



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 46: Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: (a) Non-interference in the internal affairs of States: report of the Secretary-General; (b) Implementation of the Declaration: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee .....	1895
Agenda item 122: Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States Report of the First Committee .....	1895
Agenda item 126: Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations Report of the First Committee .....	1895
Signing of the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies ....	1895
Agenda item 128: Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council .....	1906

*President:* Mr. Salim Ahmed SALIM  
 (United Republic of Tanzania)

*In the absence of the President, Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

**AGENDA ITEM 46**

**Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security:**  
 (a) **Non-interference in the internal affairs of States: report of the Secretary-General;**  
 (b) **Implementation of the Declaration: report of the Secretary-General**

**AGENDA ITEM 122**

**Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/34/790)

**AGENDA ITEM 126**

**Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations**

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/34/791)

1. Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria), Rapporteur of the First Committee (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour today of presenting to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee concerning its work on agenda items 46, 122 and 126.

2. The report on agenda item 46, on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, appears in document A/34/827. In paragraph 13 of that report the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of three draft resolutions. Those three drafts deal, respectively, with the development and strengthening of good neighbourliness between States, the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

3. The report on agenda item 122, dealing with the settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States, appears in document A/34/790. In paragraph 7 of that report the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution.

4. Finally, the report on agenda item 126, on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, appears in document A/34/791. In paragraph 11 of that report, the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of a draft resolution.

5. On behalf of the First Committee, I have the honour of recommending for adoption by the General Assembly the five draft resolutions to which I have referred.

*Pursuant to rule 66 of the rules of procedure, it was decided not to discuss the reports of the First Committee.*

6. The PRESIDENT: The positions of delegations with respect to the recommendations contained in the reports of the First Committee to the Assembly are reflected in the relevant records of the Committee.

7. May I remind members of the decision taken by the General Assembly on 21 September 1979 that:

*"when the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in the plenary Assembly, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in the plenary Assembly, unless that delegation's vote in the plenary Assembly is different from its vote in the Committee."* [4th meeting, para. 349.]

8. We turn first to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 46, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The report is contained in document A/34/827. The Assembly will now take a decision on the three draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report.

9. I call on the representative of Albania, who wishes to explain his vote before the vote.

10. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): In the debate in the First Committee on agenda item 46, the delegation of Albania set forth its views on the question of international peace and security.<sup>1</sup> It concentrated, in particular, on an examination of the situation in Europe and in the Mediterranean. On the basis of the views we explained, we did not take part in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.55/Rev.1.

11. That same draft resolution is included in the report submitted to the Assembly by the First Committee [A/34/827]. Now when the General Assembly is about to take a decision on this draft resolution, the Albanian delegation would like to explain its vote.

12. One finds in this draft resolution certain elements whose value cannot be questioned because they constitute principles which have already been recognized and are embodied in the Charter of the United Nations and in other documents, as well as correct assessments and observations regarding various international problems. But our delegation has reservations regarding several provisions of this draft resolution, in particular with respect to the second preambular paragraph and operative paragraphs 2, 6, 10, 11 and 12.

13. In the light of the events which have taken place in the 1970s, we cannot share the view that the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security has played an important role in international life. The proliferation of acts in violation of the principles and norms of international law, sovereignty and national independence, acts that are referred to in the fourth preambular paragraph, furnishes obvious proof that international peace and security have not been strengthened. On the contrary, the international situation has become more complicated and more tense.

14. Once again, we wish to stress that we cannot share the opinion which is set forth in operative paragraph 2 concerning the role to be played by the five permanent members of the Security Council. Our view is rather the opposite. We cannot trust the imperialist super-Powers who are permanent members of the Security Council when it is a question of taking action to ensure respect for the Charter of the United Nations.

15. In our opinion, there has been no international détente, nor is there now. Proof is the fact that tension has continued to increase, contradictions on the international scene have been constantly exacerbated and the hegemonistic aggressive policy of the imperialist super-Powers, the armaments race and the preparations for war have taken on new dimensions. We therefore find it inappropriate to speak of the pursuit of a process of "international détente".

16. As regards the part of the draft resolution that deals with European security, we would just like to stress that it is not accurate to refer to the situation in Europe and the Helsinki Conference<sup>2</sup> as an example

and a model of the strengthening of peace and security. Nothing has changed in Europe since the so-called Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Never, since the Second World War, has tension in Europe and in the world been as great as it is today. That situation, instead of improving, could become even worse as a result of the aggravation of the contradictions on the international scene. We believe that the meeting at Madrid,<sup>3</sup> which is scheduled for next year, cannot in these conditions obtain better results than those which were achieved last year at Belgrade.<sup>4</sup>

17. The situation in the Mediterranean, in our view, can improve only if concrete measures are taken to oppose the hegemonistic policies of the super-Powers and the imperialist Powers, and especially to combat the presence of American and Soviet war fleets in the Mediterranean basin. The Mediterranean countries must categorically refuse to allow the imperialist super-Powers to establish naval bases and strong points or to grant port facilities to the American and Soviet fleets. As we have already stated, we do not believe that proposals for the proclamation of so-called "peace" zones or "denuclearized" zones in various parts of the world, including the Mediterranean basin, prevent the danger of arms and war or strengthen international security.

18. For these reasons the delegation of Albania will not take part in the vote on draft resolution II, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 13 of its report [*ibid.*].

19. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will first vote on draft resolution I, entitled "Development and strengthening of good neighbourliness between States". The First Committee adopted draft resolution I without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly wishes to do likewise?

*Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 34/99).*

20. The PRESIDENT: Draft resolution II is entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The report of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution is contained in document A/34/831. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Domini-

<sup>1</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, First Committee*, 53rd meeting, and *ibid.*, *First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

<sup>2</sup> Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe.

<sup>3</sup> Second review session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, to be held at Madrid in 1980.

<sup>4</sup> First review session of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, held at Belgrade from 4 October 1977 to 8 March 1978.

can Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Draft resolution II was adopted by 104 votes to 2, with 24 abstentions (resolution 34/100).<sup>5</sup>*

21. The PRESIDENT: Lastly, we turn to draft resolution III, entitled "Non-interference in the internal affairs of States". A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxem-

<sup>5</sup> The delegations of Liberia, Mauritius, Sierra Leone, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United Republic of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

bourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Australia, Austria, Canada, Costa Rica, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Turkey.

*Draft resolution III was adopted by 106 votes to 11, with 14 abstentions (resolution 34/101).<sup>6</sup>*

22. The PRESIDENT: I now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes after the vote.

23. Mrs. HERNANDEZ (Venezuela) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The fact that the delegation of Venezuela voted in favour of draft resolution III, on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, does not imply that Venezuela accepts all the elements contained in the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in internal affairs of States [*ibid.*, para. 9]. The delegation of Venezuela has some observations and reservations on the draft declaration which, on a suitable occasion, it will put forward.

24. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution III contained in document A/34/827, which has just been adopted, because it deals with a matter of great importance in international relations insofar as the maintenance of international peace and security is concerned: the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

25. But we believe that this principle is of a universal nature, as set forth in the Charter of this Organization, and the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States is subsumed under that larger principle. In spite of this, we voted in favour of the draft resolution. Even though the resolution just adopted only takes note of the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in internal affairs of States [*ibid.*], we wish to express some reservations regarding certain on the terms contained therein.

26. We do not share the view implicit in the sixth preambular paragraph, where zionism is included among the policies of imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid* and racism, as this imparts a selective character to the draft Declaration.

27. We should like to express our firm reservation regarding operative paragraph 1 (*e*). As we have already said, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States is a universal principle, established in the Charter of the United Nations, and to attempt to qualify it, as is done in that paragraph of the draft declaration, is very dangerous because it detracts from its universal value and thus distorts it.

28. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Costa Rica abstained in the

<sup>6</sup> The delegations of Liberia, Mauritius, Sierra Leone and the United Republic of Cameroon subsequently informed the Secretariat that they wished to have their votes recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

vote on draft resolution III contained in the report of the First Committee concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, although we have always supported the principle of non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, since in accordance with the Charter such action is inadmissible and since that principle is of universal value.

29. In view of the fact that documents already exist on these important principles, my delegation believes that what is necessary in order to achieve the objectives and the implementation of these principles is not the formulation of new texts, but rather compliance with the principles and the recommendations which have already been adopted and amplified on many occasions. We are also of the opinion that the draft declaration would not increase compliance with decisions that have already been adopted by the General Committee for the rationalization and improvement of our work, because what we have here is just a repetition of documents and important principles which have already been adopted.

30. It is not necessary to repeat all these principles in new declarations to be implemented selectively. Nevertheless, we should formally like to express our firm support for the principle of non-intervention and non-interference in the internal affairs of States.

31. The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly will now consider the report of the First Committee on agenda item 122, entitled "Settlement by peaceful means of disputes between States". The report is contained in document A/34/790.

32. I invite members to turn their attention to the recommendation of the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the General Assembly will do likewise?

*The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 34/102).*

33. The PRESIDENT: We turn now to the report of the First Committee on agenda item 126, entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" [A/34/791].

34. Amendments have been submitted by Israel in document A/34/L.59 to the draft resolution recommended by the Committee in its report. I now call on the representative of Israel to introduce his amendments.

35. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The amendments contained in document A/34/L.59 are, in fact, self-explanatory. The problems underlying them are well understood, and I can therefore be brief in the introduction of these amendments.

36. In submitting the amendments contained in document A/34/L.59, the Israel delegation is guided by the terms of the preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of document A/34/791. The second preambular paragraph of that draft recalls the duty of States to refrain, *inter alia*, from "economic . . . coercion". The third preambular paragraph notes that hegemonism "is a manifesta-

tion . . . to control . . . economically . . . peoples or regions of the world". In operative paragraph 3, the General Assembly would reject "all forms of . . . pressure", including economic pressure, in international relations.

37. Arab oil-exporting countries have been guilty of all such actions, especially since the onset of the energy crisis in 1973, which they deliberately created. They have used economic coercion in order to control peoples and relations between States and have frequently interfered through the use of the oil weapon in the internal affairs of sovereign States.

38. No meaningful definition of hegemonism today would be complete without mention of Arab petro-hegemonism, which is plaguing the developed and developing world alike. If the world community does not curb the unrestrained use of oil by the Arab petro-hegemonists as a political, military and economic weapon, it will prevent the establishment of a new economic order and instead invite global economic chaos. It was with this in mind that my delegation submitted the amendments contained in document A/34/L.59.

39. Following the submission of our amendments, we have been in contact with a number of missions. It has emerged from these contacts that there is widespread understanding of the problem highlighted in our amendments. At the same time, it also appears that, because of the short notice given, many delegations are still without instructions on this matter and that consequently the widespread revulsion at and condemnation of Arab petro-hegemonism would not be fully reflected in the vote on our amendments. For these reasons, Israel has decided to withdraw these amendments.

40. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report [*ibid.*].

41. I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote before the vote.

42. Mr. BALETA (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The delegation of the People's Socialist Republic of Albania wishes to make a brief statement to explain its position in the voting on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee on agenda item 126 [*ibid.*].

43. During the debates on this item in the First Committee, our delegation very openly expressed its opinion on the policy of hegemony practised by the imperialist super-Powers—the United States of America, the Soviet Union and China—and the disastrous consequences that that policy entails for the freedom and independence of peoples and for international peace and security. In the course of that debate our delegation stated that it would have voted against the two draft resolutions, the Soviet draft and the Chinese draft, submitted as documents A/C.1/34/L.1 and A/C.1/34/L.8, if those drafts had been put to the vote. But the two drafts were withdrawn by their sponsors and we are convinced that their submission and withdrawal were merely manoeuvres planned in

advance to influence the work of the Committee and, above all, to prevent the adoption of a document in which it would be clearly indicated who the hegemons are. The reproduction *in extenso* of the two drafts in document A/34/791 is, in our opinion, unfortunate.

44. Draft resolution A/C.1/34/L.52, which was adopted by the First Committee and which is now before the plenary Assembly, cannot receive our support.

45. That draft emerged after a debate which was held in the First Committee as a result of a demagogic manoeuvre by the Soviet social-imperialists, who proposed the inclusion on the agenda of an item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" as a means of hiding their aggressive and hegemonic policy.

46. In our opinion, the draft resolution which is to be put to the vote fails to achieve the main purpose which should be to identify the hegemons.

47. For these reasons the Albanian delegation cannot support the draft resolution contained in paragraph 11 of document A/34/791 and will not take part in the voting on that draft.

48. Mr. de ZAVALA URRIOLAGOITIA (Bolivia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I just wish to say that my delegation, which unfortunately could not take part in the vote in the First Committee on 30 November last, will today vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/34/791 concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations.

49. However, on this occasion, we should like to express our formal reservations concerning operative paragraph 5, which condemns zionism as an expression of hegemonism within the restrictive context of the freedom of States.

50. Mr. GARCIA (Dominican Republic) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/34/791. We feel that it is a major contribution on the part of the sponsors. Unfortunately, however, my delegation has reservations regarding the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5, because those paragraphs contain certain matters with which my delegation does not agree.

51. Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Costa Rica would like to express its support for the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations [A/34/791], because it is concerned with certain policies and principles that Costa Rica has supported in the past and still supports.

52. However, we have reservations concerning the words "including zionism" in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5, because we do not agree with linking the word "zionism" with racism and *apartheid*. We have always felt that racism

should be interpreted as it is defined in paragraph 1 of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*]. We have referred to that definition on many occasions and there is no need for us to do so again now, but it is clear that that definition is not applicable to zionism.

53. Nor can we agree that zionism is a form of hegemonism. Hegemonism is a manifestation of political, ideological, economic, social and military imperialism. The term can therefore only be applied to powerful countries which pursue those policies directly or through other States which they dominate or manipulate.

54. For this reason we feel that the draft resolution loses force by including notions which do not properly come within the scope of the item under discussion.

55. I should like to refer to the amendment in document A/34/L.59 relating to the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution. We are pleased that it has been withdrawn, because we would not have been able to support it. Its effect would have been to add after the word "neo-colonialism" the phrase "including Arab petro-hegemonism", and we do not think it can be said that there exists an Arab hegemonism in the sphere of petroleum. Although we do not like the increase in the price of petroleum imposed by the exporters of that vital product, and we have suffered on account of it, in our view the matter should not be taken up here.

56. In this context, we support the initiative of the President of Mexico concerning a study of the problems of energy within the general framework of the new international economic order [*11th meeting, paras. 2-73*]. But there is a deep gulf, very difficult to bridge, between that initiative and considering that the fixing of petroleum prices by the exporting countries—which include both Arab and non-Arab countries—is a manifestation of hegemonism.

57. Mr. BLUM (Israel): In the draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 11 of document A/34/791, the General Assembly is about to spawn yet another monstrous perversion. This draft resolution could have seen the light of day only in the surrealistic world of this Assembly.

58. The word "hegemonism" was coined as part of the shadow-boxing between the world's heavy-weights. It has a certain use as a code word in international politics today and has entered the shadow world of the Assembly's agenda. Certain delegations, however, whose opposition to the peaceful settlement of disputes is well known and who prefer to flex their muscles rather than curb their appetites for power and influence, are clearly unhappy with mere shadow-boxing.

59. Those delegations have thus selected as their target the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, a people that has suffered intolerably at the hands of almost all the imperial and hegemonic Powers the world has ever seen. That bloc of Arab petro-colonialists and Arab petro-hegemonists has

sought to conceal its own attitude of exclusivism by including Zionism in the draft resolution dealing with hegemonism.

60. Zionism and hegemonism are a contradiction in terms if ever there was such a contradiction. Zionism is the Jewish people's national liberation movement, the expression of its quest for freedom and for equality with other nations. Yet in this Organization the Jewish people's national liberation movement, one of the most ancient of its kind in existence, is maligned and slandered in an endless spate of malice and venom.

61. In their drive to annihilate the Jewish people, its enemies throughout history began by distorting the image of the Jew, by rewriting Jewish history, and by fabricating some of the most odious historical and racial theories and libels. The Arab States, in their campaign to destroy the Jewish State, have adopted the same method of falsifying Jewish history and, in particular, the meaning of the Zionist movement. Zionism was the struggle of the Jewish people against the mighty imperial forces of the ancient world. Zionism was the dream of the Jewish people, uprooted from its land and dispersed all over the world, to strive to return to the Land of Israel. Zionism was the participation of the Jewish people in Jewish brigades that fought with the Allies against Hitler while Arab leaders collaborated with him. In other words, Zionism aims at restoring to the Jewish people the rights possessed by other nations.

62. As a former Foreign Minister of Israel, Abba Eban has written in an article which appeared in the *New York Times* of 3 November 1975:

“Zionism is nothing more—but also nothing less—than the Jewish people's sense of origin and destination in the land linked eternally with its name. It is also the instrument whereby the Jewish nation seeks an authentic fulfilment of itself. And the drama is enacted in the region in which the Arab nations has realized its sovereignty in 20 States comprising 100 million people in 4.5 million square miles, with vast resources. The issue therefore is not whether the world will come to terms with Arab nationalism. The question is at what point Arab nationalism, with its prodigious glut of advantage, wealth and opportunity, will come to terms with the modest but equal right of another Middle Eastern nation to pursue its life in security and peace.”

63. The Arab States will come to terms with Israel's right to exist only when they renounce their exclusivist and hegemonistic attitude towards the presence of a non-Arab and non-Moslem State in the Middle East.

64. Many members must be aware that the absurdity of including Zionism in the draft resolution before us is made possible only by the fact that individual delegations do not vote in such cases according to the dictates of conscience. On the contrary, outrageous resolutions of this type have to be steam-rolled through the Assembly by the hegemonistic bloc of Arab petro-colonialists. Is it not hegemonism of the purest kind when the Arab States reserve for themselves the exclusive right to define the national movement of another people? A group of countries, intoxicated by the feeling of power inherent in the automatic majority, has for

years subjected the United Nations to an outpouring of invective against Israel unprecedented in the annals of international organizations and to a barrage of hostile resolutions, which culminated in the infamous and abominable resolution of 1975 purporting to equate Zionism with racism [*resolution 3379 (XXX)*]. The aim of those Arab States has been to lend a semblance of respectability to anti-Semitism under the cover of anti-Zionism.

65. It was during that paroxysm of insanity and orgy of hate in 1975 that the Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations warned that a terrible lie had been unleashed in this Organization, a lie that would have terrible consequences. He said that “people will begin to say, as indeed they have already begun to say, that the United Nations is a place where lies are told . . .”<sup>7</sup>

66. The fact is that the lies told in the United Nations have turned this forum into the laughing-stock of international society. Informed opinion no longer takes seriously the deliberations here. What is more, it is no longer even outraged by a perverse mentality that, having purported to equate Zionism with racism and hegemonism, could equate it with similar justification with vegetarianism, rheumatism, philately and many other “isms”.

67. About two hours ago, the people of Israel lit the first candle ushering in the eight-day festival of Chanukah. Within the next few hours the Jewish people throughout the world will also light the first candle of the festival.

68. Chanukah commemorates the victory of the Maccabees 22 centuries ago over a hegemonistic empire of another age. Had the Maccabees lived today, they no doubt would be condemned by the numerical majority in this Assembly as Zionists for taking a stand against imperialism. But the Jewish people has been commemorating for over 2,000 years the victory of the Maccabees, the defenders of their rights and avengers of their wrongs, and celebrates the victory of the weak over the strong and of the few over the many.

69. This is the strength of the Jewish people, deriving from its unswerving attachment to its land—the Land of Israel. Many foreign empires have ruled over that land. They have come and gone, they have been vanquished and they have vanished from the face of the earth. But one small nation, more ancient still, has outlived them all and today enjoys again national sovereignty in its patrimony. That nation will not waver and will not falter in the face of obscenities, rhetorical abuse and condemnation in this hall.

70. The anti-Semitic outbursts of the Arab petro-hegemonists and their ilk cannot and will not hurt the Jewish people. But they will further erode whatever little respect, resonance and prestige the United Nations still enjoys.

71. Mr. EURWIN (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Document A/34/791 on the

<sup>7</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirtieth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 2400th meeting.

inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, which has been submitted to us for our examination, reflects the attitudes of all the parties concerned. It is a global and comprehensive text. I should like to take this opportunity to reaffirm that the mention of zionism in the draft resolution is based on the following considerations.

72. First, in resolution 1094 (XVIII) dated 20 November 1963, the General Assembly declared the necessity of speedily eliminating racial discrimination throughout the world in all its forms and manifestations and stated that any doctrine of racial differentiation or superiority is scientifically false, morally condemnable and socially unjust and dangerous. It is known that the Zionist entity bases itself, among many other things, upon being a chosen people and upon a State established on the principle of racial and religious discrimination.

73. Secondly, in its resolution 3151 G (XXVIII) of 14 December 1973, the General Assembly condemned, among other things, the unholy alliance between South Africa and the Zionist entity.

74. Thirdly, the Declaration of Mexico on the Equality of Women and Their Contribution to Development and Peace, 1975,<sup>8</sup> which resulted from the World Conference of the International Women's Year, held at Mexico City from 19 June to 2 July 1975, stated that international co-operation and peace require the achievement of national liberation and independence, the elimination of colonialism, neo-colonialism, foreign occupation, zionism, *apartheid* and racial discrimination in all its forms, as well as the recognition of the dignity of the human person and the right of peoples to self-determination.

75. Fourthly, we would refer to resolution 77 (XII), adopted by the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity at its twelfth ordinary session, held at Kampala from 28 July to 1 August 1975,<sup>9</sup> in which the Assembly considered that the racist régime in occupied Palestine and the racist régimes in Zimbabwe and South Africa have a common imperialist origin, forming a whole, having the same racist structure and being organically linked in their policy aimed at repression of the dignity and integrity of the human being. This too is hegemony.

76. Fifthly, the conferences of non-aligned countries have reaffirmed in their declarations, the most recent being that of the Havana Conference,<sup>10</sup> that zionism is a racist movement. The Declaration of the Conference of Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Lima from 25 to 30 August 1975,<sup>11</sup> condemned zionism as a threat to world peace and security, and called upon all countries to oppose that racist and imperialist ideology.

<sup>8</sup> See *Report of the World Conference of the International Women's Year* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.76.IV.1), chap. I.

<sup>9</sup> See A/10297, annex II.

<sup>10</sup> Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Havana from 3 to 9 September 1979. For the text of the Declaration, see A/34/542, annex.

<sup>11</sup> For the text of the Lima Programme for Mutual Assistance and Solidarity, see A/10217 and Corr.1, annex.

77. Sixthly, the General Assembly, in its resolution 3379 (XXX) of 10 November 1975 on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, determined that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

78. Therefore, it is confirmed that zionism is a form of racial hegemony which has been condemned at the regional level, and at the level of the non-aligned countries and of the United Nations. This, indeed, is a sufficient answer to those who are against including a mention of zionism in the draft resolution under consideration.

79. Thus the text now before us is a true reflection of the situation prevailing throughout the world and diagnoses a disease that is affecting all the body of mankind. We cannot remedy one part of the disease and disregard other parts; we must cure the disease as a whole if we want to ensure that the body is sound.

80. Mr. BAFI (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): The Iraqi delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations, submitted by the non-aligned countries and contained in document A/34/791. This draft resolution reflects all points of view, as it is a comprehensive and integrated text. It condemns colonialism, neo-colonialism and hegemonism in all its forms, including racism and zionism.

81. At all its conferences the non-aligned movement has condemned colonialism, racism, zionism and racial discrimination. The United Nations also has condemned them in General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX) on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. In that resolution zionism was regarded as a form of racism. However desperately some may try—and this is true particularly of the representative of the Zionist entity—to free zionism from its racist character, the international community has already condemned it and will continue to condemn it because it contains all the evils rejected by the international community.

82. The Zionist entity is occupying all of the territory of Palestine, in addition to territories belonging to three Arab States, and it practises there the worst forms of hegemony, despite the numerous resolutions adopted by the General Assembly in the past few years, and particularly those adopted during these past days in connexion with the questions of Palestine [*resolutions 34/65 A to D*] and the Middle East [*resolution 34/70*]. Only three days ago, the Zionist entity was condemned in regard to Israeli nuclear armament [*resolution 34/89*]. Where are we at fault in this? We are part of mankind, which aspires to peace and freedom for all. The representative of the Zionist entity would have done better to frankly state why his delegation would not vote in favour of the draft resolution on hegemonism. The reason is that this entity is one of the most outstanding Powers in the world practising hegemonism. As we have said, it still occupies the entire territory of Palestine, in addition to the territory of three Arab States, by armed force, and with the support of its ally, the United States of America.

83. The PRESIDENT: We shall now proceed to vote on the draft resolution contained in the report of the First Committee [A/34/791].

84. A separate vote has been requested on the words "including zionism" in the fourth paragraph of the preamble and in operative paragraph 5. As there appears to be no objection to that request, I now put those words to the vote. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Egypt, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Poland, Qatar, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Burma, Canada, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

*Abstaining:* Argentina, Barbados, Bhutan, Central African Republic, Chile, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Greece, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mexico, Nepal, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, United States of America,<sup>12</sup> Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire.

*The words "including zionism" were adopted by 79 votes to 26, with 33 abstentions.*<sup>13</sup>

85. The PRESIDENT: I now put to the vote the draft resolution as a whole, as recommended by the First Committee, on the understanding that the fourth paragraph of the preamble and operative paragraph 5 remain as they appear in document A/34/791. A recorded vote has been requested.

*A recorded vote was taken.*

*In favour:* Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi,

<sup>12</sup> The delegation of the United States of America subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been against the inclusion of these words.

<sup>13</sup> The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the inclusion of these words.

Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

*Against:* Australia, Canada, Israel, United States of America.

*Abstaining:* Austria, Belgium, Chile, Denmark, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Paraguay, Portugal, Samoa, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela.

*The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 111 votes to 4, with 26 abstentions (resolution 34/103).*<sup>14</sup>

86. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on those representatives who have asked to be allowed to speak in explanation of vote.

87. Mr. TROYANOVSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*interpretation from Russian*): The General Assembly has just adopted an important decision of principle condemning the policy of hegemonism in all its forms and manifestations. On behalf of the peoples of the United Nations, the General Assembly has stated clearly that no State or group of States should in any circumstances or for any reason exercise hegemony in international relations or strive to assume a dominant position in the world or any region of the world. Thus the General Assembly has taken another important step towards strengthening international peace and security, and ensuring the sovereign equality of States and the independence and freedom of peoples.

88. The General Assembly's decision on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism—a decision taken on the initiative of the Soviet Union—places a political and moral obstacle in the way of any claims to

<sup>14</sup> The delegation of Mauritius subsequently informed the Secretariat that it wished to have its vote recorded as having been in favour of the draft resolution.

hegemony in world affairs and establishes a new orientation in the struggle to widen international détente.

89. We note with deep satisfaction that this initiative taken by the Soviet Union has been given wide support, particularly by the non-aligned and developing countries that have fallen victim to the policies of hegemonism and encroachment on their sovereignty and national and economic independence. In the statements they made during the discussion of this item, the representatives of the non-aligned countries condemned such manifestations of the policy of hegemonism as colonialism, racism, imperialism, aggression, the creation of spheres of influence, the establishment of military blocs and all forms of the threat or use of force, including the practice of "teaching lessons", and great-Power chauvinism and territorial expansion. Representatives showed very convincingly in their statements that the policy of hegemonism leads to the creation of pockets of tension and destabilizes the international situation. The representatives of many countries emphasized the danger posed to the cause of peace by the form of hegemonism constituted by the striving for military superiority, which whips up the arms race and increases military arsenals.
90. The discussion of the Soviet Union's proposal on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and the adoption today by the General Assembly of the resolution on the item show that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations have taken an unequivocal position in respect of hegemonism, having advocated that an end should be put to all forms and manifestations of the policy of hegemonism.
91. As for the Soviet Union, our State has from the very early days of its existence staunchly advocated the reaffirmation in international relations of the principle of the equality of States and peoples. We have always been against hegemonism and the subjugation by some States of other States and peoples. True to that ideal of the October Revolution, and consistently pursuing a policy of peace, the Soviet Union will continue staunchly to counteract hegemonistic ambitions wherever they may emerge.
92. Mr. MENDEZ-MONTENEGRO (Guatemala) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Guatemala abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in document A/34/791 on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations because of reservations that make unacceptable parts of the fourth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 5 of that draft resolution.
93. My delegation opposed those paragraphs in the separate vote that was requested. When those paragraphs were adopted, we were compelled to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole, although we agree with most of its contents.
94. Mr. ROJAS (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation supported the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations because we believe that its content reflects a basic contradiction between the reality of international policy today and some principles and standards of our Organization's Charter. Nevertheless, we wish to recall that we abstained in the separate vote on the words "including zionism" in the fourth preambular paragraph and in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, in accordance with the position we took in regard to General Assembly resolution 3379 (XXX).
95. Mr. DUARTE (Brazil): The Brazilian delegation did not participate in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/34/791 either in the First Committee or in this plenary meeting, because it does not consider that this complex subject has been adequately dealt with in the short time available during the present session of the General Assembly.
96. Our opposition to hegemonism in all cases and in all its manifestations is well known. However, the draft resolution just adopted is, to our mind, excessively ambitious and covers areas which have already been included in other resolutions supported by the Brazilian delegation.
97. Mr. HA VAN LAU (Viet Nam) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has just voted in favour of the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations and would like to explain its vote.
98. This is the first time that the international community has adopted a resolution sternly condemning the policy of hegemonism, which is at the root of wars of aggression, as well as the domination and subjugation of peoples. That resolution also energetically condemns imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, *apartheid* and racism, including zionism.
99. During the general debate on this item, delegations that made statements pointed out the true nature and the effects of the policy of hegemony, as well as its various manifestations in international relations. Numerous delegations stressed in particular the typical case of the policy of hegemonism of a State which has arrogated to itself the right to teach lessons to another. The Vietnamese people, who for many decades were the victims of colonialism, and are at the present time still subjected to the policy of hegemony and expansionism of a great nation of Asia, are, more than any other people, in a position to appreciate the disastrous effects imposed on peoples by all these forms of domination.
100. It is indeed ironic that it should be that great country, whose hegemonistic dreams are no secret to anyone, that is breaking into loud indictments of other countries, charging them with global or regional hegemonism, as if it were itself the most ardent opponent of all forms of hegemonism.
101. Who, in fact, in order to achieve their mad hegemonistic ambitions in South-East Asia, made use of the tyrants of ill repute, Pol Pot and Ieng Sary, to complete the genocide of 3 million Kampuchean and transform Kampuchea into a spring-board for their aggression in Indo-China and South-East Asia if not the present leaders of Beijing? They are the very ones who are trying at all costs to reinstall in power those

butchers of the Kampuchean people and to reimpose on that martyred people that régime which inspires horror and disgust throughout the whole world and will go down in the annals of history as the greatest disgrace to mankind.

102. It is precisely that great-nation hegemonism that is threatening aggression and is indulging in acts of flagrant interference in the internal affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic. It is precisely that expansionist hegemonism which, in the execution of its plan to annex Viet Nam, which has been maturing for many years, has sent 600,000 troops to commit aggression against Viet Nam and at the present time is still threatening to teach Viet Nam a second lesson. It is again that hegemonism that is fomenting dissension within the countries of South-East Asia, inciting some to pit themselves against others in order to achieve its expansionist aims in South-East Asia, which it considers to be part of its natural zone of influence.

103. It is quite obvious that, when American imperialism was defeated in Indo-China and had to withdraw its troops from South-East Asia, if Beijing had not embarked upon its criminal plans of hegemonism and expansion in the region, the countries of South-East Asia would have been able to live in peace, friendship and stability and together build up understanding and co-operation.

104. While alleging that they are struggling against a so-called Vietnamese aggression, those in power in Beijing are working feverishly, ostensibly to go to the assistance of countries victims of that aggression, but in fact to secure a bridge-head for their hegemonistic designs against the countries of South-East Asia.

105. In connivance with imperialism, the Beijing authorities are stepping up the arms race and opposing the forces of peace, national independence, democracy and social progress in the world. They harbour the sinister design of plunging the world into war and so-called great anarchy, in order to realize their dream of global hegemonism.

106. The delegation of Viet Nam welcomes the initiative taken by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics concerning the inscription in the agenda of this session of the item entitled "Inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations" and greatly appreciates the strenuous efforts of the delegations of non-aligned countries, which led to the adoption of this historic General Assembly resolution. We sincerely hope that that resolution will be a landmark in the struggle of peoples for a new world in which the policy of hegemony will be banished from international life.

107. From generation to generation, sacrificing their blood, the people of Viet Nam have fought and are still fighting against imperialism and hegemonism to defend their country and to defend just causes. My delegation showed by its vote that our people will continue to make an active contribution to the struggle of peoples against imperialism and the policy of hegemonism in international relations and to the defence of peace, national independence, democracy and social progress.

108. Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation had to abstain on the draft resolution in paragraph 11 of document A/34/791, which has just been adopted, because we believe that a general resolution should not be selective and be aimed at a particular political objective in connexion with one country.

109. We have reservations regarding the fourth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution.

110. Mr. ILLUECA (Panama) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I will be brief. We voted in favour of the draft resolution, but we would like to make it clear that we have reservations regarding the language of the fourth preambular paragraph and of operative paragraph 5. With those reservations, we supported the draft resolution as a whole.

111. Mr. TIAN Jin (China) (*translation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation supports the resolution just adopted. In our statement in the First Committee on this question,<sup>15</sup> we have already given a full explanation of the meaning of global and regional hegemonisms, the latter being supported by the former. We also exposed those countries which oppose hegemonism in words but which in fact practise hegemonism.

112. The resolution which has just been adopted reflects the position of numerous countries which condemn global and regional hegemonism. The Chinese delegation therefore supports the resolution.

113. Further, as regards the Vietnamese representative's barrage of slanders against China just now, we have already on many occasions used numerous facts to refute them. It is not worth my while to repeat them here.

114. Mr. KAMANDA wa KAMANDA (Zaire) (*interpretation from French*): We voted in favour of the draft resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. As we have already stated, hegemony is the supremacy of a State or group of States over another, the will to dominate of a State or a group of States over others, in all its manifestations: military, political, economic, cultural, ideological, racial, and so on.

115. We have already said that we of the third world have not colonized anyone, that we have not imposed our culture or civilization on anyone at all, and that the problem of hegemony does not relate to us as it does to others; that the problem of hegemony relates to those that have the means to practise such a policy.

116. Therefore, now that the resolution has been adopted, I should like to say that my country, like other countries in the third world, continues to find, following independence, that the myth of the archetype has not disappeared from international relations. We never cease to denounce and reject arbitrary hierarchies

<sup>15</sup> See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, First Committee*, 49th meeting, and *ibid.*, *First Committee, Sessional Fascicle*, corrigendum.

which people want to impose on us in all fields. We sincerely hope that the adoption of this resolution on the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations will be regarded as a solemn commitment by all those who have the means to practise the policy of hegemony, all those who are prompted by the will to dominate, to stop such practices, recognizing the evils and the profound dangers that are at the root of the troubles and the turbulence in the world of today.

117. This is very important and that is why we voted in favour of the draft resolution, but it must be clear that our responsibility in this field is not commensurate with the responsibility of those who have the means to practise this policy of hegemony throughout the world. There is this "commitment" aspect of the resolution, the commitment to end that policy at once, so that we may enter a new era in international relations. That is why we voted in favour of the draft resolution.

118. Mr. THIOUNN PRASITH (Democratic Kampuchea) (*interpretation from French*): Before explaining my vote, I should like to say that if all the hegemonists would leave my country as they have just left this hall, the international Organization would be able to settle the most serious problem in the world today.

119. The delegation of Democratic Kampuchea has just supported the resolution in which the Assembly condemns hegemonism. In the First Committee, my delegation had already defined the features of world and regional hegemonism.<sup>16</sup> In fact, the whole world knows that Vietnamese regional hegemonism is destroying my country. That Vietnamese regional hegemonism has become the most serious world danger to everyone. It has already been responsible for the death of more than 1 million Kampuchean, through slaughter and famine.

120. The General Assembly, by its vote on 14 November 1979, adopted resolution 34/22, which called for the withdrawal of the 220,000 Vietnamese troops from Kampuchea. It is those regional hegemonists who, with the support of world hegemonism, spend more than \$3 million a day to continue the killing of the Kampuchean people, pursue a war of aggression against Democratic Kampuchea, and threaten the peace and security of the countries of South-East Asia.

121. Regardless of the calumnies uttered by the Vietnamese regional expansionists, the Hanoi expansionists cannot conceal their ambition, namely, expansionism in South-East Asia.

122. By resolution 34/22 and the resolution just adopted, the General Assembly has demanded the withdrawal of foreign troops from other countries. Instead of following a propaganda campaign of calumny and lies, the Vietnamese regional hegemonists should rather withdraw their 220,000 troops from Kampuchea and the more than 50,000 men at present stationed in Laos.

123. Viet Nam is now the most dangerous regional hegemonist Power in the world, and in proportion to its population it has the largest number of troops stationed abroad, that is to say, more than one third of its armed forces.

124. That is why my delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/34/791.

125. The PRESIDENT: There are no other delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote. I call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

126. Mr. BLUM (Israel): The Arab petro-hegemonists here apparently see no incongruity in injecting a reference to Zionism, the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, into a resolution purportedly dealing with the inadmissibility of hegemonism. Those Arab States, essentially the rejectionist Arab States, have proved two of the central points which the delegation of Israel has made over and over again in the course of the current session of the General Assembly. First, they have demonstrated once again their unswerving determination to turn every possible item on the Assembly's agenda into an anti-Israel item. Secondly, they are in this particular case giving vent to an exclusivist, hegemonistic attitude, which has characterized Arab political activity throughout the Middle East since the end of the First World War. A function of that hegemonistic attitude is the inability of the Arab rejectionist States to come to terms with the rights of the Jewish people to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty in its homeland—the Land of Israel.

127. Those Arab States, ranging from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf, have a combined territory of over 5 million square miles, that is to say, over 10 per cent of the world's land surface. In other terms, they embrace a land mass greater in size than China or the United States of America. They are rich in material resources, not least of them the oil on which much of the modern world is dependent.

128. None the less, as is all too clear by remarks made not just today, but also today, they begrudge the existence of one sovereign Jewish State on any part, no matter how small, of the original area of Mandated Palestine. It is their exclusivist and hegemonistic attitude, their intolerance, their fanaticism, their xenophobia, indeed their total rejection of any non-Arab group in their midst, which is the crux of so many of the problems of our area, including the Arab-Israel conflict.

129. Arab hegemonism, in general, and Arab petro-hegemonism, in particular, are very real facets of international life today. They cannot be dismissed lightly, and they will not simply go away merely because this Assembly is too frightened even to admit that they exist.

130. The representative of petro-hegemonistic Libya offered here again today his liberal and enlightened views on Zionism, as he did in the First Committee, when he said:

"We have to deal with the whole disease if we do not want the whole body of mankind to wither

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, First Committee, 50th meeting, and *ibid.*, First Committee, Sessional Fascicle, corrigendum.

away. Zionism exercises hegemony over all those who practise Judaism in the world".<sup>17</sup>

131. In the light of this and similar pronouncements from representatives of other Arab petro-hegemonistic States and their supporters, can there still be the slightest doubt that these self-professed anti-Zionists are in fact crude anti-Semites, inspired by the worst of their despicable breed?

#### **Signing of the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies**

132. The PRESIDENT: Before turning to the next item, I should like to refer briefly to resolution 34/68, which was adopted by the General Assembly at its 89th plenary meeting on 5 December 1979.

133. The Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies will be open for signature on Tuesday, 18 December 1979.

#### **AGENDA ITEM 128**

##### **Question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council**

134. The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of India to introduce the draft resolution in document A/34/L.57 and Add.1.

135. Mr. B. C. MISHRA (India): Before introducing the draft resolution contained in document A/34/L.57 and Add.1 on the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council, I should like to thank the delegations present for the overwhelming support they gave for the inclusion of the additional item which we are now considering. On behalf of Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cuba, Grenada, Guyana, Iraq, Japan, Maldives, Nepal, Nigeria, Sri Lanka and my own delegation, I have the honour of introducing the draft resolution just mentioned.

136. The proposal contained in document A/34/L.57 and Add.1 in essence envisages an increase in the membership of the Security Council from 15 to 19 with the addition of four non-permanent seats. The draft resolution contains provisions for appropriate and limited amendments to Articles 23 and 27 of the Charter, in accordance with Article 108. Operative paragraph 3 allocates the additional seats to the under-represented regional groups, in conformity with the principle of equitable geographical distribution and in accordance with the provisions of Article 23, paragraph 1, of the Charter.

137. The rationale behind the draft resolution is contained in the explanatory memorandum that we submitted with our request for the inscription of the new agenda item [A/34/246]. The members are aware that, since the Charter was last amended in 1963 to enlarge the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 members, the membership of the United Nations has increased from 113 to 152. This increase is due mainly to the emergence of and admission to the United

Nations of a large number of new States from Africa, Asia and Latin America. This increase has not been reflected, however, in the membership of the Security Council. The global average at present of the number of countries represented by one non-permanent seat in the Security Council is 14.7. The number of Asian States represented by one non-permanent seat is 18.5, while the corresponding figure for the African States is 16.3; for the Latin American States, 14; for the Western European and other States, 11; and for the Eastern European States, 10. The non-aligned and developing countries are, therefore, under-represented in the Security Council at present.

138. There are basically two ways of correcting this imbalance. One is by redistribution of the existing non-permanent seats among different regional groups, in strict proportion to the number of countries represented by the regional group concerned. The second is by increasing the number of non-permanent seats and allocating the additional seats to the regional groups which have hitherto been under-represented on the Council. Given the impracticability of and the possible injustice implicit in the first course of action, the sponsors of the draft resolution have opted for an increase in the membership of the Security Council.

139. I should like to emphasize that our proposal is a specific and limited one which affects only the composition of the Security Council and does not in any way touch upon the substantive aspects of the role and functions of the Council or the position of its permanent members. It is for this reason that we have chosen to seek the relevant amendments to the Charter in accordance with Article 108 rather than action under Article 109, which implies a review of the Charter in its more substantive aspects. This was also the reason for which we were unable to accept a proposal made by the United States, at the 6th meeting of the General Committee, to remit this item to the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization.

140. It should be noted that our proposal for seeking the enlargement of the Council by the addition of four non-permanent seats is a modest one if we take into account the fact that, since its inception in 1946, the membership of the United Nations has increased three-fold, from 51 to 152. In strictly proportional terms there should have been an increase in the non-permanent membership of the Security Council from 6 to 18. In our proposal, on the other hand, we are merely seeking an increase to the figure of 14. However, there is an informal proposal to increase the non-permanent membership to 16. In that proposal the distribution of the non-permanent membership would be as follows: five for the African States; three for the Asian States; one for the Eastern European States; three for the Latin American States; two for the Western European and other States; one for the Asian and Latin American States, in alternate terms for two years each; and finally, one for the European States, to provide, *inter alia*, better representation for the non-aligned and neutral States of Europe. This proposal, however, has not been formalized and the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1 have not had an opportunity to discuss it among themselves. If the proposal is serious and if it is intended to

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

secure an enlargement of the membership of the Security Council on a more permanent basis—and I should like to emphasize “on a more permanent basis”—I am sure the sponsors will be ready at least to discuss it.

141. Apart from the principle of equitable representation, we also have very practical reasons for seeking the enlargement of the Council. More and more non-aligned and developing countries rightly wish to contribute to the solution of international problems by representation on the Security Council. This has placed a growing burden on the regional groups that are at present under-represented in endorsing a regional candidate. This session of the Assembly itself is experiencing an acute problem in the selection of a Latin American candidate for a non-permanent seat which will fall vacant on 1 January 1980. The Assembly has already established a new record of 79 ballots, and it appears that we might soon reach the century mark. In fact, the very possibility of convening the Security Council next year is in jeopardy. An enlargement in the number of seats available to Africa, Asia and Latin America would greatly ease the problem that we are experiencing at the moment.

142. Our proposal seeks to implement one of the objectives of the movement of non-aligned countries which was recently reiterated at the Sixth Conference of Heads of State or Government, held at Havana, namely the democratization of international relations and participation on the basis of equality in solving international issues. The Havana Political Declaration [see A/34/542, annex, sect. I] reiterated the need to strengthen the representation of non-aligned countries in the main bodies of the United Nations, especially, and *inter alia*, the Security Council. These measures were recommended by the Havana Conference with a view to strengthening the role of the United Nations as an effective instrument for the promotion of international peace and security and for the solution of all international problems.

143. During the course of our consultations and during the brief debate we had in this Assembly [80th meeting] when considering the report of the General Committee on the inscription of this item [A/34/250/Add.4], a few Member States argued that any increase in the membership of the Security Council would hinder the efficiency and efficacy of this principal organ of the United Nations.

144. This is perhaps not the occasion to reflect on the present or past record of the Security Council in the discharge of its primary responsibility, that is, the maintenance of international peace and security. Suffice it to say, as an example, that the fact that a country like South Africa has been able to flout and defy its decisions has nothing to do with the size of the Security Council. In our view the Council has been capable or incapable of discharging its functions, not because of its size, but because of very complex factors involving the interests of the great Powers. A corollary to the argument against the enlargement of the Council on the grounds of efficiency would be, in fact, to decrease its membership. We do not believe that the Council would be more efficient in discharging its functions were it smaller. On the contrary, we feel

that the Council would be better able to discharge its responsibilities if it were more representative in its composition.

145. The proposal to enlarge the membership of the Security Council by additional seats to be allocated to African, Asian and Latin American States is very much in conformity with Article 23, paragraph 1, of the Charter which, apart from embodying the principle of equitable geographical distribution, also urges that due regard be specially paid “in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization”. Experience has taught us that in the majority of cases it is the non-aligned group within the Security Council that furnishes solutions to problems before the Council. I have particularly in mind a most recent case involving a delicate problem, where it was the non-aligned group that came up with a formula and a course of action for the Security Council. No one could, therefore, seriously doubt the capacity of the non-aligned and developing countries to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization.

146. Briefly, I should like to reiterate that the proposal contained in draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1 is a limited and modest one affecting only the composition of the Security Council and not its functions and powers or those of its permanent members. The proposal is based on the principle of equitable representation and is designed to give the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, which represent the majority of the world's population, a greater role and responsibility in the solution of the world's problems. By making it more representative in character, the proposal is also aimed at increasing the efficacy of the Council.

147. With these words, on behalf of the sponsors, I wish to commend the draft resolution in document A/34/L.57 and Add.1 to this Assembly.

148. The PRESIDENT: I now call on the representative of Ecuador to introduce an amendment to draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1.

149. Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): As the representative of India has said, a number of other countries have been considering the question of equitable representation in the Security Council and of an increase in its membership. In this connexion and having consulted with him as the representative of the sponsors of draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1, I have the honour to propose, on behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama, Peru and Venezuela, a few modifications the aim of which is to deal more equitably and in a more balanced manner with the question of representation in the Security Council, recognizing that it is necessary to increase its membership so as to create a more suitable geographical representation of non-permanent members.

150. In effect, the number of members would be increased to 21 and would include, as the representative of India has said, five from the African States,

three from the Asian States, one from the Eastern European States, three from the Latin American States, two from the Western European and other States, one non-permanent seat that would alternate between the Latin American States and the Asian States and one non-permanent seat that would alternate between the Western European and other States and the Eastern European States.

151. Latin America supports the essence of this draft resolution in order to contribute to the strengthening and functioning of the United Nations, as it has always done, as it did when, at the time of the founding of the Organization, Latin America provided 21 out of the 51 Member States, and as it continues to do today, when it provides 29 out of 152 Members, and it is prepared to accept new fraternal countries, above all from the Caribbean region, as proof of the growing universality of our world Organization.

152. Mr. GURINOVICH (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Byelorussian SSR, which participated in drafting the United Nations Charter and which has consistently abided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations, is profoundly convinced that the United Nations Charter has stood the test of time (already for more than a third of a century) and is the international legal instrument that makes possible the constructive and effective resolution of problems facing the international community, provided each State Member of the Organization abides strictly by its provisions.

153. Unfortunately, at this session of the General Assembly, a number of delegations have submitted in various organs of the General Assembly proposals to amend the United Nations Charter in various ways, including a proposal to revoke one of the fundamental principles, that is, the unanimity rule for the permanent members of the Security Council. We are convinced that this could not promote the effectiveness of the United Nations but would instead weaken it, because the very submission of proposals to amend the Charter's provisions in a way casts doubt on them. This provides a formal opportunity for violators of the United Nations Charter to justify their failure to comply with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter or the binding decisions taken by the Security Council.

154. The adoption of such proposals might provide an excuse, however unfounded, for, let us say, Israeli aggressors, the racists in southern Africa and their protectors and other violators of the Charter to allege that they can turn a deaf ear to the decisions of the Security Council and shirk the obligation incumbent upon all States Members of the Organization under Article 25 of the Charter "to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council".

155. In the context of the various proposals to amend the Charter of the United Nations, we are examining the proposal to increase the membership of the Security Council. We understand the dissatisfaction of the group of States with the fact that the Security Council is not always in a position to adopt decisions which fully respond to the legitimate aspirations of peace-loving forces to peace and security, and their desire for the

solution of the problems of decolonization and the elimination of racism in all its forms and manifestations, in accordance with the United Nations Charter. But this situation has nothing to do with the numerical composition of the Security Council; it is due to the fact that certain countries do not abide by the principles of the Charter. Consequently, it is our duty to oppose the pursuit of policies which run counter to the United Nations Charter rather than to revise its provisions.

156. The delegation of the Byelorussian SSR has already explained, in the General Committee and in the plenary meetings of the thirty-fourth session, our position on expanding the membership of the Security Council. I should just like to recall that, according to the Charter, the Security Council acts on behalf of all States Members of the United Nations, and that when non-permanent members are elected by the General Assembly to the Council, due regard should be paid in the first instance to 'the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization'.

157. It is also well known that the Charter envisages every opportunity for any Member of the United Nations with a particular interest in a particular question to take part in the work of the Security Council, and wide use is made of this opportunity by many States. In addition, not a single decision can be taken by the Security Council without the consent not only of the permanent members but of the non-permanent members as well. The majority of these are non-aligned countries. Furthermore, no decision can be taken by the Security Council unless seven non-permanent members of the Council from Asian, African and Latin American States vote for it. Such States are now members of the Security Council and they will be in the future.

158. Hence the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR considers that there is no need to adopt the proposal to increase the membership of the Security Council. Such an amendment to the Charter could not enhance the effectiveness of the work of the Security Council or assist it in the discharge of its functions. It would weaken the efficiency of the Security Council and could be the prelude to a far-reaching revision of the United Nations Charter.

159. In the light of this and bearing in mind our position of principle in relation to the fact that we are opposed to proposals aimed at the revision of the Charter, the delegation of the Byelorussian SSR expresses the hope that the sponsors of this attempt to expand the membership of the Security Council will withdraw their proposal.

160. Our delegation bases its position on the fact that even among the sponsors of the draft resolution there exists a lack of unanimity on this question at the present time. If it is not withdrawn, my delegation will vote against the proposal.

161. As ever, we remain faithful to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. We firmly support the strict implementation of those purposes and principles and we call upon all other

States to adhere equally strictly to the provisions of the Charter. Only in this way can we ensure the preservation and increasing vitality of this Organization, rather than by all sorts of far-fetched reforms and revisions of the Charter, which could lead in the end to consequences inimical to the interests of the peace-loving forces of the world.

162. Mr. Dago TSHERING (Bhutan): We are now engaged in debating a matter which is of great importance to a number of Member States of our Organization: the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council. This matter is of special significance to small countries like Bhutan and to the large number of newly independent countries that have increased the membership of the United Nations from 51 at its inception in 1945 to 152 at the present session.

163. The reason for the inscription of the item is well documented in the explanatory memorandum circulated to all [A/34/246]. Besides that, consultations were held with a number of delegations and regional groups. Because of all these consultations, the sponsors of the item and now of the draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1 are convinced that the current session of the General Assembly should and can take appropriate action. Despite the initial negative response by a few delegations, we believe that most Member States would like to see a change in favour of more balanced and equitable representation in the membership of the Security Council.

164. By virtue of statistics alone, the validity of increasing the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council is well founded. In 1945, with 51 Member States, the global average of countries represented by a single non-permanent member in the Council was 7.5. When, in 1963, this average had risen to 18, precedent-setting—I repeat “precedent-setting”—action was taken to restore a semblance of balance by enlarging Council membership from the original 11 to 15 members, thus restoring the ratio to about 10.8 at that time. There were then 113 Member States and, it will be recalled, there was wide support for proportionate increases in the membership of a number of important United Nations bodies, including the Security Council, so that those organs would more accurately reflect the realities of the time.

165. We are now facing a similar situation. Since 1963, United Nations membership has risen from 113 to the present 152. This increase is due mainly to the emergence and admission of large numbers of small, newly independent States from Asia and the Pacific, Africa and Latin America. The global average of the number of countries represented by a single non-permanent member in the Security Council has again risen, now to the level of 14.7. If we divide regionally countries in the non-permanent category we find that the Asian countries fare the worst. The representative of India has just drawn our attention to the fact that the number of Asian countries represented by one non-permanent member is 18.5, as compared with 16.3 for African States, 14 for Latin American States, 11 for Western European and other States, and 10 for Eastern European States.

166. Thus, any fair evaluation of the present situation would lead to the conclusion that the present composition of the Security Council is unbalanced and inequitable, particularly as it concerns the developing and non-aligned countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which are seriously under-represented on one of the principal organs of the United Nations.

167. The last time this matter of Security Council membership was raised, in 1963, the problem of the People's Republic of China's non-membership in the United Nations, and therefore its inability to share in the decision on amending the United Nations Charter, was a matter of prime importance and contention. With that bone of contention removed, we hope the smooth adoption of the resolution under consideration will be facilitated.

168. Notwithstanding the facts and figures I have just cited, I am sure that all of us present here are desirous of belonging to a dynamic and flexible Organization capable of development in the requisite directions to meet changing conditions. Under the Charter, the primary role of the Security Council—of which we are all aware, but which bears repeating—is the maintenance of international peace and security. It bears repeating because the Security Council, in spite of its best intentions, has often experienced difficulty in meeting its primary responsibility, and we feel that one reason for this is the lack of balanced representation on the Council. It is therefore essential to increase the effectiveness of the Council in order to enable it to play its role more successfully. The United Nations, as defined in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, rests on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. However, we smaller nations feel that we have not had adequate opportunity to share in the work of the Security Council and that we have a contributory role to play in helping the Council to fulfil its primary purposes with greater efficacy.

169. Our sole purpose in recommending the increase in the number of non-permanent members from 10 to 14 is to strengthen the United Nations, not weaken it, as some opposed to our proposal claim will be the result of an enlargement of the Security Council. We are not playing with the power of veto; we are merely trying to reflect the present world situation and the corresponding demands of justice.

170. In order to achieve maximum effectiveness and render justice, we must take account of the need for more adequate geographical representation among non-permanent members and more consistent representation of small and medium-sized States. This will bring the Council more into line with the reality of world politics since such conformity is, after all, the essential ingredient for the maintenance of international peace and security. In this regard, my delegation endorses fully the views just expressed by the representative of India when he introduced draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1.

171. We, the sponsors of this draft resolution, feel that this item should be considered with all due urgency. Therefore, we cannot agree with the objections raised by some Member States to the effect that the time remaining at the present session is insufficient

for its consideration. In our view, the matter should be considered urgently, and we look forward to the successful amendment of the Charter, in accordance with Article 108, and its ratification by all Member States.

172. Mr. FERNANDO (Sri Lanka): It is the privilege of the Sri Lanka delegation not only to support draft resolution A/34/L.57 and Add.1, but also to have sponsored it.

173. Since the amendment of the Charter of the United Nations in 1963, the membership of the United Nations has increased from 113 to 152. This increase is mainly due to certain historic political, economic and social developments in the world, particularly the advanced rate at which the process of decolonization has taken place in the last two decades. The new Members of the United Nations are mainly from Africa, Asia and Latin America, the regions which have suffered most under colonial domination. The Security Council, which is the body empowered to take binding decisions affecting all States Members of the United Nations in respect of international peace and security, must respect the political realities that now exist in the world. The cardinal rationale for the existence of non-permanent seats in the Council has been to permit the countries appointed to them, which account for the vast bulk of humanity, a due share in the making and carrying out of decisions which affect them as much as they do the permanent members. A much more balanced and equitable composition of the Security Council to give due representation to non-permanent members could stabilize rather than destabilize the Council.

174. Undoubtedly, the present composition of the Security Council is quite inequitable and unbalanced. The present quota of 10 non-permanent seats in the Security Council does not provide for an adequate allocation of elective seats among geographical regions and groups. The draft resolution under consideration seeks to increase the number of non-permanent members of the Security Council from 10 to 14, which would make the Council a more effective organ in carrying out its functions under the Charter of the United Nations. This proposal is not an end in itself, but a means of contributing to the realization of the ideals embodied in the Charter. It is necessary to realize that the Organization must function in accordance with the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Charter, which is devoted to the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members. Only if this principle is implemented in practice can the success of the Organization be ensured. To exist in conditions of peace, security and well-being is the birth-right of all States, great or small, developed or undeveloped, without distinction.

175. Equally, all States have an obligation to contribute to the maintenance of world peace and security. This obligation can be fulfilled only if all States are

ensured the right to participate in the work of the bodies entrusted with that task. These considerations were predominant factors on the two previous occasions when the number of seats in the Security Council was increased to meet the increase in the over-all membership of the United Nations. In the light of the further growth in the membership of the United Nations since 1963, it is necessary that we take action to bring about an appropriate increase in the membership of the Security Council in order that it may not only continue to be effective, but also become a genuinely representative organ, as contemplated in the Charter.

176. Certain delegations have suggested that we should carry out further consultations before we vote on this draft resolution. We have carried out consultations regarding this proposed increase over a considerable period of time. What we seek is solely to redress an existing imbalance and injustice. However, Sri Lanka does not wish to close the door to any necessary negotiations. It is our hope that this draft resolution, when adopted, could be ratified by all permanent members of the Security Council by 1 September 1981, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes, thereby redressing a situation created by the inadequate representation of the newly independent States.

177. The Sri Lanka delegation wishes to appeal to representatives for the adoption of this draft resolution by the greatest possible majority. We are of the belief that, following its adoption in response to the wish and the will of the world community, further consultations could continue which would help to create the conditions and the will to ensure eventual ratification of the necessary amendments to the Charter by all the permanent members of the Security Council.

178. The Sri Lanka delegation is of the view that the difficulties posed by a redistribution of existing seats are more complicated than any difficulties likely to arise from an increase in the number of seats. It would mean trying to redistribute too few seats among too many members, perhaps at the expense of some who have so far enjoyed more than due representation. This is a further reason for us to seek an increase in the number of non-permanent seats, rather than a redistribution of seats.

179. It is my privilege to commend this draft resolution for the widest support.

180. The PRESIDENT: There are still 21 names on the list of speakers on this item. In order to have a clearer idea of how to organize our work, I propose that the list of speakers be closed at 4 o'clock this afternoon. If there is no objection, it will be so decided.

*It was so decided.*

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*