

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-THIRD SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE

67th meeting

held on

Friday, 8 December 1978

10.30 a.m.

New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 67th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PASTINEN (Finland)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 50: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY: REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (continued)

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be incorporated in a copy of the record and should be sent *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550.

Corrections will be issued shortly after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL

A/C.1/33/PV.67

11 December 1978

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.45 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 50 (continued)

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE STRENGTHENING OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY:
REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The CHAIRMAN: As agreed yesterday, the Committee will commence and conclude during the day the consideration of four draft resolutions which are before the Committee.

We shall first consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58 concerning the declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, but before proceeding to a decision on that draft, I call on the representative of Poland.

Mr. KULAGA (Poland): In my statement last Monday I informed the Committee of the fruitful process of consultations my delegation had conducted in order to arrive at a consensus text of a draft declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, now contained in document A/C.1/33/L.58.

Most delegations in our debate on item 50 were kind enough to express their appreciation of the effort we have made and gave their support to the draft declaration. We are most grateful to all of them both for their fair and friendly assessments and for their great attention and warm feelings towards the initiative.

In recent days some delegations have approached us and suggested that in the preamble of the draft declaration mention should also be made of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As was the case through the entire process of consultations, we have given most careful consideration to the idea. Indeed, we believe that such an addition should in no way affect the coherence or the balance of the text negotiated in the last two months. The addition would also reflect the general atmosphere of the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I therefore move, upon consultation with our co-sponsors, to add the following after the words "Further recalling" in the last preambular paragraph:

"... the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948, as well as".

(Mr. Kulaga, Poland)

This would also be in accord with what I said on behalf of the co-sponsors last Monday when introducing the draft declaration. Thus, the last paragraph of the preamble to the draft declaration reads:

"Further recalling the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 10 December 1948, as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966, and bearing in mind that the latter states, inter alia, that any propaganda for war shall be prohibited by law".

On behalf of the co-sponsors, I should also like to reiterate our motion that the draft declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, with the aforementioned addition, be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United States, who, I understand, wishes to make a statement in this connexion before we proceed to take a decision.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The statement that I am about to make may be responsive to the suggestion just made with respect to what action we should take on this, because my statement is in explanation of vote.

In so doing, I should like to make it clear that my delegation agrees with the moving spirit and intent behind this initiative, inspired by Poland, to focus international attention on the overriding need of men and women everywhere for peace with justice. We are impressed, in particular, by that operative paragraph which reaffirms the right of all nations and human beings, regardless of race, conscience, language or sex, to live their lives in peace. However, despite the fact that the draft declaration does not create legal obligations or purport to constitute international law, there are defects in the draft which preclude our support. Consequently, the delegation of the United States will abstain when it is put to the vote.

We see two fundamental flaws in this draft declaration which impel us towards this position. The first stems from the role, responsibility and limitations of our own Government - the Government of the United States - under its Constitution. While the propagation of racism, racial discrimination and apartheid is abhorrent to my country, it would be abhorrent to us also to accept the proposition that it is the obligation of the Government to impose standards of thought and speech, even with respect to such fallacious and condemnable principles. That is censorship, and we cannot condone it as a statement of our "duty". Indeed, it is because we hold freedom of speech and thought to be so precious that we are confident that under this freedom of speech and thought racism, racial discrimination and apartheid will not prevail in our country.

Our second major but related concern is the inadequate reference to a number of basic human rights, the enjoyment of which is essential to a just and peaceful life for all persons. The right of individuals to be free from arbitrary arrest, detention, exile or deprivation of nationality, to have security of person, to be free from arbitrary interference with privacy, to have the right to travel, to have freedom of thought, to have freedom of conscience and religion, to have freedom of opinion and expression and the right to peaceful assembly, to have access to a fair and impartial system of justice - these and other rights are essential to a viable international society.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

Now, I am happy to note that the representative of Poland has added a reference that "recalls", as I understood his language, that 30 years ago, in two days, the General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Merely to recall that fact, of which all of us are aware, does not seem to me to be an adequate reference to the significance of human rights in any declaration of this kind. I am glad that at least there is some mention of it, but this rather pallid reference does not seem to the delegation of the United States to be adequate.

Now, having said that, I should like to end by commending Poland and its Government for the initiative. We concur in the sentiment embodied in this initiative, even if we cannot accept its expression in this draft declaration. Nevertheless, it is our sincerest hope that all of our societies will live not only in peace but in a world where the inherent dignity and worth of the human person is to be protected by rule of law. To ask for or to accept less is to betray our heritage.

The CHAIRMAN: As members will have noted from that statement, we shall have to take a decision by way of a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58. This draft resolution has at present 28 sponsors; it was introduced in the First Committee by the Deputy Foreign Minister of Poland at its 61st meeting on 4 December 1978. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Ireland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58 was adopted by 100 votes to none, with 1 abstention.*

*Subsequently the delegations of Angola, Bangladesh, Cuba, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, the United Republic of Cameroon and Upper Volta advised the Secretariat that had they been present they would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote after the vote.

Mr. von WECHMAR (Federal Republic of Germany): Speaking on behalf of the nine countries members of the European Communities, I should like to make a few comments regarding the decision which this Committee has just taken on the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/L.58 and introduced by Poland.

The nine countries have voted for the draft text, above all because we agree with the basic thrust of the initiative which is to advance the cause of peace and of underlining the importance that "the defences of peace must be constructed in the minds of men" as the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) so appropriately says. We wonder whether this subject should have been raised at the UNESCO Conference, as it is related to the activities of that organization.

We think that apart from the long-standing efforts of the United Nations and Governments of Member States to maintain peace, to solve conflicts by peaceful means and to lay the foundations of a peaceful future, we must indeed think of the generations to come and try to shape their approach to international life and their vision of the future of mankind in a spirit consonant with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

The declaration before us refers to the Charter and to the Declaration on Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States. But it also refers to human rights and we welcome the fact that the human rights dimension of the question of peace and security is brought up in this context.

We note that this declaration contains the concept of life in peace for individuals, not only for States. Both aspects should be seen in the proper legal context. International law does seek to secure peace for the community of States on the basis of agreed and recognized principles and this Organization itself is at the heart of this common effort.

The concept of a specific right to life in peace of States as proposed in this declaration would appear to be new, and we would have to examine the implications of such a concept.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

As far as individual human beings are concerned, we understand the motivation behind the proposal before us, but the question which arises is how to achieve tangible results. If the concept of life in peace for individuals is to have a practical meaning, we think it must be related to human rights as a whole. Peace for the individual means freedom: freedom from war, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of expression, of conscience, religion or belief.

These freedoms have been laid down in the relevant international documents, the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and the two covenants. Human rights are of fundamental importance and not subordinate to political expediency. We think that without securing peace in the lives of individuals there can hardly be a lasting peace in international life.

We think that important as it may be to take certain steps, such as to discourage propaganda for wars of aggression, and other similar steps it is also important to secure those rights of individuals, which will enable them to lead a life in peace, and here I should like to mention the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, the right to freedom of expression, of association and of movement and last but not least the right to have effective remedies available against any violation of these rights.

Coming to other aspects of the text I should like to point out that while certain rights and principles have been mentioned in the text, others have not been included and we have reservations against any selective choice concerning internationally agreed documents. We do not interpret operative paragraph 5 as detracting from the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, the friendly relations Declaration or the Helsinki Final Act. In our view all parts of the United Nations Charter are of equal status and importance. The same is true for the principles of the Final Document of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, as is explicitly stated in the first paragraph of the concluding section related to those principles.

(Mr. von Wechmar, Federal
Republic of Germany)

We also have reservations on the expression relating to so-called principles of peaceful co-existence, which is a specific concept within a particular ideological system. We can accept peaceful coexistence only in the plain meaning of those words, but not with any further implications.

Finally, I should also like formally to reserve our understanding of operative paragraph 7 in Part I, which we think should have been worded somewhat different, in the view of the nine delegations for whom I am speaking. "Manifestations of ... racism, racial discrimination and apartheid" are contrary to the human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals. Colonialism, in the sense of an administering State refusing to grant independence against the wishes of the population, on the other hand, violates the rights of peoples to self-determination. We would have preferred clearer language in this respect.

Having explained our views on the text before us, I should like to conclude by saying that we listened with interest to the introductory statement by the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, and by expressing our appreciation for the spirit of co-operation which we encountered and which helped to bring about this result.

Miss THOMSEN (Canada): Canada voted in favour of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace contained in document A/C.1/33/L.58 because like other countries we believe that we should all be actively striving for a more peaceful world. More needs to be done, both in terms of defining the principles under which we govern our lives and in terms of practical steps to reduce tensions which threaten peace. While living in peace is essential for human society, the quality of that life is also important. The promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms is necessary to create conditions that will facilitate the maintenance of international peace and security. As the Charter says, it is necessary to achieve better standards of life in larger freedom.

(Miss Thomsen, Canada)

The right to life in peace is implicit in the fabric of human rights as expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights. We are celebrating this week the thirtieth anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations. Our delegation regrets that the authors of A/C.1/33/L.58 did not find it appropriate to make sufficient mention of this Declaration among the many other documents that they referred to.

(Miss Thomsen, Canada)

The Secretary-General just recently reaffirmed that

"Under the United Nations Charter it is a duty of the world Organization 'to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small'. But faith is not enough: action is needed."

Better compliance with all the principles incorporated in these documents would lead to a more peaceful world. However, each country will have to apply this Declaration in its own way, according to its circumstances. As a federal State where education, for example, is a provincial responsibility, Canada has to interpret the Declaration as taking these facts of life into account. The Government of Canada can act only in those areas which are of direct federal responsibility. Accordingly, we register our vote on this draft resolution subject to these remarks.

Mr. ABE (Japan): My delegation would like to explain its affirmative vote on the draft declaration on the preparation of societies for life in peace, A/C.1/33/L.58, as follows.

First of all I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, who kindly referred to my country's aspirations for peace in his statement delivered under agenda item 50 last Monday. Indeed, my delegation has repeatedly emphasized in the forums of the United Nations that my country, in the wisdom learned from its own bitter experiences in the past war, has decided to dedicate itself to peace and to base its diplomacy on the policy of building a relationship of mutual trust with all countries of the world regardless of their political systems, power or geographical distance. My delegation fully shares the view expressed by the representative of Poland, that

"... peace and international security, to be durable, have to be built concurrently in the practice of international relations and in the mind of man, for the real first-line of defence against war is man himself."

(A/C.1/33/PV.61, p. 31)

(Mr. Abe, Japan)

In voting in favour of the draft declaration, my delegation, however, would like to comment that there are some elements in the text that will require further study and, in particular, that the legal concept of crimes against peace has not yet been well established but remains to be further elaborated in the United Nations.

My delegation takes this opportunity to pay high tribute to the Polish initiative in introducing the draft Declaration which has just been adopted.

Mr. HVASHOVD (Norway): Norway voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.58. We do still, however, have certain misgivings about the text just adopted. In our view certain formulations may give rise to misunderstanding concerning the spirit and scope of important international instruments and declarations, particularly in the field of human rights.

We also would have liked a more predominant reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on civil and political rights. The duty of States "to promote all-round, mutually advantageous and equitable political, economic, social and cultural co-operation with other States" is quite rightly stressed in part I of the draft resolution, but we feel that an equally important prerequisite for the promotion of peace is the duty of States to ensure the civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of their citizens and to guarantee their effective participation in the political decision-making process of society. The promotion of human rights and peace is just as much a matter of concern to individuals and peoples as to States and we would have definitely preferred the draft resolution to state that clearly.

My delegation fully supports the basic ideas contained in the draft resolution just adopted, but we are convinced that it would have been a truer reflection of what we all feel are the basic conditions for peace and understanding between individuals, peoples and nations if the elements I have pointed to had been expressed in clearer and less ambiguous language.

Mr. BROOK (Australia): The Australian delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58 and we support its principles and purposes. We are appreciative of the readiness of the Polish delegation to take into account suggestions made by many delegations and amendments suggested by them. We feel it would have been better if the limited reference to human rights made in the draft had been expanded, whether we are speaking of political, civil, economic or social rights, since these form an important part of the framework within which the life of all of us in peace will need to be built.

We note a reference in part I to "peaceful coexistence" and we accept that expression with its full meaning and not with any special meaning. We note also that the draft makes extensive reference to the duties of States and we shall need to examine that aspect with care since it raises questions which in some respects have not yet received adequate study in the United Nations system.

The CHAIRMAN: The First Committee has thus concluded its consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.58.

As agreed earlier, we shall now proceed to the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59, under agenda item 50. This draft resolution had 35 co-sponsors and was introduced on their behalf by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 65th meeting of the First Committee on 7 December 1978. I note that the delegation of Uruguay has now also become a co-sponsor of that draft resolution.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Mr. Chairman, I would request that you be gracious enough to grant me a recess of seven or eight minutes to enable me to have a brief consultation with the sponsors of the draft. The reason is that some amendments were presented yesterday afternoon at a late hour, and I have not yet had a chance to consult them.

The CHAIRMAN: As I understand it, there have been some last-minute amendments submitted to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 and therefore the representative of Guyana is asking not for a suspension of the meeting but for a few minutes' delay in the consideration of that particular draft resolution. Unless there is any objection from the Committee, I shall allow the representative of Guyana 10 minutes for that purpose. However, it is not a suspension of the meeting. I intend to continue our work by going on with the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 under agenda item 50. This draft resolution has 29 co-sponsors and it was introduced to the Committee by the representative of Sri Lanka at the 65th meeting of the Committee on 7 December 1978.

(The Chairman)

At this time, I should like to announce that the delegation of Bangladesh has expressed its wish to become a sponsor of both draft resolutions A/C.1/33/L.59 and A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

Mr. MUJEZINOVIC (Yugoslavia): I was on the way to a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 when I thought I heard the Chairman propose that the Committee consider draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1. If that is the case, then I propose that the meeting be suspended for ten minutes and that draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 not be considered now since most of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 are also the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1, for whose consideration our attention would be necessary and we could not, of course, be at two places at the same time. Therefore, I request that the meeting be recessed in order to allow the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 to consult among themselves before we take up consideration of A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: After having listened to both the representative of Guyana, who commented on consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59, and the representative of Yugoslavia, who was good enough to point out that most of the sponsors of the two draft resolutions are actually the same delegations, I propose to suspend this meeting until 12 o'clock, which should allow ample time for these consultations to be concluded, but I think it only fair to warn delegations that the meeting will be resumed exactly at 12 o'clock and that I will not entertain any further requests for delay.

The meeting was suspended at 11.45 a.m. and resumed at 12.05 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN: As members of the Committee will recall, on the proposal of the representative of Guyana, supported by the representative of Yugoslavia, the Committee decided to suspend its meeting this morning for 20 minutes in order to allow the remaining consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 to be concluded. I hope that those consultations are now concluded, and I should like to ask the representative of Guyana to report on them.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): The consultations have been completed, and favourably. I should like, if I may, to read the amendments which the sponsors of this draft resolution have agreed to accept.

In the third line of operative paragraph 1 we propose to add, after the word "internal" the following: "or external" and then in the same line, after the words "calling upon all States" we add the following:

"in keeping with the provisions of the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,".

After the words "Charter of the United Nations" we returned to the existing text, "to undertake measures to prevent ..." and so on.

The third amendment comes in operative paragraph 2 which at present begins "Expresses the conviction". We would remove those three words and say instead "Reaffirms ...".

The sponsors have agreed to accept these amendments. I should like to take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude to them for adding their names or identifying their delegations with this initiative.

The CHAIRMAN: We can now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59.

For the benefit of those members who may not have been present while the representative of Guyana detailed the changes in the text subsequent to consultations, I would repeat them.

In the third line of operative paragraph 1, after the words "in the internal", the words "or external" have been added. The phrase would then read: "in the internal or external affairs of States and calling upon all States,". Then, before the words "to undertake", we have the following, rather long, addition:

"in keeping with the provision of the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning friendly nations and co-operation among States, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations,".

I should be grateful if the representative of Guyana would confirm that this indeed is the correct language proposed by the sponsors.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): Yes, Mr. Chairman, if I heard you correctly, that is the correct language; and the paragraph continues with the words "to undertake ...".

The CHAIRMAN: Another, smaller, change has been made in operative paragraph 2: the words, "Expresses the conviction" are replaced by the word "Reaffirms".

We will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59. A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Kuwait, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Central African Empire, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Federal
Republic of, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg,
Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom of Great Britain
and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 was adopted by 110 votes to none, with
13 abstentions.*

*Subsequently the delegation of Saudi Arabia advised the Secretariat that had it been present it would have voted in favour. The delegation of Ireland advised the Secretariat that it would have abstained.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States strongly supports the principles of the United Nations Charter regarding non-interference in the internal affairs of States. We believe that those principles can best be fulfilled by universal adherence to the principles of the Charter and the Declaration on Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter, adopted by the General Assembly in 1970. We do not believe that the restatement of those principles, as involved in the present draft resolution, contributes significantly to the strengthening of international security. This is the reason my delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution.

Miss THOMSEN (Canada): On the draft resolution on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, contained in document A/C.1/33/L.59, Canada abstained for two basic reasons.

In the first place, we find the provisions of the earlier resolutions on non-interference to be extremely broadly defined. Canada believes that international commitments made by it, whether bilateral or multilateral, are open to comments by other parties to such commitments. We expect this to be the case for other States. We do not believe that that sort of review of commitments can be considered as interference in internal affairs, especially where such reviews are specifically provided for in international undertakings.

Secondly, Canada is not convinced of the need for a separate declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States. We believe that that question is sufficiently provided for in the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MOSSBERG (Sweden): The Swedish delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.59 about non-interference in the internal affairs of States. We understand and respect the concerns and fears behind the presentation of this draft resolution. At the same time, we wish to underline the fact that the principle of non-intervention is embodied in the Charter. There also exists the 1965 Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, the main part of which was included as one of the seven principles of the Declaration on friendly relations of 1970. We are pleased to see that reference to that Declaration has now been included in the draft resolution, and we are grateful to the sponsors for their flexibility on that point.

In this context I must however point out that my delegation has certain doubts about the necessity or advisability of embarking upon the preparation of a new declaration of this kind because we think that it will not facilitate a clear and unambiguous interpretation of either the Charter or the Declaration on friendly relations. However, if it would be the wish of States, the Swedish delegation could agree to a study of the need for a new declaration on non-interference. In our view, such a study could be carried out by the International Law Commission. But the Swedish delegation cannot agree to proposals that might be used to restrict the possibilities for Governments to express themselves on various questions, restrict mass media and the free expression of opinion.

Mr. NEUBERT (Federal Republic of Germany): On behalf of the nine countries of the European Communities, I wanted to make a comment on our vote on this draft resolution.

We are committed to the Charter principle of non-intervention, as stated and defined in Article 2 (7) of the Charter. We have abstained on the present draft resolution concerning non-interference because its operative paragraph 1 urges States to abide by the provisions of resolutions on which the nine countries abstained in 1976 and 1977 for reasons which we amply explained at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. We will next take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1, submitted under agenda item 50 and concerning the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Before proceeding further I have to announce that the delegation of Afghanistan has become a sponsor of this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of Greece on a point of order.

Mr. VELISSARAPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): Before we start the voting I simply wish to draw attention to the fact that there is a difference in operative paragraph 10 between the French and the English texts. In operative paragraph 10 we read:

"Bearing in mind the close relationship between security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean, the Middle East and other regions of the world, supports ...".

The English word "supports" is rendered in the French version as "fait sienne", or "endorses". I think that this is not consistent with the English text, which simply says "supports", and that the word in French should be "appui". I think it is useful to clarify that point before we proceed to the vote.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Greece for drawing the attention of the Committee to this discrepancy. I am sure that the technical services have adequately taken note of it and that it will be duly corrected in due course.

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

Mr. HESENAJ (Albania) (interpretation from French): Once again this year our Committee has before it a draft resolution on the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. Our delegation, not having taken part in the debate on agenda item 50, now would like to state its views on the subject to explain its position in respect of the draft resolution which is going to be voted on.

This draft resolution, as usual, contains numerous principles and various considerations and assessments of the international situation which can validly be taken into account, but at times might lead to divergent interpretations. We find therein elements whose value cannot be challenged because these are principles which

are already known and enshrined in the United Nations Charter or other United Nations documents, but which are repeated here again within the context of international security.

The delegation of Albania does not believe it to be necessary to list these elements. We shall therefore not read the document before us. On the other hand, we believe that in draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 there are a certain number of elements and statements in regard to which we should like to express our views so as to explain our position on the basis of our analysis of certain events and situations in the world. Our purpose, therefore, is to indicate our most important reservations in respect of the draft resolution.

It is in keeping with this line of thinking that we should like to say first of all that it does not seem to us to be acceptable to recognize that there are "... some encouraging signs and achievements with regard to the strengthening of international security ...", as is stated in the third paragraph on page 2 of document A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

If we look at international events and developments which have taken place in various parts of the world, it will not be difficult to realize that peace and international security are increasingly threatened by the policies and aggressive actions of imperialism, social imperialism and reaction. Hotbeds of tension exist throughout the world. New ones are added to the existing ones. New explosive elements accumulate. The wish to be optimistic and the hopes one might express regarding the improvement of the international situation, which is grave and tense, are not sufficient to reassure us or cause us to lose sight of the facts of life.

We also wish to state our reservations regarding the assessment of certain events mentioned in the last preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1. Our judgement concerns in particular certain aspects of those events which are not positive if viewed in the light of a more detailed analysis of their content and particularly of the specific objectives pursued. But this is not the time for such an analysis.

Further, we find in operative paragraph 2, to be specific, formulations which we cannot support. In brief, we shall confine ourselves to emphasizing that we do not agree with the opinion stated there regarding the role of the five permanent members of the Security Council. Among those members there are the imperialist super-Powers. We do not believe that they can be entrusted with the task of having the provisions of the Charter being complied with or of restoring the confidence of States in the United Nations.

(Mr. Hesenaj, Albania)

The super-Powers are the first to violate the provisions of the Charter and to destroy confidence in the Organization.

International détente is mentioned even though it is followed by the word "limited". But we have been and are of the opinion that the course of events and the tense international situation are fraught with dangers and prove obviously that there has been no détente throughout the world. The slogan of détente is used by those imperialist super-Powers to camouflage their aggressive policy and their bargaining to the detriment of the freedom and independence of peoples.

The last matter we should like to mention briefly concerns the contents of operative paragraph 10. The Belgrade meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe clearly showed that there is no security in that continent. It proved the failure of the decisions of the Helsinki Conference. Europe cannot be free from dangers and it feels insecure because nothing has changed on that continent, which still remains the arena of the hegemonistic struggle of the two imperialist Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. Other imperialists try to confuse the situation in furtherance of their policies of aggression. The weighty armies of the United States and of the Soviet Union are a burden on Europe. Whenever the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact blocs meet, the result is pure demagogery because the two super-Powers which control them are actually constantly working to strengthen their military potential and intensify their aggressive acts. So-called European security cannot serve as an example for an improvement in the dangerous situation prevailing in the Mediterranean because of the conflicts and confrontations among countries bathed by that sea and the aggressive hegemonistic policies of the two super-Powers, and in particular because of the presence of military naval units of the United States and the Soviet Union in the area.

Taking into account the specific situation in Europe and in the Mediterranean one should really fight against the serious threats to people in that area. The idea of establishing zones of peace in various parts of the world does not remove the danger of war.

For all these reasons the delegation of Albania will not take part in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Albania for his statement, which I feel succeeded to some extent the normal character of statements in explanation of vote by going rather deeply into the substance behind the draft resolution rather than commenting on the draft resolution itself. Note has been taken of the fact that when the time comes to take a decision, the delegation of Albania will be recorded as not participating in the vote.

Mr. FISHER (United States of America): The United States believes that the United Nations Charter provides the best guidelines under which member States can take practical, concrete, and effective measures to strengthen international peace and security. The international community does not suffer from an insufficiency of resolutions, declarations, and other instruments on the subject of peace and security, nor can the problem be ascribed to ambiguities in the Charter. The problem lies in the failure of States - and also of certain political groups - to observe the existing rules and to make use of the Charter's machinery and procedures for the peaceful resolution of disputes.

It is difficult to see how draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 can make any meaningful contribution to the strengthening of international security, for in some portions it merely restates principles and purposes in a potentially misleading way. This draft resolution contains many elements with which my delegation cannot agree.

For example, the third preambular paragraph omits any reference to the United Nations Charter, and therefore tends to diminish the legal force of the Charter.

Regarding the fourth preambular paragraph, we cannot agree to note "with concern" the non-implementation of unspecified provisions of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, since we have consistently held reservations on certain of those provisions.

The seventh preambular paragraph contains a questionable reference to "tendencies to divide the world into spheres of influence".

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

The eighth preambular paragraph contains an inaccurate reference to the work of the sixth special session. No consensus was reached at that session; the resolution was adopted without objection, but with far-reaching reservations. The United States still maintains its reservations on parts of that resolution.

With regard to the words "struggle" and "support", in the tenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3, those words imply approval of armed conflict rather than encouragement for the peaceful resolution of disputes. We believe that this Organization should encourage the latter rather than the former course.

My delegation also has reservations on the eleventh preambular paragraph's seemingly blanket approval of actions taken by the World Conference Against Racism in Geneva in August of this year and by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the non-aligned countries in Belgrade in July of this year. Certainly not all delegations in this hall approve of all decisions taken in those two forums.

The United States also considers operative paragraph 5 to be unacceptable, for it is drafted in such a way that it could be interpreted as contravening Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Fisher, United States)

In addition, the reference to "measures of political and economic coercion ..." is so vague and undefined that it could refer even to legitimate diplomatic activity.

Regarding the issues raised in operative paragraphs 9 and 10, the United States has consistently pointed out that the concept of a "zone of peace" is undefined and that a State or group of States cannot legally declare international waters to be a "zone of peace" in an attempt to place restrictions on traditional freedom of navigation.

Accordingly the United States will vote against this draft resolution, for we regard it not merely as superfluous but also as a departure from the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and from established international law.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution
A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with
20 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes. First, however, I understand that the representative of Venezuela has asked to be allowed to speak on a point of order.

Miss LOPEZ (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to raise a point of order. Because of the lateness of the hour and in view of the procedures this Committee has followed on other occasions - with which my delegation has duly complied - I should like to request, on behalf of the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1, that, if possible, the next draft resolution on today's agenda be voted on, leaving until another meeting the explanations of vote on it and on the draft resolution that has just been adopted. I venture to make this proposal since this Committee has followed this procedure on past occasions.

*Subsequently, the delegation of Saudi Arabia advised the Secretariat that had it been present it would have voted in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: It is my normal practice as Chairman to deal with points of order immediately. However, in this instance, because it would take a little longer to explain the situation - and I have reason to believe it will not be contradictory to the pursuit of what the representative of Venezuela is seeking -- with her permission we shall now go on in an orderly manner and hear some six explanations of vote, which I believe are very short, and then discuss the situation with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): Draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 is a loosely worded document brimming with well-worn political clichés, some of which have in the course of time become code words for a selective application of human rights and a one-sided interpretation of the Charter. It has 11 preambular and 14 operative paragraphs, none of which introduces a single new and constructive idea towards the strengthening of international security.

My delegation has to take special exception to the eleventh preambular paragraph, which enumerates resolutions adopted at various conferences where anti-Israel decisions are taken perennially as a matter of course, totally disregarding changes that are taking place in the region. Some decisions taken at those conferences seem to be calculated to build a framework for war, not peace, and therefore are completely out of place in a draft resolution submitted under an item called "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". By mentioning in the eleventh preambular paragraph the World Conference against Racism, this draft resolution draws inspiration from a decision which was rejected by all countries where men are free to speak.

Had political freedom in the world been more widespread, most countries would have been free to express their revulsion at the manipulation of praiseworthy objectives for the conduct of anti-Semitic and racist propaganda campaigns. In countries where the press is free draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 is going to be ignored, as have so many resolutions of this Assembly. If more such resolutions are adopted, the United Nations itself is going to be more and more ignored wherever men are in earnest in their quest for peace.

Israel therefore voted against this draft resolution.

Miss THOMSEN (Canada): Canada abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 concerning the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security because we doubt that annual debate on this subject actually contributes to the strengthening of international security.

Canada supported the Declaration when it was adopted in 1970. We continue to believe that the observance of Charter principles without exception by all States and the utilization of the full capacities of the United Nations system to settle disputes peacefully would materially contribute to the strengthening of international security. However, Canada prefers that particular questions affecting international security be dealt with in a substantive manner under the agenda items concerned and in the appropriate forums, bearing in mind the terms of the Declaration. We thus see little merit in repeating this debate year after year.

Mr. NEUBERT (Federal Republic of Germany): On behalf of the nine countries members of the European Communities, I should like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

The Declaration of 1970 on the strengthening of international security was carefully drafted and negotiated. The result was a solid consensus of Member States. The countries for which I am speaking here have contributed and are contributing their fair share to the strengthening of international security and they will continue to do so. This applies to efforts both in the United Nations and in other forums.

In this context, I wish to recall that the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the continuing efforts to implement the provisions of the Final Act are a major contribution to our common goal, but the debate on the Declaration has become a yearly exercise in repetition and I wish to put on record our objection to such a repetition, which, in our view, does not contribute in any practical and tangible way to the implementation of the Declaration. Much as we are convinced of the importance of the Declaration itself, so equally are we afraid that this repetitive debate will rather tend to weaken its impact, and for this reason we prefer not to participate in it.

(Mr. Neubert, Federal Republic of Germany)

The nine delegations have not been able to support draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1, and I should like to mention some of the points to which we have objections.

We cannot subscribe to the remarks on the role of the Security Council, nor can we understand the logic of a general and unspecific call in operative paragraph 2 for the application of sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter. We cannot accept references to conferences whose outcome we could not support, and some of which we did not attend. We do not think it is appropriate to refer in resolutions of the United Nations to conferences and meetings of particular regional or political groupings. We also think it is inappropriate to deal in a General Assembly resolution with matters to be discussed at a regional conference, and I here refer to the meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) to be held in Madrid in 1980. Finally, we cannot accept that the question of the Mediterranean document of the CSCE be linked in any way with another proposal of a totally different nature and origin, which is controversial and which we ourselves oppose.

As a last point, I should like to add that the Declaration of 1970 did refer to the question of human rights, which in our view should also be considered when the question of the implementation of the Declaration is discussed, and that we miss any adequate reference to this aspect in the present draft.

Mr. RAJAKOSKI (Finland): The Finnish delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1. In doing so, we followed our basic line of previous years, which is to give all possible support to the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security. However, our positive vote does not mean that all the wording in the text just adopted is in fully harmony with our views and wishes.

That is particularly the case with operative paragraph 10 and also with some preambular paragraphs. Some of the wording in those paragraphs is at variance with our well-known positions taken in other contexts, especially in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. No change has taken place in respect of those positions, and thus those paragraphs of the draft resolution were not wholly acceptable to us.

(Mr. Rajakoski, Finland)

More particularly, the wording in operative paragraph 10 is not, in our view, in accordance with the generally accepted understanding among the CSCE countries that the Final Act of Helsinki is a whole. It is a carefully balanced unity where all parts are equally important. To underline only certain parts or aspects, as does operative paragraph 10 when mentioning the Declaration on the Mediterranean, is not, in our view, in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Final Act of Helsinki.

Furthermore, I should like to put on record that Finland has not accepted, for well-known reasons, the Final Document of the World Conference to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, held at Geneva. We should have preferred the omission of mention of it in the eleventh preambular paragraph.

In spite of these and other shortcomings in the text, my delegation's vote was still in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 because of our basic position of supporting the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security.

Mr. KLESTIL (Austria): On behalf of the Austrian delegation, I should like to make the following explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1.

Because of its geographical position in the heart of Europe, Austria has always considered its national security to be closely linked to international stability and is thus vitally interested in all measures conducive to the strengthening of international security and the promotion of peaceful co-operation between States, in accordance with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. We have, therefore, from the very outset supported the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

We have also been in a position to lend our support to a number of resolutions presented in previous years under the agenda item entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", inasmuch as those resolutions reaffirmed the well-balanced and comprehensive provisions contained in the Declaration. At the same time, however, we had to register

(Mr. Klestil, Austria)

our reservations on certain formulations in those resolutions that we considered to be either imprecise or introducing new elements into the framework of the Declaration without giving the necessary time for a sincere and thorough discussion of those new elements. As far as the wording of the present draft resolution follows the wording of previous resolutions on this agenda item, the reservations of my delegation remain valid.

To those general remarks I should like to add the following specific comments.

With regard to operative paragraph 10, I should like to recall that in previous years my delegation had already indicated that the proposal for the conversion of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace - as, indeed, the notion of a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean itself - is in the opinion of the Austrian delegation unclear.

(Mr. Klestil, Austria)

We are not able to support such a proposal, prior to its discussion and definition by all countries of the region and until their readiness to participate in the establishment of such a zone has been ascertained. Furthermore, due consideration must also be given to the impact of such a zone on the regional and supra-regional stability and security.

In the eleventh preambular paragraph, the draft takes note, among other events, of the World Conference Against Racism. Members of this Committee will be aware that the Austrian delegation to that Conference voted against the final documents of the Conference. Our position as reflected in that vote remains unchanged.

It is for these reasons that my delegation has not been able to support the present draft resolution.

Mr. VELISSAROPOULOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): The Greek delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1 because in general we find in it very valid and constructive ideas for the strengthening of international security.

Nevertheless, I should like to say that while we voted in favour of that text we had a certain number of reservations which I shall not refer to in detail. They relate above all to operative paragraph 10. We should have liked it to be less categorical and more in accord with paragraph 64 of the Final Act in respect of the Mediterranean. We believe - and this has been said repeatedly as regards zones of peace - that they must be freely determined and defined by the States concerned in the region. Obviously this cannot be the result of a mere draft resolution. This is an important problem and States desirous of establishing these zones must proceed with the utmost caution and care.

Mr. BROOK (Australia): The Australian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1. There are a number of aspects of the draft resolution with which we cannot agree and which we do not see as contributing to the strengthening of international security in any substantive way, nor indeed to the efficacy of the Declaration of the General Assembly on the subject.

(Mr. Brook, Australia)

We have reservations about several preambular and operative paragraphs of the draft resolution. In view of the lateness of the hour, we should like to take up the time of the Committee to mention only one of them. My delegation has strong reservations about the eleventh preambular paragraph of the draft resolution. If there had been a separate vote on that preambular paragraph we could not have supported it. We cannot accept the references in it to several conferences, in the conclusions of which we did not participate, and especially the reference to the World Conference Against Racism.

The CHAIRMAN: We have heard the last explanation of vote on this draft resolution which the Chair will entertain in the morning meeting. It was the statement by the last of those delegations which had originally inscribed themselves for that purpose. With apologies to those other delegations which have signified their wish to explain their vote after the vote, I intend to defer those explanations to the afternoon meeting. We shall then have remaining for the afternoon, after those explanations of vote, one substantive document, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1 concerning the situation in Nicaragua.

As members of the Committee will recall, at the end of yesterday's afternoon meeting, the representative of Venezuela was good enough to inform this Committee that a revised version of the draft resolution would be issued. It has been issued this morning, and it will be the intention of the Chair that the Committee take action on this draft resolution today. However, due to the fact that the revised draft resolution came out only this morning, a number of delegations, from this morning on, have approached the Chair, expressing the wish that action on this draft resolution be taken in the afternoon so that they may be able to receive adequate instructions from their Governments. This I believe is in the interests of the Committee as well as of the proponents of the draft resolution.

(The Chairman)

We shall therefore start the afternoon's proceedings by hearing the four remaining explanations of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.60/Rev.1, and after that we shall proceed promptly to the consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1. I hope that this proposal is satisfactory to the Committee.

I call on the representative of Uruguay on a point of order.

Mr. CAMPS (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): The reason for my raising this point of order is to request that my delegation be allowed, in accordance with rule 128 of the rules of procedure, to explain its vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

I do so because the contents of that draft resolution do not flow from the debates we have had in this Committee. Therefore, I hope the Chairman will apply the provisions of rule 128 of the rules of procedure, which allows delegations to speak in explanation of vote before the vote on a draft resolution.

On that understanding, I would, as I say, most respectfully request to be allowed, at this afternoon's meeting, to state Uruguay's position on draft resolution A/C.1/33/L.61/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN: The rule of procedure cited by the representative of Uruguay does not seem to me to present any difficulty.

To make this absolutely clear, I have no intention of deviating from the normal procedure, which allows delegations to explain their vote either before or after the vote.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.