

United Nations

**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION

*Official Records**



FIRST COMMITTEE
51st meeting
held on
Thursday, 3 December 1981
at 3 p.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 51ST MEETING

Chairman: Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER AGENDA ITEMS 57 AND 58

* This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the name of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550, 6 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the record.

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

1-64302

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/36/PV.51
12 January 1981
ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 57 AND 58 (continued)

CONSIDERATION AND ACTION UPON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER AGENDA ITEMS 57 AND 58
(A/C.1/36/L.58; L.59; L.60/Rev.1; L.61)

The CHAIRMAN: This afternoon the Committee will take action on the draft resolutions in the following order: A/C.1/36/L.59, L.58, L.60/Rev.1 and L.61.

Before we proceed to the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59, I shall call on the representative of Romania, who wishes to introduce an oral revision of that draft resolution.

Mr. DIACONU (Romania) (interpretation from French): While expressing their agreement with the content of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59, on "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States," which I had the honour of introducing last Friday on behalf of 24 countries and to which five other countries have added their names as co-sponsors, some delegations have expressed the wish that operative paragraph 8 of the draft resolution should be slightly modified and worded in a somewhat more precise manner.

In order to meet this wish, the delegations of the sponsoring countries agree that the last part of operative paragraph 8 should be revised to read as follows:

"...a Report containing an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received concerning the content of good-neighbourliness as well as ways and modalities to enhance it."

(Mr. Diaconu, Romania)

Thus we request that operative paragraph 8 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 be changed to read as follows:

(spoke in English)

"Requests the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its thirty-seventh session, on the basis of the replies of States and of the views expressed during the thirty-sixth session, as well as on comments of specialized agencies, a Report containing an orderly presentation of the views and suggestions received concerning the content of the good-neighbourliness, as well as ways and modalities to enhance it."

(continued in French)

As can be seen, this is a minor change, simply replacing the word "systematic" by the word "orderly" and introducing a precision regarding the views and suggestions appearing in the report.

On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 we should like once again to thank all the delegations that participated in the preparation of this draft resolution. We hope that this draft resolution, which deals with a question of great importance, the development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States, will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee has before it draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 as orally revised by its sponsors. It relates to agenda item 57, "Development and strengthening of good-neighbourliness between States". The draft resolution has 31 sponsors, and it was introduced by the representative of Romania at the 45th meeting of the First Committee, on 27 November 1981.

The 31 sponsors are as follows: Bangladesh, Burundi, Chad, Colombia, Congo, France, Guinea, Indonesia, Lesotho, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, Mauritania, Nigeria, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkey, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Yugoslavia.

(The Chairman)

The sponsors of the draft resolution have suggested that it be adopted without vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 as orally revised without vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call upon representatives who wish to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/36/PV.21.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): The United States is pleased to have supported draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.59 and to have joined in the consensus.

This draft resolution calls upon all States to develop good-neighbourly relations. It also seeks to identify essential elements of good-neighbourliness and to foster a fuller understanding of what constitutes good-neighbourly relations between States.

The United States regards this effort to clarify essential components of good-neighbourliness as both timely and useful.

The principles of good-neighbourliness which we support are those which in fact all nations support. The pertinent question is not whether a nation supports principles of good-neighbourliness; all nations do, as I said. It is, rather, whether a nation adheres to principles of good-neighbourliness; and not all nations do.

I speak on this matter as representative of a nation having excellent relations with both its neighbours, relations which have improved markedly under the Reagan Administration. During the presidential campaign, in fact, Candidate Reagan placed improved relations with Mexico and Canada among his top foreign-affairs priorities, and he has succeeded quite well in implementing that goal. I represent a country with more than 5,000 miles of open and unguarded borders with its neighbours. We have no troops garrisoned along our borders; we have no military installations for protection along our borders; we have no weapons poised along our borders; and we need none.

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

This stands in sharp contrast with other nations around the world. They too proclaim their undying support for principles of good-neighbourliness, but they do not practise them.

In its reply to the Secretary-General's request for comments on the good-neighbourliness draft resolution, the Soviet Union highlighted its numerous treaties and bilateral declarations with nearby countries in which good-neighbourly conduct is solemnly pledged. But is it good-neighbourly to carry out a military occupation of a sovereign nation, to attempt by harsh coercion to bend an ancient people to the arbitrary will of a powerful neighbour? Is it good-neighbourly to seal the borders of a State so that only a selected few may enter or leave, shrouding its actions and its purposes even from its nearest neighbours?

A truly good neighbour encourages the free exchange of people and of ideas with neighbours. It does not raise barriers to the dissemination and discussion of views which are not official doctrine. It does not require a rigid political orthodoxy of smaller States on its borders, nor does it resort to massive armed intervention such as we have witnessed on several occasions to enforce that orthodoxy.

There is a great deal more to being a good neighbour than pledging it on a piece of paper. The United States hopes that the practice of good-neighbourliness among nations will flourish, that it will enjoy increasing acceptance and respect.

I sense a great longing among the nations of this earth, a longing we in the United States profoundly share, for the blossoming of peaceful, constructive relations between States. This blossoming would enable us to devote undivided attention to the great challenge which all of us, neighbours all on this planet, face in the decades ahead.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58, related to agenda item 58 (c), "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace". The draft resolution is sponsored by 16 countries and was introduced by the representative of Poland at the 45th meeting of the First Committee on 27 November. The sixteen sponsors are: Afghanistan, Algeria, Cameroon, Colombia, the Congo, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Hungary, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mongolia, Peru, Philippines, Poland and Yugoslavia.

I shall first call on those members who wish to explain their vote before the vote.

Mr. SUMMERHAYES (United Kingdom): On behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, I should like to say a few words on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58.

The Ten member States of the European Community voted in favour of resolution 33/73 which contained the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. On the occasion of the vote upon that resolution in the First Committee, the representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, speaking on behalf of the then Nine member States of the European Community, expressed appreciation of the basic thrust of the initiative but recorded certain reservations upon the language used in the resolution.

The Ten have similar reservations on some of the language used in the draft resolution which is currently before us. In particular, the preambular paragraph, which refers to the paramount value of "positive moulding of human consciousness", is rather unfortunate. As delegations will be well aware, the democratically elected Governments of the Ten member States of the European Community reject the concept of controlling information sources in such a way as that which might be suggested by the wording of that paragraph.

(Mr. Summerhayes, United Kingdom)

Our second hesitation in respect of the text in draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58 concerns operative paragraph 2 which lists Governments, the United Nations and various specialized agencies in a way which might be interpreted as placing them upon the same level. The Ten believe that in matters of this sort it is for the United Nations as such to exercise a co-ordination role.

Having elaborated our reservations on this text, I would repeat that the Ten nevertheless appreciate the main thrust of the initiative. When draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58 is put to the vote, we shall vote in favour. However, our vote in favour should not be taken as an indication that the Ten can necessarily subscribe to all of the content of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/36/386.

Mr. ADELMAN (United States of America): More than 200 years ago, the United States committed itself to live in peace and harmonious co-operation with all peoples on earth. Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58 effectively reaffirms many principles that appear in the Charter of the United Nations and in other solemn commitments of the United States. Consequently, we are in full accord with the moving spirit and intent of this initiative.

However, the defect that the United States perceived in the resolution adopted three years ago that set forth the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace endures in the present draft resolution. The two fundamental flaws in the Declaration itself also endure. The first is the inadequate reference to a number of basic human rights that are essential to a just and peaceful life for all persons and to a viable international society for all countries. These include the right of individuals to be free from physical or psychological coercion on the part of authority, from arbitrary arrest or detention and from exile or deprivation of nationality. They include the right of individuals to enjoy freedom of travel, to hold one's own beliefs, to peaceful assembly, to voice one's opinion and to live under a system of impartial justice. Failing the assertion of such basic rights, the Declaration is lacking in a very fundamental way.

The second flaw is the casting of governments in a role quite adverse to the principles on which the United States - and even the United Nations - was founded. The representative of the United Kingdom has made reference to this. The draft resolution calls upon all States to "prepare" their citizens for life in peace with other societies and to use government agencies, as well as schools and the information media, to achieve the "moulding of human consciousness." Free societies are free, in part, because their governments are prohibited from attempting to dictate or mould the opinions of their citizens. Specifically, the right of the Press and of individuals to speak their minds, whether or not their ideas are agreeable to current authority, is a jealously guarded freedom. Such freedoms stand at the very heart of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution, and they stand at the very heart of freedom in any society

(Mr. Adelman, United States)

The United States holds that policies and goals are worthy of support only if they earn the willing assent of the people without coercion or manipulation by authority. We believe that the ordinary person, wherever he may reside on this earth, does not need to be taught to wish to live in peace. Threats to peace arise, not from ordinary people, but from the leaders and wielders of power, particularly from powerful leaders who feel no need or desire to consult the wishes of their subjects.

For those reasons, which are quite important to us, the United States will abstain in the vote on this otherwise noble draft resolution.

Mr. AKKERMAN (Netherlands): Elaborating on the statement made on behalf of the Ten member States of the European Community, to which the Netherlands belongs, I should like to make a further brief statement reflecting the detailed position of the Netherlands on one aspect of draft resolution A/C.1/35/L.58 on the implementation of the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace.

The Netherlands holds the opinion that the concept of life in peace should apply, not only to the activities of States, but also to the life of the individual citizen. If the concept of life in peace for individuals is to have a practical meaning, we think it must be related to human rights. Peace for the individual means freedom - freedom from war, freedom from want, freedom from fear, freedom of expression, conscience, religion and belief.

In our view, international security cannot be strengthened in a world community if in some of its societies those freedoms are not guaranteed or are even trampled upon. The Netherlands regards as its duty the guarantee of the free exercise of these freedoms that are bestowed upon its citizens through its national Constitution or through international obligations. We call upon all Governments concerned to respect the exercise of those freedoms for their citizens.

(Mr. Akkerman, Netherlands)

More specifically, the Netherlands has some reservations about the language used in the fourth preambular paragraph, namely:

"positive moulding of human consciousness".

That phrase seems to imply activities by States that could run counter to the constitutional principles we share with many countries and could prejudge the outcome of the exercise of freedoms by individual citizens. We can only interpret that paragraph as referring to a requirement for our Government to provide all the available information on the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and other relevant documents, so as to enable its individual citizens fully to perceive the loftiness of those concepts, with a view to strengthening international peace and security by their implementation.

With that interpretation in mind, the Netherlands will support draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): First, I would like to say that Canada will vote in favour of this draft resolution. I do so, while at the same time I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that in Canada it is normal constitutional practice that matters such as those dealt with in the present draft resolution come under the purview of the Provinces under our federal system.

Having said that, I should like to turn to a point that has been addressed by the two preceding speakers, and that concerns the phrase "positive moulding of human consciousness". The French version of the draft resolution, it seems to us, presents less of a problem. I should like to read out the French version, because those who have the English text before them may have a different appreciation of the text than those who have the French. The French text reads as follows:

(spoke in French)

"Consciente qu'il est primordial de susciter dans les consciences humaines une attitude favorable à la réalisation des buts et des principes de la Charte des Nations Unies."

(Mr. Skinner, Canada)

(continued in English)

Now, this is not quite the same thing as "positive moulding," as the English text has it, and I am wondering - and I would put this to the sponsors - whether it might not be possible to resolve the problem presented by the English text, at least to a certain degree, by changing the fourth preambular paragraph to read:

"Aware of the paramount value of encouraging in the human consciousness appreciation for the fulfilment of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations."

If this amendment were acceptable to the sponsors - if, indeed, it is an amendment at all - I think it would solve a number of difficulties for some of the delegations present. We believe that such an amendment in fact preserves the essential idea contained in that preambular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry that the representative of Canada has chosen to suggest an amendment at a time that is quite beyond the limit for such things, as he will understand. As we wish to be as helpful as possible, perhaps we might close one eye as far as rule 128 of the rules of procedure is concerned. I would ask the representative of Poland whether or not the suggestion of the representative of Canada would be acceptable to him. He should merely say: yes or no. I do not want a discussion on this, because if we start discussing it we shall be completely out of order.

Mr. NOWAK (Poland): I just wanted to ask the representative of Canada, through you, Mr. Chairman, to repeat his amendment, because I was unable to catch it.

The CHAIRMAN: Would the representative of Canada please repeat his suggestion?

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): Thank you for your tolerance in this matter Mr. Chairman. The amendment, if it is an amendment, is as follows. The fourth preambular paragraph would read:

"Aware of the paramount value of encouraging in the human consciousness appreciation for the fulfilment ... " and so on.

The CHAIRMAN: I would ask the representative of Poland just to state whether or not this is acceptable.

Mr. NOWAK (Poland): Taking into account the very brief time I have for reflection, I cannot say at this time that I might accept it.

The CHAIRMAN: There being non-positions and non-papers, the non-amendment of the Canadian representative is non-acceptable.

As there are no further explanations of vote before the vote, I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.58. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, German, Federal Republic of, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Cameroon, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Israel, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58 was adopted by 114 votes to none, with 2 abstentions.*

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

*Subsequently, the delegations of Afghanistan and Peru advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.58 since it had, at the thirty-third session of the General Assembly, supported the Declaration on the Preparation of Societies for Life in Peace. I wish to recall, however, that at the adoption of that document the Austrian delegation had certain reservations concerning it.

Austria fully supports the concept of the right to live in peace, but we feel that it must be linked to human rights as a whole. The promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms is necessary to create conditions leading to a just and durable peace. This must be taken fully into account in all efforts to promote the objectives of the present draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: As no other delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.58 after the vote, we have now concluded our action on that draft resolution.

We shall now proceed to take action upon draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1, which is related to agenda item 58 (a), "Review of the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Yugoslavia at the 47th meeting of the First Committee on 1 December. This draft has 20 sponsors, as follows: Algeria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Burundi, Congo, Egypt, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Malta, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Yugoslavia and Zambia. A recorded vote has been requested.

In explanation of vote before the vote, I call on the representative of Israel.

Mr. EILAN (Israel): I should like to explain the position of my delegation regarding draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1.

Agenda item 58 (a), entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security", deals with fundamental principles upon which rests the whole edifice of the Charter of the United Nations. The United Nations was created with the principal aim of supporting the maintenance of peace and security in the world. This is its essential raison d'être, and all other activities, however important, are subsidiary to this, the main goal of our Organization.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

Israel has always supported resolutions of the General Assembly that were in full accord with the spirit and letter of the United Nations Charter and its ideals and purposes and will continue to do so. If one were to enumerate, one by one, all the armed conflicts that have taken place since the inception of the United Nations, conflicts that have caused so much suffering to mankind, one would easily come to the conclusion that most, if not all, of them could have been avoided. They could have been avoided if Member States had been prepared to be guided by the provisions of Article 2 of the Charter and especially by the injunctions contained in paragraph 3 of that article. Article 2, paragraph 3, says:

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

The key words in this paragraph are "peaceful means"; and peaceful means in this context connote negotiations. No negotiations are possible without contact. Even in the worst periods of the cold war diplomatic contact was maintained between the United States and the Soviet Union. It was the maintenance of contact that made negotiations between the two Powers possible at a later stage.

The draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1 contains appeals to Member States that have often been made in the past. They repeat obligations already existing under the Charter. They do not contain a single new thought that would make peace more durable or make war less likely. Here and there the language of the draft resolution departs from the accepted terminology of diplomacy and borders on the well-worn clichés of a propaganda pamphlet. When we try to take an all-over view of the debate so far, we cannot help asking ourselves whether this draft resolution - and the same goes for draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61 - and some of those adopted in previous years were really necessary.

(Mr. Eilan, Israel)

How much did this last debate - which was a repetition of so many previous ones - actually contribute to the cause of peace? And with so little to show for this debate, we accordingly regret to note the introduction into the draft resolution before us of certain semantic nuances where the original meaning of words has been changed to denote political conceptions that do not always fully conform with the principle of solving disputes by pacific means.

Certain thoughts expressed in operative paragraph 5 are acceptable to Israel, especially

"... to seek the peaceful settlement of disputes and the resolution of the focal points of crises and tensions..."

However, the rest of the draft resolution is worded in a manner and in language not calculated to encourage dialogue and mutual understanding, but rather confrontation and hostility.

Israel will therefore not be able to support this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore,

Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia

Against: None

Abstaining: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Federal Republic of, Guatemala, Haiti, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1 was adopted by 93 votes to none, with 21 abstentions.*

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

Mr. de LA GORCE (France)(interpretation from French): The French delegation voted in favour, thus conveying the support which its Government has for one of the basic objectives of the community of States: the strengthening of international security. We consider that, on a whole, the text that we have just adopted expresses a realistic and positive approach. We have also been mindful of the spirit in which the sponsors have endeavoured to accommodate certain comments to which their original draft might have given rise.

Nevertheless, although we voted for the draft resolution, we have certain reservations on some parts of the text.

For us, it is self-evident that the provisions contained in the draft resolution should necessarily be interpreted in accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Charter. In this connexion, France, which has always lived up to its obligations as a permanent member of the Security Council,

* Subsequently the delegations of Afghanistan, Djibouti and Peru advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

does not consider that the international mechanisms the purpose of which is to maintain peace and security can be questioned as institutions. Of course it is our desire that these institutions function in the most effective way possible; but the recommendations contained in operative paragraph 7 in connexion with an examination of existing mechanisms or those to be created and designed to strengthen the Security Council's authority do not for us mean that we accept any criticism of the Council's action.

With reference to operative paragraph 3, we should recall that the right each State has freely to dispose of its natural resources can be exercised only while respecting the principles of international law. The members of the European Community had occasion to point that out in the course of the interpretative declaration they made when the text relating to the strategy of the Third Development Decade was adopted.

In connexion with operative paragraph 11, and more specifically the nuclear capability of South Africa, the French delegation, which adheres to the principles contained in the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa would like to point to the distinction that must be drawn between a nuclear capability for peaceful purposes and a strictly military nuclear capability, the source of the danger denounced in the draft resolution. The French delegation, furthermore, would like to reserve its position on the request made to the Security Council in connexion with the steps outlined in that paragraph.

Finally, the French delegation must make the point that the draft resolutions which we have adopted contain references to texts to which France was unable to subscribe despite the laudable motives which inspired them. That applies to the Declaration on the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace and the 1960 Declaration on decolonization.

With respect to operative paragraph 14, which refers to a zone of peace and co-operation in the Mediterranean, we note that the principles on which such a zone would be established are unquestionable and do not affect the necessary requirements of security.

Mr. ADAMSON (United States of America): I should like briefly to explain my delegation's abstention in the vote on the draft resolution on strengthening international security in document A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1. Before doing so, however, I should like to express our appreciation to the sponsors of the draft resolution and other delegations which have conducted extensive consultations in an attempt to meet the concerns of many delegations.

We share the dismay of the sponsors of this draft resolution over the escalation of tension and threats to security throughout the world. Our view as to the cause of much of this tension is well known to my colleagues and I need not dwell on it at this time.

In addition, we should like to commend the sponsors of the draft resolution for highlighting the importance of respect for human rights and other fundamental freedoms, as well as the work of the Madrid Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We consider those freedoms essential for strengthening international peace and security within Europe and throughout the world.

(Mr. Adamson, United States)

Nevertheless, my delegation has a number of difficulties with the text which required us to abstain in the vote. The United States, along with other nations, has repeatedly stressed its difficulties with the terms of reference contained in the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace, referred to in operative paragraph 12 of the draft resolution before us. In addition, the reference to control over natural resources contained in operative paragraphs 3 and 14 should, in our opinion, note the right of all States freely to dispose of their natural resources in accordance with international law.

Further, we have consistently objected to language like that contained in operative paragraph 10, that calls for support of national liberation movements without recognizing the role that peaceful settlements of disputes ought to play in resolving differences and strengthening international security.

Finally, the United States continues to have serious reservations about the utility of the many resolutions on the strengthening of international security, no matter how noble of purpose, that have been brought before the General Assembly since the adoption of the original Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security in 1970. The international community does not suffer from an insufficiency of resolutions and declarations on this subject. The solution does not lie in more flights of rhetoric but in the real observance of existing rules. The United Nations Charter itself provides the best guidelines under which Member States can take practical, concrete and effective measures to strength international peace and security.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): The delegation of Finland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1, just adopted. In doing so, we note that its general thrust is consonant with the original Declaration of 1970 on the Strengthening of International Security, to which we continue to attach great importance.

In our view, the revised version of the draft marks a considerable improvement over the original draft. However, we cast our positive vote with some reservations as to regional arrangements dealt with the text. It is our view that such arrangements can only be arrived at freely among the States of the region concerned and with undiminished security for all. Further, we wish to emphasize strict compliance with the provisions of the Charter concerning the powers of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria has always considered its 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. We have thus from the very outset supported the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly.

Today we note with great satisfaction that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1 have prepared a text which is by and large well-balanced, comprehensive and in keeping with the spirit and substance of the Declaration. We appreciate in particular that it was possible to eliminate certain controversial elements that have in past years forced the Austrian delegation to abstain in the vote.

While we thank the sponsors for their constructive approach and their willingness to compromise, we feel nevertheless obliged to note that there remain certain provisions with regard to which the Austrian delegation has reservations. I refer in particular to operative paragraphs 6 and 7 which do not take full account of the delimitations of the functions of the different organs of the United Nations, and to operative paragraph 14. The Austrian delegation cannot support the proposal for the transformation of the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and co-operation as long as this concept has not been defined and clarified in discussions with all countries of the region, and until their readiness to participate in the establishment of such a zone has been ascertained.

In view of its agreement with the general thrust of the present draft resolution, the Austrian delegation was nevertheless able to support its adoption.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): The Irish delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1 entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security". We have done so because we are in general agreement with the general thrust of the draft resolution.

(Mr. O'Connor, Ireland)

We have nevertheless certain reservations regarding the provisions of this draft resolution, and in particular I would mention those which touch on the respective competences of the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): Security in Europe and security in the Mediterranean are closely linked, and it would not be possible to consider European security without taking the Mediterranean region into account. That was the position of Turkey during the negotiations between East and West in the 1970s, and we have always defended the idea that the Mediterranean should be included in the East-West security concept which, on the basis of recent and quite painful experience, was concentrated mainly on the old continent.

I do not want to take up the time of the Committee by referring to some interesting details of the debate which, as I said, took place in the 1970s. I should just like to underline the fact that the notion of a zone of peace, which appears in paragraph 14 of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1, conceals a veritable iceberg, that is to say, a very detailed and thorough debate during which the countries around the Mediterranean have almost always acted together, in solidarity.

This was not the case today for all the Mediterranean countries. I regret this, but I should also like to praise the understanding and the flexibility shown in the drafting and the wording of this paragraph, which takes into account our security concerns and comes rather close to our concept.

In general, the text submitted to us this year has the merit of containing most of the considerations expressed in the past by various delegations. Nevertheless, perhaps by reason of the rather hasty method of work of the First Committee, this year too my delegation has been obliged to abstain, despite the fact that it is a better and more balanced text than those of previous years.

Mr. ZELADA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): First of all, my delegation would like to thank the sponsors of the draft resolution on the implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security for the constructive efforts made to try to arrive at a text which would find wide acceptance among the delegations here present. Those efforts have resulted in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1, which has just been put to the vote.

My delegation, while acknowledging improvements introduced in the text, has had to abstain because some of the paragraphs still contain viewpoints and terms that we do not share.

These reservations, as I said, apply to several paragraphs of the draft - in particular operative paragraphs 14 and 15.

Despite its abstention, the Spanish delegation wishes at the same time to state that it fully shares the sentiments motivating the wording of operative paragraph 13, and once again expresses its firm intention to make every contribution so that the Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe may culminate, as stated in that paragraph, in:

"substantial and balanced results ... in the implementation of the principles and goals established by the Helsinki Final Act".

(A/C.1/36/L.60/Rev.1, operative paragraph 13)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61. This draft resolution relates to agenda item 58 (b), "Review of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security: Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of States", introduced by the representative of Guyana on behalf of the Member States of the United Nations belonging to the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 45th meeting of the First Committee, on 27 November.

Before we proceed to the vote, I call on the representative of Guyana.

Mr. SCOTLAND (Guyana), Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group: I have asked to speak as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group charged with the responsibility of preparing the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States. I wish to present to the First Committee a report on the work of the Working Group during this session.

It will be recalled that, by resolution 35/159, of December 1980, the Ad Hoc Working Group was mandated to continue its work at this session. The document then before the Working Group, which had been presented on behalf of certain members of the Non-Aligned Movement, was A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1. On Friday, 20 November, of this year, I informed the First Committee, in my capacity as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Working Group, that document A/C.1/35/WG/CRP.1 in revised form and then identified as document A/C.1/36/WG/CRP.1, which had been prepared and submitted on behalf of all States Members of the Non-Aligned Movement, was available for examination by members of the First Committee.

I arranged at the same time for the distribution of the document to all members of the Committee and, further, asked them to submit amendments thereto by Wednesday, 25 November 1981, in an effort to facilitate the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group. The members of the Working Group had been informed of the intention of the sponsors to obtain a decision on the draft declaration at this session.

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

Before the Ad Hoc Working Group had commenced its work, the Chairman, in deference to some of the views which had been expressed during the thirty-fifth session, consulted widely with a diverse cross-section of the membership of the Working Group as to the best method of conducting the deliberations of the Working Group at this session. The Chairman had ascertained from those consultations that the procedure of converting the Ad Hoc Working Group into, in the first instance, an Ad Hoc Drafting Group would be an appropriate and acceptable manner of proceeding to allow for the widest participation of experts in its work.

A set of amendments in written form was received from one of the two groups of States not members of the Non-Aligned Movement. Consultations were conducted by the Chairman with representatives of that group and with representatives of the sponsors of the draft declaration. Up to the time of the last meeting of the Working Group, agreement had not been reached on the specific texts for inclusion in the draft declaration.

Members representing the other group of States not members of the Non-Aligned Movement submitted no amendments in written form, nor did they, with a few notable exceptions, speak to the points of their concern, either in the Working Group or in the Ad Hoc Drafting Group. Some of those members were prepared to make known to the Chairman, unofficially, their concerns about the draft declaration, but without commitment as to their stand on it. They could not say that they would be favourably disposed towards the draft declaration, even if all the concerns they had expressed were met by changes in the text.

Others of that Group were content to rest on the contention that they had raised in previous years: that the draft should be referred to the Sixth Committee. They did not seem able to indicate to the Chairman why the procedure of an Ad Hoc Drafting Group which would allow for the participation of experts in every field relevant to the draft declaration was either inappropriate or inadequate; nor were those delegations ready to discuss textual changes in the draft declaration. As such, while conducting very intense consultations with a few members of that group who had presented a very helpful and constructive posture towards the draft declaration, the Chairman of the Working Group was very much aware that those delegations proceeded without commitment or obligation, and thus remained free to determine their approaches to the draft declaration, notwithstanding efforts to accommodate their concerns.

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

Certain other members of this group pleaded the paucity of time to conclude work on the draft declaration but did not feel, nevertheless, that they should begin work on the draft declaration with a view to seeing how far progress can be made at this session.

In the face of the realities within the two groups of States not members of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Chairman did not find that he was in a position publicly to attempt in any meaningful manner a reconciliation of the positions of these two groups with that of the sponsors of the draft declaration.

The sponsors of the draft declaration informed the Chairman that under those circumstances it was their intention to put the draft declaration to the vote in its present form.

I wish to express my appreciation to all members of the Ad Hoc Working Group who have in some measure contributed to the understanding by the Chairman of the realities attending adoption of this draft declaration.

While I have the floor, and speaking now as the representative of Guyana, I wish to state on behalf of the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement that it is their intention, as I indicated to this Committee on Monday 23 November, to obtain a decision on the draft declaration at this session. It was the intention of the Non-Aligned Movement to present to the General Assembly a draft declaration for adoption by consensus.

I must emphasize that in the course of the very extensive consultations which have been undertaken since the appearance of this document I was very encouraged by the serious and positive approach displayed by some delegations to the Committee's consideration of this document. Unfortunately, this attitude was not as widespread as we would have liked it to be or as it needed to be for the purposes of the present draft declaration. There were many useful hours of discussion with some delegations in an attempt to establish the widest possible ground and I do sincerely regret that when everything is taken into consideration these efforts should not have led to a different result in which we could all have shared at this time.

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

It would be fair, I believe, to say that the non-co-operation of some States not members of the Non-Aligned Movement on this draft declaration, the self-exclusionary approach taken by others to the negotiations, the fact that yet others appear to lay down pre-conditions for their participation in discussions on the text of the draft declaration - these points have been notable. Others among those States would prefer even at this time, the third successive year, to discuss generalities of the text or to discuss specific texts only on their terms and in a context determined by them. Yet others remarked on the lack of time but were not disposed even to start work on the draft declaration at this session. All these approaches dealt a serious blow to the aspirations of the Non-Aligned Movement for the adoption of a document by consensus.

The discussions and consultations did not appear at times to contain that element of readiness to give and take characteristic of negotiations. And yet, many delegations through their representatives in the general debate in the General Assembly remarked on the frequent instances of intervention and interference, both actual and threatened which have occurred in recent times. Many delegations also admitted that there were elements in the draft declaration to which they were favourably disposed. That notwithstanding, there has been a marked reluctance on the part of those delegations even to begin the process of consultations and negotiations in earnest or, indeed, to give an indication as to whether or how soon they would be prepared to co-operate as a group in that endeavour.

These approaches to the draft declaration gave the distinct impression in some quarters that the difficulty which many delegations claimed to have with the text of the draft declaration lay less within the text itself than outside it, that the principal issue may not, after all, have been the text of the draft declaration. A statement that there are difficulties with the text of a draft accompanied by a refusal to specify those difficulties did not prove to be a helpful course.

(Mr. Scotland, Chairman of the
Ad Hoc Working Group)

A detailed statement of difficulties followed by a refusal to discuss texts to accommodate those difficulties did not prove an asset to negotiations. Given the advanced stage of the work on the draft declaration, the length of time that this item has exercised this Committee -- five sessions, during three of which the First Committee had before it the text of a draft declaration, given the aspirations and expectations of the sponsors of this document, it could not be a reasonable request on the part of some delegations not members of the Movement for a postponement of the vote on this draft declaration when those delegations offered in return nothing -- neither any indication of a real change in their approach to the draft declaration, nor any indication of an intention to negotiate in earnest for the adoption of a declaration by consensus in a spirit of give and take and mutual respect.

As I remarked at the start of this part of my statement, the Non-Aligned Movement wished for the adoption of a draft declaration by consensus and was prepared to and did, indeed, strain every nerve in its efforts to this end. Those towards whom these efforts were directed did not appear ready to join in the search for compromise and consensus.

More in sorrow than in anger, I regret the fact that this draft declaration, with its potential for so much good, could not benefit in its final form from the participation of those States not members of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on those delegations which wish to speak in explanation of their vote before the vote.

Mrs. DA SILVA (Venezuela) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Venezuela would like to make a few comments in relation to the "draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States", which appears as an annex to the draft resolution introduced by Guyana, contained in document A/C.1/36/L.61, the title of which is "Non-Interference in the Internal Affairs of States".

My country in its international relations has always shown the strictest respect for the principles and purposes which guide this Organization and the commitments undertaken by virtue of the Charter. This is why we attach particular importance to the preparation of a draft declaration on the principle of non-intervention.

Venezuela has always faithfully fulfilled its international obligations, particularly those laid down in the Charter of the United Nations and considers that the principle of the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States is a principle which the international community should recognize and develop, but not in the terms of this draft declaration and not without the relevant safeguards that it should have contained.

(Mrs. Da Silva, Venezuela)

Venezuela sees a series of incongruences and contradictions in the draft declaration as regards the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, but it does not intend to analyse all of its weaknesses. It wishes simply to point them out generally and to say that in a broader perspective many of the paragraphs of the draft declaration can be seen as limiting the commitments under the Charter as regards the principles that we want to develop.

Venezuela would have liked the declaration to have included some elements that would supplement it, such as the statement that nothing in the declaration affects the rights of States under treaties, validly entered into, concerning territorial disputes nor should any State use it to evade the obligation to try to find, by peaceful means, solutions to territorial disputes which are envisaged in such treaties as have been duly signed.

Nor is there any reference to the recognized existence of dispute on territorial matters still pending and not yet solved. Consequently there could be contradictions between several of the paragraphs of the draft declaration now before us, with the results arising from the solution of the said dispute. That is why Venezuela will vote against document A/C.1/36/L.61, which contains in its annex the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

Mr. de LA GORCE (France) (interpretation from French): The French delegation will have to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61. We regret having to do so because that draft resolution deals with a principle - non-interference in the internal affairs of States - to which France naturally gives its unreserved support. May I add that a number of the provisions to be found in the draft resolution are acceptable to us. I would observe that the French delegation has been very actively engaged in negotiations to explore the possibility of reaching agreement on the text, and in this connexion we have made very precise proposals.

Although, as I have said, certain of the text's provisions meet with our agreement, the same is unfortunately not true of others. In this connexion I shall confine myself to referring to the absolute opposition of

(Mr. de La Gorce, France)

the French delegation to paragraph (ix) of part II of the draft declaration. This provision is aimed at dissuading States from collectively organizing their defence and security. It claims to make it a duty to refrain from any initiatives and indeed any actions directed to that end. That provision is therefore completely at variance with a fundamental article of the Charter, Article 51, which refers to the natural and inherent right of individual or collective self-defence and consequently the right of States to organize and to provide for the exercise of that right of legitimate defence.

I would add that this text, which contains a number of complex provisions, could usefully have been the subject of discussion in the Sixth Committee, which would have been entirely justified by the inherent legal aspects of its provisions.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote upon the draft resolution in document A/C.1/36/L.61.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Kampuchea, Democratic Yemen, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, 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,
Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia

Against: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France,
Germany, Federal Republic of, Iceland, Ireland, Israel,
Italy, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal,
Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and
Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela

Abstaining: Finland, Gabon, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti,
Paraguay, Swaziland, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61 was adopted by 90 votes to 21, with
8 abstentions.*

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

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation
from French): The Soviet delegation would like to explain its vote in connexion
with the adoption of the draft declaration on the inadmissibility of
intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States.

The situation that has arisen in the world in recent times quite
legitimately causes concern and anxiety among all who are concerned with the
peaceful coexistence of peoples. The sources of the present international
tension seem to be rooted in the policy of aggressive imperialist circles
and the actions of those who are undermining and destroying détente and
stepping up the arms race. Specific manifestations of this imperialist
policy can be found in Europe, in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America.

Through its policy the United States is trying to arrogate to itself
the right to declare any part of the world a sphere of vital American
interests in which it can, it says, freely carry out its interventionist
plans. To that end the United States has created especially rapid deployment
forces designed to serve as a police truncheon to be aimed at young
liberated States. For that purpose it has concluded strategic alliances -
for example, that with Israel - as an additional tool for imperialist
intervention.

*Subsequently the delegation of Peru advised the Secretariat that it
had intended to vote in favour.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

Given the growing aggressiveness of imperialism, it is perfectly justified and legitimate for States to aspire to strengthen the United Nations Charter principle on non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and to guarantee that it be observed unswervingly.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

The Soviet Union is extremely sympathetic to such an approach and is prepared to support it in every possible way. The Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, I.I. Brezhnev, on 27 April this year, submitted a proposal on a sui generis code of conduct which States should observe in their relations with young States in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We are very gratified to see that many of the provisions contained in the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States are in consonance with that Soviet proposal. We consider that the essence of Part II, paragraph (ix) of the Declaration is completely correct when it refers to:

"The duty of States to refrain from any measure which would lead to the strengthening of existing military blocs or the creation or strengthening of new military alliances, interlocking arrangements, the deployment of interventionist forces or military bases and other related military installations conceived in the context of great Power confrontation".

That paragraph, however, could have been considerably strengthened if it had included a provision on the need to dissolve military alliances. On the other hand, the very end of that paragraph, which refers to actions "conceived in the context of great Power confrontation", we believe, is inappropriate. First, it is not the socialist countries, but rather the West, which was the initiator of military alliances. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) bloc was created six years earlier than the Warsaw Treaty Alliance. It is not the socialist countries, but rather the West, which was the initiator in the past, as it is today, of military alliances. The socialist countries favour the dissolution of such alliances.

As recently as the last session of the General Assembly, the Soviet Union submitted an initiative for refraining from expanding the existing and the formation of new military groupings. At the recently concluded meeting of the Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the countries parties to the Warsaw Treaty, it was emphasized that it was of fundamental importance in averting the further deterioration of the international situation to refrain from taking any steps to create new

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

or to extend existing military-political alliances or to extend their activities to other regions. Those who participated in the meeting also reaffirmed the proposals they had frequently repeated that there should be simultaneous dissolution of the Warsaw Treaty and the NATO bloc and, as an initial step, the elimination of military organizations belonging to both of those groupings, starting with a reduction of their military activities.

Secondly, the present wording at the end of paragraph (ix), to which I have referred, could be utilized by the imperialists in order to lend some justification to the deployment of their interventionist forces and their military bases directed against the developing countries. In that way, this formulation is a serious omission, and we have frequently had occasion to point to this during the consultations that were held.

On the whole, however, the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States is a positive and constructive document. It stresses the inalienable right of a State freely to determine its political, economic, cultural and social system, to develop its international relations and to exercise permanent sovereignty over its natural resources in accordance with the will of its own people, without outside intervention.

The Declaration confirms the Charter principle that States shall refrain from the threat or use of force and also the duty to refrain from any forcible action which deprives peoples under colonial domination or foreign occupation of their right to self-determination, freedom and independence.

The Declaration also refers to the rights vested in States to depend their sovereignty and national independence. It is also significant that the Declaration assumes the legitimacy of political and armed struggle of peoples who are under colonial domination or under the oppression of racist régimes.

All that made it possible for our delegation to support the draft Declaration of the non-aligned countries.

Mr. ADAMSON (United States of America): The United States strongly supports the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and deplores any interference which violates that principle. This concept is an important element in the international system which this Organization is pledged to uphold and to protect. We therefore share the deep concern of non-aligned States that this principle be reinforced as a deterrent to nations that would violate it, as the Soviet Union has done, despite its tendencious rhetoric just repeated here, by its invasion and continuing occupation of Afghanistan, and as Viet Nam has done, by its invasion and continuing occupation of Kampuchea. It is heartening that the General Assembly has once again during this session called for an end to those illegal acts.

My delegation believes that there is much to commend in the draft Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention and Interference in the Internal Affairs of States, contained in the annex to document A/C.1/36/L.61. The draft reaffirms some fundamental and vital principles of the United Nations Charter, for example, self-determination and equal rights of peoples as well as the political independence and territorial integrity of States. The draft text affirms that no State has the right to interfere with the free exercise of those rights. It stresses the duty of States to refrain from threats or use of force to violate existing internationally recognized boundaries, to refrain from armed intervention and to refrain from carrying out subversion or unlawful military occupation.

(Mr. Adamson, United States)

Those points are useful reaffirmations of basic principles that merit re-emphasis.

In spite of those commendable points in the text of the draft resolution, my delegation believes that the text is seriously flawed in many respects. My delegation pointed out many of those flaws in a meeting held by the ad hoc working group last Friday, which - I should emphasize - was the first meeting of that group. Today, I shall briefly point out a few of the most serious substantive difficulties my delegation has with the draft declaration.

The draft declaration purports to create numerous new rights and duties, which are not contained in the United Nations Charter or in international law, and it seeks to expand existing Charter principles in ways not called for by the Charter itself. It defines those rights and duties in vague, imprecise and sometimes unbalanced language. For example, in its paragraph on a new international information order and on the dissemination of information, the text directly contradicts the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, notably Article 19 of that Declaration, which affirms the right of everyone to receive and impart information across frontiers. In its pejorative reference to "military bases" and "military alliances," the text of the draft declaration directly contravenes the right of States to engage in individual and collective self-defence, under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. That point is a grave flaw in the draft declaration and constitutes a very serious omission in its treatment of the subject of interference and intervention.

The text of the draft declaration also refers to the duty of States "to refrain from the exploitation and the distortion of human rights issues". The confusing and imprecise language of that portion of the text could be interpreted as discouraging progress towards internationally recognized standards of human rights. The draft declaration even purports to define new and hitherto unrecognized duties of States with regard to economic assistance and multinational corporations. The language of the draft declaration does not address those issues either realistically or equitably. This listing summarizes only a few of the many substantive deficiencies my delegation finds in the draft declaration.

(Mr. Adamson, United States)

Although my delegation shares the desire of non-aligned States to strengthen international support for the principle of non-intervention and to oppose interference, we do not think that the draft declaration addresses clearly or judiciously many of the issues it raises. My delegation made clear its willingness to support a procedural resolution that would have forwarded the draft declaration, along with any other proposals on the subject, to the Sixth Committee for its consideration at the thirty-seventh session of the General Assembly. We think that the Sixth Committee would have been the appropriate forum for consideration of this initiative, since it involves, for the most part, the restatement and interpretation of legal principles and is therefore related to other issues that are before the Sixth Committee, for example, Charter review, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-use or threat of use of force.

However, since the sponsor of A/C.1/36/L.61 insisted on pressing the draft declaration to a vote, my delegation was compelled to cast a negative vote, based on the serious substantive shortcomings of the text.

Mr. MEGALOKONOMOS (Greece)(interpretation from French): Draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61 on non-interference in the internal affairs of States, introduced by the delegation of Guyana, undoubtedly contains many positive elements for the strengthening of international security, a matter that has always been of great interest to Greece. We fully agree, in particular, with the reaffirmation of the principles of the Charter, the prohibition of armed intervention, respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of countries, the non-encouragement of secessionist activities within other States, and so on.

The foreign policy of Greece has always been based upon such principles. However, the draft declaration also contains elements to which we cannot subscribe, such as the paragraph dealing with the right of States to belong to alliances, a right that is in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter, as well as the paragraphs that appear, inter alia, to limit human rights and fundamental freedoms and the right to information.

(Mr. Megalokonomos, Greece)

For those reasons, while recognizing the positive aspects of the draft declaration, my delegation was obliged to abstain in the voting on it.

Mr. BLOMBERG (Finland): The delegation of Finland abstained in the vote just taken on draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States is a basic, underlying principle of the Charter of the United Nations and of several other instruments of international law. My delegation views with sympathy the efforts made to give further effect to basic principles embodied in the Charter, but we have doubts with regard to the advisability of and the need for further declaratory statements, particularly if such declarations - as in the present case - interpret the basic principles of the Charter in a selective and arbitrary manner. That constitutes our principal reservation with regard to the approach adopted in the draft resolution.

As to the content of the draft declaration itself, we find several paragraphs objectionable. The draft declaration contains internal contradictions, and several of its formulations are not in keeping with the Charter or with our concept of human rights or, for example, with the provisions of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. We object specifically to the way in which questions concerning human rights, the dissemination of information and the economic aspects of the principle of non-interference are dealt with in the draft declaration. Had those paragraphs been put to a separate vote, my delegation would have voted against them.

Mr. LEHNE (Austria): Austria is firmly committed to the principle of non-intervention, which is the cornerstone of the existing international system and one of the most fundamental elements of the Charter. In view of the clear and unambiguous formulation of that principle in Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter and the existence of a number of other pertinent international instruments, such as the 1965 Declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and the 1970 Declaration concerning friendly relations, the Austrian delegation

(Mr. Lehne, Austria)

has certain doubts about the necessity for preparing a new declaration on this subject.

At the same time, we fully understand the concerns of the delegations that have supported this initiative. Indeed, we share their apprehensions about the frequent violation of the principle of non-intervention in recent years, which has led to a grave deterioration of the international situation. We would therefore have been willing to engage in a constructive dialogue on ways and means to strengthen the principle of non-intervention. Unfortunately, that was not to be. The delegation of Guyana introduced a draft declaration at a very late stage of the present session of the General Assembly, one that contained, apart from very valuable and useful ideas, a number of highly controversial elements, some of which seemed to us incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations. A long and intensive discussion on the basis of this proposal might have led to positive results. Called upon to take a decision on the draft declaration today, the Austrian delegation had, regretfully, to cast a negative vote.

Mr. HELLER (Mexico)(interpretation from Spanish): My delegation voted in favour of the draft declaration contained in document A/C.1/36/L.61. It did so because that draft declaration contains principles to which my country totally adheres in its foreign policy. Nevertheless, my delegation would like to state that, although it does have some doubts with regard to some aspects of the draft declaration which seem to address circumstantial factors rather than general principles, it regrets that the absence of a negotiating attitude on the part of some delegations as regards questions of both procedure and substance, has not enabled us to arrive at a better text that would have merited the Committee's consensus.

Mr. O'CONNOR (Ireland): My delegation has voted against draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61, on non-interference in the internal affairs of States. We have done so with regret, in view of the importance attached by the sponsors to this question and the many positive provisions in the draft resolution and in the draft declaration annexed to it. However, there are also several provisions which are not acceptable to my delegation.

Of the difficulties which are created for us by some of the provisions of the draft declaration, I will mention three by way of illustration. First, in the view of my delegation, there are provisions in the draft declaration which are not consistent with the letter and the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Secondly, the present draft declaration contains provisions which, in our view, are inconsistent with the right of the appropriate organs of the United Nations to take collective action that may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Thirdly, in view of the responsibility of the United Nations, in accordance with the Charter, to seek peaceful solutions to disputes, my delegation cannot associate itself with the inclusion of an explicit endorsement of armed struggle in a United Nations declaration.

Mr. JITOKO (Fiji): The Fiji delegation has voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/36/L.61 as a reflection of my country's inherent belief that the independence and sovereignty of any State and its right to determine and pursue its own goals and affairs, without outside interference, constitute one of the very basic elements contributing towards the strengthening of international security. No one can deny, least of all the members of this Committee, the gravity of the present international situation, brought about to a large extent by the failure of States to adhere to this very basic principle of non-interference. This is in spite of the many General Assembly declarations and resolutions that in the past have attempted to elaborate codes of behaviour among States in accordance with Articles 1 and 2 of the Charter.

The draft declaration on the inadmissibility of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of States, which we have just adopted, in defining in a very comprehensive way what the principle of non-intervention and non-interference entails, is one which my delegation finds little difficulty in

(Mr. Jitoko, Fiji)

supporting or adhering to. The rights and duties of States enunciated therein are in the main consonant with the purposes of the United Nations as set out in Article 1 of the Charter.

However, while my delegation associates itself with the many aspects and the over-all thrust and objective of this draft resolution and declaration, we should like at the same time to reserve our right concerning the interpretation of part II (ix) and to record our reservation with regard to part III (ii) of the said draft declaration. We interpret part II (ix) as not precluding a State from entering into any arrangement that is commensurate with its own genuine security needs. My delegation notes, in this regard, paragraph (e) of the draft declaration. Our reservation concerning part III (ii) of the draft declaration is based on my Government's long-held view on the legitimacy of armed struggle.

Notwithstanding our reservations just expressed, my delegation would like to associate itself with the draft declaration. It remains only for each and every Member State, including those that have supported the draft, to live by it.

Ms. BOYD (Australia): Australia is, of course, fully committed to the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Therefore my delegation regrets that it has felt obliged to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/36/L.61 today.

Australia appreciates greatly the concerns of so many of its friends within the non-aligned group which have motivated them to devote so much time and effort to the drafting of this draft resolution. Australia takes these concerns seriously. It is for this reason that we urged the sponsors to give delegations sufficient time to have the draft discussed with the deliberation due to a document of this nature. We regret that the sponsors have judged it better to persist now with this text, which, while containing much of merit, also includes elements which cause us serious difficulties, but which, given time for examination and consultations, might have been overcome.

Mr. ERSUN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): The drafting of the text of a declaration on non-interference in the internal affairs of States by a group of non-aligned countries has taken up considerable time. My delegation believes that it is quite understandable and legitimate to give to such a subject the time that its importance warrants. However, we cannot say the same about the negotiations that have taken place in the First Committee this year. Without wishing to cast aspersions on the goodwill and the pragmatic and constructive approach of the delegation of Guyana, which presided over the work of the Ad Hoc Working Group, I would say that it is obvious that the few meetings that were devoted to this matter were insufficient for finding common ground among extremely divergent positions and conflicting ideas in connexion with this draft declaration.

Secondly, we are convinced that the Sixth Committee is the most appropriate body for carrying out such a discussion. As we noted during the informal consultations, there are a number of constructive elements to be found in the text of this draft declaration and also other elements which would have prompted the Turkish delegation to cast a negative vote. To give one example, I would refer to part II (ix) of the draft declaration, which deals with alliances.

Nevertheless, we preferred to abstain rather than cast a negative vote on this text, because the Turkish Government attaches particular ~~importance~~ to the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States. It would undoubtedly have been desirable if the process of negotiation, however discouraging its beginnings may have been and however disconcerting the circumstances in which we proceeded during this session, had been pursued with perseverance and patience because consultations could have gone on throughout the year in New York and in capital cities, without waiting for the regular sessions of the General Assembly, in order better to evaluate the possibility of producing a text which would gain the consensus of States. The importance of this subject, we believe, deserved such an approach. It would probably be a somewhat slow process but perhaps more promising and in the final analysis more productive.

NR/jg/jlc

A/C.1/36/PV.51
64-65

The CHAIRMAN: Several representatives have asked to speak in exercise of their right of reply.

Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian) Frequently today we have heard statements by representatives of the United States, apparently to explain its vote, but in fact the United States representatives have attempted to denigrate the policies of other States and mainly to advertise their own policies.

First, the representative of the United States spoke on the question of good-neighbourly relations between States. Let us compare the words of the United States with the actual deeds of that country in this connexion. The United States representative claimed as a model of good-neighbourly relations the relations between the United States and Mexico. The imprint of those so-called good-neighbourly relations can clearly be seen today on the map, because many towns in the United States and even whole states bear Mexican names. The United States took away from Mexico by force two thirds of its territory. One may wonder about these relations, which the United States considers good-neighbourly relations.

On the other hand, the United States has given wide publicity to its relations with another neighbour, to the North - Canada. As far as Canada is concerned, 60 per cent of its economy is controlled by United States transnational monopolies. That is why Canadians say that they are not perhaps afraid of Toronto's being destroyed by the United States Army; what they are afraid of is that Toronto's destruction may be programmed by a computer belonging to a United States transnational monopoly somewhere in Texas. Is that an example of United States good-neighbourly relations?

Let us go further. The United States has frequently referred to good-neighbourly relations with the countries of Latin America, primarily with the Central American Republics. Those are the words of the United States. But what are the facts?

In 1954 the United States organized the overthrow of the progressive régime in Guatemala. Today we can say something about that by referring to the documents that have been unveiled by the State Department. I should like to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that quite recently, about a couple of months ago in fact, a book was published in the United States, entitled The Declassified Eisenhower, which is based on material

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

that belongs to the State Department. In it we can see that the United States State Department, like other such institutions, deliberately planned, organized and carried out the overthrow of the Government of Guatemala. Furthermore, as soon as that Government had been overthrown, the book continues -- referring directly to documents held by the State Department of the United States -- the United States Ambassador in Guatemala immediately produced a long list of persons who should be destroyed in 24 hours. Does the United States regard that as an example of good neighbourly relations?

In April 1961 the United States organized and carried out an invasion by mercenaries against Revolutionary Cuba.

In May 1965 10,000 United States troops were sent to the Dominican Republic and landed there.

Such a United States policy in relations with its neighbours is not only borne out by history, including recent history, but is also a United States policy which exists till the present day. We know quite well, for example, that the United States is threatening to use force against Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, El Salvador and others.

If we wanted to say what motto best characterized United States policy towards its neighbours, it would be a slogan put forward at one time by President Theodore Roosevelt, namely: "Speak softly, but carry a big stick." That is why many Latin Americans speak bitterly to the effect that they regret God is so far and the United States so near.

Secondly, today the First Committee adopted a draft resolution on the question of educating peoples in the spirit of peace. The only two delegations which did not support the idea of educating peoples in that spirit of peace were those of the United States and Israel. Obviously, the point is that the United States and Israel, which have just concluded a military treaty on strategic co-operation in the Middle East, are concerned not with educating peoples in the spirit of peace, but, rather, with bringing up their peoples in a spirit of readiness for war in the Middle East.

(Mr. Ovinnikov, USSR)

A third point where we might compare the words and deeds of the United States today is on the question of non-intervention in the internal affairs of States and the Declaration which was just adopted by the Committee. The United States, a country which has not yet cleansed itself of the shame of its intervention in Viet Nam, voted today together with its partners in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization against non-interference in the internal affairs of States. In other words, today the United States by its deeds had demonstrated that it intends to maintain the possibility for direct gross and military intervention in the affairs of other States.

Those are, on the one hand, the words and, on the other, the deeds of the United States.

Mr. SKINNER (Canada): I suppose it was inevitable that I should have to say something about this extraordinary statement by the Soviet Union on the nature and kind of relations we have with the United States.

I am astonished at the statement. I hope that in due course the Soviet Union will regret having made it, and I equally hope that members of this Committee will note and draw the right conclusions from the motivations which prompted such a statement.

Mr. ADAMSON (United States of America): I shall be very brief. I speak simply to reject the contentions of the Soviet representative. He has chosen to speak on behalf of a number of America's neighbours. I would say, however, that the USSR, as the last great colonial empire and as a nation which flagrantly abuses the rights of its neighbours - today, Afghanistan; yesterday, many other States which I need not enumerate now - is in no position to make such charges against the United States.

This Committee has much better things to do than to listen to this tired shopping-list of Soviet propaganda.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.