

1515th meeting

Wednesday, 4 December 1974, at 3.35 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Milan ŠAHOVIĆ (Yugoslavia).

A/C.6/SR.1515 and Corr.1

AGENDA ITEM 95

Need to consider suggestions regarding the review of the Charter of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/9739, A/C.6/L.1001, L.1002, L.1008)

1. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel), speaking on a point of order, asked the Chairman for a ruling on the following. At the previous meeting he had asked for the floor in order to make a brief reply to the incorrect allegations about Israel made by the representative of the Soviet Union. His request had been granted, but he had hardly started to speak when another representative, who had managed to waste much of the Committee's time—more than he himself would have required for his reply—had, on a point of order, moved for the adjournment of the meeting. The Chairman, without asking whether any representative wished to speak on that motion, had formally closed the meeting. That was the second time during the current session that his right of reply had been abruptly cut off. He assumed that his right of reply would be reserved for the current meeting.

2. The CHAIRMAN assured the representative of Israel that his right of reply would be reserved for the final part of the meeting.

3. Mr. USTOR (Hungary) recalled that his delegation had stated its position on the item under consideration at the 1379th meeting of the Sixth Committee, on 4 December 1972. The head of the Hungarian delegation had pointed out then that the Charter of the United Nations had stood the test of time and continued to prove a suitable basis for co-operation in a changing world. Certain major changes in the world situation had occurred precisely because of the implementation of the provisions of the Charter. Those results included the liquidation of the colonial system, the accession to independence of colonial countries and peoples and the admission of the newly independent States to the United Nations. The fact that 81 States had acceded to the Charter since its adoption had been clear evidence that the Charter had been a time-tested instrument. The multi-

farious and ever-expanding activities of the United Nations had demonstrated the flexible and dynamic character of the Charter.

4. The institutions established under the Charter had made a positive contribution to the maintenance of peace and had made it possible to avert a number of international crises. The Charter had continued to reflect the basic interest of all countries and the peaceful coexistence of States notwithstanding their differing economic and social systems, and there was no evidence that any change in the text would bring about improvements in international relations. As had been rightly stated by a previous speaker, the effectiveness of the United Nations depended not on institutional changes but rather on the collective will of its Members. A fuller utilization of the opportunities provided by the Charter would yield more beneficial results than changes in the existing United Nations structure. Full compliance with the provisions of the Charter would be more fruitful than their revision. The efficacy of the Organization clearly depended on the determination of Member States to strive for the consistent realization of the peaceful aims which had been set.

5. Chapter XVIII of the Charter stated the conditions in which amendments could be made. On that basis, it was not realistic at the present time to envisage any change in the Charter in the near future. His delegation fully agreed with the view set forth in draft resolution A/C.6/L.1001 on that point. It was true that times changed and that laws should change with them. However, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 had included a preambular paragraph reaffirming support for the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter. In that case, it was not the law but the basic structure of the Organization which they sought to change. In that respect, however, his delegation believed that the requirements of stability and security were paramount and that it would be extremely dangerous to upset the delicate balance of the structure of the Organization. Even if the Committee had before it concrete proposals for the changes to be undertaken in that structure, it would not deem it advisable to experiment with them. However, the sponsors of draft resolution

A/C.6/L.1002 were seeking not the consideration of such concrete proposals but the establishment of a machinery to find out what viable proposals could be made, i.e., to find ways and means to change for change's sake. Of course, behind those tendencies certain ambitions were hidden which might or might not be justified in themselves, but his delegation did not think that the time had come to put forward claims to a redistribution of power positions in the Organization. If the need for constant change was mentioned in that connexion, he would cite Montesquieu, who had said that there was a limit to the possible sacrifice of security to the interests of change. If the relation of change to the requirements of justice was referred to, one should not forget the admonition of a modern writer who had pointed out that stability and security were in themselves powerful constituent elements of justice. If those words sounded conservative coming from a delegation which claimed to be progressive, he would point out that the changes in the world which had taken place since the adoption of the Charter had come about precisely because of the implementation of its provisions and not in spite of them and not against the will of the socialist countries but with their help. The socialist countries would continue to work for further progress in the world, for the elimination of existing injustices, for the maintenance and further extension of the current détente and for the co-operation of all States for the full implementation of the purposes and principles of that instrument. There was much to be done in that regard, and there was nothing in the organizational provisions of the Charter which could hinder such co-operation and the full realization of the purposes of the Charter.

6. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) recalled that, when the Charter had been signed at San Francisco, many States, including his own, had complained that it had certain short-comings. They had been told that the Charter was, however, the best instrument on which agreement could be reached. Many States had taken exception to the veto, while others had thought that colonial peoples had been neglected. However, as the years passed, those States had found that the fault lay not so much in the Charter itself as in those who were rationalizing certain of its provisions or misinterpreting some of its phraseology. That had not been apparent during the early sessions, when there had still been a euphoric belief that the Charter could create a Utopia. In the mid-1950s there was still talk of a "world Government" after the anguish that had been the legacy of the Second World War. Many learned articles had been written on the topic, and philosophers and political scientists of the past had been cited concerning the possibility of creating a new world order. The Arabs, too, had once thought that they could establish a single Arab State reaching from the Atlantic to the Arabian Gulf. The Arab League had been established, and he himself had been a torch-bearer of pan-Arabism. There was nothing wrong in such dreams, but it was time to recognize them as such. The Arabs had their differences like any other group of countries. Thus, Utopia still seemed far off. Similarly, the moral codes of religions and the constitutions of States were very hard to live up to. What was required were not tribunals but moral advancement.

7. The Charter should be considered from two aspects: the substantive, and the structural and organizational. The

Preamble and the statement of the purposes and principles of the United Nations, which took up a very small part of that instrument, reflected the hopes and aspirations of the survivors of the anguish of the Second World War. The Preamble was a masterpiece and had met with no criticism at San Francisco. The purposes and principles were succinct and non-controversial, although they set a very high ideal for human conduct. The Preamble and the purposes and principles were almost perfect and formed the corner-stone of the Charter. It was the remainder of the Charter, which was devoted to structural and organizational aspects, which could be manipulated. The fault did not lie in the phraseology but in the fact that States might manipulate those provisions to serve their petty self-interests or to extend their power. The tremendous increase in the membership of the United Nations since its establishment had been cited as grounds for making changes in the Charter to reflect the universal will of the United Nations rather than fossilized decisions taken by the 51 founding Members. The amendments which had been made so far to the Charter were all structural in nature and related, for example, to increasing the membership of the Security Council—although he did not feel that the Council was acting more efficiently as a result—and the enlargement of the membership of the Economic and Social Council, which had rightly been done in order to enable more States to participate. Such structural amendments were like changes in the doctrine of a religion; the basic moral code remained unalterable.

8. He wondered, however, what lay behind all the clamour for new amendments to the Charter. Many had had misgivings originally concerning the veto, since it was to be the prerogative of the five permanent members of the Security Council, for them to use in their own interests, which they had done. In retrospect, however, the veto, which had been agreed upon by the two Powers that had emerged from the Second World War, namely, the United States of America and the USSR, had proved not to be so hazardous. Those two Powers had demanded the veto because they knew that States could be manipulated and they had had misgivings concerning what a majority could achieve, not so much by force as by propaganda. The veto had indeed become a blessing when later the general cry had been for détente and consensus had replaced the veto. Consensus, when not genuinely based on equity and justice, was much more dangerous than the veto; the cry for consensus "in the name of détente" was a complete sham. The consensus which had paved the way for détente worked entirely in favour of the two super-Powers. The USSR representative, speaking on the question of Korea in the First Committee, had referred to the capitalist system and the socialist system. That was not the issue; the world was groping towards a world system. The purposes and principles and the Preamble of the Charter were indivisible and emanated not from capitalism or socialism, but from humanism, which was the only valid "ism" for the United Nations.

9. Why tamper even with the structural part of the Charter? He had heard that some States wished to become permanent members of the Security Council or members for a term of three or five years, in order to derive advantages. Such considerations as the size of a State's population or its wealth were not conditions for admission

to the United Nations or to the Security Council. Fiji and Mauritius were fine examples of small States admitted to the United Nations and they had contributed a great deal to its deliberations.

10. Another reason behind the urgent call for changes in the Charter was rumoured to relate to the emergence of the so-called third world as a power. Saudi Arabia was labelled as belonging to the third world. Other States were labelled as belonging to the socialist world, others to the democratic world. Who could ensure the small States that, if the structural part of the Charter was tampered with, the practice of such groupings could not be used for manipulations? A group would lend its name as sponsor of a draft resolution on a basis which recalled the Arabic proverb, dating from tribal days: "I and my brother against my cousin, and my cousin and I against the stranger". In the United Nations, the principle should be: "I and the stranger against my cousin or my brother if my cousin or my brother is wrong". The tribal code had been modified with the development of custom and religion, because no society could be based on the principle that might was right or on family ties. Accordingly, if the General Assembly opened the door to a revision of the Charter, things might be inadvertently introduced which would lead to grief. At the time of the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, he had said that people fought not for human rights but for more wealth, more power or more glory; at the level of nations or groups of nations those motives gave rise to three phenomena, namely power politics, the balance of power and spheres of influence. There was trouble with the Charter because no new approach had been taken to questions which should be tackled on the basis of that instrument. The combining of small Powers into one group could injure their cause, depending on the issue involved. Voting by group was, as Vishinsky had said, tantamount to a "mechanical majority". When the United States had had the greatest influence with the Organization of American States, it had been able to induce them to vote *en bloc*. Some of the States members of OAS had needed United States aid and had therefore voted with the United States, particularly in the difficult period following the Second World War. He recalled that Mr. Romulo, who had introduced the item currently under discussion, had once refused to vote on a certain item, even though it had been intimated to him that the Philippines, which had just been weakened by the Second World War, would not get United States aid if it refused to cast its vote as advised. Experience had proved that the "mechanical majority" would have been much worse without the veto and that consensus could sometimes be worse than the veto. Unfortunately, the powerful and wealthy were apt to be self-righteous and act on the principle that might was right.

11. Some Members wanted a surgical operation on the Charter. Was that really necessary? Was the Charter dying? Who could guarantee that there would be no more confusion if a revised Charter was applied? The patient might even die under surgery. If States would live up to the high ideals of the Preamble and the purposes and principles of the Charter, there would be no complaints from most of the small nations.

12. Two draft resolutions had been submitted on the item: draft resolution A/C.6/L.1001 sponsored by socialist

States and draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002, sponsored by capitalist States. The former said that the Charter should be left as it was and appealed to States to try hard to implement it fully, while the latter wanted to tamper with the Charter in order to achieve better results. Both texts were unsatisfactory to his delegation, and accordingly he was submitting draft resolution A/C.6/L.1008. Both of the other draft resolutions referred to various General Assembly resolutions and someone would no doubt see double meanings in the wording of those texts. The fourth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1001 was perhaps the longest preambular paragraph he had ever seen. Even so it was not exhaustive. Operative paragraph 1 of the same draft resolution, although constructive, was prosaic; it should stress the importance of compliance not only with the letter but also with the spirit of the Charter, as was done in draft resolution A/C.6/L.1008. The last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 was very useful, and he had adopted it as the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1008. The second preambular paragraph of the latter draft resolution noted that the purposes and principles of the Charter had not been consistently observed; that was a statement of fact and should be admitted. Paragraph 2 appealed to all States to endeavour to judge controversial issues on their merits rather than on the formal solidarity of groups regardless of ideological systems or narrow national interests. He had actually wished thereby to shock the third world and Europe. The practice of grouping was becoming general, and he had already stated the grave dangers that entailed. If the practice of a "mechanical majority" was to be followed, delegations might just as well obviate lengthy debates by merely placing their votes in a ballot box and using a computer to obtain the results. While the recommendations contained in paragraph 2 of the Saudi Arabian draft resolution could not be observed completely, it was at least an ideal which States should try to live up to, in accordance with the Preamble and the purposes and principles of the Charter, rather than trying to manipulate the structural and organizational chapters of that instrument, which were the target of the intended review. The instrument was adequate, and should not be tampered with, because it might not work thereafter.

13. Paragraph 3 of the Saudi Arabian draft resolution was procedural in nature. The words "future date" had been used, because he could not foresee the future. As many States still felt strongly that revision of the Charter was necessary, it would still not be wise to tamper with it until there was a very large measure of agreement. At present, with the draft resolutions reflecting the division of the Committee into two groups, it would be impossible to achieve good results. The Charter was the best instrument currently available to the United Nations. Members should try to reform themselves before trying to reform others, and he appealed to representatives to plead with their leaders to endorse a new approach to the solution of international issues.

14. Mr. ARITA QUIÑONEZ (Honduras) said that the representative of the Philippines, in introducing draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 at the 1512th meeting, had ably expressed the feeling of all the sponsors. Honduras had become a sponsor because it firmly believed that by supporting the draft resolution States could increase the

efficiency of the United Nations. A review of the Charter was necessary because only 51 States had been present when the United Nations had been founded. Membership was now almost universal and it was completely ridiculous to think that the United Nations today, with its 138 Member States, could have the same outlook as it had had at the time of the signing of the Charter. The United Nations must move with the times.

15. His delegation fully supported the purposes and principles of the Charter but at the same time felt that consideration should be given to its review. It agreed that an *ad hoc* committee on the Charter of the United Nations should be established, because its report was necessary for further study of the question, particularly by those States which did not believe a review of the Charter was needed. The *ad hoc* committee would be established with due regard for the principle of equitable geographical distribution and would submit its report to the General Assembly at its thirtieth session. It was inconceivable that any delegation should have anything to fear from the establishment of such a committee with the mandate set forth in paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002. His delegation wished to participate in joint action that would achieve more effective and more dynamic implementation of the principles of the Charter. For that reason Honduras had sponsored draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 and requested that it should be given priority in the voting.

16. Mr. GÖRNER (German Democratic Republic) recalled that in 1973, when the German Democratic Republic had become a Member of the United Nations, it had solemnly declared (2134th plenary meeting) its readiness to assume the obligations arising from the Charter of the United Nations. Universal respect for the Charter was a basic prerequisite for peace. The principles of the Charter, in so far as they had been observed, had fostered positive changes in international relations and to the present day the viability of those principles had remained undiminished. Especially in the recent past, the substance of the purposes and principles of the Charter had been embodied in numerous treaties, thus showing that, in the light of new international conditions, there were growing possibilities of applying the Charter with even greater effectiveness.

17. The purposes and principles of the Charter also provided the foundation for the structure and procedures of the Organization itself. The rules it laid down ensured the proper functioning of the United Nations in the pursuit of its main aim of securing peace. Since those rules were based on such principles as the sovereign equality of States, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for the right to self-determination, the German Democratic Republic considered them to be also in conformity with the interests of States which had joined the United Nations after its founding.

18. The Security Council, on which primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security had been conferred, occupied a special position in the United Nations system. The principle of unanimity among its permanent members reflected the particular responsibility of the great Powers for the maintenance of international peace and had proved its worth in the settlement of conflicts. The fundamental importance of that principle as

a means of averting imperialist aggression, maintaining the equality and sovereignty of States and defending the rights of peoples fighting for their liberation from colonialism had been proved time and time again by the actions of the USSR as a permanent member of the Security Council.

19. His delegation had carefully considered the arguments in favour of a review of the Charter. But neither the failure of the United Nations always to live up to expectations, nor the time that had elapsed since the Charter was adopted, nor the possibility of review provided for in the Charter itself, were convincing reasons for such a review. If, since its founding, the United Nations had not always been able to fulfil its tasks, the fault lay not with the Charter but rather with those Member States which had not always shown the necessary readiness to co-operate in solving outstanding problems.

20. Nor could review be justified by the fact that the German Democratic Republic, for instance, had for years been denied equal participation in the work of the United Nations. The Charter was based on the principle of universality. Despite the time that had elapsed since 1945, it had proved so flexible that it had kept pace with far-reaching changes in international affairs and the Organization had easily coped with the doubling of its membership. To review a document that had proved to be so dynamic presented an unforeseeable risk for the existing system of international relations. It was because the Charter prevented the States of one social system from predominating over those of another system that the Organization had preserved its viability. The German Democratic Republic therefore shared the view of those States which saw no need to revise the Charter.

21. After drawing attention to the observations of the German Democratic Republic set forth in document A/9739, he recalled that so far only 38 Member States had communicated their observations to the Secretary-General in compliance with General Assembly resolution 2697 (XXV) and most of them, including the German Democratic Republic, had declared themselves opposed to it. His delegation therefore considered that the proposal set forth in draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 to establish an *ad hoc* committee was neither necessary nor appropriate. His delegation strongly opposed the establishment of such a committee, whose only aim was to keep an artificial item on the agenda. Since it was not advisable at present to take any step to revise the Charter, the German Democratic Republic had become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1001.

22. His delegation was not unaware that the effectiveness of the United Nations was susceptible of improvement. But that could also be achieved by making wider use of certain provisions of the Charter which had so far played a minor role. For example, the authority of the United Nations would be enhanced if greater use were made of the sanctions provided for in Articles 41 and 41 against those States which stubbornly refused to adhere to Security Council decisions. Whenever Member States and organs were guided by their obligations under the Charter, the United Nations made effective contributions that had favourable repercussions on the international situation. At the current stage of détente in international relations,

structural and organizational questions should not be placed in the foreground. The United Nations should rather make use of all means at its disposal to promote the process of détente, since in that process the very purposes and principles of the Organization were being implemented.

23. Mr. NYAMDO (Mongolia) said that his delegation completely agreed with the convincing arguments against any review of the Charter advanced by the Soviet representative at the preceding meeting. His delegation's views on that subject were well known, having been explained at earlier sessions of the General Assembly and in his Government's observations communicated to the Secretary-General in compliance with resolution 2697 (XXV).¹ The Charter was the most important modern international treaty embodying the fundamental principles and rules of general international law. The principal purpose of the United Nations, according to the Charter, was the maintenance of international peace and security. The Charter was also designed to promote co-operation among States with different social systems. The Charter placed the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security on the great Powers, which were required to concert their efforts and to reach unanimous agreement on questions affecting the maintenance of international peace.

24. The principle of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council, which was a characteristic feature of the United Nations, guaranteed peaceful coexistence between the two world social systems. Many of those who were in favour of reviewing the Charter considered the principle of unanimity among the permanent members of the Security Council as a major shortcoming of the United Nations. They advocated abolishing the veto on the grounds that it constituted a privilege of the great Powers and was contrary to the principle of the equality of all States. His delegation could scarcely agree with that view. The principle of unanimity was not a privilege of the great Powers but rather placed a special responsibility on them for the maintenance of international peace. The overwhelming majority of States were convinced that abolition of the principle of unanimity would undermine the very foundations of the existence of the United Nations.

25. The advocates of Charter review pointed to the increased membership of the United Nations as one of the reasons necessitating such a review. In his delegation's view, the increase in the Organization's membership merely confirmed the value and vitality of the Charter. By acceding to the Charter as an international treaty, States gave notice that the provisions of that treaty were in keeping with their interests. It was widely felt that the Charter had stood the test of time and had demonstrated its value for the co-operation of States with different social systems.

26. The fact that only 38 Member States had communicated observations to the Secretary-General concerning the review of the Charter, and that most of them had opposed such a review, showed the lack of general support for the idea. Moreover, the consent of the permanent members of the Security Council was an essential condition for a review of the Charter. In the absence of general support among the

membership and of the consent of the permanent members of the Security Council, there would appear to be no need to review the Charter at the present time.

27. For all the foregoing reasons, his delegation strongly opposed the establishment of the *ad hoc* committee proposed in draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002. At the current stage attention should be focused on the strict implementation of the provisions of the Charter by all Member States and on how best to utilize the possibilities provided by the Charter. In the final analysis, the effectiveness of the United Nations depended on the compliance of Member States with their obligations under the Charter. Accordingly, his delegation supported the draft resolution submitted by five socialist countries in document A/C.6/L.1001.

28. Mr. IKOUÉBÉ (Congo) supported the views expressed by the representatives of the Philippines and Colombia (1512th meeting) concerning the need to review the Charter. The arguments which had been advanced in the debate should serve to dispel any doubts still present in the minds of certain delegations. His country, which fully subscribed to the purposes and principles of the Charter, had always been in favour of bringing the Charter into line with the realities of a constantly changing world. Being desirous of contributing to any effort to strengthen the role, authority and effectiveness of the United Nations, his delegation had decided to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002. In doing so, however, his country had no intention of opposing any State or group of States. He objected to the allegation by the Saudi Arabian representative that draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 was sponsored exclusively by capitalist countries. If that had been the case, his country would certainly not have become a sponsor.

29. The CHAIRMAN announced that Senegal should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002.

30. Mr. ROSENNE (Israel), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union concerning Israel at the preceding meeting had been gratuitous and had nothing to do with the item under discussion. The many irregularities in which the automatic majorities indulged at Israel's expense were living witnesses to the utter ineffectiveness of the United Nations as an organization and of the Charter as a legal instrument to maintain international peace and security or to protect individual peace-loving States from aggression and other abuses. Israel's bitter experiences and above all the large number of unprecedented occurrences at the current session of the General Assembly were justification for a substantive review of the Charter and current practices. The statement by the representative of the Soviet Union led his delegation to think that he was really afraid of such a review, for reasons at which one could only guess. It was a well-known fact that since 1948 Israel had been the victim of continuing aggression. When that aggression commenced in 1948, the representatives of the Soviet Union had been among those who had recognized the existence of aggression and had suggested Security Council action designed to terminate it. It was not Israel's fault that peace had not been restored in the Middle East.

¹ See A/8746/Add.1.

31. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China) said that during the current debate the representatives of some third world countries had convincingly explained the need for a review of the Charter and the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee on the Charter and had forcefully refuted the fallacious argument advanced by the delegation of the Soviet Union against the review of the Charter. An increasing number of small and medium-sized countries demanded that the United Nations and its Charter should adapt to the needs of the times.

32. Standing in opposition to the third world countries, the Soviet Union had desperately opposed a review of the Charter. In order to obstruct such a review, the Soviet representatives had not hesitated to resort to intimidation. They had falsely accused the countries which favoured a review of undermining the Charter and destroying the very basis of the existence of the United Nations. They openly vilified those countries as "reactionary forces". Their intention seemed to be to turn the United Nations into a one-State forum, subjecting other Member States to the orders of the Soviet Union. In the current era, when the numerous third world countries had become increasingly awakened and united, the Soviet Union was still trying to wield the stick in the United Nations. That would only enable the small and medium-sized countries to see more clearly the ugly features of Soviet hegemonism, evoke their indignation and strengthen their conviction of the need for a review of the Charter.

33. The representatives of the Soviet Union gave no tenable reasons for their opposition to a review of the Charter. The true intention of the delegation of the Soviet Union in opposing such a review was to defend the privileged status of Soviet social-imperialism in the United Nations in order to continue its big-Power hegemony. Not daring to reply to that point, the representative of the Soviet Union had resorted to vilification, which was a manifestation of political impotence.

34. The representative of the Soviet Union had accused the Chinese delegation of "anti-Sovietism". It should be pointed out that China was indeed against the revisionism and big-Power hegemony pursued by the ruling clique of the Soviet Union. As was known to all, that clique had long betrayed Leninism, socialism and the world revolutionary people. It had degenerated from a socialist country into social-imperialism, betraying the Soviet people who had fought against fascism during the Second World War. The ruling clique of the Soviet Union had turned it into a super-Power carrying out aggression, subversion, interference, control and bullying against the numerous small and medium-sized countries. China had been opposed to and would continue to oppose such a super-Power.

35. The representative of the Soviet Union had also unabashedly styled himself a protector of small countries, asserting that the existence of the Soviet Union had guaranteed the interests of small countries and that consequently there was no need to review the Charter. That was sheer deception. The Soviet Union was clearly bullying the weak in the United Nations. At the sixth special session of the General Assembly and the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea held at Caracas the Soviet Union had obdurately defended the vested interests

of the super-Powers. On the Middle East question, it falsely supported but in reality betrayed the Arab countries subjected to aggression. On the Cyprus question, it had been contending with the other super-Power for hegemony. Those hegemonic acts on the part of the Soviet Union were still fresh in people's minds and could not be covered up. The numerous third world countries resolutely opposed big-Power hegemony. That was also an important reason why an increasing number of small and medium-sized countries favoured the review of the Charter. If the Soviet representative continued to impose his will on Member States by obstructing the review of the Charter, he would surely meet with their opposition.

36. The Soviet representative had also bragged about the fraud of sham disarmament. It was clear to all that the Soviet ruling clique had constantly pursued a policy of frantic arms expansion and of nuclear blackmail. The leading group of the Soviet Union was one of the biggest merchants of death in the world and had reaped fabulous profits by taking advantage of the temporary difficulties of some small and medium-sized countries.

37. Since the restoration of its lawful seat in the United Nations, China had maintained that the affairs of countries should be managed by the people of the countries concerned, that world affairs should be managed by all the countries in the world, and that the affairs of the United Nations should be managed by all States Members of the Organization. China was firmly opposed to one or two super-Powers controlling and manipulating the United Nations. The Chinese delegation supported all just demands of the small and medium-sized countries and firmly opposed all hegemonic acts of the super-Powers. In conformity with the principle of equality of all countries the Chinese delegation was in favour of reviewing the Charter. It was clear to all that the reason why the delegation of the Soviet Union was so afraid of the review of the Charter was that it was attempting to continue its practice of big-Power chauvinism and hegemony in the United Nations.

38. Mr. BAJA (Philippines), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that he wished to correct an erroneous interpretation made by the representative of the Soviet Union at the preceding meeting to the effect that the Philippines delegation wanted to kill the Charter. The United Nations was, as it should be, an organization for all countries of the world, not a preserve of some nations. His delegation's aim was to breathe more life into the Organization and its Charter, not to take its life. It was in that spirit that the Philippines, together with other developing countries, commended draft resolution A/C.6/L.1002 to the attention of the Sixth Committee.

39. Mr. ESCOBAR (Colombia), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, expressed regret that the delegation of a country with which his own Government had the most friendly relations had referred to the position adopted by the Colombian delegation in a disparaging way. In the 29 years of the Charter's existence, Colombia had never been accused of acts which violated the purposes and principles agreed upon in San Francisco. Colombia was a peace-loving country which did not put pressure on other States or resort to arguments that were not based on reason. His delegation did not believe that the Charter was sacrosanct and incapable of further improvement.

40. Mr. KOLESNIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that it was well known that the current political course of Peking ran counter to the trend towards a relaxation of international tensions. It was in that context that the activities of the Chinese delegation to the United Nations should be viewed, in particular its position on the question of the review of the Charter. China fiercely opposed all proposals for disarmament, for the promotion of friendly relations among States and for the strengthening of international security. The facts were well known and had been stated by the head of the delegation of the Soviet Union at the preceding meeting. In connexion with the item under discussion, the Chinese aim was clearly to undermine the foundations of the United Nations and to create chaos.

41. The Chinese delegation tried to make its position more acceptable by posing as a defender of the countries of the third world and by claiming to speak on behalf of the third world. But who empowered the Chinese delegation to speak for the developing countries? A country's position should be judged by its deeds, not by its words. What had the Maoists done for the countries of the third world? They had little to boast about in that regard, whether in connexion with the elimination of the vestiges of colonialism or assistance to the victims of imperialist aggression and racism.

42. As to the statements made by other speakers in exercise of the right of reply, he did not deem it necessary to comment in detail. Some of those statements showed

that the speakers had not had time to study carefully the statement by the head of the delegation of the Soviet Union. Other statements showed that the delegations in question were unwilling to heed the unanimous view expressed by the overwhelming majority of Member States.

43. Mr. AN Chih-yuan (China), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the representative of the Soviet Union could do nothing but resort to vilification and slander of the Chinese delegation. He had not replied to the question asked by the Chinese delegation, thus revealing his fear of the truth. He had only confirmed that the Soviet ruling clique had betrayed Leninism, socialism and the world revolutionary people and that his country was pursuing a policy of social-imperialism.

AGENDA ITEMS 92 AND 12

Respect for human rights in armed conflicts: report of the Secretary-General (A/9669 and Add.1, A/C.6/L.1006, L.1007)

**Report of the Economic and Social Council
[chapter V (section D, paragraph 493)]**

44. The CHAIRMAN announced that Canada, Finland, Mali and New Zealand should be added to the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.6/L.1006.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.