



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 25: Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons ( <i>continued</i> ) . .	1

*President:* Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 25

**Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (*continued*)**

1. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): Three particular reasons induce the Polish delegation to consider the present debate and the Soviet proposal [A/L.676] as a possible turning-point in the efforts made by the United Nations for the implementation of the most noble of its principles: the exclusion of force from international relations and the strengthening of conditions which will make possible the elimination of war.

2. First of all, the Soviet initiative constitutes a constructive synthesis of the efforts made thus far by the United Nations for the fulfilment of its main task: to preserve mankind from the scourge of war.

3. Secondly, this draft resolution proceeds from the reality of the contemporary world; it is based upon the positive developments in the international situation while taking into account the negative trends which have taken place, and it meets the requirements which these changes impose on the international community as a whole. Its purpose is to consolidate and develop the positive processes which we are observing in international relations.

4. Thirdly, it reflects a profound sense of responsibility and the conviction that it is truly possible to base international relations on increasingly firmer principles and obligations.

5. The Polish delegation perceives in this debate a new trend, in conformity with universal aspirations and needs, which may give tangible form to the optimism expressed at the present session of the General Assembly concerning the prospects for the international situation and the activities of the United Nations.

6. It would be no exaggeration to say that the present decade is marked by an evolution and by transformations at the international level of an unprecedented scope which affect all parts of our globe in different degrees. Out of the diversity, so complex, of the contemporary world one

common denominator, one unit of fundamental interest seems to emerge ever more strongly, and that is the recognition of the urgent need to place international relations upon a base which excludes the use of force and prohibits the use of nuclear weapons.

7. Awareness of the potential danger of the growth of arsenals of nuclear and other weapons and of the risks inherent in existing conflicts strengthens the determination to hold back and stop this process. We are witnesses to trends and actions aimed at promoting international détente. The principle of peaceful coexistence is no longer a theoretical concept but a reality gaining ever greater recognition and respected as a basis for relations between States having different economic and social systems.

8. The development of these relations, based upon the principles of the non-use of force or threat of force, is a fact that is more and more characteristic of the international situation. These principles also underly the various concepts of regional security. They are confirmed in different parts of the world.

9. The European continent in particular is an example of that. I shall limit myself here to mentioning the treaties between the Soviet Union and Poland on the one hand, and the Federal Republic of Germany on the other, the agreements and the process of the normalization of relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, the declarations signed between the Soviet Union and France, between Poland and France and between Poland and Sweden. I might also mention the negotiations in progress concerning the early establishment of a system of security and co-operation in Europe.

10. If I have taken Europe as an example it is because the process to which I am referring is particularly advanced in this part of the world. It is also because we Poles are actively participating in this process in which we have a direct interest—and indeed a direct obligation towards our people and its future generations—and in which we see an element of primary importance for a positive evolution in international relations.

11. But this process is far from being limited to Europe. We should mention in particular the document concerning the establishment of mutual relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.<sup>1</sup> We can discern similar trends, particularly in the bilateral relations between the Soviet Union on the one hand, and India and Iraq on the

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972*, document S/10674.

other. Moreover, we find them integrated in the Georgetown Declaration on international security and disarmament.<sup>2</sup> We see them in relations in the Far East.

12. Those trends and actions certainly do not cause us to forget the tensions and conflicts which persist. That is all the more reason for us to stress the fact that those tendencies and the favourable political climate should become the dominant and decisive factors in relations between States; and further reason for stating that they should better reflect the principle of the indivisibility of security and international peace and insisting that they should assume a universal dimension. What has been accomplished makes it possible to pass to a new stage, to codify and develop on a global scale the principles already laid down and in that way to establish a system of international obligations which will bind all States and respond to their common interests. The prevention of resort to force in international relations and military conflicts, which is essential to the security of each country, underlies, and indeed strengthens, the principles of international law which must govern relations between States, such as sovereignty, equality, non-interference, the inviolability of frontiers and territorial integrity. Such a system of obligations would greatly contribute to the gradual dispelling of distrust and thus to increasing mutual trust and promoting the settlement of controversial problems by purely peaceful means.

13. Here the General Assembly has a highly constructive role to play, a role fully in accordance with its vocation: that of generalizing and promoting the positive trends which emerge in various parts of the world, of adapting to a universal scale the principles which have proved themselves on the bilateral and regional scale, and giving them the force of law. That is a role which the Assembly must play in the interests of peace and international security, and indeed in the interests of its own position and prestige.

14. The initiative before us today, concerning the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, is designed precisely to attain the goals I have just mentioned. It proceeds from the principle contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, and in the Preamble of the United Nations Charter and develops the commitments assumed earlier by Member States of our Organization. We would wish to emphasize particularly three features which are essential in our opinion.

15. First of all, for the first time in the history of the United Nations the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of weapons, including nuclear weapons—two interdependent and inseparable elements which have thus far been discussed separately—are now indissolubly associated. By combining those two elements we have eliminated the difficulties we have always encountered whenever they were considered separately.

16. Secondly, this initiative takes fully into account and—and I have no hesitation in using the word—makes it possible to guarantee equal security to all countries, which is of special importance to the medium-sized and small

countries, the non-aligned and those with limited military potential.

17. Thirdly, this initiative is designed to bring the principles it contains to the level of international law, and this flows particularly from operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.676].

18. The prohibition of the use of weapons flows from the principle of the inseparability of security and disarmament. The final objective, obviously, remains the attainment of general and complete disarmament under effective international control. I shall not dwell here upon the causes which have thus far made it impossible to achieve that objective—which we deplore—but unless we wish to mislead public opinion and engender a spirit of pessimism and frustration we cannot deny that 26 years of effort, patience and perseverance in changing political conditions which were frequently unfavourable have nevertheless made it possible to reach a series of international agreements on the limitation of the arms race. Those agreements, limited and partial to be sure, have nevertheless reduced the danger of a nuclear war. In the circumstances, the agreements concluded between the Soviet Union and the United States on strategic arms limitation and the prevention of the threat of nuclear war, as well as the commitment by the two Powers to follow the course on which they have embarked, assume particular importance.

19. If we admit that the use of those arsenals would be tantamount to deliberate suicide, we must observe the complete absurdity of this state of affairs and, therefore, seek to get ourselves out of this impasse.

20. Whereas the objective of the United Nations is general and complete disarmament, it is the duty of all to explore and use all the possibilities which collateral measures offer in order to come closer to that final goal. If the concept of the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear and other types of weapons are accepted as a rule of international law at the universal level, that would, in our opinion, not only have a great moral and psychological effect but, more than any collateral agreement, would create far more lasting foundations for subsequent disarmament measures, which would be far more effective and extensive than those adopted thus far.

21. Ever since the adoption of the very first resolution by the General Assembly of the United Nations, passing by way of the draft convention relating to the prohibition of the use of atomic weapons, *inter alia*, presented to the Atomic Energy Commission in 1946 by the representative of the USSR, Mr. Gromyko,<sup>3</sup> resolution 1653 (XVI), initiated by a group of African States, the Soviet draft convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons<sup>4</sup> of 1967 and resolution 2289 (XXII), the problem of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has been constantly a subject of negotiations on disarmament.

22. The non-use of force, and therefore the non-use of weapons, cannot be restricted in character and limited

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the Atomic Energy Commission, No. 2* (second meeting), pp. 26-29.

<sup>4</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-second Session, Annexes*, agenda item 96, document A/6834.

<sup>2</sup> Declaration adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries at Georgetown, Guyana, on 12 August 1972.

exclusively to nuclear weapons. Technological progress in the field of conventional weapons has made it possible to make them so destructive that many of them far exceed the traditional concept of so-called conventional weapons.

23. It is therefore fully justified, and indeed imperative, that we settle also the question of prohibition of the use of conventional weapons, because such use of force has had devastating effects in armed conflicts and wars which, especially since the Second World War, have gone well beyond purely military objectives, and continue to do so. This was rejected in the last century by international instruments such as the Declaration of the Brussels Conference of 1874 and the Conventions of The Hague Peace Conferences of 1899 and 1907. The prohibition of the use of those weapons would contribute to reducing considerably the threat of war or military conflict and thus establish favourable conditions for the cessation of existing conflicts. The non-use of force with not only nuclear but also conventional weapons would, by emphasizing the specific responsibility of the nuclear Powers and others with considerable military potential, take into account the security of all countries on an equal footing. That principle, which is just and realistic, would be fully in keeping with the concept of the indivisibility of peace and security.

24. The present proposal encompasses all the proposals advanced thus far. It combines the real and the possible with what is essential, in an entity that is in accord with the needs and hopes of peoples. That is the new and different element, compared with all the earlier proposals advanced either in the United Nations or outside it by, might I emphasize, any country.

25. However, the proposal does not in any way deprive any country whatsoever of the right to individual or collective self-defence, in conformity with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. It does not in any sense deprive the colonial and oppressed peoples of their right to fight for their liberation and independence. It does not deprive any people of the right to fight for the restoration of their rights, violated through the use of force—and that because the right of individual and collective self-defence is a natural right of each nation which no one can deny. That is because the right to fight against any aggression, against all the consequences of aggression, to eliminate all their aftereffects is the inalienable right of all peoples; because the right of peoples under colonial dependence or oppression to struggle for their national liberation is their right, and it has been reaffirmed many times by the United Nations. It confirms the illegality of the use of force against colonial and oppressed peoples, and it enshrines the legitimacy of their struggle for liberation. It is in that context that we see the application of the principle of non-use of force in relation to problems of decolonization and the liberation of peoples from racist oppression.

26. The implementation of commitments contained in the proposal submitted for our consideration would constitute a qualitatively new stage in international relations based upon the practical realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence. At the same time it would give a new impetus to the efforts and the fight for a world without aggression, without armed conquests and without colonial oppression. It would promote and bring us closer to the end of conflicts

and military confrontations. It should also facilitate in a decisive fashion the adoption of effective disarmament measures.

27. The problem on the agenda which we are now debating affects the supreme interests of international security. Its solution depends solely upon the goodwill of all States, and in particular all the nuclear Powers and countries having a substantial military potential. The United Nations is in duty bound to bring its actions into line with the new circumstances resulting from the changes that have occurred in the international situation. It is in duty bound to promote by joint efforts on the part of all Member States a positive and constant evolution in international relations.

28. Guided by that objective, the Polish delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.676. It expresses its confidence that the General Assembly, aware of its responsibilities, will contribute to the attainment of the urgent and real goals provided for in this draft resolution.

29. Mr. SZARKA (Hungary): The delegation of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the item now under discussion is one of the most important that has ever been put on the agenda of the General Assembly during the 27 years of existence of the United Nations. We are glad that, on the basis of an initiative of the Soviet Union [A/8793], we can discuss in this Organization questions relating to the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. This issue concerning the fate and future of all mankind is so important that not even opponents of the proposal can claim that the point at issue serves only the interests of one or another country, one or another Power-grouping. In fact in connexion with this agenda item the only interested part is the community of nations, the whole of mankind; the essence of the proposal derives from the lofty principles which are laid down in the Charter and for the realization of which our Organization has been established and is working.

30. The First World War already caused peoples and nations to be aware that it was no longer admissible for international relations to be subjected to arbitrary rule, to brute force. This awareness was reflected also in the Covenant of the League of Nations, which, though not quite consistently, restricted the right to make war. After the Second World War an important landmark in the development of international law was the drafting of the United Nations Charter, in accordance with which international disputes can legally be settled only by peaceful means. It is well known, however, that the road from the drafting of a principle to its practical implementation is long and laborious. Whereas, in consequence of the strenuous efforts and exertions of the socialist countries and other progressive forces, the international situation has greatly improved and tensions have lessened, we have still not reached the point where we can say that the renunciation of the use of force is a principle generally accepted, still less generally applied and adhered to, in relations between States.

31. It was this very circumstance that prompted actions to be initiated here in the United Nations which in themselves

sified the confirmation of this important principle. It is enough to refer to the momentous documents adopted by the General Assembly at its twenty-fifth session: the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)], and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations [resolution 2627 (XXV)].

32. The vital principle of the renunciation of the use of force has been affirmed not only within the framework of our Organization but in a number of highly important bilateral agreements and treaties as well. Among them are some whose importance goes far beyond the circle of the States concerned, for example the treaties between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany<sup>5</sup> and between Poland and the Federal Republic of Germany.<sup>6</sup> The conclusion and entry into force of those treaties have given a forceful impetus to the entire process of détente in Europe.

33. To achieve this end, the European countries, regardless of their social systems, are co-operating with one another. There will soon start in Helsinki the multilateral preparation of a European conference on security and co-operation. All European countries, the Hungarian People's Republic among them, wish to continue their positive contribution to the creation of a new European security system, and they look forward to that with great hope. We wish that the peaceful co-operation of the European peoples, based on the non-use of force and mutual advantage, as well as its consequent positive influence upon other parts of the world, might be strengthened further.

34. My delegation would like to stress specially the general validity of the declaration on basic principles of mutual relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed by representatives of the two countries at Moscow on 29 May 1972. I wish to quote only one paragraph:

*"First. They will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. Differences in ideology and in the social systems of the USA and the USSR are not obstacles to the bilateral development of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, non-interference in internal affairs and mutual advantage."*<sup>7</sup>

35. The above-mentioned highly important treaties and agreements have been most instrumental, as evidenced by the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly, in that the vast majority of Member States have been in a position to express the view that the present international situation is favourable and that, in comparison

with the past, the tendencies towards the relaxation of tension and the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence are in fact increasingly gaining ground. This state of affairs provides a more propitious opportunity than before for the General Assembly to consider seriously also the long overdue topic of the renunciation of the use of force.

36. Having lived through two destructive world wars in our time, and being under the influence of pressing, yet unsettled, questions, we are aware that the peoples demand more and more loudly, and with good reason, the definitive elimination of wars and of the threat and use of force from the life of mankind. They expect their Governments, as well as every responsible body and organization—primarily the United Nations—to extinguish the hotbeds of war, to put an end to all forms of aggression and territorial expansion, and to ease the burdens of armament imposed upon the peoples. This determination is peculiar to the process which, in spite of all past or existing difficulties, is increasingly characteristic of the development of international life, as is so well manifested in the draft resolution now under discussion [A/L.676].

37. The struggle for peace has from the beginning inspired the international aspirations of those countries desirous of promoting human progress by means of their foreign policies. And we do not forget that the Soviet State, practically at the moment of its birth on 8 November 1917, adopted a decree on peace, in which for the first time in human history a State took an absolutely clear stand in favour of the prohibition of wars of aggression. One of the most essential basic principles of the foreign policy of the Hungarian People's Republic is also the striving for peaceful coexistence with countries having different social systems. Peaceful coexistence, as has already been demonstrated by historical facts, is and should be an integral part, a fundamental principle, of any policy promoting international peace.

38. Today, in the shadow of thermonuclear weapons and the dangers they involve, it is reasonable and logical that the agenda item under discussion should closely connect two subjects: the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Owing to the world-wide consolidation of the forces of peace, progress and socialism, the possibility exists today, for the first time in history, to banish from the life of peoples the fear of the future, namely the scourge of war. The way is open—as the 27-year history of this world Organization shows—to the sensible, peaceful and careful examination and settlement of disputed questions. This requires, of course, that all parties concerned should display goodwill and size up the situation realistically. We might say, as well, that the parties should exercise self-restraint.

39. Of course, the principle of the renunciation of the use of force does not and cannot mean that States should renounce their right of individual and collective self-defence, a right that is furthermore guaranteed by the Charter. Until such time as there are States which, in disregard of the most elementary provisions of international law and the Charter of the United Nations, continue to commit acts of aggression against other States, to occupy parts of their territories, or to refuse to grant peoples their

<sup>5</sup> Signed at Moscow on 12 August 1970.

<sup>6</sup> Treaty on the Bases for the Normalization of Relations, signed at Warsaw on 7 December 1970.

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for April, May and June 1972*, document S/10674.



inherent right to self-determination and independence—until then, but only until then, and only against those States, is the use of any means, including recourse to armed force, permissible. But the States which act in defiance of the Charter and the related United Nations resolutions are not many, and they are becoming increasingly isolated. We cannot tolerate the whole system of normal international relations being governed, for their sake, by their “principles” and by their “laws”. On the contrary, the fundamental rules of the main trend in development should be applicable to them as well.

40. It follows logically from what I have said that the Hungarian delegation supports the Soviet proposal in its entirety, for it sees in it an adequate means of bringing closer the advent of a world without war, the heartfelt desire of all peoples. The proposal has been conceived entirely in the spirit of the most essential provisions of the Charter, and it allows both the General Assembly and the Security Council to play a role in accordance with the Charter. Consequently, the Hungarian delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.676 when it is put to the vote, and sincerely hopes that other delegations, conscious of their responsibility, will do the same.

41. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I have had occasion to read the draft resolution submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [A/L.676]. I have also listened attentively to this morning's two speakers, none other than my good friends and colleagues from Poland and Hungary. All they have said seems to reflect the desire of people all over the world for peace and security.

42. If we read the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph, especially its preambular part, we find nothing to which anyone can object. The renunciation of the use or threat of force is proclaimed in the United Nations Charter. In view of the fact that many have resorted to force since the Charter was written, I believe the Soviet Union thought it was high time that we should be reminded of that provision of that instrument.

43. Then, as to the most interesting second preambular paragraph reading:

*“Bearing in mind at the same time that the use of force is still occurring in violation of the United Nations Charter and that the threat of the use of nuclear weapons continues to exist,”*

I should like to make a few remarks regarding what I believe can and cannot be done.

44. I have said in many committees of the United Nations that nowadays the major Powers—or those which wield power, to put it that way—do not want a confrontation, and rightly so. By “confrontation” they mean a third world war, which would spell the end of mankind. However, we have noticed that the intervention of States in the affairs of other States, especially on the part of the major Powers, has been conducted in a clandestine manner, in the apparent belief that they can thus be absolved of any responsibility for their intervention. I do not wish to name any major

Powers or, for that matter, other Powers which ape them because they think that is the right thing to do. We know that nowadays the budgets of intelligence agencies are so huge that their funds are not earmarked solely for gathering intelligence, which is sometimes legitimate in order to see what a State of which one is suspicious is doing and whether it might perhaps one day intervene or interfere in the affairs of another State. But from books which have been written by former agents of some of those intelligence agencies we find that funds have been used to subvert other States and to create chaos in certain States, sometimes leading to civil wars of varying dimensions.

45. That is one thing on which the major Powers have so far not pronounced themselves one way or the other in a draft resolution or otherwise. What can we small Powers, some of which, as I have said, are following in the wake of the major Powers which have set the pattern, do about that? Why should I send my armies and perhaps generate what might be called criticism by other nations when I can do things surreptitiously? I think that our good friend from the Soviet Union, Ambassador Malik, may want to insert something to that effect, about the clandestine interference of States in the affairs of other States, but I do not know whether he can do so. I think it is high time that something should be done in that direction lest we be forced to witness troubles which we find out later have been fomented with the use of the funds of certain Powers, big or small.

46. I now come to the question of the threat of nuclear weapons. We have been told that nuclear weapons are necessary, so to speak, for the time being as a deterrent against one Power taking the law into its own hands and dictating its terms to another Power. The alignments of States with certain major Powers seem to provide a makeshift kind of assurance that as long as they are clients of that Power or have a secret understanding or perhaps a treaty with it the presence of nuclear weapons acts as a necessary deterrent as regards major conflicts. I submit from my humble experience since those weapons were devised that the whole fabric of society is in tatters on account of the fear among the young that one day there may be a war of annihilation. Therefore the proposal for the non-use of nuclear weapons as provided for in this draft resolution is most laudable, but who is going to entertain the hope that is included in this draft resolution? We know—and I do not have to name the countries—that there are at least two nuclear Powers which from this podium have made it very clear that they will not undertake not to use nuclear weapons unless all States do the same and destroy the weapons in their arsenals.

47. Why have I mentioned that in connexion with the second preambular paragraph? Because this will lead us to the two operative paragraphs on which I shall comment in a moment. The last preambular paragraph reads:

*“Believing that renunciation of the use of force and prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should become a law of international life”*

Nobody can object to that, but do we have the machinery here to write a treaty or convention to that effect? We would rather see the major Powers come to an understand-

ing on this point before we are asked to take an academic stand on the paragraph. Therefore, where do we go from here?

48. This item has been with us for two or three years. I remember when Mr. Gromyko made a very lucid speech about the necessity for such undertakings as are embodied in this draft resolution. But this year we find that many are lukewarm about this draft resolution although it has merit, I think, and something should be done not only to make it acceptable and capable of securing a majority but also to give it a certain force, if possible, although the General Assembly has no power other than to recommend.

49. It is always the prerogative of the Security Council to implement. Has the Security Council been implementing? I submit that the Security Council has been paralysed, not by the rotating members but unfortunately by the permanent members, and I am not putting on any one member the blame for the Security Council not having observed the Charter as it should. Many decisions have been taken on the basis of the national interests of the individual permanent States; whenever there has been an area of agreement among them, those States have refrained from using the veto, at the expense of the justice due to those which brought their complaints before the Council.

50. Let us face facts. That is what led the Security Council a few years ago to the method of resorting to consensus rather than risking a veto. But this is just like having peace, progress and higher standards of living because of the fear of a confrontation, but at what expense? At the expense of justice, which on many occasions the Security Council failed to mete out to applicants which brought valid complaints in cases which were at times flagrant. If I were to cite examples this Assembly would perhaps engage in a bitter political dispute, but I think that my colleagues who are new here know what I mean because they have the records of the Security Council since its inception, and those of us who have been here for many years know those cases very well.

51. I like operative paragraph 1 best because it:

*“Solemnly declares on behalf of the States Members of the Organization, in accordance with the United Nations Charter, their renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons”.*

52. Reference has been made to Article 51 of the Charter, which provides for the “inherent right” of self-defence. But I do not see in this draft resolution any concrete phraseology with regard to Article 51. The representative of the Soviet Union perhaps shied away from including such phraseology in order not to make this draft resolution too controversial. On the other hand, what about those cases where there are many peoples here and there—or I should say several peoples, because, thank God, many colonial peoples have been liberated—that are struggling for their self-determination. Would that “non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons” draft resolution apply only to inherent self-defence or equally to the struggle of peoples that are clamouring for self-defence? That is the question.

53. I believe this draft resolution could have incorporated such references to make sure that the Soviet Union does not believe, like other Powers, that regardless of certain injustices that are being perpetrated against people clamouring for their independence, the *status quo* should be maintained. At least some of the major Powers—and I am not referring specifically to the Soviet Union—may still want to maintain the *status quo*. And I do not mean only the five major Powers, which have funds and the knowledge for subverting other nations surreptitiously. That is what I meant by clandestine interference in the affairs of other States. As General Romulo stated from this podium [2058th meeting], there are many wars that are being fought by proxy. I have said the same thing many times before.

54. This is the crux of the question. Where do we small Powers stand vis-à-vis the “non-use of force in international relations” when we all know that some of the major Powers would rather refrain from confrontation, and have refrained from confrontation on many occasions, when they thought it less costly, perhaps, to interfere by buying certain factions within a State that was not being governed to their liking and have caused revolts and rebellions to suit their own purpose. That is nothing new in international affairs. This has always been so. If we study history we discover that man has always found ways and means, without fighting battles, to subvert other States surreptitiously.

55. I come to the last operative paragraph. I think it is a most difficult paragraph. To some it will not present any difficulty—that is, to any State which, like my own, is not a member of the Security Council. But how can I recommend that the Security Council should take, as soon as possible, an appropriate decision whereby the present declaration of the General Assembly will acquire binding force under Article 25 of the United Nations Charter?

56. It stands to reason that, if we adopt the recommendation embodied in this draft resolution and refer it to the Security Council, it will be up to the five permanent members to take a decision for or against it, for the simple reason that those members still exercise the veto. Any one of them can veto our recommendation and very lucidly and forthrightly, whether they are right or wrong, give their reason for doing so.

57. Therefore, if I may, I would suggest—I am not going to submit any amendments—that my good friend Ambassador Malik change the terminology of operative paragraph 2. That paragraph could start with the words: “Calls upon the permanent members of the Security Council to discuss informally, as soon as possible...”. Parenthetically, I would say that “as soon as possible” may be five days after the resolution is adopted or it may be five years. I think the words “as soon as possible” have been used very loosely by the United Nations in cases when one is not very hopeful that forthright action can be expected.

58. To continue, my suggestion is that operative paragraph 2 might read as follows:

*“Calls upon the permanent members of the Security Council to discuss informally, as soon as possible, the contents of recommendations in this draft resolution so that at a future session they might be able to report to*

the General Assembly any progress they may have achieved.”

59. Let me be clear: this is a suggestion; it is not an amendment in any way. Why not recommend to the Security Council to take an appropriate decision as soon as possible? Because I checked with some members—I am not going to name them—and they said that they were not prepared to enter into any agreement that called upon them perhaps to destroy their nuclear weapons or not to use them in case of need.

60. Then where do we others stand? It would be perhaps a moral victory to approve what is embodied in this draft resolution. But let us not allow expectations to run away with us. We have an Arab proverb which says: “If you want

one inch of one thing, we want one foot”. We all want one foot of this draft resolution although it may end up with one inch. But can we attain these aims that are enunciated in it?

61. To sum up, I think this draft resolution would stand a better chance of receiving more votes if my suggestion regarding operative paragraph 2 were taken into account so that we could have a respite between now and any time that the permanent members might deem that it was high time for them to do something to remove this sword of Damocles hanging over the head of mankind, the sword of Damocles of total war, which I am sure our colleague from the Soviet Union would like to see abolished.

*The meeting rose at 11.40 a.m.*