

Updating the UNO

1- Shortcomings of the institution

In private conversations, when you speak of the UNO, someone intervenes to ask whether it still exists. In fact nowadays there is not much mention of the institution in the press in contrast with the situation as it prevailed some 20 or 30 years ago. Even the UNO Day passes unnoticed, with hardly some talks without conviction in schools and colleges. Why and how did we reach this stage? The simple answer is that the action of the ONU is more and more rare and insignificant.

In the socio-economic front, action has been continuously disappointing. It is true that some countries have registered phenomenal progress, but that happened without the help of the UNO. The downtrodden people of poor countries are soaked in misery, are deprived of drinking water and elementary medical care; they even die of starvation. Inequality between men is growing more and more. It is estimated that 1% of the world population owns 40% of the total wealth and that half of the world population has access only to 1% of the global wealth. The help afforded by UNO is utterly insufficient; even that much is ill conceived and proves often inefficient.

Vital concerns of poor countries, like financial aid, rate of interest, variations of exchange rates, growing State debt are no longer discussed within the precincts of the UNO as it was the practice in the years 1970. Rich countries prefer to negotiate directly with countries in need of help in order to get diplomatic mileage.

In the field of peace and world security, in the course of these 65 years of existence of UNO, there have been approximately 400 wars, small or big. The ill effects of the first war, that of Korea are still manifest. The wounds of the last war, that of Iraq, are still to heal. This war is the one which shook deeply the confidence on UNO. So the main sequence of facts deserves to be recalled. That country was the object of envy for its vast resources in petroleum. It is true that it was governed by a dictator; he was not the only one in the world, but he emboldened to challenge the United States. The latter decided to invade the country. For that purpose it would have liked to get the assent of UNO, however it proclaimed that, assent or not, it would occupy the country. It went a step further and declared that if the UNO did not permit the occupation it would meet the same fate as the League of Nations. The UNO did not yield to such an imprecation. The United States, blinded by its formidable military power, occupied all alone Iraq in March 2003. The General Secretary of the UNO made a appeal to put an end to the occupation and to restore the sovereignty of that country. Then the idea was mooted to send a UNO contingent to supervise the occupation. The United States accepted on condition that it was done under its control. With the help of high diplomatic activity it secured on the 16th October of the same year the ex post facto approval of its occupation by the Security Council and the installation of an international force under its command.

In other words the United States committed a grave act of aggression on IRAQ much against the opinion of the UNO and by a diplomatic trick-riding managed to obtain a mission by it. The whole episode shows the extent to which the UNO was flouted with impunity. During this whole sequence of facts the world press used to speak of "the UNO and USA" as

if the USA was not part of the UNO. The press did not care for legal nuances and reported the reality as it appeared viz that the USA got out of the UNO for the purpose.

On the other side, till the collapse of the Soviet regime the Security Council was paralysed by the bipolarity of the world, now it is manipulated by the all mighty USA. At any rate, past experience shows abundantly that leading members of the UNO did not act in accordance with the lofty ideals of the institution; they rather made use of the UNO to promote their own interest. That is quite natural on account of the unfettered egoism of nations. When the UNO is not apt to promote their interest they think of some other groups.

The marginalisation of the UNO is evident with the emergence of more and more parallel international bodies like the NATO, the G8, the G20, the BRIC, the Atomic powers association, the Economic community of Western Africa States etc...

A continuous decline of the UNO is thus evident, however there is a universal desire to procure vigour and efficiency to it. The necessity therefore arises to scan the international institutions to detect what deserves change. This should not lead to a face lifting exercise which would not yield any lasting result but to an in-depth reform of the important organs of the UNO, namely the General Assembly and the Security Council

B- General Assembly

Circumstances of creation

The UNO charter is not the outcome of a common deliberation of all nations of the world. It is essentially the making of nations which emerged victorious in the Second World War. They give it the name of United Nations, a denomination apparently imitated from United States which is itself inspired by the United Kingdom. Those nations shaped the new world body according to their own vision of the future of the world and also in conformity to their own interest. The defeated Axis powers which were of more or less of equal importance were not included in the new body. The founding nations thought that those powers were the only threat for peace in all times to come.

The essential provisions of the Charter were conceived by a conclave consisting of the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom to which China and France were admitted thereafter. These Five Big as they called themselves had their plan endorsed by other nations which they invited to join the new world body. These nations did not make any substantial contribution to the content of the Charter; they adopted without discussion the views of the victorious nations. It is under these circumstances that the Five Big granted to themselves exorbitant privileges like the status of permanent members of the Security Council and the right of veto. The UNO was therefore born when the world was still under the shock of a war of an unprecedented gravity the end of which had the prestige of a miracle. It was not moulded in a calm atmosphere with an aim of incorporating the entire world with its diversity of all sorts into a harmonious body able to meet all contingencies susceptible of cropping up.

2- Constitution and working of the Assembly

51 countries have adopted the Charter at the time of its inception and are considered as founding members without any special rights. The door was kept open to other nations to adhere to the world body provided they accepted the obligations arising from the Charter and were considered apt to fulfil those obligations and inclined to do so. In reality the act of

admission of new members to the world body has been a matter of routine. It is provided in the Charter that members who violate deliberately the principles of the Charter could be expelled from the world body by a vote of the General Assembly upon a recommendation of the Security Council. This never occurred even though occasions did arise.

The UNO has now 192 members which represent an increase of 300%. The clothing tailored for 51 countries is longer suitable. The most striking feature of the new assembly is the presence of a large number of tiny States. 41% of members have less than 5 million inhabitants, 20% less than 2 million and 16% less than half a million.

As per article 18 of the Charter each member state whatever its importance has one vote in the assembly. This principle was adopted in an impulse of generosity. Further at that time out of 51 prospective members only one, namely Luxemburg, was a tiny state with 500 thousand inhabitants; all the others had more than 3 millions. With such a composition of the Assembly the principle of one vote was acceptable. Now there are about 50 tiny States whose votes can be easily purchased by the mighty powers, twisting thus the result of the consultation which is deemed to reflect the world public opinion. Therefore the principle of one vote per State whatever its importance raises problems and requires a second look.

3- Possibility of reform

The founding fathers of the world body desired that small States do not feel neglected. Of course they should have their place in the world body to make their opinion known but the question is to what extent they should weigh in the decision making. It is worth noting that the principle of equality embodied in article 2 was not followed in the Charter itself which provided a special status for the Five Big. Further the Charter has taken care to affirm in the preamble that it was made in the name of the peoples composing the nations. This indicates that one should take into account of the population and not only the juridical body which represent it. On account of the manipulation of tiny States by mighty powers the principle of equal representation is undermining the institution which it is meant to serve.

Moreover at present the voice of China with 1300 million inhabitants has the same value as the voice of the State of Tuvalu with 12 thousand inhabitants. This is against nature and cannot be allowed to last. It weakens considerably the value of the vote of the Assembly. In an association in which there is enormous inequality between members such inequality has to be taken into account for the association to work smoothly. Therefore it becomes obvious that the principle of equality of voting power which was acceptable at the time of inception in 1945 is no longer tenable with the new composition of the world body. It is necessary to depart from that principle and the same has to be accomplished at the earliest if UNO is to be saved.

4- Possible solution

Can we think of a system of a representation proportionate to the population instead? Then we will fall in another trap. China with its 1300 million inhabitants will corner for itself one fifth of the votes. Such an arrangement would reduce to silence small States and would be contrary to the spirit of the Charter. In a unequal society absolute equality as well as the rigorous proportionality would lead to incongruous results. We have to combine both in a judicious manner and adopt a system of temperate proportion.

For instance one may contemplate a system like the following one:

One vote for each State

An additional vote for each 10 million up to 100 million

An additional vote for each 20 million from 100 to 500 million

An additional vote for each 50 million above 500 million.

What would be the result of such a system for the Five Big?

France with 65 millions will have $1+6=7$ votes

United Kingdom with 62 millions will have $1+6=7$ votes

Russia with 141 millions will have $1+10+2=13$ votes

United States with 300 millions will have $1+10+10=21$ votes

China with 1368 millions will have $1+10+20+17=48$ votes.

At the first sight the share of China may appear enormous. But if strict proportionality was followed it will have 130,000 votes as against 1 for Tuvalu.

C- Security Council

Composition and mode of functioning

Among the shortcomings of the UNO the most striking ones are those relating to the maintenance of peace. So there is no wonder that there is a unanimous urge to reform the Security Council in order to give it representativeness and efficiency. Even inside the UNO establishment there are committees endeavouring to elaborate a new formula. In order to reach a proper solution it is necessary to diagnose exactly the nature of the ailment.

In the beginning the Security Council consisted of five permanent members and six elected members. The last figure was raised to ten in 1965. Out of the world population of 6790 million, 1946 million are found in the countries of the five permanent members, which works out as one seat for 389 millions. For the rest of the world population viz 4844 million there are ten seats which works out as one seat for 484 million, which disclose a noticeable disparity in representation between permanent members and the others which has no justification of any kind.

In the geographical distribution of those ten seats the disparity is still more glaring. As per a resolution of the General Assembly of 1991 those ten seats are distributed as follows: five for Asia and Africa, two for Latin America, one for Eastern Europe, two for the Western Europe and others. One fails to understand why Asia and Africa are clubbed whereas Europe is divided into two. Those two continents do not have identical problems nor the same perception of world affairs. Further Asia and Africa less china have 3740 million and are allotted only five seats whereas the other five seats are allotted to the rest of the world, less the permanent members, which has only 1100 million inhabitants. The rate of representation of Asia and Africa is less than one third of that of other countries. So the inequality of allotment of seats is blatant and without any manner of justification. That affects necessarily the weight of the decisions of the Council and deserves immediate correction.

2- Permanent members

Another question which arises now is the legitimacy of the permanency of tenure. The permanent members as mentioned in the Charter are the United States, China, the Soviet Union, France and the United Kingdom. At the time of conferment of the status of permanent members, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union had each a vast

empire and deserved thus the rank of big powers. Those empires got dismantled which fact has generated a great number of independent States which have become members of the UNO in their own right. So the status of permanent members which was based on the important number of inhabitants then represented by those three countries finds itself now without justification. The cause having ceased to exist the effect should follow.

As far as China is concerned it has disappeared from the international horizon for a number of years and its seat was occupied by its shadow (Taiwan) and was then given back to continental China. By such an eclipse China lost the status of permanent member. By its very nature, permanency has necessarily to be continuous; it cannot be recovered once it has ceased.

The United States has more than once deliberately refused to pay its contribution to the UNO and has from that act of its own withdrawn temporarily from the world body and had lost thus its permanent status.

It is seen that in one way or the other the Five Big have lost their status of permanent member. The continuance of the enjoyment of such a status is not legal. On the other side the very concept of permanent member is a challenge to history because no one knows what will happen to a nation which is a living entity. It is therefore in the fitness of things to do away with the category of permanent members altogether. That is necessary more especially as those members vindicate privileges not provided in the Charter. For instance they claim they need atomic weapons to perform their duty as guardians of peace. more especially as

3- Veto power

The Big Five having lost their status of permanent members, the veto power which was linked to that status has also disappeared in law. Even otherwise it has no justification. To better appreciate the value of this right let us have a peep into the genesis of the right. The Five Big were united in their fight against the Axis powers, but as soon as the victory profiled in the horizon they took stock of the divergence of their interests and realised that they cannot agree on the manner of settling the world problems likely to arise thereafter. Tension was apparent between the Soviet Union and the western powers led by the United States. Each side was worried of the hegemonic pursuit of the other in the world. They apprehended also dangers to their respective political and economic systems which were opposed and which were articles of faith for them. They wished to avoid any decision of the Council against their interest by a majority led by the other side. They wanted an efficient shield and found it in the veto power. On that point they agreed. The other members who approved the Charter did not give attention to this pernicious device. They were still in admiration of the military prowess of the victorious States of the Second World War. They felt honoured by their admission to the new prestigious body and did not notice the emasculation of their power by the right of veto which left them with no option other than waste time talking.

Now let us turn to the performance of the Council. The veto power was not used by the depositories of that right in the spirit of the Charter and in order to promote its ideal but in their personal interest or in the interest of their allies. It is well known that the Council remained paralysed by this veto power which was profusely utilised. There was considerable

waste of time and energy by the fact of the Council deliberating at length on burning problems whilst it was evident from the beginning that the matter would end by a veto. Exasperated by the paralysis of the Council, the General Assembly voted a resolution on the 3rd November 1950 enabling the General Assembly to make recommendations to member states relating to collective measures including the use of force when the Security Council has failed in its duty towards the maintenance of peace on account of lack of consensus among permanent members. This resolution is a clear disapproval of the right of veto.

The Council could function with a semblance of normalcy only after the collapse of the Soviet Union, in the nineties. But if another member ventures on blocking systematically the majority decisions, the Council would enter again in hibernation. It is clear that the use of veto against the world interest is the main reason of the discredit in which the UNO finds itself. The right of veto by a single member is against the democratic norms. It is an affront to other members. It is hard to conceive that in matters concerning the whole world a single State could have the last word. Unanimity is a good thing when it is the goal but becomes harmful when it becomes a must.

4- Review of some ways of reform

Once the permanency of the Five Big and the veto power is eliminated, how to shape the new Security Council. That body is empowered to take police action. It should be able to intervene quickly and efficiently, if necessary with the help of arms. Its decision should receive universal respect. A group of weak and overpopulated countries would be unable to impose its decisions on a recalcitrant member strongly armed. Therefore the strength of population which was found acceptable for the decision of the General Assembly does not suit for the election to the Council..

Then should we take into consideration the military strength of nations as the basis for the election to the council? Of course a decision by a group of nations equipped with modern arms has a good chance of getting respected. But such an arrangement would be a premium to arms race whereas the ultimate objective is the general disarmament. Further the military capacity cannot be measured with the desirable accuracy in order to distribute the seats of the Council on the basis of that capacity. On the other side a country may have accumulated arms without having the necessary expertise to use it efficiently. So the military might is not also a suitable basis for the election to the council.

Can then the gross national product be considered as the yardstick? But there is no necessary correlation between the GNP and the actual military might. A country with a low per capita income and a large population may have a high GNP without any military might worth the name. So this factor also is not suitable as the basis for the election to the Council which should command respect.

5- A possible solution

The fact of constitution a Security Council possessing the required ability, appears to be in the nature of squaring a circle. The main source of difficulty is the great inequality among States, inequality in the strength of population and inequality in wealth. It is perhaps possible to reach an acceptable solution in dissociating the sanctions provided in articles 41

and 42 from the other responsibilities of the Council. Sanctions may be ultimately decided by the General Assembly when in session or otherwise by all members asked to vote electronically on a draft prepared by the Council. The required majority may vary according to the nature of the measure contemplated: partial economic blockade, total economic blockade, limited military intervention, enlarged military intervention, etc... Thus the population of the whole world will get mobilised at the stage of the sanction whilst now the most of the countries are looking at it as mere spectators.

The next important question is the number of votes to be attributed to the States for the election of the members of the Council and for decision on sanctions. We have already seen that the strength of population, the military might and the GNP were all unsuitable. One way out is to attribute votes in proportion to the contribution to the budget of the organisation. That would be nothing but just because no country can be given the right to use others' money for the police of the world in the way it desires. Further when extra money is required those who decided should be in a position to supply it. The present permanent members who would have lost their veto power can still influence heavily the decision on account of their high voting power based on their contribution. The only risk is that the great contributors like the United States or Japan exercise excessive influence to have a decision in favour of their view point. In order to avoid such contingency it would be necessary to prescribe a ceiling of contribution, which shall be considered later.

So it would not be difficult to constitute an adequate Council in charge of performing functions other than deciding finally on sanctions. To that effect the world may be divided in the number of zones equal to the number of seats of the Council, each zone having the same number of population. A State from each zone will be elected by the General Assembly for a certain number of years. For such election the member states will have a number of votes proportionate to their contribution to the budget. Members elected would be re-eligible. The present permanent members of the Council may get elected on the strength of their own contribution and regain permanency of fact, which they will have to deserve continuously.

Such a solution takes into account both the population and wealth of nations. It allows the different parts of the world to express themselves. Preparation of measures of sanction and their confirmation belonging to different bodies there is not much risk of drifts. The entities in charge of those two functions having the same basis viz the contribution to the budget one can expect harmony in their functioning. The weight of each nation will keep on varying according to the variations of its contribution; so there will be no vested interest like at present.

D- Financing

Any institution in order to fulfil its mission needs money in sufficient quantity. UNO is no exception. Unfortunately the budget of the UNO remained frozen for about twenty years. If in nominal terms the amounts were stable, in real terms there was an erosion of 3 to 5 % on account of inflation. This fall of income can by itself explain in large measure the shortcomings of UNO in the socio-economic field where the needs were on the increase.

The bulk of the income of the UNO consists of the contribution by members. The share of each member is fixed by the General Assembly. It is based on the payment capacity of the member states. This is in conformity to the principle of solidarity espoused by UNO. It

allows the evolution of the share in consonance with the variations of the GNP of each nation. It is to be noted that the principle of the ratio of the contribution to GNP suffers some adjustments. A minimum was fixed, it is equal to 0.001% of the overall contributions. For the less developed countries there is a maximum fixed at 0.01%. When one takes a look at the distribution of contributions as it prevails most of the countries pay less than 1%, even countries which can pay more like India which pays 0.4%, Iran which pays 0.2%, Saudi Arabia which pays 0.7%. Those who pay substantial contributions are: United States 22%, Japan 16.6%, Germany 8.5%, the United Kingdom 6.6%, France 6.3%, Spain 5.9%, Italy 5.9%, Two "permanent members" China and Russia do not make substantial contribution: China pays only 2.4% and Soviet Union 1.2%.

It is to be noted that the United States and Japan cover 38% of expenses, 6 other nations 32%, 8 others 13%. The 176 remaining nations cover only 13%. The most important contribution, that of the United States, amounts to 600 million dollars and the lowest contribution, that of poor States amounts only to 24 thousand dollars each.

This so unequal bearing of expenditure leaves one perplex. With such a state of things the world body cannot function according to the ideals of the Charter since the will of big payers will prevail in one way or the other. Of course the capacity to pay is a good yardstick to determine the amount of contribution; it is an equitable measure. But to leave 38% of the expenditure at the charge of two States is neither just nor wise. It is pregnant with dangers. Naturally those countries would like the others to vote according to their wish; they can hardly accept their money be employed to finance measures adopted against their wish. This would lead them to be tempted to stop paying their contribution which would paralyse the institution.

To avoid such a danger it is necessary that a ceiling of contribution is prescribed as there is a minimum. Such a ceiling may be now 10%. The balance of 18% which has to be taken off the shoulders of the United States and Japan has to be distributed to some 100 countries other than tiny States and less developed ones. The increase for each of those 100 countries will not be considerable and appears feasible. If they wish the UNO to pay attention to their viewpoints they should pay the price.

Some countries do not pay regularly their due in time, putting the world body in a state of financial embarrassment, especially if the defaulting country happens to be a big contributor. In fact the United States has been found defaulting in a chronic manner, which was criticized within that country itself. Such lack of funds has slowed down the activities of the world body and disarrayed its action. One fails to understand how the United States who is a responsible partner can resort to refusal of paying their dues like a simple individual. It is open to it to quit the organisation or to renegotiate the amount of its contribution, it is certainly not acceptable that it continues to influence considerably the decisions of the world body while abstaining to pay its contribution.

In order to enable the UNO to function without fear of bankruptcy and to play its role in the world, it is necessary that it is free of financial uncertainty. There is periodically a resolution of the General Assembly unanimously adopted inviting all member states to pay timely their integral contribution without putting conditions, since the amount is fixed according to accepted criteria. Such resolution is not respected by those who voted it, therefore other coercive measures have to be contemplated. Article 18 of the Charter stipulates that member states who do not pay their contribution for two consecutive years

cannot take part in any vote. Two years of default is too much, because the default of a single year by a big contributor would paralyse the institution. It is necessary to modify that article to reduce that period to one year and to provide for a grace period. Such a change will not cause much inconvenience to poor countries since the same article provides for excuse of non payment if the country justifies the delay by circumstances independent beyond its control.

It is also necessary to take a more radical measure to avoid any delay in payment. The General Assembly may decide that the contribution fixed according the accepted norms need not be subjected to the vote of the Parliament of each country, that it should instead appear among the charged expenses in the budget in the country.

In order to develop the action of the UNO without increasing the contribution by members it is necessary to find other sources of revenue. Time has come to think of international taxation. Many items are available for the purpose. They are the export of arms or even the production of arms, the use of air and maritime routes, the international movement of capitals other than for payment of goods or services, the deposit of money in foreign banks. One can think also of royalty on natural resources unequally distributed in the world like petroleum, gold, uranium, thorium etc... The concerned countries already levy royalty on those products. It would be enough to provide for a share therein for the benefit of the UNO. The stock of atomic arms may also be subjected to a sort of tax like the wealth tax. So there are vast possibilities of increasing the revenue of the UNO, they only await for being taped.

D- Prospects of reforms

Any change raises enthusiasm and at the same time resistances. Institutions are more conservative than men. When a superior authority contemplates a reform, opposition comes forth from all sides, sometimes without their understanding the real implications, and succeeds in torpedoing the reform. When the reform has to emanate from the institution itself there is inbuilt resistance. Such is the case of the UNO. That is the dilemma of all democratic institutions. That is why they can progress only by way of costly revolutions or on the occasion of grave crisis provoked by their ill conceived constitution. Therefore we cannot nurture illusion on the success of reforms in the normal course; but we need not despair because the world is undergoing sea changes which may impel modifications.

As par the Charter, for any change in the UNO two third majority of the General Assembly and the assent of the Security Council are required. Let us gauge the chances of adoption of proposed reforms by those bodies. We have to bear in mind that those bodies will examine any proposal of reform not in the interest of the future of the UNO but in consideration of its impact on themselves that is to say the modification of their importance in the world body.

Let us examine first what could be the reaction of the General Assembly? The reform of the Security Council giving the last word on sanctions to all members whilst now they are taken without their being consulted would be welcome by the General Assembly. As far as the reform of the Assembly itself is concerned members states having more than 10 million would be favourable to the new scheme since it would increase their weight in the decision making process. But such countries are only 81 against 128 required to get the 2\3 majority. 47 seven more votes are required. Is it possible to secure the votes of that number

of States among the 111 States having less than 10 million inhabitants? That is doubtful since they would not like their relative importance to go down. However if big countries get really interested in the scheme they may by a suitable diplomatic effort coupled with financial aid wrench the votes of a sufficient number of States.

As far as the Security Council is concerned a majority may be obtained, but the Big Five would strongly oppose the reform because they would not like to lose their right of permanent membership and their cherished right of veto. But is it not time for them to realise that those rights which they consider as their historical rights are nothing else than privileges meant to disappear one day or the other. They may therefore take the pain of assessing exactly what they are going to lose right now. As regards the right of permanency they will not lose much since they will get elected to the Council on the strength of their own votes. In the place of the right of veto they will have more influence at the time of finally deciding about sanctions on account of the increased number of votes they will be given for the purpose. They will have also a greater weight in the election of the members of the Security Council. Therefore their influence will remain considerable. Only the exorbitant power of blocking any decision and paralysing the institution will go away. Further each one of them had to suffer in the past from the exercise of the right of veto by others one time or the other. These considerations coupled with diplomatic pressures by other influential States and the international public opinion which will get echoed in the internal press may induce some of them to yield but not all.

In fact to the owners of the right their privilege appears natural and forming part of themselves. So one cannot expect they will consent to give it up in the interest of the institution. But the world cannot wait. We have already shown the noxiousness of the veto power. So it will be necessary to divest them of that abnormal right without awaiting for a calamity. How to achieve it? It is necessary for the General Assembly to embolden itself to hold a special session with the mandate to decide on the future of the right of veto. It is to be remembered that on 3rd 1950 the General Assembly passed a resolution enabling the assembly to short-circuit the Security Council in case of impasse caused by a veto.

What would impel the General Assembly to resort to such a bold step? Only the important changes which are taking place in the world. One can easily note more and more globalisation in all domains. Many factors are at work in that direction: increased migrations, internet, international TV, cheap international telephone communication, exchange of scholars, intense air travel, pop culture, international trade, international investments, movement of assets, action of multinationals, of NGOs and of international associations, etc...The world is not the same as it was at the time of creation of UNO. The human paste is getting kneaded. It is aspiring for a leaven to produce effect. In fact what is needed is an international impulse in the minds. In the years which followed the creation of the UNO there was a wave of enthusiasm. Eminent personalities expressed the desire to become world citizens. So the much needed world movement towards the revitalisation of the UNO is possible.

The internationalization through nations is hampered by the exacerbated feeling of sovereignty of States which stand in the way. It belongs to individuals who ultimately have to suffer from the shortcomings of international bodies to take the initiative of pushing into action their respective States which are after all only their creatures and which do not exist for themselves. In other words it is imperative to realise that the UNO does not exist by the

nations and for the nations but for the peoples, who are the true makers of the Charter, whose opening words is “ We the peoples of United Nations”

David Annoussamy