



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 23: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (<i>continued</i>)	1
Agenda item 59: Assistance in cases of natural disaster: report of the Secretary-General (<i>concluded</i>) Report of the Third Committee	1
Agenda item 95: Scientific work on peace research	3

President: Mr. Adam MALIK (Indonesia).

AGENDA ITEM 23

Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples: report of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (*continued*)*

1. The PRESIDENT: May I remind members that, in accordance with the decision taken yesterday [2016th meeting] by the General Assembly, the list of speakers will be closed tomorrow, 15 December, at 12 noon. The time-limit for the submission of draft proposals has been set at 5 p.m. tomorrow, but I have been requested to extend it to Thursday, 16 December, at 5 p.m. If I hear no objection I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that request.

It was so decided.

2. The PRESIDENT: Since no representative wishes to speak on this item at the present time, the debate will be continued at tomorrow afternoon's meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 59

Assistance in cases of natural disaster: report of the Secretary-General (*concluded*)**

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/8430/ADD.1)

3. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour to introduce the report of the

Third Committee (part II) on agenda item 59 [A/8430/Add.1].

4. The Third Committee, in the course of its discussion on this item, had in mind six basic points:

(a) The fact that throughout history natural disasters and emergency situations have inflicted heavy loss of life and property, affecting every people and every country;

(b) Its awareness of the suffering caused by natural disasters and their serious economic and social consequences for all, but especially and basically for the developing countries;

(c) The fact that emphasis should be placed on the needs of nations experiencing such disorders;

(d) The difficulties facing the international community in respect of its aid to countries in disaster situations;

(e) The need to strengthen and render more effective the collective efforts of the international community in the field of international disaster assistance.

(f) The competence of the United Nations and its related agencies to render assistance in cases of natural disaster and other disaster situations.

5. Having discussed this important item, the Third Committee endorsed, in the draft resolution now before the Assembly in paragraph 9 of its report, the Secretary-General's proposals for an adequate permanent office in the United Nations to be the focal point in the United Nations system for disaster relief matters.

6. Therefore, the Third Committee called upon the Secretary-General to appoint a disaster relief co-ordinator, who would report directly to him and who would be authorized, on behalf of the Secretary-General, to perform certain functions, including the establishment and maintenance of the closest co-operation with all organizations concerned.

7. The Third Committee hopes that the General Assembly will adopt the draft resolution on assistance in cases of natural disaster.

8. In accordance with the usual practice, as the Rapporteur of the Third Committee, I should like to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that, if there is any difficulty or error in the translation or reproduction of the draft resolution, the Secretariat will be glad to be notified so that it may be able to rectify it.

Pursuant to rule 68 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the report of the Third Committee.

* Resumed from the 2016th meeting.

** Resumed from the 1961st meeting.

9. The PRESIDENT: Separate votes have been requested on operative paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 10 of the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 9 of the report of the Third Committee [A/8430/Add.1]. As there is no objection we shall proceed accordingly.

10. I first put to the vote operative paragraph 2.

Operative paragraph 2 was adopted by 68 votes to 10, with 6 abstentions.

11. The PRESIDENT: There has been a request for a recorded vote on operative paragraph 3.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Burma, Ceylon, Dahomey, France.

Operative paragraph 3 was adopted by 77 votes to 7, with 4 abstentions.¹

12. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on operative paragraph 4. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

¹ The delegations of Cameroon, Colombia and Lesotho subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the paragraph.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Barbados, Burma.

Operative paragraph 4 was adopted by 78 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions.

13. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on operative paragraph 10, again by recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

Against: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining: Japan.

Operative paragraph 10 was adopted by 81 votes to 9, with 1 abstention.

14. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Burma, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Hungary, Mongolia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 86 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 2816 (XXVI)).

15. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Sweden in explanation of his vote.

16. Mr. REGNELL (Sweden): My Government has constantly argued that the United Nations must be better prepared for action in the disaster field. As a step in this direction, the Swedish Government in 1968 notified the Secretary-General that a technical unit especially trained for disaster activities was to be put at his disposal. This technical cadre was used for the first time in Peru last year.

17. We are accordingly gratified with the widespread support for the proposals of the Secretary-General on assistance in cases of disaster, and with the content of the draft resolution adopted by the Third Committee. We believe the following aspects of the resolution to be especially important: first, that the co-ordinator should be appointed at the level of Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations; second, that the co-ordinator should have a permanent office at his disposal, adequately manned so as to be able to cope with the crucial tasks entrusted to it; third, that the office should be located in Geneva in order to facilitate co-operation with the League of Red Cross Societies, the World Health Organization, and other bodies.

18. There is another aspect, however, that we should like to have further explored, namely, the possibility of increasing the financial means put at the Secretary-General's immediate disposal in cases of emergencies, which in the draft resolution has been established at the level of \$200,000. We strongly feel that this fund has to be substantially increased if it is to serve its purpose as a means for the co-ordinator to take prompt and effective action as soon as a disaster has occurred.

19. We are consequently looking forward to the report of the Secretary-General in which he will further develop his plans and proposals in order to make it possible for the United Nations to play its much needed role as an international co-ordinator in this field.

AGENDA ITEM 95

Scientific work on peace research

20. The PRESIDENT: Under this item a draft resolution has been submitted by several countries in document A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2. The administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution appear in the report by the Fifth Committee [A/8554]. I call on the representative of Belgium, who wishes to introduce the draft resolution.

21. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): The problem of war and peace was probably born the day the human race was created.

22. Despite the legend of the golden age, a great deal of suffering and fumbling efforts were required before slowly becoming aware of himself, the human animal developed into a being endowed with reason and moral judgement that could become aware of the good and evil of which he was capable and above all of the dimensions of this good and this evil when they affected collective antagonisms. With the development of scientific thought, he must have realized that, far from resolving problems, the use of force always created new ones. The treacherous dilemma of the ends and the means condemned him, however, to repeat over and over the same mistakes and the same horrors. Unfortunately, the history of mankind is a record of perpetual beginnings anew.

23. Scientific thought on war and peace for a long time and until quite recent times has been confined exclusively to the disciplines of history, morality, philosophy, and even theology.

24. Ancient Greece produced two thinkers who, each in his own field of studies, developed opposing theories concerning the use of power. For Plato the city existed as the incarnation of justice and the good. Thucydides, on the other hand, believed that power is the prerequisite of, and not the justification for, the existence of the city.

25. Plato's Utopian Republic presupposed a rigid internal organization aimed at achieving an ethical ideal which would guarantee to the collectivity of citizens a minimum of the means of existence and success in the wars with cities of more or less equal power. The objective history of imperialist Athens, on the contrary, made it possible for the author of *The History of the Peloponnesian Wars* to discern the causes for the failure of a foreign policy, which boiled down primarily to the neglect of the principle that political power, both internal as well as international, is subject to laws beyond its control or, in other words, that the pursuit of unlimited power or power for its own sake in the long run leads only to self-destructive actions.

26. From this viewpoint there is much that is still valid in *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. Viewed as a historical parallel the question whether the city of Athens should be reinforced with ramparts is quite similar to that which today concerns the great Powers which want to shield themselves behind a cordon of anti-ballistic missiles. From a reading of Thucydides for that matter we can draw the conclusion that the behaviour of the small cities of Greece was in no way different from that of peoples of modern times and that they allowed themselves to be led to war for the same motives of jealousy, prestige, ambition, rivalry, fear, messianism and economic and political interests.

27. Still the thinking of Thucydides and Plato had something in common. In each author the supreme justification of policy was the city. Transposed into contemporary terminology this means the nation, the State.

28. If the two different theories of State have continued to divide men when they begin to think about political behaviour, they have always allowed themselves to be guided by the premise of the interest of the State without bothering their heads about any system which could have

transcended the State. Thus, history has long been a science called upon to glorify and justify the actions of princes and sovereign peoples against other princes and other equally sovereign peoples, and on another level of human sciences morality was asked to provide through the devious approach of so-called natural law the theory of the just war and later other increasingly nefarious theories such as that of the State as the absolute manifestation of human will and later that of the State as an instrument of the superior race. That was not always so far removed from the thinking of another Greek philosopher, Aristotle, for whom the just war was the war that one had won and for whom there were peoples by nature born to be slaves.

29. The persistence of the conceptual error, however, allows me to skip lightly over 2,000 years of history and to deal with an important change that occurred fairly recently in scientific thinking on war and peace.

30. Under the impact of the dramatic events of our century—world wars, revolutions, counter-revolutions, decolonization, racial persecutions, the emergence of nuclear weapons—a whole series of wise men came to the conclusion that the problem of war and peace would never find an adequate solution so long as we continued to tackle it solely from the angle of the State and of inter-State relations. They came to the conclusion that the empirical approach was false and that war should be studied as a phenomenon in itself in order to serve peace, just as medical science studies disease in order to cure the sick. This movement emerged immediately after the First World War and also benefited from the generally accepted belief that it had become absurd to justify war any longer as a normal instrument of policy, as war being “nothing more than the continuation of politics by other means”. It was the sociologists primarily who devoted themselves to the study of war as a repetitive social phenomenon, so much so that the Tenth Congress of the International Institute of Sociology, held at Geneva in 1930, was able to greet the birth of a new discipline, that of “the sociology of war and peace”. The political evolution of the 1930s, unfortunately, shattered the forward movement of this new and promising initiative; but we should none the less mention that it produced a work which deserves to be remembered—that is, the monumental study of war published by Quincy Wright² during the Second World War itself.

31. After that war, Professor Gaston Bouthoul coined the term “polemology”, although he experienced great difficulties in having this new branch of scientific thought accepted in scientific circles. The obstacle was this: people were shocked to talk about war and this led to sentimental reactions, which prevented the phenomenon from being studied as objectively as a chemical reaction. That is why some decided that they would prefer to change the term “polemology” to “irenology”.

32. Early in the 1960s several things became clear: that general peace was provisionally ensured by the nuclear balance; that disarmament was not foreseeable; that the nuclear balance was exceedingly fragile and did not rule out miscalculations or mistakes; that conventional war could continue, and was continuing, behind the shelter of the

nuclear balance of power; and that the problems of the third world were not settled merely by political decolonization—in other words, that new situations capable of creating war had made their appearance and that the older situations had not thereby been eliminated.

33. It is against this backdrop, therefore, that we see the multiplication throughout the world of institutions devoted to polemology or peace research.

34. There is a shade of difference in meaning between the terms “polemology” and “peace research”, the latter term being closer to “conflict research”. To simplify matters, one could say that polemology is an approach to the phenomenon of war consistent with a French school that inclines towards the accumulation of systematized knowledge. “Peace research” would rather be of Anglo-Saxon inspiration and directed towards the solution of current problems, while “conflict research” would be a Scandinavian variation of the Anglo-Saxon school and would be careful not to assimilate the object of research with pacifism. But it is perhaps an exaggeration to try to settle this split by use of language. Behind the semantic difference there lies an interesting debate of an epistemological nature. The need was felt not only to produce results in terms of knowledge, but to go beyond this and to apply them in the practice of sociology and politics. This implies that there is no difference between polemology and “peace research”, but that there are certain divergent views on the content of the polemic on which a science was founded, and basically it is the conflict, eternal and appropriate to any science, between basic research and pragmatic research. We need not take a position in this academic discussion.

35. Now when we consider the direct subject of the work of the polemologists, or peace researchers, we can note at the outset that this is an interdisciplinary science *par excellence*. For example, economists study the trade in weapons throughout the world. This is the main focus of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. Psychologists consider the phenomenon of aggressiveness in the individual and societies. Sociologists like Bouthoul examine war and peace as the consequences of social structures and mechanisms. Jurists like Röling deal with the relationship between war and the legal relationships between men and societies. The futurist polemologist patiently examines what measures are likely to bring us closer to a peaceful world order. Existentialist polemologists analyse the means of avoiding imminent wars and of resolving conflicts, and so on. All of this finds its place in a synthesis which enables the science of polemology to respond to an absolute need different from that of political science proper, law, sociology or the discipline of international relations. Polemology thus appears as a positive science and, to use the words of Professor Rapoport, its end purpose is to give an “instrumental response” designed to have an impact on the environment and to transform it. Its course of action is, therefore, to ascertain the causes of phenomena in order to create adequate instruments designed to alter the consequences. In an editorial published on 2 November last in the daily newspaper *Le Monde*, Professor Bouthoul concluded in this connexion:

“To the Roman adage—which has been so many times contradicted but which is still essential—*si vis pacem,*

² *Study of War* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942).

para bellum, we should add, to put the greatest chance of success on the side of peace, particularly in our atomic age, 'if you want peace, study war'. In other words, study its biology, its aetiology, its functions, its rhythms, its periodic cycles. We cannot circumvent fatalities except by knowing them."

36. What now is the relationship between the United Nations and the science of polemology?

37. The explanatory memorandum, which is annexed to document A/8394, recalls that Mr. Harmel, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Belgium, in his statement at the twenty-fourth session drew the attention of the General Assembly to the intensive but very scattered development of scientific and interdisciplinary studies concerning the problems of peace, conflict, disarmament and other related questions which all have a close connexion with what constitutes the primary purpose of our Organization, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security.

"I do not believe"—said my Minister—"that scientific research of such vital interest to us should not claim our Organization's attention." [1765th meeting, para. 138.]

If we become acquainted with these studies we could retain the useful proposals which they undoubtedly contain.

38. Indeed it would be ridiculous if our Organization were to overlook scientific studies, generally of a very high level, which could in the long run help States—and above and beyond States, the United Nations—to attain their common fundamental objective. Thus we very much appreciated the fact that the Secretary-General, at his level, made in principle a first step in the direction suggested by Mr. Harmel. As is clear from paragraph 118 of the draft budget for 1971;

"... the Secretary-General recently approved the creation of a Peace Research Unit in the Office of the Director of the Political Affairs Division. The function of the Unit is to collect and make available to the Department and the Office of the Secretary-General information on the activities of the major organizations and institutes, governmental, non-governmental and academic, which are carrying out peace research... relating to political problems with which the United Nations is concerned." [A/8006, p. 39.]

39. There is, therefore, a nucleus here on which we could build.

40. But there is even more that can be said. The international community, as it is expressed through our Organization, is somewhat in the situation of Mr. Jourdain, who spoke prose without knowing it. Obviously, our Organization is not a research institute—to such an extent that UNESCO's *International Repertory of Institutions Specializing in Research on Peace and Disarmament*³ does not classify our Organization as such. But it is equally obvious that it continually produces documents, reports

and studies which could be considered as a contribution of raw data to the research on peace.

41. Our explanatory memorandum indicates, further, that some organs of the United Nations family, such as UNESCO and UNITAR, work directly in this field. In a study that is going to be published very shortly, Mr. Yassin El-Ayouty, Assistant Professor at St. John's University of New York, points out that this is also more or less the case with institutions such as the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development at Geneva, the United Nations Social Defence Research Institute at Rome, the International Institute for Labour Studies at Geneva, and many others.

42. To sum up, research on peace is not alien to our Organization. What is lacking is an over-all view of an entire series of interdisciplinary and interorganizational undertakings, an over-all view which would enable our Organization and States to derive advantage from this work to the extent that all these undertakings have an effective value for the attainment of our common goals in the field of international peace and security. We are certainly not suggesting that the United Nations itself should engage directly in this work of research on peace, nor are we suggesting that political bodies exercising their political responsibility should defer to the judgement of scientists. The only thing—I repeat, the only thing—that we have in mind is a focal point towards which we could turn to obtain, in the light of the Charter, practical and useful information on everything that is being done throughout the world by the savants who are active in the search for peace. The findings of polemology would therefore be brought to the knowledge of Governments which, each in turn, could draw the greatest benefit from this in the individual and collective conduct of their foreign relations. This would also be a way of mobilizing public opinion, because animosity, and even war, only too often still form part of the mentality and the culture of peoples.

43. All of these considerations have led my country to submit to the General Assembly draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2. We have done this together with the following countries: Burundi, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ghana, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Lebanon, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Romania and Yugoslavia. On behalf of my Government, I should like to convey to all of the sponsors my deep gratitude.

44. The purpose of the draft resolution is very simple. As is clear from operative paragraph 1, we are asking the Secretary-General:

"... to prepare every other year an informative report on scientific works produced by national and international, governmental and non-governmental, public and private institutions in the field of peace research".

By "informative report" we mean primarily a bibliographical summary. In an introduction, the Secretary-General could set forth his views on the methodology used in the preparation of the summary, because it is obvious that this in itself implies some research and even a certain degree of selectivity. There are people doing research on peace who do not know that is what they are doing but whose work is

³ Reports and Papers in the Social Sciences, No. 23, 1966 (Paris, 1967).

undoubtedly of great interest. There are countries in which there are institutes that are not called polemological institutes or peace research centres, but whose disciplines are intimately intermingled with the object of this science. Moreover, anything which appears to be polemological in nature or to be research for peace is not necessarily related to the objective pursued by our Organization. It is in this spirit, therefore, that we must understand some of the considerations of the preamble. The fourth preambular paragraph, which is taken from the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 1734 (XXV)], brings out that for our Organization the problem, and the study of problems, cannot be an end in itself. The fifth paragraph of the preamble lays down the principle that the permanent recording of studies on peace and war should be done "in the light of the purposes and principles of the Charter"; that is to say, they should refer precisely to what is related to these principles and objectives.

45. As this would be an informative report, we believe that the Secretary-General could follow up this bibliographical summary with information that he would have received from the research group on peace in the Office of the Director of the Political Affairs Division. But, in any event, the informative report should be objective and descriptive. The Secretary-General should not take a position or pass a value judgement endorsing the works that have been listed.

46. Operative paragraph 2 is a means of inviting Governments and the institutions concerned to get into contact with the Secretary-General and to bring to his attention the works, the books, the articles, that they consider fall within the category of relevant studies.

47. Operative paragraph 3 is addressed to UNITAR and the specialized agencies, which can help the Secretary-General actively in preparing the informative report.

48. Finally, in operative paragraph 4, the Secretary-General is asked to present his first biannual report early in the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. At this time we are not going to ask that an item should be included on the provisional agenda of the twenty-eighth session, for the purpose of considering this first report. We will look into this when the report has been issued, for we do not want to commit Governments yet on this point: it will be for them to judge after they have seen the report.

49. We think that draft resolution A/L.645 offers nothing which can be controversial. Thus, we request the assembly to accept it unanimously and without reservations.

50. The sponsors sincerely believe that their initiative may lead to a fruitful dialogue between those who seek peace, on the one hand, and the Governments and the Organization, on the other. If we succeed in arousing interest in scientific thinking on war and peace, we shall have become more attentive to the stakes involved in this thinking, which after all are the reasons for which the United Nations itself exists.

51. Mr. MAGENGE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2, I wish to take the floor to support this item

that has just been presented to the Assembly for its consideration.

52. First of all, on behalf of my delegation, allow me to pay a well-deserved tribute to Mr. Pierre Harmel, the Belgian Foreign Minister, who for the first time at the last session envisaged the idea of bringing to the United Nations this item, which was so brilliantly presented a moment ago by the representative of Belgium.

53. Although this problem constitutes a new field for research the speaker gave us a presentation with a wealth of examples, based on his outstanding knowledge of ancient, modern and contemporary history. I should also like to congratulate the representative of Belgium on his solidly reasoned argumentation, reflecting a high level of philosophical and sociological knowledge.

54. After these preliminary remarks, allow me to comment on the subject before us.

55. At a time when research is father to economic, social and cultural progress, there is one area that must not be overlooked, namely, research in the political sphere, and we take this expression in the etymological sense of the term when "political" is intended to designate that science designed to govern and to enlighten leaders. If war can be considered as the failure of the policies of countries, it then becomes necessary to determine the causes and the warning signs of war, while polemology—which is a scientific study of the phenomenon of war and peace as was rightly stated by Mr. van Ussel, this science, although a new discipline, is practised by many research institutes which are unaware of each other's existence; consequently, there has been no co-ordination in their work. As a result, there has been a lack of co-operation and of mutual exchange of documentation on this subject, namely, peace research.

56. In addition to the concern for co-ordinating studies, the raising of this question at the United Nations makes it possible to alert world public opinion to the dangers of war to the highest degree, for there is no other body so qualified to disseminate this information throughout the world as our Organization, the universal and world-wide vocation of which hardly needs to be demonstrated. The maintenance of international peace and security being the very essence of this Organization, it is therefore natural for the United Nations to have an office, the task of which would be to supply the General Assembly with detailed information on progress in peace research.

57. If I may draw a parallel with the field of health, I could say without fear of error that even in medical science, progress is due solely to research. Since war is a disease, and perhaps the most deadly of all diseases, it is only right that we should now attempt to study its biology, its aetiology and its periodicity, as was pointed out so ably by the preceding speaker. In short, we must try to diagnose all the symptoms of this disease in order to preserve peace.

58. For this reason I wish to reiterate our warmest congratulations to the Belgian delegation for the noteworthy initiative it has taken, which Burundi wholeheartedly and enthusiastically supports.

59. My delegation indeed shares the view expressed by Belgium to the effect that the Secretary-General should be invited to prepare an informative report on the question before the Assembly.

60. We also feel that the results of the studies on the subject, summarized in a document that would be circulated for the information of all countries, would be an excellent barometer for alerting States and the Organization to potential conflicts. Such studies should predict, or try to predict, the circumstances which might lead to war, as well as the means of restoring peace and achieving a relaxation of tension.

61. Mr. FACK (Netherlands): In the view of the Netherlands delegation, the Government of Belgium took an appropriate and timely initiative when it proposed last July an item entitled "Scientific work on peace research" for consideration by the General Assembly [A/8394]. The proposal particularly commends itself in view of the Assembly's keen interest in the strengthening of international security—a subject on which the General Assembly last year adopted a comprehensive Declaration [resolution 2734 (XXV)] which, in all its parts, deserves the lasting support of all Member States. The Belgian suggestion to give attention to scientific work on peace research is, in our opinion, timely, because scientific peace research has spread its wings significantly over the last decade.

62. In many countries there are now centres dedicated to the scientific study of the causes of war and the prerequisites for lasting peace. I am thinking, for instance, of the Polemological Institute at Groningen, the first centre of this kind in the Netherlands. Many of the scholars, societies and institutes engaged in this research have embarked on a form of co-operation in the International Peace Research Association, which was established in 1965 and until recently had its secretariat in the Netherlands.

63. In spite of the valuable work done in this field, peace research often suffers from a lack of interest in official quarters. In the opinion of my delegation, this is a pity, on the one hand because official neglect may lead to a sense of frustration on the researcher's part and, on the other, because policy-makers, both on the national and on the international level, can benefit by a more intimate knowledge of the contributions of peace research.

64. My delegation has no illusion that peace research could present neat, ready-made answers to the many thorny political problems of our times. But we do feel that such scientific research work can often contribute towards a better understanding of the background and the structure of a given political situation, at the same time highlighting the consequences of various options—both in the short and in the long term.

65. Although this may sound paradoxical in this era of advanced and sophisticated scientific technology, many politicians and even Governments often seem inclined to underrate scientific analysis in the preparation of political decisions. This tendency may be understandable because policy-makers attach particular value to their own detailed and intimate knowledge of the problems before them and, in addition, to their personal experience and their political

feeling. But it seems clear that, in our complicated world, a scientific examination of the historical, psychological, social and political aspects of certain situations and of the interdependence of measures and effects should be welcomed as a useful adjunct to the experience and knowledge of diplomats and politicians.

66. The draft resolution now before the General Assembly [A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2] aims at establishing this valuable contact between scientists and policy-makers on the international level by means of a modest proposal concerning the availability of the results of scientific work on peace research. Through this availability we may expect the level of discussion on world problems to be raised and our understanding of different aspects of the problems under discussion to be improved. A biennial report from the Secretary-General would inform all Member States systematically of available publications on peace research.

67. But such a biennial report would also have another beneficial effect: it would act as a stimulus for the scientific research workers involved, because it would give them the satisfaction of seeing their work more widely known and, perhaps, more generally appreciated. An added advantage, of course, would be that peace researchers would be kept informed of scientific analyses produced in various cultural spheres and on the basis of divergent ideologies. This might lead to an increased understanding of different views and possibly even to an enlarged range of political solutions.

68. In this context, I should like to mention that a couple of years ago the Netherlands Government had already become convinced of the need for a better link between scientific research in the field of peace and security, on the one hand, and policy-makers and society as a whole, on the other. To this end my Government was instrumental in the establishment in 1969 of the Netherlands Institute for Peace Problems, a non-governmental institute largely financed by, but entirely independent of, the Government.

69. The aims and purposes of the Institute are to contribute by study, information and education to a growing awareness and a better understanding of the problems of war and peace. The Institute provides upon request information, documentation and orientation to all persons and bodies concerned with such problems, including not only the Government and the Parliament but also, for instance, the press, other publicity media, religious groups, political parties, universities, educational authorities, peace groups, youth and student organizations, trade unions and employers' organizations. The Institute maintains contacts with related centres at home and abroad; but as far as we know there exists no other institute with exactly the same sphere of action.

70. One of the Institute's functions is to advise the Government, the Parliament and other bodies, both on request and on its own initiative. In general, its advice is public. The Institute does not engage in theoretical research. Its studies are devoted to concrete political problems. It uses, *inter alia*, the results of scholarly research in universities and other scientific centres. Equally, by its activities in the field of information and education, it hopes to encourage the translation of scientific finds and insights, and their being made accessible to broader circles.

In those ways, the Netherlands Institute for Peace Problems intends to perform the function of an active link between research workers and society.

71. On the basis of our experience in the Netherlands in the field of scientific peace research, my delegation feels that the General Assembly is indebted to the Belgian delegation for the latter's initiative, which we gladly support.

72. My delegation has the honour to be a sponsor of draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2, which has been so eloquently and convincingly presented by the representative of Belgium.

73. I should like to conclude by expressing the hope that the General Assembly will give its unanimous approval to this draft resolution.

74. Mr. KOMATINA (Yugoslavia): The Yugoslav delegation is one of the sponsors of draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2, to which we attach great importance for the following two principal reasons.

75. In essence, the draft resolution calls for international co-operation in scientific research in one of the vital areas of international relations: the maintaining of international peace and security. We all agree that the problem of security is basically a political one; however, that well-known fact does not minimize, but rather accentuates, the need for utilizing all research possibilities with a view to shedding light upon it from all angles and thus better to illuminate the avenues leading to the strengthening of security through co-operation. The growing interdependence in the world calls for a more diversified co-operation, which should not be limited only to co-operation between governments and governmental institutions. There is no doubt that co-operation among scientific institutions represents one of the important spheres of international co-operation and that it is conducive to the strengthening of better comprehension and *entente* in the world and, thereby, of international security.

76. The initiative of Belgium reveals another very important facet of the role of science in international relations. It is a matter, not simply of accumulating knowledge on vital issues of war and peace, but of a critical review of all the aspects of contemporary reality and of the foundations of future changes which have become possible through present-day accomplishments.

77. Every thought along the lines of the humanization of international relations gives rise to a question of the direct participation of science in the formation of a true image of the contemporary world. This area is open to highly interesting comparative research into international relations with a view to opposing *clichés*, blind forces and the "knowledge monopoly".

78. More specifically, we are of the opinion that co-operation in the field of scientific research—research free of pragmatic servitude to the current policy—could contribute towards the democratization and the promotion of international relations in the following domains:

79. First, only science can provide a reliable explanation of all the dangers inherent in the present-day military technology and the arms race. In this respect, of particular significance could be a search for solutions to various technical problems related to disarmament.

80. Secondly, a comprehensive study of international relations calls for an in-depth perception of the social reality and for identifying social forces causing international crises as well as for charting the course of action and indicating options vital to the lasting interests of the international community.

81. Thirdly, harmonious relations either among individuals or among States are not possible without a minimum of generally acceptable and recognized norms of morality and law conceived as a dynamic category in a changing world. These norms, which should serve for the benefit of the community of sovereign States rather than for the benefit of Powers aspiring towards domination must be illuminated from the point of view of establishing and exploring the minimum lasting common interests of all members of the international community, that is, of all nations and States. It is understandable that these categories in different historical conditions assume diverse forms; nevertheless, they can be reflected in the most general medium of seeking common denominators of the international community, which basically are enshrined in the United Nations Charter.

82. Fourthly, a field in which co-operation in scientific research could contribute to a realistic and far-reaching international policy is research into the new and complex problems facing the developing countries and the drawing of attention to this major phenomenon and its impact upon international relations. It is possible to claim with confidence that the urgency of the problems of the developing countries is far from being fully perceived and understood. We are dealing with a vicious circle: mounting issues continue to cause international crises resulting in higher military budgets and consequently a curtailment of the resources needed for resolving the problems of under-development.

83. We do not harbour illusions about some kind of supernatural science, or a science devoid of class distinctions. Scientists belong to their own respective peoples and perform within the framework of the interests of their countries. Precisely because they are armed with greater knowledge than others, they can better—but not always—recognize the futility of dead-end approaches, single them out and actively oppose them. World interdependence leads to increased co-operation and renders imperative the transcending of national and State barriers standing in the way of co-operation in scientific fields. Such co-operation can only facilitate the resolution of common problems, without which there can be no serious cause for regulating international relations today or in the international community of tomorrow.

84. My delegation is confident that the draft resolution now before us will receive broad support and that its adoption will enhance co-operation in the field of scientific peace research.

85. Mr. SAFRONCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation has carefully studied the Belgian proposal concerning scientific work on peace research, which has now been submitted to the General Assembly for its consideration.

86. We understand Belgium's concern for the cause of peace and its endeavours to take definite steps, as we understand it, to strengthen further international security and to enhance the rôle played by the United Nations in this noble cause. We do not deny the importance of carrying out scientific research on the problems of war and peace.

87. In the Soviet Union fundamental research is being carried out into these problems and this work involves many scientific research institutes which come under the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Dozens of monographs and studies have been published in the Soviet Union in recent years analysing such questions as the causes and the nature of the Second World War. A six-volume history of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against Hitlerite Germany has recently been published. Soviet historians play an active rôle in international conferences and symposia of scholars and historians at which the origins of modern wars are studied in a scientific manner. In their research work, Soviet historians pay particular attention to exposing the pernicious rôle played by international monopolies and aggressive imperialist groups in unleashing wars and military conflicts, including wars against peoples who are struggling for their national and social liberation. At the same time, the Soviet Union consistently advocates that the United Nations should direct its main efforts towards achieving its principal purpose, as set out in the Charter, namely, the maintenance of peace and security. That has been the objective of the proposals submitted by the Soviet Union for the consideration of the United Nations throughout the 26 years of the Organization's existence. At this present session of the General Assembly, at the initiative of the Soviet Union, consideration is being given to such important international problems as the convening of a world disarmament conference, the prohibition and elimination of bacteriological weapons, the strengthening of international security and many other important questions.

88. The Soviet Union will continue to strive by all means to enhance the rôle and effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for the strengthening of international peace and security.

89. However, the Soviet delegation cannot agree with the specific proposal contained in document A/L.645. We are aware that certain changes have been made in that text as compared with its original version. Unfortunately, those changes do not affect the substance and they cannot remove the objections that our delegation has advanced from the outset.

90. In our view, the implementation of this proposal might have an adverse effect on the activities of the United Nations, since it would divert the attention of the Organization from the achievement of its main purpose—the maintenance of peace and international security. Moreover, as we well know, the United Nations is not dealing with

that task satisfactorily. It would therefore be quite 'inadvisable to transfer the attention of the Organization from the major important and urgent problems of ensuring peace and security to theoretical and abstract questions connected with peace research, which is sometimes carried out without reference to reality and to existing problems, but at times runs counter to the very purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

91. We find quite unacceptable an approach whereby certain States, which initiated this proposal, are for example, not ready to agree that the General Assembly should systematically consider such an important document as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*] but yet suggest that the United Nations should, on a permanent basis—I repeat, on a permanent basis—be given the task of recording scientific research studies.

92. We find that attitude quite contradictory and inconsistent. In addition, as we see it, the draft resolution recommends that the Governments of States Members of the United Nations should concentrate their attention on providing information on scientific research work, whereas the interests of the United Nations and those of all peoples require above all that the efforts of States should be directed towards implementing the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and putting its most important provisions into practice.

93. We also cannot agree with the proposal that the activities of the United Nations aimed at the actual co-ordination and systematization of scientific work on peace research should be directed by the Secretary-General of the Organization. As is well known, under the United Nations Charter the Secretary-General is the chief officer of this Organization and he does not have this kind of function.

94. To assign such work to the Secretary-General might divert his attention from his basic functions and might have an adverse effect on the work of the Secretariat, for which he is primarily responsible.

95. Finally, the implementation of the proposal contained in document A/L.645 would, at least in the near future, entail additional expenditure under the United Nations regular budget, and in view of the present very difficult financial situation of the United Nations my delegation believes that that, too, is undesirable.

96. In view of those considerations, the Soviet delegation will vote against draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2.

97. Mr. HAMBRO (Norway): I had not intended to participate in this debate since from the outset the Assembly has heard such very learned exposés from several of the representatives of the sponsoring countries. However, the last intervention seems to me so specially interesting from the point of view of logic that I am tempted to say a few words.

98. If I correctly understood the last speaker, he seemed to indicate that the task of engaging in scientific work on peace research in the United Nations would divert the

interest and forces of the United Nations from peace and security. To me, that very logic in itself indicates the necessity for this Organization to engage even more than before in scientific research on peace and conflict.

99. I want to add only one small argument in favour of what has been said by all speakers save the last one. That is the following. It is necessary to disseminate all the information we can get on research into peace and conflict in order to bring the knowledge of the experts to the attention of statesmen and diplomats. If we do not do so, research into peace and conflict may become entirely esoteric and have no practical importance. And I venture to suggest that one of the dangers of our world is the lack of connexion between science and practical politics. I venture

to say that the knowledge of the scientist only very rarely dispels the ignorance of the politician, and it seems to me that every effort we can make, even within the United Nations, to help bridge the gap between the ignorance of practitioners and the knowledge of scientists should be greeted with joy, and we should grasp the opportunity as soon as we can.

100. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now vote on draft resolution A/L.645 and Add.1 and 2.

The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to 7, with 3 abstentions (resolution 2817 (XXVI)).

The meeting rose at 4.50 p.m.