



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 76: Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (<i>concluded</i>): (d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 78: Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>continued</i>) Chapters XVII, XVIII, XIX (section B) and XXI (sections B and C): report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 84: United Nations international School: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 11: Report of the Security Council	2
Agenda item 34: Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	6
Agenda item 35: Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	6

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

AGENDA ITEM 76

Appointments to fill vacancies in the membership of subsidiary organs of the General Assembly (*concluded*)*
(d) Investments Committee: confirmation of the appointments made by the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8884)

AGENDA ITEM 78

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8732)

* Resumed from the 2097th meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

CHAPTERS XVII, XVIII, XIX (SECTION B) AND XXI (SECTIONS B AND C): REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8731)

AGENDA ITEM 84

United Nations International School: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8971)

1. Mr. PASHKEVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee (*translation from Russian*): On behalf of the Fifth Committee, I have the honour to introduce the reports on agenda items 76 (d) 78, 12 and 84.

2. The report of the Fifth Committee on item 76 (d) is submitted in document A/8884, paragraph 4 of which contains the recommendation of the Fifth Committee to the General Assembly on the item.

3. The report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 78 is submitted in document A/8732, in paragraph 12 of which the Fifth Committee submits a draft resolution for approval by the General Assembly.

4. The report of the Fifth Committee on those chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council which are of interest to it appears in document A/8731, in paragraph 3 of which the Fifth Committee submits an appropriate recommendation for confirmation by the General Assembly.

5. Finally, the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 84 is contained in document A/8971. In paragraph 9 of that report, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly approve a draft resolution which was adopted in the Fifth Committee by 59 votes to 8, with 8 abstentions.

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

6. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will first consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 78 (d) [A/8884]. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts the recommendation of the Fifth Committee in paragraph 3 of that document?

The recommendation was adopted.

7. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): May I also take it that the General Assembly adopts the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 4 of the same document?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2988 (XXVII)).

8. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now consider the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 78 [A/8732]. I invite Members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the Fifth Committee in paragraph 11 of that document. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation was adopted.

9. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 12 of its report. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides to adopt that draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2989 (XXVII)).

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 12 [A/8731]. The recommendation of the Fifth Committee appears in paragraph 3 of that document. May I take it that the General Assembly adopts that recommendation?

The recommendation was adopted.

11. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The next report of the Fifth Committee is on agenda item 84 [A/8971]. We shall now vote on the draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee in paragraph 9 of the report.

The draft resolution was adopted by 86 votes to 7, with 7 abstentions (resolution 2990 (XXVII)).

AGENDA ITEM 11

Report of the Security Council

12. The PRESIDENT: (*interpretation from French*): The next item on our agenda concerns the report of the Security Council for the period 16 June 1971 to 15 June 1972 [A/8702]. The General Assembly has before it, in document A/8847 and Add.1, the report of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolution 2864 (XXVI).

13. I call on the representative of Tunisia, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/L.692.

14. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): First of all I should like to express the regret of the delegation of Tunisia at seeing agenda item 11 coming to the plenary so late when the session is drawing to a close. It should have been taken up, together with agenda item 10, "Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the

Organization", immediately after the general debate, or at least after the priority discussion of agenda item 22.

15. I further note that the report of the Secretary-General submitted under resolution 2864 (XXVI) is dated 8 December 1972, but we received it only a few days ago.

16. Those two factors, and the limited time that seems to have been allotted to the debate of the item before us, make it difficult to undertake a serious and thorough consideration of the activities of the Security Council and of the ideas contained in the report of the Secretary-General, which includes suggestions by Governments on how to strengthen the effectiveness of the Council.

17. Our remarks on this subject can therefore only be general and incomplete. We venture to hope that at the next session and at subsequent sessions sufficient time will be given this item early in the time-table of the session so that we will be able to undertake a serious study of the report of the Security Council. That is not only a wish prompted by our desire to see the Council fulfil its task effectively but an obligation under Article 24 of the Charter, which in paragraph 3 states:

"The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration"—I repeat "for its consideration".

18. That paragraph of the Charter is perfectly clear. The Council's report is submitted for consideration and not for the General Assembly simply to take note of it. And when it is a matter for consideration, it necessarily entails discussion, criticism and, if need be, recommendations.

19. For many years the General Assembly has routinely limited itself to taking note of the Security Council's report as it takes note of the report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization.

20. During the twenty-sixth session, after the disappointments we experienced in the Security Council, when it found it impossible to put an end to the war on the Asian subcontinent, the delegation of Tunisia seized the opportunity offered by the presentation of the report of the Security Council and formulated criticisms and suggestions. Together with the delegations of Belgium and Burundi, we submitted a draft resolution¹ in which we proposed that the General Assembly should not limit itself to taking note of the report but should request the Secretary-General to submit at this twenty-seventh session suggestions based on replies from Governments with a view to strengthening the Security Council. Thus resolution 2864 (XXVI) came into being.

21. It is a pleasure for me to thank the Secretary-General, who was so good as to prepare the report in document A/8847 in accordance with that resolution and in the spirit of Article 98 of the Charter, which calls on him to perform the functions entrusted to him by the organs of the United Nations. This report is brief, cautious and edifying. Above all it enables us to take note of the views of some 20 States

¹ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 11, document A/L.654/Rev.1.

on means to strengthen the action of the Security Council. Whether it is a matter of holding meetings at the foreign minister level, of establishing subsidiary organs in accordance with Article 29 of the Charter, the implementation of Council resolutions, of respect for the Charter or of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the ideas contained in those replies deserve to be studied and supplemented by the views of other Governments that have not yet replied in writing and to which more time must be given to enable them to do so.

22. Nevertheless, those views already represent a series of opinions which in turn reflects the various political trends of our world. I should like particularly to mention the remark which I found in the reply of the United Kingdom, as follows:

“But the way ahead for the Security Council lies mainly in a change in the spirit with which members of the Council approach their role and view the task of the Council.” [A/8847, annex, p. 23.]

23. We agree with the delegation of the United Kingdom that it is not necessary that each discussion or consideration of a situation should be concluded by the adoption of a resolution and that the process of negotiation, of mediation, should be used more frequently.

24. Holding sessions of the Council away from Headquarters is also a means of revitalizing the action of that organ. The meetings held in Addis Ababa were edifying. The Council should also meet in the great capitals—Moscow, Washington, London and Peking—apart from meeting in the capitals of the third world. We would list a number of suggestions, but we believe that the initiative we took last year should be continued until it is possible to have a thorough debate on the action of the Council, a debate which might lead to recommendations adopted by consensus, if possible, so that they could be more effective.

25. The point is that the Council is part of the United Nations system. It is the executive organ, and the Charter makes it incumbent upon the Council, under paragraph 3 of Article 24, which I have already quoted, to present to the General Assembly annual and special reports for its consideration.

26. I should like here to quote Article 10 of the Charter:

“The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the . . . Charter . . . and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such question or matters.”

I shall also quote Article 12 in order not to give rise to any confusion. Paragraph 1 of that Article reads as follows:

“While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the . . . Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.”

27. Vast possibilities for action are offered to us under the Charter. Routine and difficulties of all kinds prevent or have prevented us so far from doing our duty. It is up to us, especially the medium-sized and small countries, if we wish to strengthen the United Nations and its organs, to face our responsibilities and create a new atmosphere more conducive to respect for the Charter and the obligations it places on all of us.

28. In our view, the Charter clearly provides an opportunity for amendments and changes which would enable the system to develop smoothly. While keeping an open mind regarding changes at the right time, we in the delegation of Tunisia believe that it is possible, with the means already available to us, to improve the effectiveness of the system. We should have the will to persevere in our effort to renew and strengthen our means without forgetting that, despite its imperfections, the United Nations is our only hope of salvation.

29. Draft resolution A/L.692 had been distributed. I believe that it is clear. I am sure that my colleague the Ambassador of Burundi is better able to go into the details of this draft resolution, and with your consent, Mr. President, I shall yield to him.

30. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to join with my colleague, the representative of Tunisia, in presenting to the Assembly draft resolution A/L.692, sponsored by the delegations of Madagascar, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia and Burundi. We have taken the initiative of approaching this matter in a different way; in effect, the primary importance of peace, as the delegations in whose name I have the honour to speak conceive of it, has caused us to consider the problem in as profound and objective a manner as possible. I shall therefore make a few comments with regard to the draft resolution.

31. In the first place, Article 25 of the Charter states:

“The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.”

32. In the 27 years of the Organization's existence there have been new circumstances, situations different from those that prevailed in 1945. And yet, even at that time the founding fathers—I am speaking of the original signatories of the Charter—realized the need to implement the decisions taken by the Security Council. This leads me to place special emphasis on operative paragraphs 1 to 3 of our draft resolution.

33. It will be noted that the General Assembly, in operative paragraph 2

“Calls upon Member States to ensure the strict application of the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations”.

I have just quoted this Article. In introducing that provision into our draft resolution, we did not lose sight of the national interests of the States Members of this Organiza-

tion. However, if we draw a parallel between the national constitution, or the national laws, of a country and the Charter, we are bound to observe that, if the citizens of a given nation could choose, each for himself, whether to obey or disobey the law depending on how it affected their individual interests, the automatic and inevitable result would be real anarchy.

34. In the same way, the States Members of this Organization are the subjects of international law and, accordingly, subjects of the Charter. Thus, if each State, since the beginning of our world Organization, had allowed itself to choose whether to observe or reject the decisions of the Security Council according to whether or not those decisions were in conformity with its national interests, it is easy to see how this Organization would have fared.

35. This is why our Security Council needs a new breath of life; and that new breath of life must come from the States Members of the United Nations—that is from us.

36. I would add that our draft resolution also takes into account the special characteristics of each State, each government, each geographical region, of which we form part. However, on both the national and the international level, to the extent, of course, that the Security Council decisions are respected and strictly applied, the States directly concerned may at times find these a heavy burden, something to be borne in one way or another. But the States as a group, that is to say the world community, are the beneficiaries; and, in the last analysis, as the experience of all the decisions so far taken by the Security Council proves, if these are indeed respected, it is better from the national point of view, because it is the international community that benefits.

37. As I have the honour of presenting this draft resolution, I recall that a year and a half ago, as President of the Security Council, I spoke on its behalf in order to clarify the obligations and advantages for all States of complying with the decisions of the Security Council. I shall quote what I said at the time, to show how far we are from disregarding the special characteristics of each State, particularly as regards the great Powers; we all know, and we recognize it publicly here, that they are not always in a position to comply strictly with the obligations inherent in the decisions of the Security Council in view of certain national requirements. I said at that time, and I should like this to be part of the statement I am making today on behalf of the sponsors, that:

“One is often tempted to judge the actions of great Powers without mercy, without patiently examining the reasons which inspire their national and international policy, without understanding the ultimate reasons for their position. I must admit that that supremacy, if it is used on behalf of peace, overbearing as it may superficially seem, is reassuring if it is possible to understand its scope. If the five gigantic Powers . . . in the framework of peace and security, adopt attitudes almost leading to the *de facto* abdication of their omnipotence, it is undoubtedly because they find it difficult to conciliate their obligations on the national level towards their citizens and the fundamental obligation towards the objectives of

the United Nations. Thus, interpenetration of interests and interrelation of causes threaten to transform this virtual abdication into a final capitulation of the five great Powers.”²

38. If I cite the five great Powers, it is because, as I said at the time, it is ultimately on them that the primary responsibility for international peace and security rests, as well as for the safeguarding of mankind, given their importance in every field, which enables them to play a preponderant role. This is why we are submitting for the consideration of the General Assembly this draft resolution, which we hope will be unanimously adopted. We have tried to embody a new approach, to galvanize the powers and duties of the Security Council, not on behalf of a handful of Powers, but on behalf and in the interests of the world Organization: that is to say, on behalf of our peoples and nations, which we have the privilege of representing in the international arena.

39. Mr. ISSRAELIAN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In connexion with the discussion of the report of the Security Council for the period from 16 June 1971 to 15 June 1972, contained in document A/8702, and also with the draft resolution submitted under agenda item 11 by the delegations of Burundi, Madagascar, Senegal, Sudan and Tunisia, appearing in document A/L.692, the Soviet delegation feels it necessary to make the following statement.

40. In accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council, as members are aware, bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Security Council, and only the Security Council itself, may consider and determine ways and means of enhancing its effectiveness in the discharge of the responsible tasks entrusted to it. Equally, it alone may establish the methods and procedures for its own work, in strict accordance with the Charter and in the manner laid down by its provisional rules of procedure. It is common knowledge that, from the constitutional standpoint and under the Charter, questions of enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council cannot and must not fall within the competence of the General Assembly as defined by the United Nations Charter. As members are aware, the Security Council does not discuss, and never has discussed, questions of enhancing the effectiveness of the work of the General Assembly; if it did so, it would be violating the Charter.

41. The attempt to draw the General Assembly into consideration of questions of enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council is equally contrary to the Charter and unconstitutional. We have felt in the past, and still feel, that anyone really interested in enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council cannot fail to take into account the fact that in recent years the Security Council, aware of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, has taken a number of useful steps which are in practice helping to enhance its effectiveness. In particular, the Security Council has in recent years made use in its work of such an important method as the holding of

² See *Official Records of the Security Council, Twenty-sixth Year, 1567th meeting, para. 123.*

the first periodic meeting. Moreover, at the beginning of 1972 it held at Addis Ababa a number of meetings devoted to consideration of questions relating to Africa.

42. In both cases the Security Council made use of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter, which gave it the possibility of enhancing its effectiveness. The seriousness of the Security Council's attitude to the discharge of its functions under the Charter is shown by the fact that this year it established a special working group to prepare its reply to the Secretary-General's questionnaire of 25 February 1972 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. This working group, which held 16 meetings on the subject and discussed the question carefully and from every angle, prepared a draft reply from the Security Council to the Secretary-General's letter on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security,³ and that reply was, as members are well aware, subsequently confirmed by the Security Council. The reply pointed out, in particular, that in recent years the Security Council had made extensive use of such methods in its work as the sending of a group of Security Council observers consisting of Council members, the sending of a Council mission to make on-the-spot investigations, the establishment of a special Security Council group on the wider use of previously established subsidiary bodies of the Council, and the establishment of new subsidiary bodies.

43. The Security Council must take further steps in this direction, towards a more responsible attitude on the part of its members to their obligations and towards a wider use by the Council of the possibilities open to it under the Charter. The Soviet Union, for its part, has advocated and still advocates enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council in every possible way.

44. In this connexion, the Soviet delegation is favourably disposed towards operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/L.692, which calls upon Member States to ensure the strict application of the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with Article 25 of the Charter of the United Nations.

45. A number of the proposals which the Soviet Union has put forward for consideration by the United Nations in recent years have been aimed precisely at enhancing the effectiveness of the Security Council. It is this course of action, a course which is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, which would serve the interests of the vast majority of States Members of the United Nations.

46. In view of what I have said, the Soviet delegation considers that operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution are superfluous; it requests a separate vote on paragraphs 3 and 4, and will abstain when the vote on them is taken.

47. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): In accordance with rule 91 of the rules of procedure, a motion for division has been submitted and, therefore, I shall call on two speakers for and two against on this subject.

48. Mr. TERENCE (Burundi) (*interpretation from French*): I would request the indulgence of the President and of the Assembly, since I feel compelled to speak once again. On behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, my delegation has been authorized to request that the draft resolution be voted on by roll-call.

49. As regards the proposal of the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—which was a formal one—we would have wished, of course, that he had not made such a request. However, in view of the attitude we have just observed and which seems to us to be most constructive, without being formally prepared to subscribe to his proposal, we do not propose to obstruct it.

50. Furthermore, his statement is reassuring in the sense that a general consensus is emerging in favour of the final objective, namely, the strengthening of the Security Council by the strict implementation of the decisions of that supreme organ of the United Nations, which is charged with the maintenance of international peace and security.

51. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): If I correctly understood the representative of Burundi, he did not object to a separate vote on these two paragraphs. I now call on the representative of Italy, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

52. Mr. MIGLIUOLO (Italy): After the lucid and eloquent introduction of draft resolution A/L.692 made by the representatives of Tunisia and Burundi, there is hardly any need for me to explain why the Italian delegation will vote in favour of that draft resolution. But if I have asked to speak in explanation of our vote, it is mainly to say why we feel that operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution also need to be voted upon. It was maintained a few moments ago that they are useless, as everything is perfect with the Security Council and that the Security Council is acting with full effectiveness. May I simply draw the attention of the members to the fact that, in the Security Council's reply to the Secretary-General's letter of 25 February 1972, concerning General Assembly resolution 2880 (XXVI), on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, reference is also made to the problem of the effectiveness of the Security Council. That reply, which has been prepared by the Security Council itself, states clearly that the members consider that there is a need to increase, by all possible means, the effectiveness of the Security Council. If everything were perfect with the activities of the Security Council, we do not think that the members of the Security Council itself would have indicated that there is a need to increase its effectiveness. For that reason the Italian delegation feels that operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of the draft resolution are also necessary for ensuring the greater effectiveness of the Security Council.

53. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Unless I hear any objection, under rule 91 of the rules of procedure I shall now put to the vote operative paragraphs 3 and 4 of draft resolution A/L.692.

³ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Year, Supplement for October, November and December 1972, document S/10822.

Operative paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted by 99 votes to none, with 23 abstentions.

54. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put draft resolution A/L.692 as a whole to the vote. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Pakistan, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Canada, Denmark, Israel, Malawi.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 8 abstentions (resolution 2991 (XXVII)).

55. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call upon the representative of Portugal, who wishes to explain his vote.

56. Mr. LOURENÇO (Portugal): The Portuguese delegation abstained in the vote just taken on draft resolution A/L.692 for the following reasons, among others.

57. First, in our view there is nothing in the United Nations Charter which gives the General Assembly competence to issue directives regarding decisions of the Security Council. The Security Council, like the General Assembly, is one of the independent and principal organs of the United Nations and has all the necessary competence to give effect to its decisions when they are adopted in consonance with the Charter provisions. Furthermore, a number of resolutions have been approved in the Security Council in the past in circumstances which made it imperative for the Portuguese Government to request clarifications on certain points with reference to them. No

clarifications were given; thus we do not consider ourselves bound, one way or the other, by those resolutions. The vote of the Portuguese delegation must be viewed in the light of these considerations.

AGENDA ITEM 34

Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace:
report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8908)

AGENDA ITEM 35

Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8909)

58. Mr. SANTISO GALVEZ (Guatemala), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from Spanish*): At the 2093rd meeting of the General Assembly, held on 29 November last, I had the honour of introducing to the Assembly the reports of the First Committee on six of the agenda items relating to disarmament: items 26, 27, 30 to 33. At that time the First Committee had not completed consideration of a seventh item relating to disarmament, item 34. Today I have the honour to submit to the Assembly the report of the First Committee on that item [A/8908].

59. In paragraph 9 of the report, it is noted that the First Committee at its 1910th meeting decided to put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/L.631/Rev.1, on the understanding that the names of the members to serve on the *ad hoc* committee to which operative paragraph 3 refers would be designated by the Chairman and would be communicated to the President of the General Assembly before the draft resolution was put to the vote in plenary, and that this decision should be recorded in the report of the First Committee to the General Assembly. Pursuant to this decision, the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Ramphul of Mauritius, has already designated the members of the *ad hoc* committee and has communicated their names to the President of the General Assembly in a letter dated 14 December [see A/8976].

60. In paragraph 11 of the report the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution. I am very pleased to submit this draft resolution to the General Assembly for consideration, and to point out that the First Committee has now completed its consideration of all the items relating to disarmament which were allocated to it by the General Assembly at the present session.

61. I shall now introduce the report relating to agenda item 35. The First Committee considered this item during 11 meetings, from 20 to 24 November and from 8 to 12 December. The general debate and the explanations of vote on this occasion showed once again the major concern of Member States to ensure the effective implementation of all the provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Many speakers emphasized that this legitimate concern to ensure the full implementation of

that Declaration, which is of historic significance, prompted the delegations of 55 countries to sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/L.640, which was adopted in the First Committee by 94 votes to 2, with 12 abstentions. In paragraph 10 of the report the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of this draft resolution. I have the honour to submit it to the General Assembly for its approval.

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

62. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will first consider the report of the First Committee on item 34 [A/8908].

63. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

64. Mr. AMERASINGHE (Sri Lanka): May I first of all make it quite clear that I am not here to explain my vote. I am precluded by the rules of procedure from doing so because I am one of the sponsors of the draft resolution that was adopted in the First Committee. I asked for the floor in order to make a statement in explanation of the draft resolution itself in answer to certain observations that have been made by countries which abstained on it in the vote in the First Committee. In that sense, I am quite sure that I am well within the rules of procedure. I thank you very much, Mr. President, for giving me this opportunity.

65. First of all, I should like to draw attention to an error in the Rapporteur's report, and I do so with great respect to a very able Rapporteur. In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the report that the Rapporteur of the First Committee has just presented to this Assembly, document A/8908, the Rapporteur has stated that at its 1860th meeting, on 9 October, the First Committee decided to have a combined general debate on the items relating to disarmament allocated to it, and he goes on to list, among those items, item 34 "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace...". In paragraph 4 of that same report the Rapporteur states that the general debate on the seven disarmament items took place at the 1872nd to 1890th meetings, from 23 October to 13 November.

66. I wish to make it clear that at the very outset in the course of consultations with the Chairman of the First Committee, I made it abundantly clear that my delegation did not consider the item "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace..." to be a disarmament item. That, I think, is brought out in the proceedings of the First Committee.⁴ At that meeting, the Chairman stated that the items listed in document A/C.1/1020,⁵ which are the items assigned to the First Committee, should be considered in the following order, and he placed them, first of all, in three groups. The first group consisted of items 28, 29 and 37, relating respectively to international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space, the preparation of an international treaty concerning the moon, and the preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct

television broadcasting; the second group consisted of only one item, item 26, the convening of a world disarmament conference; the third set of items consisted of items 27, 30, 31, 32 and 33, namely, the implementation of the results of the Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States, general and complete disarmament, chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, the urgent need for suspension of nuclear and thermo-nuclear tests, and implementation of General Assembly resolution 2830 (XXVI) concerning the signature and ratification of Additional Protocol II of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America.

67. The Chairman went on to say:

"In the case of the disarmament items"—and he was referring to those items that I have just mentioned—"I suggest that the procedure of last year be followed again. . . . that they be the subject of a joint general debate."⁶

68. He then went on to the fourth category of items assigned to the First Committee, and in the fourth category appeared item 34, "Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace". I raise no objections at all to what I consider to be a slight, though significant, misinterpretation of the Chairman's statement by the Rapporteur of the First Committee and I hope that, in doing so, I am not causing that very able Rapporteur any embarrassment. I wish merely to clarify the position, lest it be thought that we have ever regarded the question of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace as a contribution to disarmament. It is not. That question is in quite a different category. I would rather say it is a contribution to the strengthening of international security.

69. I should like to take this opportunity to deal with the reasons given by the many delegations that did not find it possible to support our proposal but, at the same time, did not oppose it and instead abstained in the vote on it. The reasons for these abstentions fall into three categories.

70. The first category of abstentions concerns what is regarded as inequality of treatment and the absence of provision at the very outset for the elimination of all foreign military bases in the area.

71. The second category concerns interference with universally acknowledged rules of international law, particularly the freedom of the high seas.

72. The third category of reasons for abstaining refers to the alleged lack of unanimity among the littoral and hinterland States.

73. There was also a fourth objection, which was that the draft resolution is intended to implement the Declaration adopted last year in resolution 2832 (XXVI).

74. May I say, first of all, that the draft resolution which was adopted by the First Committee and is now before this Assembly does not seek to implement resolution 2832 (XXVI). On the contrary, it is because of the objections raised to any attempt to implement the Declaration immediately that we saw fit to ask the General

⁴ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, First Committee, 1860th meeting.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, prefatory fascicle.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1860th meeting, para. 15.

Assembly to authorize a study of the implications of the proposal. If that study discloses that this is a woolly and fantastic idea, then I can assure the Assembly that we shall be practical enough not to pursue something that is considered by the membership to be visionary.

75. I should like to deal with the different categories of objections in turn.

76. The first objection seems to concern mainly the 12 Powers members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and seven of the Powers parties to the Warsaw Treaty, which together comprised 19 out of the 35 abstentions. The objection is simply that in preparing recommendations relating to peace and security, equal account should be taken of the interests of all sides without any one side receiving an advantage, and that the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace should call for the immediate elimination of all foreign military bases in the area.

77. It is very well known that those who now ask us to start with the elimination of all foreign military bases, themselves in their joint statement of agreed principles for disarmament negotiations,⁷ made that the final stage of their programme for general and complete disarmament. Why, then, is it that they ask us to start where they are prepared to end? It would seem that, for them, politics is the art of the possible, but for us politics should be the art of the impossible.

78. I must draw the attention of those who raised this objection to the statement which I made in the First Committee⁸ that it was not our intention to allow any bloc to remain in a position of advantage or superiority over the others, an advantage which would not only encourage the other party to attempt to gain equality, but which must inevitably result in increasing tension. And if their declared objective, their avowed purpose, is to reduce tension and to retard or stop the arms race, then I cannot see how they can raise objections to a proposal that is designed essentially to halt the further escalation and expansion of the military presence of the great Powers in the Indian Ocean, which is stated expressly in paragraph 2 of the Declaration.

79. That same paragraph of resolution 2832 (XXVI):

“Calls upon the great Powers, in conformity with this Declaration, to enter into immediate consultation with the littoral States of the Indian Ocean with a view to:

“(a) Halting the further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean;

“(b) Eliminating from the Indian Ocean all bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great Power military

presence in the Indian Ocean conceived in the context of great Power rivalry”.

80. Now, if we asked them to enter into immediate consultations for the removal of these military bases, how can they, when they have not even made the least effort to enter into these consultations, turn round and tell us that we should eliminate foreign military bases before we can create the zone? It is not a fair argument; it is not a logical argument.

81. May I now turn to the second category of objections? These objections stress the inviolability and sanctity of certain rights ensured under international law, particularly the 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas. Article 2 of that Convention states clearly that freedom of the high seas is exercised under the conditions laid down by that Convention and by the other rules of international law and that that freedom comprises, *inter alia*, freedom of navigation, freedom of fishing, freedom to lay submarine cables and freedom to fly over the high seas.⁹

82. What are the other rules of international law that limit the exercise of the freedom of the high seas as defined in the 1958 Convention? There is one that was created and was in existence before the 1958 Convention and which must prevail over all other rules—and that is the rule laid down in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations which states:

“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.”

83. May I ask those who raise these objections, whether there is any provision in the Declaration in resolution 2832 (XXVI) which is in the least inconsistent with the doctrine of the freedom of the high seas as enunciated and as clearly defined in the Geneva Convention of 1958?

84. These objections state that steps to strengthen security in any given area should not be detrimental to the universally acknowledged rules of international law, particularly the freedom of navigation. The 1958 Geneva Convention on the High Seas, they say, confirmed as a universally acknowledged rule of international law freedom of navigation for all vessels including naval craft and the carrying out of scientific research by means of such vessels. The delegation that raised this objection stated that last year's Declaration was not fully consistent with the above-mentioned principle.

85. Further, another delegation stated that operative paragraph 1 of the Declaration included in the same context the Indian Ocean, the air space above and the ocean floor adjacent thereto, and that this approach might lead to arbitrary interpretations aimed at identifying the régime to be applied to the surface of the sea and to the sea-bed; that the implementation of the Declaration would imply the recognition for certain States of new rights likely

⁷ *Ibid.*, Sixteenth Session, Annexes, agenda item 19, document A/4879.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Twenty-seventh Session, First Committee, 1887th meeting.

⁹ See United Nations Treaty Series, vol. 450, No. 6465, pp. 82-84.

to impair or assail the principle of freedom of navigation on the high seas for all types of vessels; that the basic principles of international law, that of the freedom of the high seas being the most ancient and unchallengeable, cannot be modified even in a limited geographical region by a General Assembly resolution, even though, as in this case, it is inspired by eminently peaceful and laudable intentions.

86. Those who raise these objections ignore certain aspects of international law and seem to want to degrade freedom into licence. Any freedom that is exercised or invoked in defiance of the lawful wishes of others and in disregard of their legitimate rights is not worthy of respect and cannot be allowed to remain within the corpus of international law. Where, however, is the inconsistency between the peace-zone concept and the freedom of the high seas?

87. Let me refer to the specific provisions of last year's Declaration. In paragraph 3 that Declaration called:

"... upon the littoral and hinterland States of the Indian Ocean, the permanent members of the Security Council and other major maritime users of the Indian Ocean, in pursuit of the objective of establishing a system of... international security through regional and other co-operation, to enter into consultations with a view to the implementation of this Declaration and such action as may be necessary to ensure that:

"(a) Warships and military aircraft may not use the Indian Ocean for any threat or use of force against the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of any littoral or hinterland State of the Indian Ocean in contravention of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations".

This is an unmistakable reaffirmation of Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter.

"(b) Subject to the foregoing and to the norms and principles of international law, the right to free and unimpeded use of the zone by the vessels of all nations is unaffected".

If anybody can say that these provisions in the least seek to modify existing international law, then he is only misleading himself.

88. The objection has also been raised that our draft resolution seeks to establish a special régime for a regional area, that this interferes with the unitarian treatment of the law of the sea, which will be examined at the forthcoming Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, and that there are also certain discrepancies with regard to the very text of the draft itself. Any member is entitled to say what he likes, but at least he owes it to this Assembly to point out what those discrepancies are. I, myself, have gone through this draft resolution—last year's Declaration and this year's—and cannot detect anything that can even appear to be in the least a discrepancy.

89. As for interference with the concept of the freedom of the high seas, one might just as well say that the denuclearization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor is inconsistent with the freedom of the high seas. It would

appear that only if one deals with the problem of nuclear weapons on the high seas is one being strictly consistent with the doctrine of the freedom of the high seas. But if one attempts to deal with conventional weapons—and really that is not the point here—that is inconsistent with the freedom of the high seas. What we fear is the use of the Indian Ocean by nuclear-powered submarines, and, therefore, if no objection was raised to denuclearization of the sea-bed and the ocean floor, I do not see how any objection can be raised to this proposal which seeks to keep all Powers out of the Indian Ocean if they make it an arena for the intensification of the arms race.

90. As regards the argument that the draft resolution seeks to modify, even in a limited geographical region, the basic principles of international law, I regret to have to observe that this is merely a lame excuse.

91. It has also been stated in the course of the debate in the First Committee that only international détente and true disarmament can bring to the coastal States of the Indian Ocean and to the peoples of other regions of the world the security to which they aspire. In whose hands does the creation of this international détente and true disarmament rest? It is the very countries that object to the proposal that we have put before the Assembly. Therefore what importance can we attach to these objections and to these reasons? What better way is there of establishing international détente than by the creation of zones of peace?

92. Another argument has been put forward that zones of peace cannot be established regionally. It would be absolutely impossible to make the whole world a zone of peace overnight. We selected the Indian Ocean because the arms race could still be arrested in that ocean, which is the last ocean left comparatively free from the rivalry of the great Powers. But now it would appear doomed to the same fate as the other oceans and major seas of the world, unless we act promptly and with vision and faith.

93. The fourth category of objections is that this year's draft resolution is intended to implement the Declaration of last year in resolution 2832 (XXVI). I have answered that already; but, even if it were intended to implement it, why should we be horror-stricken at the thought? However, we have only asked for a study, and, as I stated in the First Committee, I appeal to the General Assembly to give the study a fair chance, instead of preventing it altogether.

94. I realize that the ultimate attainment of the objective of declaring the Indian Ocean a zone of peace might lead to unemployment among generals and admirals, but in recent times we have found that, even if those great soldiers and sailors cannot practise their profession, the profession of war, they are equally as competent as other statesmen to practise and pursue the arts of peace. There are excellent examples even in this very continent. The other day at the unveiling of a plaque donated to the Assembly by the Latin American States in honour of the liberator of Mexico, Benito Juárez, his famous dictum was quoted: "Respect for the rights of others is peace." We might equally say that respect for the wishes of others is also peace, especially

when those wishes are related to the attainment of peace itself. At present in the international community there seems to be an overwhelming obsession with war. Instead, the purpose of our draft resolution is to create a positive preoccupation with peace. It is in that spirit that I appeal to the representatives to give their full support to the draft resolution that we proposed in the First Committee and which was adopted in that Committee. Here again I wish to emphasize that, in deciding to establish an *ad hoc* committee, we ask for a study of the implications of the proposal, with special reference to the practical measures that may be taken in furtherance of the resolution, and, I emphasize, having due regard to the security interests of the littoral and hinterland states of the Indian Ocean and the interests of every other State consistent with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

95. Mr. PEREZ DE CUELLAR (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Peru abstained in the vote on the item in the First Committee during the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly for reasons which we then explained and which appear in the verbatim records of that Committee at that session. For the same reasons my delegation abstained when the draft resolution now before the Assembly was considered in the First Committee. However, Peru has always been and continues to be in favour of the principles and purposes sought by the declaration.

96. Accordingly, and because of the overwhelming vote in favour of the present text in the First Committee, my delegation will now be pleased to vote in favour of it. In so doing, I wish to place on record that the remarks made by the representative of Peru in the First Committee when this item was considered at the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh sessions,¹⁰ in which we said that it was preferable to deal with this item either in the context of the preparation of the conference on the law of the sea or in the manner adopted by the Latin American countries when they drafted the Treaty of Tlatelolco, constitute reservations in regard to Peru's support for the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace.

97. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before we proceed to the vote, I should like to draw the Assembly's attention to the letter from the Chairman of the First Committee [A/8976], which refers to operative paragraph 3 of the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in document A/8908. The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of that draft resolution is contained in document A/8964.

98. I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution, with the addition in operative paragraph 3 of the names of the 15 States designated by the Chairman of the First Committee to become members of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Indian Ocean. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

¹⁰ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, First Committee, 1849th meeting; ibid., Twenty-seventh Session, First Committee, 1911th meeting.*

Chad, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dahomey, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, Norway, Oman, Poland, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand,¹¹ Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada.

The draft resolution was adopted by 95 votes to none, with 33 abstentions (resolution 2992 (XXVII)).¹²

99. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 35 [A/8909]. I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

100. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): Tunisia abstained in the First Committee when the vote was taken on the draft resolution concerning the strengthening of international security. We wished thereby to indicate our preference for a resolution which would have mentioned more clearly the problems threatening international peace and security and provided practical measures for their solution. Our main concern was to avoid restricting our action to declarations of intent without any future because they were devoid of concrete decisions. However, in solidarity with the non-aligned countries and in view of the possibilities which, after all, the draft resolution offers for future action, we propose to change our abstention to a positive vote. Our hope is that this draft resolution will be a new step in the process towards the peace which we are all committed to establishing throughout the world. Once the

¹¹ The delegation of Thailand subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

¹² The delegation of Rwanda subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

draft resolution is adopted, we shall have to think of implementing its contents in practice.

101. My delegation would like particularly to express its concern at the threats to peace and security in our region of the world, that is, the Mediterranean. The present situation in the Mediterranean makes it one of the most serious hotbeds of tension in the world and represents a danger both to coastal countries and to international security.

102. The economic and political importance of the Mediterranean, as well as its geographical position, confer on it the role of intermediary between various continents. Thus it is obvious that any conflict breaking out in the area would have unforeseeable consequences for the peace of the world.

103. Aware of the seriousness of the situation, most of the Mediterranean countries have decided to hold a fruitful and frank dialogue likely to eliminate all causes of tension in the area and establish an era of peaceful coexistence and co-operation.

104. We are convinced that the United Nations will not fail to give its support to all these efforts for peace, and we hope that next year the General Assembly will discuss this thorny problem, which this year we have confined ourselves to mentioning, without submitting any draft resolution.

105. This debate will then fall within the general context of the maintenance of peace and will be inspired by the draft resolution on the strengthening of international security now before us, particularly its operative paragraph 2, in which the General Assembly

“Expresses the hope that the present favourable trends in bilateral, regional and multilateral relations, including the creation of zones of peace and co-operation in various areas of the world, will continue and that efforts to that end will be pursued and intensified, thus furthering the strengthening of international security, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations”.

106. In ancient times a cradle of civilization, a cross-roads of ideas, religions and races, the Mediterranean has now rapidly become an area of confrontation and conflict. Today we see more and more warships sailing this sea. We see the great ravages caused by more and more modern weapons. The peaceful area of the Mediterranean is becoming a field for a show of rival military forces.

107. The strategic interests of the great Powers are thus replacing the concerns of the countries of the area, countries facing grave problems of development and unable to succeed in their inspiring task in the absence of security and complete peace.

108. This climate of tension is considerably aggravated by the policy of aggression pursued by Israel against the Arab lands. The constant defiance by Israel of the United Nations resolutions constitutes one of the principal causes of the crisis in the Mediterranean area. The conflict in the Middle East, coming as it does in an area particularly tense

because of what is at stake, both politically and economically, in the Mediterranean, contains many risks of complications as regards the security of the neighbouring countries and, in a more general sense, security throughout the world. Thus it is the duty of all countries to consider this question seriously and to work ceaselessly to bring back a climate of justice, brotherhood and co-operation to that region.

109. We are convinced of the urgent necessity to put an end to the developing tension in the Mediterranean area. To that end, it will suffice to put an end to the military escalation, to eliminate all the causes of conflict behind that escalation, and to devote all our energies to economic development. The countries on the northern shore of the Mediterranean should thus increase their efforts to render assistance for the economic development of the less-developed countries on the southern shore. Such action can only serve to narrow the gap separating them and, by the same token, increase the chances of greater harmony in the Mediterranean basin.

110. We should also like to see Europe engage in a dialogue with the countries on the southern shore and act with greater decisiveness in the Israeli-Arab conflict. By taking part more actively in the general development effort, Europe would make a more decisive contribution to reducing instability in that region. The forthcoming European security conference should assign particular importance to a consideration of the situation in the Mediterranean and should define the role that Europe intends to play in that region in order to contribute to the creation of an era of peace and prosperity.

111. It is equally important for the Mediterranean countries once again to take the initiative in decisions affecting their own security. They should embark upon a sincere and thoroughgoing concerted effort aimed at creating the conditions necessary for maintaining peace, strengthening their solidarity and, above all, promoting loyal co-operation.

112. It is our conviction that peace in the Mediterranean is the wish of all, particularly of Tunisia, which would like to contribute to a situation in which security and economic and social development will be the only factors bringing together the two shores of the Mediterranean, in which co-operation and technical assistance will replace empty rivalries, confrontations and military expenditure.

113. It is only in these circumstances that we shall be able to take our peoples forward into a future of prosperity and peace.

114. Mrs. NHOUNG PENG (Khmer Republic) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution in document A/8909, because of the very worthy principles and noble ideals it contains.

115. We hope that this draft resolution will not remain a dead letter. In fact, since the adoption of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [*resolution 2734 (XXV)*], the Khmer people, the innocent victims of an unjustified and unjustifiable aggression from abroad,

continues to suffer in its flesh and blood. The distance that separates me from my country cannot remove from my thoughts or dispel from my mind the picture of the horrors and tortures committed by the invaders against our civilian population: our wives mourn their dead husbands, our orphans their mothers, our monks their ruined monasteries, and our refugees their lost homes.

116. In this abyss of horror into which our North Viet-Nameese neighbours have without reason cast us, the Khmer people are struggling with courage and determination; they are fighting for their future, for their survival, for their very existence as a nation. It is precisely this conviction that gives us our strength, a moral strength that no campaign of subversion, no weapon, can weaken. But in this struggle to liberate our country from the claws of the foreign invaders, who are better equipped and better trained militarily than the Khmer people, our people needs, if not the assistance, at least the understanding and encouragement of all peoples who have formally committed themselves to honour the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter.

117. More than at any other time in its existence, the Khmer people has come to realize how great will be the danger for mankind if the United Nations does not intervene in an effort to put an immediate end to the aggression—so systematic, so foolhardy—that has been launched by North Viet-Nam against a peaceful people whose only crime is to want to live in peace within its own frontiers and in good relations with all nations, and especially its neighbours, without distinction as to ideology, race, religion or system of government.

118. Thus, this aggression is all the more unjustifiable in that it is directed against a peaceful and neutral State, a country that is weaker in both numbers and military strength, one that has never threatened any other country. Profoundly imbued with the Buddhist principles, the Khmer people has the reputation of being one of the most peaceful in the world.

119. Proofs multiply day by day, bearing witness to the atrocities committed not only against our defending armies but also, and above all, against our civilian populations, our children, our Buddhist clergy, our doctors, not to mention the destruction inflicted on our economic, cultural and social infrastructure and the terrorist acts perpetrated against our peaceful people in the villages and the countryside. This obvious aggression is proved by the large numbers of weapons and documents that have been seized and by the statements of North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong prisoners at present detained in Phnom Penh. Many foreign observers who have had free access to the Khmer territory since April 1970 no longer challenge the fact of that invasion, despite enemy propaganda efforts aimed at camouflaging the four North Viet-Nameese divisions and the C-40 Regiment of the Viet-Cong by representing them as a so-called army of liberation.

120. I repeat, in the Khmer Republic there is but one struggle, and that is the national struggle of the Khmer people to free its country from the invaders. There is at the present time in the Khmer Republic only one foreign aggression, and that is the aggression of the North Viet-

Nameese and the Viet-Cong, for there are neither American troops nor American military bases on our soil. While claiming that they are "liberating" us, the foreign invaders are seeking only to exterminate the Khmer people, just as the former Kingdom of Champa was exterminated.

121. For all the reasons I have just stated, it seems to us urgent for the international community to shoulder its responsibilities towards a Member State that is weak and the victim of aggression, and to take effective action to put an end as soon as possible to the North Viet-Nameese and Viet-Cong aggression against the Khmer Republic; because that aggression, continuing to this very day with ever greater intensity, constitutes not only a grave threat to the existence of the Khmer people, but also a threat to all the neighbouring peoples, which are peace-loving and have no expansionist aims.

122. Before concluding, I should like to reiterate our faith in those sacred principles which constitute the worth of our Organization and the dignity of man.

123. I hope that the new year will be a truly happy one for all and that it will bring peace to men who are the innocent victims of unjust wars.

124. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution under consideration when it was discussed in the First Committee, and we shall do so again in the plenary Assembly.

125. As we stated in the debate in the First Committee, our delegation considers, as do the vast majority of the States Members of this Organization, that the strengthening of international security constitutes the primary task of the United Nations, and this is why we gave our full support to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security when it was solemnly proclaimed by the General Assembly, and this is also why we have supported the present draft resolution.

126. In so doing, my delegation wishes to express its hope that the adoption of this text and its reaffirmation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security will cause all those States which are really desirous of maintaining international peace on the basis of strict respect for the rights of all peoples to adopt effective measures to ensure that the purposes and principles contained in that Declaration become a reality.

127. To this end we consider that Member States should not confine themselves to the casting of their vote in favour of this kind of document, but rather that they should adopt practical measures intended to ensure the effective exercise by all peoples of their national rights, support peoples who are fighting imperialist aggression and support the liberation movements which throughout the world are endeavouring to win national independence for their people.

128. In speaking at this time of the strengthening of international security, if we genuinely desire our action to be effective rather than mere verbal expressions from this rostrum, we must above all pay a tribute to the peoples of

Indo-China, who, like none other, have for a decade been defending the principles of international law—the principles proclaimed in the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security—by their sacrifices and their blood and who have faced in this epic struggle the power of the strongest imperialism ever known to history, an imperialism which has not stopped at any method, however inhuman, to deny the peoples of Indo-China their legitimate and inalienable right to independence.

129. In speaking of international security here today, we must demand as the first measure for its true effectiveness that the Government of the United States sign the agreements to which it had committed itself and thus put an end to the aggression against the people of Viet-Nam and cease its obstinate determination to interfere in the affairs of the peoples of Indo-China, particularly through the imposition of puppet régimes in Saigon and Phnom-Penh, which not only represent no one in that region, but are merely fronts for foreign aggression against their peoples. In speaking today of international security, we must consider, in all their magnitude, the pressures and aggressions exercised against the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, not just those which are brought to the surface through armed conflict.

130. That is why my delegation welcomes the inclusion of operative paragraph 4 in the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee, which

“Reaffirms that any measure of pressure directed against any State while exercising its sovereign right freely to dispose of its natural resources constitutes a flagrant violation of the principles of self-determination of peoples, and non-intervention, as set forth in the Charter, which, if pursued, could constitute a threat to international peace and security”.

This principle was fully reflected at the recent meeting of the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held at Georgetown, Guyana in August this year. The non-aligned countries not only reaffirmed that any pressure directed against those States which freely dispose of their natural resources was a flagrant violation of the Charter, but also proclaimed their will to take specific, practical steps to defend those States which were the victims of imperialist pressures with regard to the exercise of their sovereign rights over their natural resources.

131. This is why my delegation, in voting in favour of the draft resolution which has now been submitted by the First Committee, appeals to Member States which are really and genuinely interested in the implementation of the principles that were considered under the heading of international security to do more than adopt this draft resolution: they should take joint measures to oppose the pressures and interference of imperialist interests against those peoples which have exercised the right mentioned in operative paragraph 4.

132. We hope that the adoption of this draft resolution will be an expression of the majority will of the inter-

national community to take practical steps to oppose the imperialist measures unleashed against those peoples which have taken possession of resources which are theirs alone, resources with which nature endowed them, in their soil or in their waters, for the benefit of their peoples, and which served for many years only to swell the bank accounts of certain American monopolies. Let us hope that the adoption of this draft resolution at this particular time will be, as we hope, an invitation to all Members to express their specific and effective solidarity with the people and Government of Chile who today are the victims of insolent measures on the part of international imperialism aimed at weakening and ignoring that country's sovereign will.

133. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 10 of document A/8909. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Oman, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway.

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, France, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 113 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions (resolution 2993 (XXVII)).¹³

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

¹³ *Idem.*