealed to us that those in authority who have declared war were preponderantly men over forty years old, men of my age and your age, Mr. President. Thank God, we are men of peace. If in the past only men over forty had been

conscripted to fight, no one would doubt that they would have opted for peace. It is indeed high time politicians all over the world ceased to make the battlefield a chequer-board on which to play with the lives of men.

78. Secondly, mothers in all countries should be consulted as to whether or not their sons should be sent to war. A mother by nature is a protector of life. I am sorry to say that so far the human male has proven himself to be a destroyer of life.

79. Last but not least, if it is not yet possible to have universal conventions to that effect at this stage, as may well be the case, then no youth or young man who has not had a chance, by virtue of his tender age, to relish life as his elders have done should be coerced to sacrifice his own life in war. Nowadays modern technology provides diabolical devices whereby the engines of destruction can be deployed by pushing buttons, with a minimum of physical exertion. Hence, let the elderly men spare the young and do what they consider their patriotic duty by pushing the war buttons themselves, if they find no other way of exercising their patriotism than by subjecting mankind to possible suicide. In the absence of such universal legislation as I am suggesting today, young people everywhere will continue to be driven to the slaughterhouse in many parts of the world, while we quibble here fruitlessly about the question of peace-keeping operations.

80. I have dealt with both the political and the juridical aspects of the item before us and, I should say, the humanitarian aspect also. The financial implications of peace-keeping operations do not arise unless the great Powers concur on whether the United Nations peace-keeping operations are to be devised in a manner satisfactory to all concerned. However, if the major Powers concur, I believe, the financing should be done on a voluntary basis. Such an arrangement need not preclude the creation of a special endowment fund to which States and individuals the world over may contribute with a view to supplementing the budget for peace-keeping operations.

81. In conclusion, in spite of all doubts that anything practical will materialize from our deliberations on this item during the present session, we should not relax our efforts in our quest for the necessary machinery to regulate peace-keeping operations on a just and equitable basis. In the interim period, and pending our finding a satisfactory solution, perhaps a few years from now, I firmly believe that the only way open to us at present is to judge each case requiring peace-keeping operations on its own merits—which should be done primarily by the Security Council and in a recommendatory manner by the General Assembly in conformity with the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Another alternative which should not be ruled out and which applies to a restricted number of cases is that two or more States at war with one another might defray the expenses of peace-keeping operations, provided those States elect to do so and can afford to meet the expenses involved.

82. Mr. IGNATIEFF (Canada): Our experience during and since the last session of the General Assembly with the subject of peace-keeping has shown, I think, quite definitely that disputation on general principles is of no avail—for the very obvious reason that, in the

face of pronounced differences among various Powers in the interpretation of the Charter, no Members or groups of Members are likely to yield on strongly held positions of principle. Recognition of this basic fact seems to be essential if we are to achieve any meaningful progress in the future.

83. Experience in the Special Committee on Peace-keeping operations, the Committee of Thirty-three, despite the modest results contained in its current recommendations, has shown, in our view, that it is none the less possible to discuss profitably certain specific questions in an endeavour to find practical solutions. First and foremost, various suggestions have been put forward on the methods of financing future peace-keeping operations. These remain to be further discussed and explored, taking into account various useful proposals which have been made, including the possible establishment of a finance committee.

84. Meanwhile, the recommendation of the Committee of Thirty-three renews the appeal that Member countries which have not made voluntary contributions, particularly the highly developed countries, should make voluntary contributions to overcome the continuing financial difficulties arising from past disagreements.

85. Secondly, practical progress should be sought in preparations for future peace-keeping operations, as the recommendation of the Special Committee suggests, in regard to the facilities, services and personnel which Member States may voluntarily provide to the United Nations in order to meet future emergencies. Preparations involve such questions as technical studies and exchange of information as well as the implementation of Article 43 of the Charter.

86. From what I have said so far, it follows that both the Security Council and the General Assembly—or, rather, its continuing Committee of Thirty-three, can and should continue to try to resolve specific questions in a practical way. The Canadian delegation believes that progress can be made if we focus attention on the common interests that we have in strengthening the capacity of this world Organization to deal with situations of the kind which have arisen in the past and unfortunately may be expected to arise in the future. This should be done in a practical and effective way rather than by debate on questions of principle on which we are unlikely to persuade one another to change one another's points of view. This seemed to us to be the approach which animated most members of the Committee of Thirty-three during its latest deliberations, and for that reason we are able and willing to endorse the recommendation submitted for our consideration by the Committee of Thirty-three in its fourth report to the General Assembly.

Mr. Khalaf (Iraq), Vice-President, took the Chair.

87. We therefore agree that the Committee should be authorized to continue its work and report to the twenty-second session of the General Assembly. In this connexion, I listened to the remarks of the Chairman of the Committee of Thirty-three, the representative of Mexico. We agree with him that this Committee should study and take into account the

recommendations in the report of the Special Political Committee to the twenty-first session of the General Assembly, which is also on our agenda. My delegation would consider such action appropriate on the assumption that progress can be made on peace-keeping, through the Committee of Thirty-three and the Security Council, and that Member States will co-operate towards the achievement of practical results.

88. I could not, of course, make a statement on peace-keeping in this Assembly at this time without alluding to the events of the past few days. These events, the disturbing implications of which our Secretary-General has brought to the attention of the Assembly and also of the Security Council, have served to underline, in a most dramatic way, the real and continuing importance of peace-keeping. The maintenance of peace and security, I need hardly remind the Assembly, is the primary aim of this Organization, on the basis of co-operation among all—I repeat, among all—the Members of this Organization. This is the main purpose and responsibility of the United Nations. In the fulfilment of that responsibility—that solemn trust given into our care on behalf of humanity by the Charter—there can be no victories, save for the cause of peace. There can be no defeats, save for the bewildered and long-suffering peoples of the world who are always the victims of events beyond their control.

89. It has been sometimes questioned why Canada places so much emphasis on peace-keeping. If by this is meant a wholehearted devotion to the purposes of the Charter and to the role of the United Nations in striving for world peace and harmony among the nations of the world, then I am happy to plead guilty on behalf of my country. We are at the same time prepared, and always prepared to consider on its merits every proposal, from whatever source, on the best ways and means which in given circumstances may contribute to the achievement of this aim. This may seem to some rather idealistic an attitude; but one of the greatest of Canada's Prime Ministers, Sir Wildred Laurier, once said: "Let our purpose be ideal and our action be practical".

90. This, I suggest, in all humility, might well serve as a motto for us all in this most grave time when our Organization is going through one of the most severe trials in its history. It is, I can assure the Assembly, the spirit which will continue to animate Canada in our continuing efforts to find solutions to the problems of peace-keeping.

91. This is no time for complacency, nor for despondency, nor for discord. Let us not fall into the temptation either of despair or of mutual recrimination. Let us rather redouble our efforts in the search for peace, using every means made available to us through this world Organization, which was one of humanity's most noble and hopeful structures, and which we must not now allow to fail.

92. Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): The task of maintaining peace and deciding as to appropriate action for that purpose calls first and foremost for a clear understanding of where the threat to peace lies, what forces must be overcome, and what obstacles removed to achieve har-

monious coexistence among nations, the supreme aspiration of our Organization. To achieve this, all that need be done is to open the windows of the General Assembly to take soundings on the world of today and to put the question to the peoples fighting and dying in their efforts to emancipate themselves and to bring peace for everyone.

93. Some representatives raise the question what is to be done to safeguard peace; what mechanisms are to be created to avoid conflict between nations and to make the hopes which led to the creation of the United Nations come true. Our reply is: ask the Vietnamese people who bear witness to the honour and dignity of mankind and with incredible tenacity resist the savagery and barbarism of aggression unparalleled in history; ask the peoples of Africa, Asia or Latin America fighting in the mountains and the cities to gain their independence; ask the peoples spilling their blood and expending their strength to destroy the last bastions of colonialism; ask the millions of black people struggling to wipe out the monstrous cruelties of apartheid and racial discrimination; ask the starving millions, ask the landless peasants, ask the unemployed workers, the children without schools and the women without bread. Their reply is not given in words, but in blood, not in speeches but in fire: "Work with us to overcome the aggressors, to wipe out imperialism, to put an end to the exploitation and oppression of peoples".

94. Safeguarding peace means wiping out imperialism. Either we fight with determination against imperialism or we do not really want peace. This is more and more certain in present circumstances, where some regions of the world have peace in a literal sense, though basically it is fictitious, while in others, particularly in South-East Asia, the imperialists are giving daily proof, with acts of brutality which will astound future generations, of their ruthless determination to subjugate all peoples, their unlimited will to sack and plunder, the madness of their plans to dominate the world and trample under foot the principles and rules of international law.

95. It is enough to try the patience of the most forbearing among us to listen, in the calm atmosphere of this hall, while the representatives of the imperialist Government of the United States sing the praises of peace at the very moment that American aircraft are bombing the factories and cities of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and half a million Yankee aggressors are attempting to enslave the South Vietnamese people, at the very time when men and women, old folks and children in Viet-Nam are being massacred on the orders of the imperialist Government of the United States. Here the affable smile, the smooth behaviour and the sober speech; there the 500 lb. bombs, the napalm and the chemical and bacteriological warfare agents; here the spirit of conciliation and promise of negotiation; there the bombed out hospitals, the ruins of schools, the temples reduced to ashes; here the phoney coexistence and the pharisaical peace; there genocide, destruction and crime.

96. Washington wants to impose its own Yankee law and Yankee peace on the world. According to the American imperialists, peace and the precarious, unstable and wavering type of coexistence which

exists in some parts of the world can be maintained as long as they are given a free rein to control and oppress the weaker peoples. Agreement can be reached with the American imperialists as long as and on the condition that they are allowed to bomb the civil populations of sovereign States whenever the whim takes them; as long as they are allowed to invade the territory of any country and set up puppet Governments of traitors in their pay; as long as they are allowed to use napalm and chemical and bacteriological warfare, substances against anti-imperialist popular movements; as long as their monopolies are allowed to plunder whole continents, robbing them of their natural wealth and keeping their peoples hungry, backward and ignorant; as long as they are allowed to threaten, interfere with, blackmail, exert pressure on and commit aggression against the countries which have escaped from their exploitation; in short, as long as they are allowed to keep their privileges even at the cost of the death of millions by machine-gun or through poverty.

97. Men want peace so badly that even the imperialists are forced to talk of peace. But their peace is not the same as ours; theirs is not the peace for which the people are struggling. The American imperialists have their own ideas about international order, in which they have staked out for themselves the ownership of the world and the right to crack the whip over the people. These assertions are borne out by history generally and the history of American imperialism. The truth is there for anyone to read at any time, not in words but in deeds which nobody can deny, in South-East Asia, in Latin America and in Africa.

98. When the United Nations Charter was signed in 1945 after a bloody war, many people no doubt fondly imagined that a new era was to begin among nations, based on mutual respect, equality and law. But two decades have sufficed to remove every trace of that hope. The American imperialists have supported the United Nations to the extent that it has served their interests; they have respected the Charter of the Organization to the extent that it has not prevented them from proceeding with their crimes and plundering. On the other hand, what has the American Government done whenever it has met with resistance to its plans within the Organization? It has purely and simply trampled the Charter under foot and ignored the recommendations of the General Assembly; it has mocked the Member States. It has made it perfectly clear that it cares nothing for international law. It has shown that the international order it advocates is not that which makes for the harmonious development of all nations but that which increases the profits of its monopolies. It has shown that it is not interested in the world's public opinion but in its cheap raw materials, not in its aspirations but in stable markets, not in moral sanctions but in easy profits. It has shown that it does not want international cooperation but domination of the weak, that it does not want friends but serfs or victims.

99. The prerequisite of human progress and the building of a new world free from war or poverty is the overthrow of the aggressors and the elimination of imperialism. Imperialism—and at the present juncture American imperialism first and foremost—

is the sole cause of the conflicts, tensions and threats arising in the international community. In these circumstances, since American Government exercises a powerful influence in the Organization, is it possible to place any hope in the effectiveness and the desirability of allowing the United Nations to act as arbitrator, including the use of armed force, to settle international conflicts? If the root of such conflicts is to be found in the imperialist policy of aggression, the only possible solution, now or in the future, is to fight the imperialists.

100. Is it possible today to conceive of an international peace force organized by the United Nations acting against American interests, and directed against the Yankee aggressors? In the present international situation, with the balance of power as it is in the Organization at the present time, imperialist interests are bound to predominate in such peace forces, in their make-up, their command and their political leanings, just as they prevail in the other centres of power of the United Nations.

101. This Organization still has hanging over it the shameful memory of the Korean and Congo operations in which the United Nations covered itself with blood and dust to serve as a tool for Yankee aggression. In the former case, in violation of the provisions of the Charter, the flag of the United Nations was used to protect the American invaders in their shameless aggression against the Democratic Republic of Korea. Scorning the prestige of this institution and the principles on which it is supposedly based, United States troops continue to occupy the southern part of Korea and to use the flag of the United Nations, under which they are committing acts of armed provocation north of the 38th Parallel and continuing to threaten socialist Korea. In virtue of what principle of international law has the United States Government been able to manipulate the United Nations for seventeen years and turn it into a tool of aggression against a sovereign State? What Article of the Charter authorizes the Organization to interfere in the internal affairs of the Korean people, to divide it artificially by force and to carry out a criminal and foolish crusade against socialist Korea?

102. More recently there have been the Congo operations. Patrice Lumumba appeared before the United Nations and asked for its intervention to preserve the unity and territorial integrity of his country and to put an end to secessionist intrigues organized by foreign monopolies. Lumumba had faith in the United Nations and the effectiveness of its intervention and, it must be admitted, that was his one mistake as a statesman. What happened in the Congo? How did the United Nations forces respond to the hopes Lumumba had placed in them? The outcome could not have been worse—Lumumba was assassinated; Tshombe, the secessionist leader, became Head of State; and the whole of the Congo fell into the hands of the imperialists. Such was the result of United Nations intervention, for the simple and painfully obvious reason that the United Nations troops acted as tools of the monopolies against the Congolese people, assassinated Lumumba and with him destroyed the illusions and hopes he had placed in this Organization.

103. With unbelievable cynicism the imperialists and their de facto agents are trying to speculate about some of the most serious problems affecting the newly-independent States today. They say it may be necessary to use coercive measures, including armed force, against resistance to the United Nations decisions on the part of the colonialists and racists still dominating a large part of the African continent. But is it possible to conceive of military operation, with the participation of the Americans, and their allies, to liberate the people of South West Africa, to sweep away the racist minorities in Pretoria and Salisbury, or to force Portugal to respect the right of the people of Guinea, Angola, or Mozambique independence? Who is it but the Americans and their allies that have done everything possible to obstruct United Nations action in favour of those people? Who, if not they, has disregarded the recommendations of the General Assembly and has given and continues to give economic, military and technical assistance to those spurious régimes? How could the racist Governments in South Africa and Rhodesia or the decadent colonialist Government of Portugal have survived without that support, in the face of universal condemnation and the sustained efforts of all the African peoples?

104. We feel we must state our conviction that apart from a certain moral solidarity, nothing good can come of United Nations actions for those people. Their liberation will come as a result of the struggle of their peoples against the imperialists, colonialists and racists. In that struggle, the support of the African States and of all the revolutionary States in the world will be of inestimable value, but the unthinkable "assistance" of the imperialists—the fountainhead and mainstay of all the forms of racism and colonialism which still exist in the world—will never be.

105. Another argument used by the imperialists to deceive the representatives of small countries is that of the equality of States, allegedly safeguarded by giving the General Assembly the power to take decisions on important matters which, under the express provisions of the Charter, are reserved for the Security Council. Both in theory and in practice, Cuba is an ardent defender of the sovereign equality of all States anywhere in the world; but we do not believe that such equality depends on formal equality as regards voting in certain international bodies. True equality will be brought about as a result of the struggle of the small countries of the world, with the elimination of privilege and oppression in international life. Moreover, the Security Council has beyond any doubt betrayed the wishes of the so-called Third World time and time again. But the true reason for the ineffectiveness of the Security Council can easily be seen from a review of the records of its meetings. Quite simply, the causes are the policy of the great imperialist Powers, particularly the United States of America, the Security Council's support of all the reactionary Governments in the world, and its overt or covert opposition to any progressive change in international relations. But do not those same factors and pressures exist today in the General Assembly? Have not the imperialists contrived, do they not still contrive, to impose their wishes on the Assembly through the use of mechanical

majorities made up of the votes of their numerous puppets, swelled by the different expedients they have for bending the will of the weaker States?

106. For these reasons, Cuba is opposed to the right of the United Nations to act in so-called peace-keeping operations, which it was claimed were justified following the Second World War as being a device for eliminating the last remains of the vanquished international Nazi-Fascism. Today the same situation does not exist in the world; the characteristic features of our times are the collapse of colonialism and the open struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for liberation.

107. We believe that the interests of the peoples, and especially the peoples of the under-developed world, are not vindicated at the present time by discussing in which United Nations body—the Security Council or the General Assembly—the responsibility lies for so-called peace-keeping operations; those operations are not promoted or carried out under the banners of the international Organization. For, at the present time, what the imperialists are trying to do is to gain juridical support for their definite plans for armed intervention in the countries of the three continents. Examples of this are the conversion of the Organization of American States into a repressive police apparatus designed to fight against the peoples it cynically claims to represent, and the plans to organize a permanent inter-American force, the henchmen of imperialism in the Americas.

108. The recent disastrous Conference at Punta del Este,^{3/} the worsening state of poverty and backwardness in Latin America described in the last report of the Economic Commission for Latin America,^{4/} and the growing unrest among the Latin American peoples are sure signs of the imminent collapse of Yankee domination over our nations.

109. Nevertheless, the imperialists are not resignedly awaiting their demise. On the contrary, they are stepping up their manoeuvres against Cuba and trying desperately to check the growing emancipation movement of the peoples of Latin America—the Organization of American States is having its last fling. The puppet Government of Venezuela has called an extraordinary meeting of the Organization of American States, supposedly a regional organ of the United Nations but in fact the Colonial Ministry of the United States of America, with a view to accusing Cuba of acts of aggression towards its bogus sovereignty and fictitious independence. In that connexion, the Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party has recently published a declaration which I shall read in its entirety so that the Assembly will know what is our position:

"As our people have been able to see from the international press agency cables published in full in our newspapers, the lackey Government of Venezuela, obviously acting under instructions from its masters in Washington, is attempting to whip

up a hysterical campaign of violence, aggression and war against our country.

"They talk brazenly of blockades by air and sea, of an ultimatum, of joint armed attacks, of economic boycott against Cuba's trading partners, etc. In other words they threaten and try to intimidate our country in a most shameful manner.

"What has sparked off this fit of warlike hysteria, these feaseome threats and stentorian war cries?

"Are the 'distinguished' governors of Latin America whipping themselves up to go to the assistance of the Dominican people whose country is still occupied by Yankee troops?

"Are they going to insist that an end be put to the occupation of the Panama Canal and that punishment be meted out for the massacre of the people of that country not long ago by the military forces of the United States?

"Do they intend to denounce the barbarous and brutal bombing of North Viet-Nam and the genocide which is being committed against the people of South Viet-Nam?

"Are they rising in protest against the United States for the brazen participation of members of its special forces in activities designed to repress the revolutionary movements in Latin America and demanding the closure of the military schools established in Panama and in the United States itself by the imperialists to train hordes of killers of the oligarchical armies in the technique of hunting down and exterminating the revolutionary fighters?

"Are they demanding the return to Cuba of the territory of the Guantánamo naval base from which periodically shots are fired against Cuban territory, killing Cuban sentinels?

"Are they condemning, however belatedly, the invasion of Girón, organized by the Central Intelligence Agency from bases in Nicaragua and Guatemala; the bombing of our cities by Yankee aircraft with Cuban markings; the pirate incursions from bases set up around Cuba; the thousands of acts of infiltration, the massive air-drops of arms to supply the counter-revolutionaries, and all other such acts committed by the Yankee imperialists without interruption against Cuba for the last eight years?

"Do they intend to browbeat the imperialists into calling off forthwith the criminal and cowardly economic blockade against a Latin American people, in violation of all rules of human and international conduct, and with the disgraceful complicity of all the Latin American Governments save for Mexico, an honourable exception?

"No—these and other facts of the kind are of trivial importance, altogether unworthy of consideration.

"What is really arousing fury and hysteria is the announcement of the presence of three Cubans, one of whom was killed and the other two arrested as they were allegedly assisting a group of eight Venezuelan revolutionaries to return to their home-

^{3/} Special session of the Inter-American Economic and Social Council, held at Punta del Este, 15-17 August 1961.

^{4/} Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Forty-first Session, Supplement No. 4 (E/4181).

land, after struggling for years to free their country from domination and exploitation by the Yankee monopolies—for which crime they are assassinated ipso facto when they fall into the hands of the police State. This is what incites them to prompt, violent, homicidal acts against Cuba.

"This is the philosophy, these are the legal concepts and principles of international law, the morals and norms which the imperialists wish to impose on the world.

"The odd thing is that when these pious gentlemen talk of war against Cuba they think of a war fought by the Yankee army, navy and air force. In other words, cowards that they are they think in terms of what in their view would be a quick and easy massacre of our people by the imperialists. Such is the real reasoning underlying the melodramatic sabre-rattling of Mr. Leoni. Incidentally, his statements contained a series of lies. None of the Cubans mentioned belonged to the Cuban Regular Army.

"Antonio Briones Montoto, 27 years old, took an active part in the underground struggle against Batista when hardly out of his teens. Later he rendered services in many different branches of the Revolution, but he never belonged to the Cuban Regular Army.

"Manuel Gil Castellanos, 25 years old, could not take part in the guerrilla fighting because of his age, and was never subsequently a member of the Cuban Regular Army. Like Briones, he took part in other revolutionary activities.

"Pedro Cabrera Torres, 29 years of age, of peasant extraction, was on the Army's records for a little over a year between 1961 and 1963 when he left the Army.

"It is likewise false to allege that a Cuban rifle of Soviet manufacture was captured because all such arms supplied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Republic of Cuba are duly registered and checked by the Weapons Section of the Army and none has been reported missing.

"The remaining allegations in the official declaration merely reflect the testimony of persons who are completely at the mercy of their gaolers, whose callousness and brutality are only too well known.

"But let it not be argued that we are anxious to evade responsibility. With regard to the goals of the imperialists and their policy of repression of the revolutionary movement in Cuba, it is not necessary to invent any lies or prove any truths. Yankee imperialism is a system which they are trying to impose on the world by the most barbaric and ruthless methods. It is waging a struggle to the death against the revolutionary movement throughout the world. Our people have been only too painfully familiar with the consequences of this imperialist design ever since the day on which, after a heroic struggle, for the first time in four centuries we earned the right to be masters of our own fate and to work out our own future.

"It is against this criminal imperialism and all its accomplices and lackeys that we are fighting

and will continue to fight, unswervingly and unflinchingly.

"The sickening farce of the Organization of American States is superfluous, for the imperialists have never needed excuses to commit their crimes, nor does the Cuban Revolution need to ask their permission or their pardon for fulfilling its duty to demonstrate its solidarity with all the revolutionaries in the world, including those from Venezuela; because the very existence of imperialism is the justification of the revolutionaries' activities.

"The basic goal of imperialist strategy in the world today is quite clear: to stamp out the liberation movements, making the most brutal and violent use of its military power to repress them, to colonize anew the newly independent countries, to establish throughout the world conditions of complete privilege for their economic interests, and ruthlessly to impose their will on the whole of humanity.

"In order to carry out its bloodthirsty policy of repression of revolutionary liberation movements in under-developed countries, Yankee imperialism has tried to establish a very strange right—the right of military intervention with armed forces and the right to wage destructive, merciless wars against small, weak countries, overcoming them one by one: e.g., in Santo Domingo, with an army of 40,000 men, without any pretext or any green light from OAS, which they subsequently suggested should indecently give its approval. At the same time, near to a million soldiers of various nationalities are waging a genocidal war against the people of South Viet-Nam; Yankee troops are continuing the military occupation of South Korea and part of the territory of Laos; they are savagely bombing the territory of North Viet-Nam and the liberated zones of Laos; they are threatening Cambodia and North Korea with aggression; and they are upholding their protectorate of Taiwan with their squadrons.

"To perpetrate these misdeeds, they use military bases established in territories belonging to many nations on all continents, and sometimes held on to by force, as in the case of the occupied territory of Guantánamo. Some of these bases, such as those in Thailand, take a direct, active part in the aggressive acts committed.

"Imperialism gives its repressive wars an international character by using soldiers of different nationalities. It did so in Korea, and it is doing so at present in South Viet-Nam, with the help of South Korean, Thai, Philippine, New Zealand and Australian troops. It did so too in Santo Domingo, with subsequent help from Brazilian, Costa Rican, Honduran, Nicaraguan and Paraguayan soldiers; and it is attempting to do the same by establishing an international force under the auspices of OAS to be used against Cuba and the liberation movements on this continent.

"In the eyes of Yankee imperialism these acts are legitimate and morally sound; they consider they have the right to practise piracy and perpetrate crimes in all corners of the world—Korea, Viet-Nam, the Congo, Laos, Cuba, Santo Domingo.

"No country can feel safe, because tomorrow Yankee imperialism could unleash new acts of aggression in Korea, in Cambodia, Syria, the United Arab Republic, Algeria or Cuba, to mention but a few examples.

"The intrigues of the Central Intelligence Agency and reactionary coups d'état such as those of Brazil and Argentina in Latin America, Ghana in Africa, and Indonesia in Asia, continue without interruption. Directly or indirectly, Yankee imperialist activities today affect every nation on every continent.

"Western Europe itself is becoming economically more and more a colony of Yankee imperialism. Millions of European workers are toiling to increase its profits. Yankee monopolist capital is taking an increasingly large slice of many of the key industries, and this increased participation is due not only to the profits made in Europe by exploiting English, French, Italian, Spanish, German, Belgian, Dutch and other workers, but also, as has been said by certain financial authorities, to the banking resources of those countries themselves, since their monetary cover to a large extent is in American bank notes while the gold remains in the coffers of the United States. And in all the European firms where the Yankees have a controlling or decisive interest, the policy of the United States Government is imposed over and above national sovereignty. None of those industrial enterprises, wherever they are located, is willing to trade any product with countries like Korea, Viet-Nam, China or Cuba, against which Yankee imperialism has built up its Draconian economic blockade; in fact they exert all manner of pressure on the other national industries, threatening them with economic reprisals to force them to join in their criminal policies; and the same is true of banks, commercial and shipping concerns.

"Nor does the United States mask its intention to use economic relations to infiltrate, weaken, demoralize, corrupt and divide the socialist countries in Europe. This morality, this policy and these strategic objectives underlie every single act of Yankee international policy.

"The military coup instigated by the United States in Greece has shown that even Europe does not escape the techniques used by Yankee imperialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

"But it is in the small and militarily weak countries of the so-called Third World that imperialist policy can be seen in its most brutally aggressive and truculent form.

"There is no system which safeguards the peoples there from its acts of vandalism. The United Nations itself has utterly failed to give these peoples the least sense of security; on the contrary, it has actually served on the whole as an instrument for condoning the crimes and misdeeds of the Yankee imperialists. It could not be otherwise, since the system which operates within the United Nations is the one which the imperialists have imposed on the parts of the world represented in the Organization.

"Our international policy is determined by these realities, which are only too evident, especially for

those parts of the world which feel more directly, and in their living flesh, the claws of the imperialists and have to fight a grim and all-out battle—against great odds—to keep imperialism at bay.

"That is why we Cuban revolutionaries have not subscribed and will never subscribe to any agreement relative to the cessation or banning of nuclear tests or against the proliferation of such weapons drawn up under the auspices of the United Nations, although in our present state of technical development this may reflect only a stand on principle.

"The Yankee imperialists are not only developing their nuclear weapons more and more; they are also going full speed ahead in developing deadly agents of chemical and bacteriological warfare. What can it achieve for people to abandon the development of their defence system except to provide the imperialists with ideal conditions for subjecting the world to their terror and their blackmail? Until there is a system which gives the whole of mankind, without any exception, equal and effective safeguards of their security, without privileges for anybody, the right of those countries threatened by imperialism to develop their means of defence, whatever they may be, cannot be renounced.

"This is why we refuse to accept any international United Nations force, which would only serve to place yet another instrument of aggression in the hands of the Yankee imperialists.

"This is why we cannot accept the right of the United States to dictate—as occurred in the October crisis—what type of arms our country, which is constantly threatened, should possess; still less can we agree to the inspection of our territory, for that would amount to confirmation of the right of the aggressors to decide on the arms its future victims should or should not possess.

"This is why we consider that it is not only a revolutionary moral duty but a vital necessity for the peoples of the present-day world, in the face of the imperialist policy of repression and internationalization of their punitive wars against the revolutionary movements, to encourage and increase to the utmost their solidarity with and assistance to revolutionaries fighting in all parts of the world or anxious to fight against imperialism.

"Some people believe that the adoption of a consistent and determined revolutionary policy in the face of imperialism would inevitably lead to a nuclear conflict. That would presuppose that the Yankee imperialists are potential suicides. They are powerful, but they are not invincible, nor are they suicidal, and the path which the pattern of history indicates will lead to a solution of the conflict between the interests of the imperialists and the rest of mankind is through the revolutionary struggle of the people. Confronted with this struggle, neither their conventional, chemical, bacteriological or nuclear weapons will be of any avail to them.

"The overthrow of imperialism does not mean the destruction of the American people or nation. The groups that control Yankee monopoly capital are a very small minority within the United States. The immense majority of the people of the United

States are the millions of industrial workers, farmers cultivating the land, intellectuals and students, and among those millions are the substantial numbers of the black population who are struggling fiercely for their rights.

"It is seldom realized that in the United States the people are one of the chief victims of Yankee imperialism. It is the people who in large measure pay for the unjust repressive wars of the imperialists with the sweat of their brow and the blood of their sons. The Pentagon recently stated, perhaps in an attempt to reply to the revolutionary watchword of Commander Ernesto Guevara, that it was in a position to wage several wars like that in Viet-Nam at the same time. That is what the Pentagon thinks, but not what the American mothers think, nor the black population of the United States, deprived of its most elementary rights; nor could it conceivably express the thoughts of the workers who live from hand to mouth or the immense majority of American students and young people.

"That assertion by the Pentagon may be true as a quantitative expression of its total technical capacity, but it is very far from being true with regard to its human, moral and political resources. In that respect, it has not sufficient resources even to win a victory in one single country: Viet-Nam, let alone to wage several wars of the same kind. To keep that boast would stir the conscience of the people of the United States in an unpredictable manner; and for this reason the historical process of our times will see the people fighting to free themselves, and the people of the United States, draw closer and closer together; and one day they will live in true peace and friendship on the ruins of an imperialist policy which can only survive by resorting to crime and the massacre of entire peoples. The problem for the peoples concerned is this: whether to capitulate to imperialism or to resist and struggle. Throughout the ages, resistance and struggle have meant facing the risks inherent in them, just as capitulation means nothing more than capitulation.

"Fear of nuclear blackmail does inexorably lead to surrender without resistance, without a struggle, in the face of imperialism, so that the fiction and the false pretense that the imperialists are prepared to commit suicide turns into a far more effective weapon for them than their atomic arsenal.

"If we want peace, it must embrace all peoples equally. In the world today, afflicted by domination which stretches out to every continent, the concept of peace can only be honoured if it means universal peace. Similarly, unless the integrity, sovereignty and independence of all countries, large or small, are guaranteed on an equal footing with the concept of peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems, this concept basically runs counter to the principles of proletarian internationalism. What peace do the Viet-Namese enjoy? What type of coexistence does America practise with regard to that country? What meaning do the words peace, European security, peaceful coexistence and similar pious phrases have for the mean and women, the old, the young and the children, who are dying each day, the victims of the latest military techniques,

with so many bombs falling on their land that soon they will have exceeded the total weight of bombs dropped on Europe during the Second World War, and their over-all destructive power will be greater than that of the atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki?

"Our Party and our people, therefore, do not shirk their revolutionary responsibility to the world, nor will they shirk from the fight, with all its consequences and sacrifices, however and wherever the imperialists decide to engage in battle against us.

"We are accused of wanting to disrupt the order on this continent, and indeed we do assert the historical necessity for people to disrupt the order established by imperialism in Latin America and in the rest of the world. They accuse us of preaching the revolutionary overthrow of the established Governments of Latin America, and indeed we do believe that all oligarchical Governments, composed of gorillas, with or without uniform, the lackeys of imperialism and accomplices to their crimes, must be swept away in the revolutionary struggle of the peoples. We are accused of assisting the revolutionary movement, and indeed we do give and will continue to give assistance whenever it is requested, to all revolutionary movements fighting imperialism in any part of the world.

"We will never accept the status quo which the imperialists are trying to impose on mankind nor their Draconian laws nor their moral unscrupulousness. Right for us means the right of people to free themselves from exploitation and slavery, the right of humanity to rebel against imperialist crime and aggression, the main prop of reactionary thinking throughout the world. Law for us means the laws of the inevitable revolutionary development of human society; morality for us means the morality of the revolutionary fighters, and one of their most sacred and ineluctible principles in the world today is international solidarity.

"What we shall do in the face of the threats which are hanging over our country today, is increase our defence efforts while not neglecting our difficult but increasingly successful work for the cultural, technical and economic development of our country under the present conditions of economic blockade and, if it were necessary, even under a complete blockade, for at the present juncture no force in the world is capable of destroying our revolution. The Yankee imperialists and all their accomplices in the acts of aggression against Cuba will have to bear the consequence of their acts.

"We are not at all surprised that the corrupt lackey gang of traitors who govern Venezuela are fostering the imperialist war against Cuba, since for years they have been waging war against the people of Venezuela and their inability to stamp out the revolutionary movement explains their desperation. Today they appeal for imperialist intervention against Cuba; tomorrow they will call for the intervention of the Marines in Venezuela itself.

"If it is true that the young Cuban Antonio Briones Montoto died from two bullet wounds in the head and is buried in the Machurucuto cemetery, some sixty

yards from the beach, shot for having assisted the Venezuelan revolutionaries, our Party and our people would express their deep solidarity with his altruistic, revolutionary, internationalist and heroic gesture. To give one's life for the Venezuelan revolution is not only an example of the purest Marxist-Leninist tradition; it is also a gesture worthy of the noble tradition of Bolivar and the Venezuelan nation, whose sons fought and died for the independence of many sister nations on our continent. Bolivar wanted one day to fight for the independence of Cuba. Those who fight the imperialist war against our country should refrain from taking his name in vain. There will never be war between the peoples of Venezuela and Cuba, no matter what the Organization of American States and its masters decide in Washington. Our country or death. We will conquer. The Central Committee of the Cuban Communist Party."

110. Mr. President, my delegation will oppose any attempt to broaden or reinforce in any way whatsoever the jurisdiction of the United Nations in matters of peace and security. Neither the United Nations as an institution, nor any of its organs, is today competent to safeguard the rights of small States nor to establish international peace and order. Hence, the use of armed forces by the United Nations, far from being a safeguard for the peoples of the world would be a real threat to their legitimate interests. For the same reasons, Cuba does not intend to co-operate in any way in such operations and refuses to contribute financially to any operations, past or future, carried out in violation of the Charter and against the genuine interests of the peoples concerned. Such so-called operations, which have little to do with peace and a good deal to do with the policies of aggression and exploitation of the imperialists, are the exclusive responsibility of the imperialists and must be paid for by them like all their other misdeeds committed against the nations.

111. There will be those who read into my words a feeling of pessimism concerning the possibility of this Organization's fulfilling the noble role for which it was created. Nothing could be further from the truth. What we have repeatedly stated from this rostrum is, in fact, that the United Nations will never fulfil its mis-

sion so long as the influence of the American Government persists at the heart of the Organization. We shall never tire of emphasizing the need for all revolutionary and progressive States to pool their efforts to minimize that influence and to thwart the imperialist aim of converting the United Nations into a tool of its aggressive policy.

112. The diplomatic activities of the progressive States in the United Nations must be combined with the revolutionary activities being carried out in the mountains and in the cities, by the people struggling to combat aggression or to achieve complete independence. It is in fact the members of the liberation movements in oppressed countries, the vanguard of the world revolutionary movement, that constitute the real force striving to achieve and maintain true peace. The only sure road to peace is through sincere and unreserved co-operation with those movements, through moral and material solidarity with those in arms fighting to combat imperialism.

113. This militant solidarity is and will continue to be the kernel of the international policy of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba. We are steadfastly following that path, upholding the ideological principles underlying our revolution and inspiring our people. We are faithful to the aspirations which, more than twenty years ago, the peoples of the world tried to see reflected in the Charter of San Francisco; and we join with mankind in wishing to build a new world without exploiters or aggressors, without bombs and without hunger.

114. We repeat yet again that peace will not come out of diplomatic haggling or pious requests. It will be the fruit of achievement and of sacrifice. It will be won by the oppressed people on the battlefield, as a prize for their fight to the death, without quarter, against the exploiters. The vanguard of three continents, united by martyrdom and by courage, are already on the march into battle and towards victory. From this hall, let us salute their gunfire like a hymn heralding the rapid coming of the morrow.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.