



CONTENTS

Page

Agenda item 25:  
Non-use of force in international relations and permanent  
prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (*continued*) . . . 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. MAGHUR (Libyan Arab Republic): We are convened to consider a new agenda item. At first glance, this item appears new, but if we think carefully about its theme, we will find that the United Nations has already spent 26 years indirectly deliberating this very subject.

2. Still, the need for this new item is blatant: no one can forget the misery and destruction which our world suffered during the Second World War. It is essential for us, now more than ever before, because of the snow-balling creation of weaponry more sophisticated than any in previous existence, to find an island of peace in this distraught world of today.

3. Our world has become a huge stockpile in which weapons of mass destruction are stored by man for eventual use against his fellow man. In this way, man has become a terrible danger to himself. The arsenal he has built up is a kind of assurance of mankind's final annihilation. It is frightening to know that one Power, with enough weapons to destroy our entire planet three times over, continues to manufacture arms. It is likewise frightening to know that in this world the worth of a nation is commensurate only with its strength. The old theme, "show me your strength and I'll show you your rights" is, regrettably, the main factor governing relations between nations, even within the United Nations itself. The fact that this situation, the reason why we fought the Second World War, still exists, demonstrates our failure to learn a lesson from history.

4. For many reasons, all of them valid, it is evident that we need to conduct an exhaustive consideration of the subject before us. Still, despite the importance of this item for the peoples of the United Nations, I regret that it fails to relate to situations occurring in our world today. On the contrary, such an item could pertain only to a perfect and ideal world. In the present, imperfect world, colonialism, identified since the end of the Second World War as one of the major causes of unrest, oppression, frustration and war, is still alive and thriving. And, in our world, the concept of aggression still underlies the plans of even some of the

members of this community; it is used by some against their neighbours to fulfill their expansionist dreams and by others to dominate the economies and the internal affairs of less fortunate nations. Today, millions of human beings are subjected to the evils of exploitation, oppression, colonialism and *apartheid* and thus, in violation of the Charter, are denied the exercise of their inalienable right of self-determination. There are super-Powers which try by economic or military means to impose their interests and wills upon those peoples of the world which are still struggling for the essentials of life. Insatiable, the super-Powers seek to exert control over the life of every human being on earth.

5. While in principle it is a laudable act to call for restraint in the use of force, could we, in good conscience, ask the people of South-East Asia to put aside their arms and wait for a merciless shell or bullet from the American aggressors' war machinery? Could we ask the people of South Viet-Nam to abandon their arms and accept a government imposed by the will of American imperialism? Or could we ask the heroic people of Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau) and Zimbabwe to refrain from fighting, while seated among us are representatives of the Governments of racist South Africa and colonialist Portugal? Could we really ask the people of southern Africa to abandon their struggle by all the means available to them against *apartheid*, hatred and inequality, which control their lives? Or could we ask the oppressed people of Palestine to abandon their arms, while the biggest Power in the world supplies sophisticated war *matériel* to the Zionist aggressors?

6. The United Nations committed a terrible act of injustice by partitioning Palestine against the wishes of the overwhelming majority of its inhabitants. It then did those people further injustice by not enforcing the implementation of its many resolutions condemning Zionist expansionism. In this light, could the United Nations now force the Palestinians to accept the role of homeless refugees or second-class citizens by taking away their only remaining means to achieve recognition and the restoration of their rights?

7. Could we ask the peoples of Syria, Egypt and Jordan not to exercise their legitimate right to recover their territories occupied by the forces of aggression? Could we ask them not to feel compelled to use force while the United States veto is ready to block any condemnation of Zionist aggression which might be adopted by this international Organization? The attempt by the United States to justify Zionist aggression has surely contributed to the deadlock facing the Middle East today.

8. In this connexion, it is worth-while to refer to the United Kingdom's veto which blocked a decision that could

have restored to the people of Zimbabwe their right to self-determination. It is regrettable to notice that the United Kingdom, that traditional colonialist Power, continues to practise colonialism, even in the Security Council.

9. The Charter has provided the big Powers with the veto mainly to protect the peace and security of the world, to prevent attempts by opportunists to jeopardize the freedom and territorial integrity of any Member State, and to prevent the colonialists from denying any people its right to self-determination. However, the reverse is true today. We are witnessing the use of the veto power for the protection of the aggressors, to block the decisions of this Organization and to jeopardize the principles enshrined in the same Charter which permits the veto.

10. The peoples of the United Nations have already learned the lesson which we, their representatives, must learn and apply to our deliberations and decisions. We should learn that injustice will certainly breed violence. Nothing but the removal of injustice can restore peace and security to the world. We, here in the United Nations, must eliminate the causes of injustice completely and forever. Only in that way shall we eliminate the use of force.

11. But if we should fail in that task, we must not authorize ourselves to ask the peoples of the world to refrain from using the only means left to them to restore their inalienable rights. Indeed, one must distinguish between the just use of force by the oppressed to restore their fundamental rights and the unjustified use of force for the sake of aggression and expansion. Should we fail to meet our obligation as Members of the United Nations, we should not, nevertheless, doubt the legitimacy of armed struggle by the national liberation movements. Rather, we should support their struggle by all means at their disposal to restore their rights.

12. We, the peoples of the United Nations, believe in the principles of our Charter as the only means to provide our world with peace and happiness. The Charter is still a valid instrument to bring to fruition the hopes of mankind. However, by failing to implement the provisions of the Charter, by ignoring the resolutions adopted by this body, and by allowing certain Powers and their shadows to impose their will in opposition to the will of the majority, we certainly have weakened the positive role that the United Nations could play in the troubled world today. Some Members, protected by certain big Powers, choose to ignore Article 25 of the Charter. They feel exempted from respecting United Nations resolutions since the big Powers' protection will prevent the international community from applying the provisions of Article 6 against them.

13. The policies of some of the big Powers permit the continued existence of colonialisms by providing the colonialists, the racists and the aggressors with economic and military aid. Moreover, by providing them with political support within the United Nations, certain big Powers paralyse the effectiveness of the international Organization. In this way, the practices of a few constitute a dangerous threat for all to the existence and worth of our Organization.

14. The problems of peace and security cannot be attributed to any deficiency in our Charter for, on the

contrary, the United Nations Charter is the only instrument which, when effectively implemented, could resolve the conflicts and dilemmas of our world. However, it must be allowed to be applied to all situations, regardless of the weight and prestige of the parties involved and regardless of the Powers behind them. By permitting the unequal application of provisions of the Charter, we are actually condoning and perpetuating world conflict, rather than striving to preserve the principles of justice, equality, peace and freedom.

15. We have been invited to declare our renunciation of the use or the threat of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Although my delegation does not question the good intentions behind this initiative, we doubt that the intended goals could be reached by adopting such a declaration. Although in 1970 we adopted the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], we are still witnessing today the unjustified war in South-East Asia. Although the United Nations recognized in 1967 the principle that the territory of a State cannot be acquired by another State as a result of the threat of force or the use of force, the territories of three Member States are none the less still under Zionist occupation, and Namibia is still illegally occupied by South Africa. This is not to mention the numerous United Nations resolutions which have been conveniently ignored. Indeed, some nations, unwilling to respect their obligations as Members of this Organization, have committed flagrant acts of aggression. Others have attempted to justify aggression. And still others refuse to respect United Nations resolutions. Some, having voted for certain declarations, then try to interpret the provisions thereof to serve their own interests. Of what good, then, can a non-implemented instrument be? Only when the Charter is applied, United Nations resolutions are implemented and Member States respect their obligations—only then will the peoples of the United Nations no longer need declarations prohibiting the use of force.

16. The security of our world depends on a complex network of political, military, economic, social and humanitarian factors which the United Nations should act upon simultaneously if we wish to achieve peace on this planet. If we cannot apply effective measures to ensure the provisions of our Charter, we do not have the authority to ask the oppressed to renounce their just struggle, armed or otherwise.

17. The use or the threat of force may take many forms and so conceal itself under many guises. Thus, as long as our world is built on the basis of the big and the small, the strong and the weak, the implantation of the seeds of war, imperialism, colonialism and injustice, peace and good neighbourliness will not be achieved by mere words or resolutions.

18. My delegation bears in mind that we all should live as good neighbours and renounce the use or threat of force. For it we know that this will come about only when we shall have devoted all our strength to eliminate by all ways and means the evils of imperialism, aggression and colonialism.

19. The peoples of the United Nations have not yet lived in peace, due to the combined forces of the warmongers who

use all their machinery, in all fields, to perpetuate the misery of mankind.

20. Mr. SEN (India): Ever since the United Nations came into existence about 27 years ago—and indeed for many decades before then—we have been discussing the best framework in which international peace and security can be fruitfully pursued and a satisfactory world order achieved. We may never achieve that ideal, and even men with strong faith and long memory need to be reminded from time to time of the great tasks that lie ahead of us, of the purposes and principles of the Charter, to which we have solemnly pledged ourselves, and of the efforts and energy that will be required of us in our slow and painful march for a better and fuller life for all of us.

21. The complaint is frequently heard that much of our debate on the subject before us is repetitive, unrealistic and, cynically, even propagandistic. Yet, the main articles of our united faith can, as always, bear repetition. The realism of international politics and policies changes from time to time, making it necessary for us to review the situation as it is today and obliging us to work out the direction in which we must move. If this is propaganda, so is the daily exhortation about the Sermon on the Mount and many others besides, and no one has doubted the great merit of such repeated reminders of what we are about, and how, why and where we have failed.

22. The greatest and most significant change in the international political scene today is the spirit of détente to which many foreign ministers and others drew our attention in the general debate. From Tokyo, to Peking, to Moscow, to Germany, to Washington and to New York, a relaxation of tension is noticeable. In our part of the world, particularly in the subcontinent, we are striving continually to bring about an atmosphere of conciliation and negotiation in place many years of barren conflict and confrontation. Even in Viet-Nam, years of horrible killing and destruction are expected to end—we hope without further delay. On 3 October 1972, the Foreign Minister of India said in the General Assembly:

“Our purpose in this improving situation will be to ensure that the momentum towards an ever-expanding area of understanding and accommodation is maintained.” [2051st meeting, para. 51.]

In these circumstances, the Soviet proposal to prohibit the use of force in international relations seems to us to be both timely and opportune.

23. But there is much more than correct timing to commend the proposal to this Assembly. The United Nations has, through the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security of 1970 and the resolution on friendly relations of 1971,<sup>1</sup> laid down certain guidelines in elaboration of the purposes and principles of the Charter. These measures will not, however, by themselves bring about any significant changes unless the basic causes of threat to international peace and security are diagnosed and

<sup>1</sup> 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)).

remedies prescribed. In any serious and fruitful discussion of the subject, we shall have to keep three considerations always in mind, because they are really most major considerations.

24. First, we have to recognize that all the principles of the Charter, as also the elaborations of them which the Assembly has given from time to time, will have to be taken together. When there is any conflict between these principles or in their application, as there often is, conscious efforts have to be made to remove these conflicts or contradictions or inconsistencies in such a manner as would enable the United Nations to take action in the light of all available data and all basic considerations. If, instead of taking this approach, the United Nations tends to be selective in the application of its high principles—as has often been the practice in the past, either because the Member States decide arbitrarily on some kind of priority or, more frequently, because they find that the task of resolving the conflict of principles is too arduous or time-consuming—then many of the actions we may take will fail to solve the problems we face.

25. Secondly, for years now we have been struggling for satisfactory and generally acceptable definitions of aggression, force and the like. On our part we should like those definitions to be comprehensive and precise so that all aggressive actions, direct or indirect, can be identified at the earliest possible moment and the various measures available to the international community can be applied in a timely and effective manner.

26. Thirdly, quite clearly the use of force or the threat to use it is directly related to the means available. Any discussion of the non-use of force is, therefore, closely linked to disarmament and indeed it is a facet of the problem of general disarmament under international supervision. Those who do not wish to work for disarmament for whatever reasons cannot obviously be interested in any arrangement which would prohibit the use of force in international relations.

27. The proposal before us deals specifically with the third consideration I have set forth. With a number of agreements, including those relating to nuclear explosions as also to other forms of mass destruction, it becomes all the more necessary that the prohibition on the use of force should not be limited only to nuclear weapons. Such a prohibition must extend to other forms of force; it has to include all weapons of mass destruction and all types of conventional weapons which continue to be more and more sophisticated with each passing day and the use of which may make the restrictions on the use of nuclear weapons more tenuous to maintain. The division between nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction has been blurred and, if we are not to be brought to nuclear brinkmanship every time tension or crisis in international relations develops to a dangerous level, we shall have to ban the use of force altogether.

28. While, as a general principle this proposition may be acceptable to many, if not most delegations, there are certain specific problems and situations where the theory of non-use of force cannot apply. For instance, for areas still under colonial domination, those struggling for liberation and independence cannot be denied the right to use all

means at their disposal, including force, to achieve their objective. This right becomes absolute when the colonial Powers do not or will not allow the application of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter and of the relevant decisions of the Assembly, particularly resolution 1514 (XV), the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

29. Similarly, the right of self-defence cannot be reduced or modified by the principle of non-use of force. That right is both basic and inherent and has been clearly stated in Article 51 of the Charter. I have already referred to the difficulties of defining certain terms of international usage such as aggression of all types; but whenever aggression occurs and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States are threatened in any manner whatever, the States have the unqualified duty and the absolute right to protect themselves.

30. Furthermore, there are specific problems, such as in the case of the Middle East, where the United Nations has rightly denounced the illegal acquisition of territory by the use of force, but has not yet been able to restore territories so acquired to the States to which they belong. Such specific problems have to be excluded from the principles of non-use of force if this Organization of ours is not merely to secure peace but also to serve justice.

31. Apart from these exceptions, we also cannot overlook that in international life today there are certain dangers and dominations which would require relief and redress if we are to achieve full sovereign equality and equal worth and dignity for all States, big or small. *Apartheid*, racial discrimination, intolerable economic exploitation—past, present or future, whether on land, on the sea or even in the air—would require special attention. Besides, we have concluded a number of international conventions, and adopted several important declarations on such vital matters as human rights and genocide, and yet have failed to provide effective machinery for determining when and why they are violated or for providing timely remedies. All those deficiencies will no doubt make for increased tension from time to time, but perhaps not to the extent where it would be permissible for States to remove those tensions and difficulties by the use of force until and unless all other means for correcting specific situations had demonstrably been exhausted. My purpose in raising those problems is simply to indicate that they require much more serious and objective studies than we have given them up to now.

32. Not unnaturally, some of the exceptions I have mentioned and the problems I have briefly raised are not dissimilar to those which we are discussing in the Sixth Committee on the question of terrorism.

33. After indicating some of the limitations and qualifications to which the principle of non-use of force in international relations must necessarily be subjected, at least at present the great importance of the proposal before us is that it develops further the commitments assumed by Member States under the Charter. For the first time, an attempt has been made to bring together the concept of non-use of force with a firm prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons. Such an integrated approach should remove some of the difficulties we have faced in the

problem of disarmament and may contribute to equal security for all countries. This is an objective the non-aligned countries especially have highly valued and it was clearly stated as early as 1964 when they met in Cairo.<sup>2</sup>

34. In presenting these views to the Assembly, the Indian delegation has been greatly influenced by the prevailing climate of understanding, particularly among the great Powers. If the various European treaties already signed are faithfully carried out and if similar developments take place in other parts of the world, especially in Asia, then the ban on the use of force, in spite of all the difficulties, will be a great step forward towards universal peace and towards total disarmament under international supervision. In examining the draft resolution before us [A/L.676] and such other suggestions and modifications as may be forthcoming, my delegation will apply the criteria I have indicated in this statement.

35. Finally it is our conviction that if we, all of us, think like men of action and act like men of thought on this and other related matters, we can achieve much in bringing about the kind of world which I like to think we all desire.

36. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Before this very Assembly, the Prime Minister of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba, Comandante Fidel Castro, stated: "When this philosophy of despoilment disappears, the philosophy of war will have disappeared."<sup>3</sup>

37. In this statement, we find summed up the contemporary problem of war and violence. For indeed, what other origin do international conflicts and tensions and the use of force in relations between States have if not the desire of the powerful to impose their hegemony on the weaker? Whence arises the interest in domination if not from the need, inherent in the imperialist system, to exploit others, to take over their wealth, and, in the end, to despoil them of what is theirs?

38. Throughout the length and breadth of three continents the imperialists for centuries imposed their will, plundered resources, forced on the peoples an unequal relationship based on exploitation by the large monopolies. They disrupted their normal rate of development. Those peoples were plunged into backwardness and subordination. They were bound by the fetters of colonialism and neo-colonialism. The most brutal forms of violence were the very essence of the emergence of contemporary colonialism and capitalism. By fire and sword the most powerful nations of the West ruled over what today is called the third world. By the blood and sweat of our slaves and the proletariat, they amassed the wealth that enabled them to establish their might. From these rotten roots developed a breach between the under-developed countries and the great capitalist countries.

39. In response to this violence, which was imposed upon them historically from abroad, the so-called third world has answered with revolutionary violence and the violence of the

<sup>2</sup> Second Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held in Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964.

<sup>3</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifteenth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 8721st meeting, para. 188.

liberation movements. The peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America have had to engage in and continue to engage in a constant struggle to defend their national rights, win independence and fend off the aggression of the imperialists who would subjugate them.

40. The confrontation between the developing countries and imperialism is one of the principal factors in the building of a genuine and universal structure of peace and international security. As a consequence of this combat, the number and influence of independent peace-loving States have increased. There has been a reduction in the basis of material support for imperialism and thus the possibilities of holding back aggressors and preserving world peace have increased.

41. The process of decolonization, which in not a few instances has led to serious armed conflicts, has brought into the international community new independent States in Africa and Asia which are contributing actively to the cause of peace and true co-operation among peoples. None the less, colonialism is making a futile attempt to remain on the scene of history. It clings with all its might to its last remaining possessions, refuses to abide by the decisions of the international community, and continues to deny to millions of human beings their inalienable right to independence. To preserve its hateful system colonialism has to have recourse to force as the only means within its grasp to put down the desires of the oppressed peoples for freedom. By force it seized the territories upon which it imposed its domination. By force it attempts to keep its grip on those territories.

42. The persistence of the colonial régimes in various parts of the world, including the contemptible variant of *apartheid* not only constitutes a radical denial of the rights of the peoples that are victims of foreign oppression, but is a continuing source of danger to the security of independent States in the neighbouring areas and constantly endangers international peace.

43. It is with this twofold approach that the Assembly should consider the existence at this late stage of the twentieth century of hotbeds of colonialism in Africa and the Caribbean.

44. A prerequisite for the elimination of the policy of force in international relations is beyond question the ending of colonialism and racism in Guinea (Bissau), Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Puerto Rico, Namibia and South Africa.

45. At the end of the Second World War, with the liquidation of fascism, it was believed that we were setting up a new system of relations among nations which would banish armed confrontations from the international scene. The creation of the United Nations and the coming into force of its Charter, it was thought, would constitute solid foundations for that new order. Experience over the years since that time provides examples which are completely contrary to the hopes that were born of the San Francisco Conference.

46. It is true that the world has been able to avoid another global conflagration. It is equally true that since the

explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki the nuclear weapon has not been used directly in war. But universal peace, with security for all peoples, continues to be a remote ideal.

47. The last quarter of a century has passed without the unleashing of the feared world conflict, but throughout this period so-called local conflicts have erupted which on occasion have been outbursts of war which have known no limitation other than geographical.

48. Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism have been the cause of all international conflicts, in particular those unleashed after 1945. Suffice it to repeat that United States imperialism has launched in Viet-Nam a tonnage of explosives three and a half times greater than the total used by the Allies during the Second World War; and that in Indo-China the aggressor armies of the United States have had recourse to methods of war which in their genocidal nature have far surpassed the atrocities of Hitler.

49. Despite the Charter adopted in San Francisco and despite all the principles of international law and the universal protests engendered by its policies, Yankee imperialism has sown death and destruction over thousands of miles of that territory and has converted the peninsula of Indo-China into a laboratory for the testing of the most despicable tools which a prostituted technology has placed in the hands of the war criminals of the Pentagon.

50. If we wish to create conditions that will permit the advent of the world that was proclaimed in the Charter of this Organization, we must most vigorously condemn the continuation of Yankee aggression against Viet-Nam and demand of the United States Government that it put an end to that war immediately.

51. Full recognition of the inalienable right of the people of Viet-Nam to decide their destiny for themselves and the vigorous repudiation of the Yankee intervention are our most decisive and urgent tasks if we wish to foster conditions that will enable us to strengthen international security.

52. My delegation listened with great attention to the statement made on 9 November last by the head of the delegation of Chile [2081st meeting]. We consider that it was an important contribution to this debate. We fully agree with him that the use of force can be undertaken in many ways, not only through armed attack. The peoples of Latin America have experienced in their own flesh how imperialism tends to bring into play a variety of devices to impose its domination and repress any attempt at genuine liberation such as Chile is enjoying today.

53. The use of imperialist force in Latin America has shown many facets: armed aggression, subversion, reactionary plots, diplomatic pressures, slanderous propaganda, pressure, economic and commercial aggression, and even the threat of the use of nuclear weapons. Throughout history imperialism has used these methods, variants of one and the same attitude of imperialist arrogance, in striving to keep our peoples subjected to the exploitation of their monopolies. Cuba wishes to avail itself of this opportunity to restate its total solidarity with the Chilean people and Government in the face of the inadmissible economic

aggression of which it is the victim. In condemning the use of force in international relations, we are also speaking out against actions such as those taken by the Yankee monopoly Braden-Kennecott against the Chilean people, actions which represent flagrant violations of international law and expressions of the imperialist policy of aggression and exploitation.

54. For all these reasons, the importance of the item proposed by the Soviet Union is obvious. We should welcome the fact that the Soviet Government has taken this timely initiative in asking for its inclusion on the agenda of the present session of the General Assembly. We also are grateful to its representative in this Assembly, Comrade Ambassador Yakov Malik, for the clear and precise fashion in which he introduced the item at the beginning of this debate [2078th meeting]. We likewise wish to state for the record that the Cuban delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/L.676.

55. Mr. NUR ELMI (Somalia): The delegation of the Somali Democratic Republic considers the question of the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons as an important matter which deserves our serious consideration. For the first time in history, particularly in the history of the nuclear age, one of the most powerful States in the world has proposed the non-use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of the very weapon in its military arsenal that is the most deadly and destructive of all weapons. That proposal is, we believe, consonant with the demands of the developing and non-aligned States, which for many years have been trying persistently to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons. In 1961 the General Assembly approved the Declaration on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear and Thermo-nuclear Weapons [resolution 1653 (XVI)]; but even though that was a step in the right direction, it did not receive the backing of the majority of nuclear States, for a variety of reasons. An attempt is now being made to try a new approach: to prohibit the use of force—that is, the use of conventional types of weapons—in international relations, with a simultaneous permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons.

56. In the view of my delegation, the consideration of this question by the General Assembly is both timely and reasonable; it is an answer to the processes which are now taking shape in the world, and we believe that the United Nations has to meet the challenge. Substantial experience has already been accumulated through discussions in the United Nations of important problems in the principles dealing with the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security. The proposal put forward by the delegation of the Soviet Union would, in our view, constitute a step towards the consolidation of international peace and the security of States because it is against the use of force, including the use of nuclear weapons, for the purpose of aggression, intimidation and the subjugation of peoples, particularly peoples of small countries that do not possess powerful nuclear weapons for their defence against aggression.

57. We feel that this proposal serves the interests of all States, particularly of those countries which do not have powerful military forces, for it is often against such

countries that acts of aggression are committed through the use of conventional weapons by aggressive States which follow a policy of crude force in international relations.

58. A study of the draft resolution now before us shows that it represents a good basis for preparing an agreed final resolution of the General Assembly on this important question. We have noted the new approach, in operative paragraph 2 of the Soviet draft resolution [A/L.676], concerning the use of the competence and authority of the Security Council under the Charter, which regrettably is being used progressively less and less for strengthening the role and effectiveness of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and security.

59. We have received with satisfaction the USSR delegation's clarification [2078th meeting] that the proposal it has submitted does not affect or deprive the peoples of colonial countries, or other oppressed peoples, of their inalienable right to struggle for their national freedom and independence, using all the means required for that struggle. That right has been recognized and reaffirmed in a number of resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

60. We have also taken note of the explanation by the USSR delegation, and we want to state very clearly here that our understanding is, that the undertakings by States to renounce the use of force against other States do not affect in any way their legitimate right under the Charter to individual and collective self-defence, embodied in Article 51 of the Charter, nor does it affect the right of a State which is a victim of aggression to struggle to eliminate the consequences of that aggression.

61. In conclusion, the delegation of the Somali Democratic Republic, while it finds the draft resolution acceptable in principle, is ready to consider any amendment to it or any other draft resolution which takes into consideration the purposes of the USSR proposal.

62. Mr. MAKKAWI (Lebanon): My delegation notes with satisfaction the introduction by the Soviet Union of this item, and welcomes this opportunity to state its position on this important question.

63. The history of mankind has always been a struggle between the forces of war and conflict and the forces of peace. The elimination of force and conflicts among nations and the establishment of a genuine peace based on freedom and justice have always been the sincere desire of honest and honourable men everywhere. The creation of the United Nations out of the shambles of the Second World War and the lessons drawn from the failure of the League of Nations is clear proof of the wish of the majority of people in the world for peace.

64. Lebanon, a founding Member of the United Nations and a small peace-loving country has always upheld the goals and principles of the United Nations and respected its decisions. We, like many other small and medium-sized nations, have everything to gain from the renunciation by States of the use of force in international relations. The huge sums of money spent every year by these countries on armaments, which after a short period of time become

obsolete, could be spent on development projects which are badly needed. We firmly believe that development and the consequent raising of the standard of living of people constitute one of the basic elements of achieving and strengthening peace in the world.

65. The authors of the Charter, mindful of the mistakes and weaknesses of the League of Nations, and in order "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war", built into the Charter a system to prevent the use of force in international relations and to ensure the settlement of disputes among nations by peaceful means. Article 1 of the Charter states that one of the purposes of the United Nations is:

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

66. Article 2, paragraph 4, asks Members to undertake for specific obligations. It states that:

"All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

67. Furthermore, Chapter VI lays down the rules and procedures for the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. Similarly, Chapter VII enumerates the actions that the Security Council may take with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression. Specifically, Article 43 makes it possible for the Security Council to have at its disposal, in accordance with a special agreement or agreements with Members of the United Nations, armed forces for the purpose of maintaining peace in the world.

68. In the field of disarmament, Article 11 of the Charter states that the General Assembly may, among other things,

"... consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments ...".

69. It is clear from reading the Articles of the Charter that our Organization was entrusted primarily with the task of maintaining peace and security in the world, and for that reason was empowered by the Charter to prevent the use of or recourse to force. The Security Council in particular was envisaged as the primary organ for maintaining the peace. However, differences of ideologies and national interest among the permanent members of the Security Council made it difficult for the Council in the early days to perform its functions. Today, these differences, though somewhat less acute, still hinder the Council in arriving at concrete results and in enforcing its decisions.

70. Instead of living up to their legal and moral engagements and assuming their obligations in accordance with the Charter, certain countries embarked in the post-war era on waging wars and subjugating other peoples, in pursuit of their national interest. A senseless war is still being waged in Indo-China; peoples in Africa that are struggling for self-determination and freedom are being subjected to all kinds of wars and intimidation.

71. In our part of the world, the Middle East, the State of Israel, which owes its existence to the United Nations and which, more than any other Member, should respect its obligations under the Charter, has continuously ignored and flouted the decisions of the United Nations. In addition to expelling the Palestinian people from their indigenous and ancestral homes and forcing them to live as refugees for the last 25 years, Israel continues to wage wars of aggression against Arab countries.

72. The war of 1967 culminated in the occupation by Israel of certain territories belonging to three Member States of the United Nations. In defiance of the Charter and of all the resolutions on the matter adopted by our Organization, Israel continues today to deny to the people of Palestine their right to return to their homeland and it persists in consolidating its occupation of the Arab territories conquered in the war of 1967. Recently, it has embarked on a new policy of attacking without any provocation Arab countries, including my own, where Palestinian refugees live, thus inflicting heavy casualties on civilian populations. All these acts are being committed by Israel while the world is watching in silence.

73. The elimination of the use of force in international relations calls in the first place, as was stated by the representative of Yugoslavia [2080th meeting], for the removal of its causes. Among its first causes, in our belief, is armament, both conventional and nuclear. Lebanon, with other non-aligned countries, has always advocated the banning of nuclear weapons and of the production, stockpiling and testing of these weapons. As a matter of fact, the overwhelming majority of the States of the world are in favour of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. It is up to the big Powers, and in particular those that have mastered the technical know-how in this field, to arrive at concrete results, to ban the use of all forms of nuclear weapons. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, [resolution 2373 (XXII)], though it has some loopholes, is considered a step forward to disarmament, but this Treaty still does not command universal adherence.

74. However, my delegation notes with great satisfaction the atmosphere of détente and relaxation which has been created in several parts of the world. We note, in particular, the signing of the agreement on strategic arms limitation between the United States and the Soviet Union;<sup>4</sup> the normalization of relations and the signing of treaties between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic of Germany<sup>5</sup> and between Poland and the Federal Republic of

<sup>4</sup> Interim Agreement on Certain Measures with Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed in Moscow on 26 May 1972.

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

Germany;<sup>6</sup> and also the normalization of relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Reference should be made also to the preparations for the European conference on security and co-operation. Similarly, the conflict in Indo-China seems to be drawing to an end.

75. The only hotbed of tensions which still remains and which endangers international peace is the conflict in the Middle East, where Israel has persistently resorted to the use of force and obstructed all avenues to a just and lasting peace.

76. Parallel to this atmosphere of détente and positive developments, the United Nations has not failed to make a further contribution to strengthening the concept of international security and the non-use of force in international relations. During its twenty first session, when examining the problem of the strict observance of the prohibition of recourse to the threat of force or the use of force in international relations, as well as the strict observance of the right of peoples to self determination, the General Assembly adopted resolution 2160 (XXI), which explicitly reaffirmed the obligation of States

“... strictly [to] observe, in their international relations, the prohibition of the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.”

The resolution also states:

“... armed attack by one State against another or the use of force in any form contrary to the Charter of the United Nations constitutes a violation of international law giving rise to international responsibility.”

77. Furthermore, the principle embodied in the Charter concerning the prohibition of the use of force has also been reaffirmed and strengthened in the three historical declarations adopted in 1970 by the United Nations on the occasion of its twenty-fifth anniversary. Paragraph 3 of the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations reaffirmed the obligation of States to “refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force” [*resolution 2627 (XXV)*]. This same principle was also reaffirmed in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security and in the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

78. As has been stated above, those who wrote our Charter gave primary importance within our Organization to the question of the non-use of force in the general context of preserving international peace. The United Nations as a living organ has added over the past 25 years a wealth of jurisprudence to strengthen the concept of peace. The record of the United Nations in peace-keeping operations is not all black: the United Nations has played in certain cases and with success a positive role in maintaining

peace in many troubled areas of the world. Its role in this domain would have grown bigger and would have become more effective if it had not been hindered by the differences that arose between the permanent members of the Security Council on the nature and scope of peace-keeping operations. The result of these differences was the weakening of the role of the United Nations, and in particular of the Security Council, which should be allowed once more to play an effective role in maintaining peace and security in the world.

79. The small nations rely basically for the protection of their territorial integrity and political independence on the United Nations, as stated in Article 1 of the Charter, where the Organization has taken upon itself the duty “to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace”. The principle of the non-use of force as stated in the Charter is compatible with Article 51 of the Charter, which gives each State the inherent right, individually or collectively, to defend itself against aggression. This principle is, in our view, of paramount importance and should be reaffirmed by the world community so long as there are still peoples which are subjugated by colonialism, oppression and occupation and are denied the right of self-determination. This principle is essential to liberate oneself from these evils.

80. In the light of those explanations my delegation cannot but welcome any call from any source for the non-use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. We are confident that such a call expresses the wish and the desire of most nations in the world. The essential thing is for Member States to observe strictly and genuinely their obligations under the Charter. This item, because of its paramount importance, deserves a thorough examination and a wider participation by Members of this august body in the debate on it. We hope that constructive suggestions will ensure such a course and ultimately will enable us to adopt a resolution commanding the support of the overwhelming majority of the Members.

81. Mr. KAMIL (Indonesia): The members of the international community are formally dedicated and legally bound to the principle of the non-use of force in international relations. This principle is enshrined in the Charter to which they have subscribed and which they are obliged to implement in good faith. In the preamble to the Charter Member States, identified therein as peace-loving States, pledge “to practice tolerance and live together in peace”, to ensure “that armed force shall not be used” and “to employ international machinery for the promotion” of the well-being of mankind.

82. Article 2 of the Charter states that Member nations “shall settle their . . . disputes by peaceful means” and that they shall refrain “from the threat or use of force against . . . any State” in any “manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations”.

83. But, notwithstanding the noble ideals and aspirations of the founding fathers of the United Nations that this body would become an instrument “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war”, and notwithstanding the lofty principles enshrined in the Charter with this aim

<sup>6</sup> Treaty on Normalization of Relations, signed in Warsaw on 7 December 1970.



in view, the years since the Second World War have seen no peace in various parts of this world. Be it in Europe, in America, in Asia or in Africa, armed force has remained an instrument of foreign policy.

84. In Africa brutal armed force has been and continues to be used to perpetuate the subjugation and domination of peoples and to suppress their right to freedom and independence.

85. In the Middle East the protracted illegal occupation of Arab lands exploded into the war of June 1967. There armed force in its most naked form is still being employed to perpetuate the occupation of those lands and the eviction of Palestinians from their homes and properties. The representative of Egypt has eloquently described the situation in these words:

“Contemporary man’s highest achievements in the service of peace and justice, the Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 are pushed aside and ignored. They had to make way for the arrogance of power to rule supreme in the Middle East. Thus, force is used to prevent peace.” [2080th meeting, para. 34.]

86. Closer to my country, Indonesia, in South-East Asia, notwithstanding fervent hopes and contentions that peace is at hand, the war in Indo-China, which has been raging for more than a generation, continues to cause untold destruction and misery.

87. A cursory analysis of the use of force in the past quarter of a century leads us to these observations. First, in almost all cases it is the territory of developing nations which has become the arena for the use of armed force. Secondly, though occurring on the territory of developing nations, many of these wars have not been wars of their own making but wars fought directly or by proxy by and in the interest of outside powers. Thirdly, the United Nations has not in all cases been successful in extinguishing the fires of war or in bringing peace. In the case of the conflict in Indo-China the United Nations had proved totally powerless. In the Middle East Israel is able to strengthen its grip on occupied Arab territory in violation of all United Nations resolutions.

88. In the face of all this turmoil, man has not stood idle, but has pursued his quest for peace and the establishment of a saner world. Man’s struggle to eliminate the use of weapons of destruction for the furtherance of national interest has also been manifest in a number of decisions taken in various international conferences.

89. The Asian and African leaders, meeting at the Asian-African Conference held at Bandung in April 1955, formulated the ten principles on world peace and co-operation, now generally known as the Bandung principles. In announcing the ten principles the leaders of Asia and Africa then stated: “Free from mistrust and fear, and with confidence and good will towards each other, nations should practise tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours and develop friendly co-operation on the basis of the . . . principles”.

90. The Bandung Declaration resolutely rejects the use of force in international politics, as can be noted from the following relevant principles:

(a) Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country;

(b) Abstention by any country from exerting pressures on other countries;

(c) Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against any country; and

(d) Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means.

91. Six years after the Bandung Conference the non-aligned countries met at the First Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries in Belgrade against the backdrop of nuclear explosions and the intensification of the cold war. In rejecting the policy of war and the use of force the non-aligned chiefs of State and heads of Government affirmed their unswerving faith that the international community “is able to organize its life without resorting to means which actually belong to a past epoch of human history”.

92. Later, at the Second Conference in Cairo, the non-aligned movement called upon the world to abstain from all use or threats of force and asked that all international conflicts be settled by peaceful means, in a spirit of mutual understanding and on the basis of equality and sovereignty.

93. In the United Nations, urged by the non-aligned Member States together with like-minded States from America and Europe, the General Assembly during the past several years has adopted a series of declarations and resolutions meant to amplify those provisions of the Charter which concern the rejection of force, peaceful coexistence and the promotion of friendly relations. Those are, among others, the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United Nations. Furthermore, there is resolution 2160 (XXI) which reminds us in clear and unambiguous words that it is incumbent upon all States to observe strictly the prohibition on resorting to the threat or use of force in international relations.

94. Our Organization has also adopted several resolutions relating to nuclear weapons, their testing, emplacement and dissemination. We may thus observe that, while wars and the threats of war go on in many parts of the world, strenuous and resolute efforts have been made within the walls of the United Nations to promote the principles and aims of disarmament and to make obsolete the use of force.

95. My delegation believes not only that it is urgent to undertake measures leading towards the prohibition of the use of force and the accompanying sanctions to enforce this prohibition but also that the time is propitious for taking those steps. The recognition of the futility of the arms race between the major Powers and the huge expenses involved in that unending race have ushered in an era of negotiation

meant to preserve their own mutual self-interest. It is hoped that the prevailing atmosphere of détente, originally limited to the continent of Europe, will gradually extend to other areas of the world as well. Agreements on Berlin and Germany and the recent accords on the limitation of strategic arms give further evidence of the desire of the two principal major Powers to blunt the sharp edges of the areas of confrontation and reduce the possibility of a major armed conflict.

96. It is in this light of a general trend towards lessening the emphasis on the solution of conflicts and disputes by means of force that my delegation views the initiative of the Soviet Union on the issue now before us. In addressing itself to the issue of force my delegation believes that it is not appropriate to limit the meaning of force to its military sense alone. The experience of the small and developing nations has shown that it is not only military force, including military intervention, that can be exercised upon them to make them acquiesce in the will of bigger and mightier forces. Indeed, force can assume many other forms and guises, and some of them can be as vicious. And it should be remembered that a reduction in the use of military force might well cause an escalation in the employment of other types and forms of force as a means to impose the will of the stronger on the weaker.

97. For example, the use of economic measures for political motives, such as the manipulation of prices and stringent limitation and sudden refusal of the purchase of commodities, can be very harmful to a developing nation which has to depend on ready and steady markets for such commodities for its very survival. If exercised deliberately it may well cause the collapse of a country's economy and its legitimate government and system.

98. Another area in which the indirect use of force can be exercised is in the field of subversion. The supplying of financial backing, weapons and propaganda from abroad to foment internal dissension and conflict falls in this category. This is common knowledge in developing countries and has been a bitter experience for many of them. It is a present-day phenomenon evident in many places.

99. Therefore the use of coercion, through either economic means or subversion, should equally be prohibited and renounced if the security of nations is to be assured. The non-use of force, especially nuclear force, is to a large extent of primary concern as regards the security of major and nuclear Powers. For the developing countries, however, their security is no less endangered by economic and subversive pressures. Thus, to make sense and to protect all nations alike, the prohibition of force should apply to force in all its forms and manifestations.

100. It is obvious that the renunciation of the use of force should not in any way impair the inherent right of peoples to defend themselves, either individually or collectively. This right of self-defence is recognized and provided for in the Charter. Such a renunciation should also not restrict the right of colonial peoples to use all means to assert their right to independence. That right has also been recognized in various resolutions of the General Assembly since its adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in resolution

1514 (XV). As a matter of fact, the history of decolonization has shown that in several cases it has been by the use of all means at their disposal, such as in the cases of Indonesia and Algeria, that many peoples have regained their God-given right to freedom.

101. Having expressed our views regarding the necessity and wisdom of adopting a resolution on the issue before us, my delegation recognizes that such a resolution would constitute only one necessary step forward to a further improvement of the system for the peaceful settlement of disputes as laid down in the Charter. Left to itself, such a resolution will be little more than pious words and noble exhortations, the fate of many other resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

102. Of more importance are the essential steps that must follow to ensure the effective observance by all nations of their commitment to renounce the use of force in all its forms and guises. Some of the concrete steps my delegation regards as necessary are based on the following considerations. First, there is an urgent need for improving and tightening the legal binding force of provisions relating to the prohibition of force in international relations. Secondly, enforcement action must be made possible against any violation or non-observance of the prohibition of the use of force. Toward that end, the solution of the problem of peace-keeping operations should not be delayed. Thirdly, resolute steps should be taken and continuous progress should be made in disarmament negotiations.

103. In considering the Soviet draft resolution now before us and eventual amendments or other draft resolutions, my delegation's judgement will be arrived at in the light of the various points I have just raised—namely, that the prohibition of force should include all forms and kinds of force, and that effective measures will have to be worked out to give teeth to any resolution on the non-use of force.

104. Mr. BISHARA (Kuwait): We are grateful to the Soviet Union for proposing the inclusion of the present item on the agenda of this session of the General Assembly. The proposal of the Soviet Union is wide in scope and has a close bearing on items listed on the agenda of the First Committee such as disarmament and the strengthening of international security. It even has some relation to the work of many other bodies. This should not cause any surprise, since force is at the root of most international problems. In fact, force is synonymous with evil.

105. The Charter of the United Nations was rightly not content with prohibiting war; it also prohibited the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. The framers of the Charter, who benefited from past experience, selected a comprehensive wording which would prohibit the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

106. If force is still being used on a large scale in the world today, it is not on account of any omission in the Charter but rather because some States refuse to abide by the rule of law and deliberately violate the provisions of the most solemn of all international agreements.

107. My country is located in a region which has been deprived of peace and tranquillity for almost two decades. After being subjected to Western colonialism, which in itself is a manifestation of the application of force for the subjugation of people and denial of their right to self-determination, our region has become the scene of a new type of aggression which is even more serious in its dimensions and effects than the classic type of colonialism.

108. Brute force was used in Palestine to uproot the indigenous Arab population from their homeland and to deprive them of their land and property. The Israelis perpetrated this ugly crime on the sole ground that might is right and that homelessness and the wilderness should be the lot of the defenceless. The Israelis erected barbed wire to prevent the legitimate owners of the land from returning to their homes. The dispossessed Arab refugee would look across the barbed wire to gaze at his house and farm, now occupied by newcomers who have squatted there and keep possession at the point of a bayonet. This is the most glaring example of the use of force and its deification not merely as an instrument of conquest but also as an instrument for denying people their most basic human rights.

109. Twenty years later, Israel used its military armour to occupy large parts of the territories of three neighbouring Arab countries. Thus force was not only the barrier which prevented the Arab refugee from regaining his home but also became the fiendish machine which deterred Arab Governments from regaining their occupied territories.

110. In Viet-Nam, the most devastating type of aerial bombardment is being used 24 hours a day to break the will of the Viet-Nameese people. The ostensible purpose of the bombing, we are told, is to expedite the peace negotiations in Paris and to improve the chances of reaching a settlement. While duress vitiates consent in the law of contracts, coercion is advocated as the most potent means of imposing a settlement at the international level. In territories still pining under the colonial yoke, force is still being used to retard the hour of liberation and to reverse the course of history. In South Africa and Namibia, force is the means of treating man as a beast of burden and making him an outcast in his own country.

111. This is, indeed, a very gloomy picture. But we are in no sense prophets of gloom and doom. Though desperate diseases require desperate remedies, the international community still has the power to mete out justice and to redress wrongs.

112. The malaise is rooted in the apathy of the United Nations and its failure to take effective action. However, the will of the United Nations and its capacity to act are determined by the conduct of its Members, who either endow it with the capacity to uphold the Charter and enforce the rule of law or deprive it of all efficacy and stultify its power to act.

113. Many of the previous speakers have dwelt at length on the détente which now prevails in the relations among the big Powers and the bright prospects for further improvement in the international situation. Although we welcome all visible signs of relaxation of international

tension we should beware, lest the rapprochement among the big Powers should lead to the creation of spheres of influence or the imposition of constraints on the small countries.

114. The non-use of force does not necessarily imply the absence of force. While the recent strategic arms limitation agreements imposed a quantitative ceiling on the production of nuclear weapons, they left the two super-Powers full freedom to improve the weapons allowed within that ceiling and to perfect the quality of those weapons.

115. The partial test-ban Treaty<sup>7</sup> did not impose any restrictions on the conducting of underground nuclear tests. Moreover, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons did not abolish the nuclear club, but closed the door to new applicants. Even those moderate aims of the Treaty were thwarted by the reluctance of many countries with nuclear potential to become parties to it. Hence the whole pattern of past partial disarmament measures has been not the elimination of nuclear arms, but their being made the exclusive preserve of a select few.

116. Conventional weapons are now so sophisticated that their power of destruction cannot be ignored simply because they do not threaten the world with a holocaust. Besides, most of the persistent evils on the international scene are the outcome of conventional methods of warfare, which have proved to be effective in enslaving nations and depriving them of their natural rights.

117. It has been the practice in the United Nations for some time to elaborate some provisions of the Charter in the form of declarations and solemnly worded resolutions. Although this is a laudatory practice, we must not be oblivious to the fact that a treaty is still the most effective means of contracting mutual obligations of a legally binding character. The Charter has the additional element of having precedence over any other international instrument, since it is clearly provided that in the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

118. According to the Charter, the Members of the United Nations conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agreed that, in carrying out its duties under this responsibility, the Security Council would act on their behalf. The Charter also provided that in discharging those duties the Security Council would act in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The rhetorical question is whether the Security Council has been allowed to prove its loyalty to the lofty principles and aims of the Charter. We are all aware that the absence of agreement among the permanent members paralysed the Security Council and prevented it from exercising a constructive influence on the course of international events. It is no secret that many States violate the Charter with impunity, knowing perfectly well that they will find an accomplice and ally within the ranks of some of the permanent members.

<sup>7</sup> Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water, signed in Moscow on 5 August 1963.

119. The starting-point of all our efforts to prevent the use of force in international relations should be the rehabilitation of the authority of the Security Council and the implementation of its resolutions and those of the General Assembly. If the big Powers are really serious about creating a new healthy international climate, they must start by reforming their own conduct. There is always a small area in which all good deeds begin, and that is within ourselves. The Security Council should hold periodic meetings to follow up its own resolutions and take the necessary measures for putting them into practice.

120. The Charter definitely places many means at the disposal of the Security Council. The Council may apply a wide variety of measures, including complete or partial interruption of economic relations and rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. Should these prove to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

121. Had such action been taken, would the Arab people of Palestine have remained homeless for 25 years or the territories of Arab countries have languished under Israeli occupation for the past five years? Could the Republic of South Africa have dared to challenge the authority of the United Nations in Namibia or impose its detested *apartheid* practices on the defenceless indigenous African people in southern Africa? Would Portugal still be capable of imposing its odious colonial yoke on the Territories under its administration?

122. Article 2 of the Charter lays down one of the basic principles of the United Nations.

123. The Covenant of the League of Nations obligated its Members to respect and to preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all Members, and placed on them the further obligation "not to resort to war" under specified conditions.

124. At the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, held in Washington in 1944, the conferees agreed to include in the Charter the obligation of Members to refrain from the use or threat of force in their international relations in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of the Organization. This phraseology was intended to achieve maximum commitment of Members.

125. Efforts made in the days of the League to prevent aggression were not successful. Little has changed since then. The Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression is still facing major difficulties in its attempts to define aggression.

126. It is significant to note that Article 2 of the Charter is not limited to prohibiting the actual use of force; the threat of its use is also prohibited. The Charter, however,

explicitly permits the use of force in the exercise of the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations. One problem, however, remains: that countries which are the victims of aggression are frequently not able to repel the aggressor. The misuse of the veto in the Security Council has prevented the United Nations from deterring aggression or eliminating the consequences of aggression.

127. The Soviet proposal is timely because it brings into sharp focus the shortcomings of the United Nations and the dilapidated fabric of the whole system of international security. The Soviet proposal cannot be examined in isolation. This question must be studied against the background of the work of the United Nations, especially in such vital fields as disarmament and the maintenance of international peace and security.

128. A promising sign in the field of disarmament is the proposal to hold a world disarmament conference which might rescue the question of complete and general disarmament from the impasse it has been afflicted with for many years. In the work of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the views of the advanced military Powers had prominence. The small and medium-sized countries were never able to exercise a decisive influence over the deliberations or procedures of that body. The world disarmament conference would serve as a proper forum for the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which is an ideal cherished by all mankind.

129. The proposal of the Soviet Union regarding the non-use of force should encompass the past and not be merely addressed to the future. Naturally, we wholeheartedly support the call for a solemn declaration by States Members of the United Nations that they would renounce all threat of force in international relations. We would have liked the Soviet draft, however, to refer explicitly to illegal occupation and related situations resulting from aggression and the use of force against the territorial integrity and independence of States in the past. We would have liked the Soviet draft resolution to reaffirm the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force and the need to eliminate the consequences of aggression.

130. We would also have welcomed a solemn undertaking by the permanent members of the Security Council to uphold the provisions of the Charter and to refrain in future from abusing their veto power. We would also have welcomed a statement by the five permanent members that they would take immediate action to implement previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council relating to international peace and security and the inalienable rights of peoples.

131. At present, there is no guarantee that all the permanent members of the Security Council will allow the Council to take an appropriate decision under which the declaration to be adopted by the General Assembly on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons will acquire binding force under Article 25 of the United Nations Charter.

132. My delegation, however, supports the general features of the Soviet draft as being a modest step in the right direction. We have indicated the comprehensive measures which should have been taken in this context. We realize, however, that we frequently must be content with partial measures, especially if they contain a promise of better things to come.

133. I should like to conclude by quoting Sir Robert Peel, when he said: "You can move back or you can move on, but you cannot stand still." Let us move forward to an era in which the non-use of force is adhered to not in words, but in deeds.

*The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.*