

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-FIFTH SESSION

Official Records



1932nd
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 16 December 1970,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Agenda item 72: Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1970 Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 73: Budget estimates for the financial year 1971 Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 78: Audit reports relating to expenditure by the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: (a) Allocations from the Technical Assistance Account of the United Nations Development Programme; (b) Allocations from the Special Fund Account of the United Nations Development Programme Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 79: Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 80: Implementation of the recommendations of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies: (a) Report of the Secretary-General; (b) Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 81: Publications and documentation of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 82: Personnel questions: (a) Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General; (b) Other personnel questions Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>continued</i>) Report of the Fifth Committee	1
Agenda item 12: Report of the Economic and Social Council (<i>concluded</i>) (a) Note by the Secretary-General; (b) Chapters considered directly in plenary meeting	6
Agenda item 26: International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space Report of the First Committee	7
Agenda item 32: Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General Report of the First Committee	8

AGENDA ITEM 72

Supplementary estimates for the financial year 1970
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8267)

AGENDA ITEM 73

Budget estimates for the financial year 1971
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8099)

AGENDA ITEM 78

Audit reports relating to expenditure by the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency:
(a) **Allocations from the Technical Assistance Account of the United Nations Development Programme;**
(b) **Allocations from the Special Fund Account of the United Nations Development Programme**
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8261)

AGENDA ITEM 79

Administrative and budgetary co-ordination of the United Nations with the specialized agencies and the International Atomic Energy Agency: reports of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8265)

AGENDA ITEM 80

Implementation of the recommendations of the *Ad Hoc* Committee of Experts to Examine the Finances of the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies:
(a) **Report of the Secretary-General;**
(b) **Report of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions**
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8266)

AGENDA ITEM 81

Publications and documentation of the United Nations: report of the Secretary-General
REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8226)

President: Mr. Edvard HAMBRO (Norway).

AGENDA ITEM 82**Personnel questions:**

- (a) **Composition of the Secretariat: report of the Secretary-General**
 (b) **Other personnel questions**

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8098)

AGENDA ITEM 12

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

REPORT OF THE FIFTH COMMITTEE (A/8246)

1. The PRESIDENT: I invite Mr. El Baradei, Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee to present in a single statement the Committee's reports on the items now before us.

2. Mr. EL BARADEI (United Arab Republic), Rapporteur of the Fifth Committee: I have the honour to present the reports of the Fifth Committee on agenda items 72 [A/8267], 73 [A/8099], 78 [A/8261], 79 [A/8265], 80 [A/8266], 81 [A/8226], 82 [A/8098] and 12 [A/8246]. The reports contain draft resolutions which the Fifth Committee recommends for adoption by the General Assembly.

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

3. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will consider first the report on agenda item 72 [A/8267].

4. I ask members to turn their attention to the recommendations in paragraph 18 of the report. I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 86 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions (resolution 2729 A (XXV)).

5. We now turn to draft resolution B. Since it was adopted unanimously by the Fifth Committee, may I take it that the General Assembly also adopts it unanimously?

Draft resolution B was adopted unanimously (resolution 2729 B (XXV)).

6. The next report of the Fifth Committee relates to agenda item 78 [A/8261]. In paragraph 3 of that report the Committee recommends the adoption of a draft resolution. It was adopted in the Committee without any objection. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2730 (XXV)).

7. We now take up the report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 79 [A/8265]. I invite members to turn their attention to the decision adopted without objec-

tion in paragraph 13 of the report. May I take it that the General Assembly takes note of those decisions?

It was so decided.

8. We turn now to the draft resolution recommended in paragraph 14 of the report which was adopted without objection. If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the General Assembly wishes to adopt the draft resolution.

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 2731 (XXV)).

9. The next report of the Fifth Committee is on agenda item 81 [A/8226], and in this connexion amendments have been submitted in documents A/L.623/Rev.1 and A/L.624.

10. I call on the representative of India to introduce his amendment.

11. Mr. GUPTA (India): In the Fifth Committee the delegations of Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Liberia, New Zealand, Philippines and Poland introduced a draft resolution on this subject, and the delegation of the United States introduced an amendment to paragraph 3 of that draft. The amendment was adopted by 17 votes in favour to 12 against—17 out of 127 countries.

12. Year after year the General Assembly has been adopting resolutions on the subject of documentation, the control of the volume and cost of documentation; there has been widespread concern at the excessive amounts of money spent on this, a concern which, I believe, is shared by everybody in this house. Particularly during the last two or three years, due to the strenuous and commendable efforts of the Secretariat, control has finally been established and the volume and cost of documentation have been going down—in the context of the fact that activities have been increasing. Although there might be an over-all increase, the situation is now under control. We feel therefore that it is more than sufficient for the General Assembly to adopt a resolution exhorting the Secretariat to continue its strenuous efforts to control both the volume and the cost of documentation without mentioning a specific sum, a sum which we believe was arrived at arbitrarily. Furthermore, if these savings could be effected—which is also doubtful—the result might be detrimental to the work programme.

13. In document A/L.623/Rev.1, therefore, we have set forth an amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft resolution appearing in paragraph 6 of the report; and in view particularly of the preoccupations of the United States delegation, we have included, at the end of that paragraph, the words "keeping in mind the suggestions specifically made in the Fifth Committee for greater economy in this regard".

14. I would respectfully commend this amendment to the Assembly for the widest possible approval.

* Resumed from the 1930th meeting.

15. Mr. FINGER (United States of America): I have asked to speak in order to introduce the amendment set forth in document A/L.624 and to comment on the amendment which was just presented by the representative of India.

16. As he has pointed out, paragraph 3 of the draft resolution resulted, in part, from an amendment proposed by the delegation of the United States which had the effect of introducing a target figure of \$1 million for the reduction of costs. I should like to explain why we believe that that target figure would be useful and why we are convinced that the savings in documentation could be accomplished without any detriment to the work of the Organization.

17. We are all conscious of the fact that we suffer from indigestion caused by a surfeit of documentation. It is true that, by and large, this documentation comes about as a result of decisions of intergovernmental bodies. Very often the representatives of Governments in one body are not fully aware of what the representatives of Governments in another body are doing. Nevertheless, we feel that the Secretariat can help to bring about substantial reductions in the cost of documentation in a way that not only would not interfere with the work programme of the United Nations but in fact would expedite it by avoiding the inundation of delegations with documents that they simply do not have the time to read.

18. I recall from my own experience in two different Committees of the General Assembly that at one time we had both provisional verbatim records and final verbatim records. The final verbatim records usually appeared some eight or nine months after the provisional ones, and it is doubtful that they were ever read, except perhaps by a few students in libraries. In those Committees it was then decided that the provisional verbatim records would be issued, followed by delegations' corrections—which together would constitute the authoritative record. The savings thus effected have been roughly of the order of 30 per cent. The target that we have suggested here is about 5 per cent of the total amount for documentation, and therefore we consider that it is realistic.

19. It has been suggested that this target of \$1 million is arbitrary. My delegation does not think so in any way whatsoever. But may I point out that no one is saying here that there should be savings of a minimum of \$1 million, or that there must be savings of exactly \$1 million—it may be \$800,000, it may be \$1.5 million—but we do feel that the concept of a target would give much more meaning to the effort to reduce the cost of documentation. We therefore believe that this notion of a target should be maintained in order to accomplish two essential purposes: first, to reduce the amount of documents that delegations are required to cope with and, secondly, to reduce the level of the budget.

20. I might add that, having served on the Committee of Contributions earlier this year, I am perfectly aware that the burden on those countries which pay .04 per

cent is relatively just as heavy as it is on the industrialized countries; and it is therefore in the interest of us all to have a maximum of economy.

21. In order to clarify our position further, we should like to introduce one revision to the amendment we have put forward in document A/L.624. We wish to add the phrase "without detriment to the work programmes of the United Nations". We have done this in a spirit of compromise. We note that the phrase appears in the text just introduced by the representative of India, and although we thought this was implicit in our text we have no objection to making it explicit.

22. Therefore the amendment as so revised would read:

"In operative paragraph 3 delete the words 'costs with . . . twenty-sixth session' and replace them by the words 'in those areas that are within his competence and authority and without detriment to the work programmes of the United Nations, with a target of reducing documentation costs by \$1 million during 1971, taking into account the efforts of the United Nations organs, bodies and committees mentioned in paragraph 5 below'."

23. With this amendment we believe that we have met the concerns of the sponsors of the other amendment. We have made it clear that we are aware of the competence of the Secretary-General and of the various committees, organs and bodies of the United Nations, and we have made it quite clear that the figure of \$1 million is not a mandatory figure nor an arbitrary figure, but a very desirable target towards which the Secretary-General should aim.

24. The PRESIDENT: I shall now call on representatives who wish to speak on the amendment.

25. Mr. MSELLE (United Republic of Tanzania): The draft resolution contains a paragraph 3 which was adopted as an amendment by 17 votes to 12, with 42 abstentions. Since we had such a large number of countries abstaining, my delegation feels that something was wrong somewhere along the line. I believe that the large number of countries that abstained did so because perhaps they were not quite clear how the Secretary-General could achieve the target of a reduction of \$1 million in the budget of 1971.

26. When this amendment was adopted in the Fifth Committee we served notice that we would have occasion to co-operate with other like-minded delegations in the General Assembly to introduce an appropriate amendment. We have done so because we believe that the proper method of reducing documentation would be first of all to agree on those areas in which we would like documentation to be reduced.

27. We should like a draft resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly which the Secretary-General would feel competent to implement in its entirety without his coming here next year and telling us that the resolution which was adopted and which contained the target of a reduction of \$1 million could not be realized.

28. Another point is that the cost of documentation and publication is spread over all the sections of the budget, and we were not clear how, for example, the United States delegation arrived at the calculation that there could be a reduction of \$1 million without detriment to the programme of work.

29. For these reasons, and because we believed that the figure had been set arbitrarily without recourse to a close examination of those areas where there is duplication or overlapping and where we feel documentation could be reduced without harming the work programme of any committee, we considered, when the Fifth Committee adopted the amendment submitted by the United States, which is now submitted in this draft resolution before us, that the method not only was arbitrary but would create a lot of unforeseen dangers with regard to other appropriations, either next year or in the foreseeable future.

30. Accordingly, we regretfully announce that we will have no alternative but to vote against the amendment submitted by the United States in document A/L.624.

31. Our position on the other amendment, contained in document A/L.623/Rev.1, does not need any explanation because we are one of its sponsors.

32. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): The general objective of the United States delegation in its amendment to effect economies in documentation is laudable. This amendment is contained in document A/L.624, and a target amount of \$1 million is indicated therein. Economies are laudable, but I do not think that in finance it would be wise to make any prognostications as to how those economies would be effected. In a way, I believe the United States delegation would be tying the hands of the Secretary-General with regard to where to apply the axe of economies.

33. The Secretary-General—and when I say the Secretary-General I mean those to whom he delegates power in documentation—may inadvertently and arbitrarily make economies where they should not make economies. They would be influenced by the directive contained in the United States amendment. There would be a danger lurking there, because they would be most anxious to meet the target and at the same time to please one of the great Powers which contributes the lion's share of the budget. In so doing, there might be some victims, especially among the small Powers, to which documentation is essential.

34. I would draw the attention of my good friend and colleague, Ambassador Finger, to the fact that there is a rack on the third floor where every day we find that the United States—and, in fairness to the United States, other delegations such as the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom and, once in a while the French—have placed documents. This they do at their own expense in order to propagate certain ideas of theirs or speeches for that matter, although those speeches are mentioned in the documentation of the United Nations. They have the means to issue documents of their own. Small nations have not the means

to do so; they depend on the documentation of the United Nations to send to their Governments and to those who apply for it. They do not have the secretarial staff available to duplicate these documents and send them where they should be sent.

35. I believe that the amendment presented by India [A/L.623/Rev.1], which is sponsored by several delegations, takes into account the objective of the United States without tying the hands of the Secretary-General as to how the amount should be reduced and at whose expense. If there should be some mistake in curtailing documents which affect the interests of small Powers, I think the Secretary-General would be in trouble because the small Powers would take issue with him as to why he did this and why he did that. But if we adopt the amendment presented by our colleague from India, then the Secretary-General will use his discretion, and since we have full confidence in the Secretary-General his discretion is good enough for us without tying him to a certain figure.

36. Therefore I appeal to my colleague from the United States to reconsider his amendment because I do not believe it redounds to the interests of smaller States. And I may draw his attention to certain facts which will give him some food for thought. The United States and other States Members of the United Nations encouraged the establishment of many seminars which were unnecessary. They are becoming institutionalized. They encouraged during the days of Ambassador Goldberg, for example, the United Nations Council for South West Africa. Also the Committee on colonialism¹ was also enlarged from 18 members to 24 so that many of our colleagues here might have a seat on it. I believe it is high time that the Fifth Committee and the whole United Nations should think of retrenchment and economies, because we should run the United Nations on a sound financial basis. This year, for example, the United States encouraged the creation of a new post, none other than that of High Commissioner for Human Rights, which would have entailed an initial expenditure of a little over \$300,000. I am sure this would have expanded to \$1 million in a few years—perhaps in two or three years. What would have been the documentation entailed? We should go directly to the basis of documentation.

37. I believe that many of these seminars are becoming institutionalized. Many of the Members here—and I must be frank with our membership—want to be members of certain organs or sub-committees so that they may travel at the expense of the United Nations—leave aside the documentation. This is where economies should be effected, not in the documentation that is important for the small Powers. What are we doing now? We have this Committee of Twenty-Four—which at one time was a committee of 18—for colonialism. Except for the Portuguese colonies and South West Africa decolonization is almost complete. What do they do? They go from one place to another and, I must

¹ Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples.

say, they have a good time. I have been checking on their work. This is where the documentation emanates—from seminars on this issue of human rights, as if by holding a seminar in Timbuktu or New Zealand, and so on, human rights are going to be promoted. I have been involved in questions of human rights for the last 24 years; I have not participated in one seminar, and I do not think I am the poorer for that in knowledge of what is going on in human rights.

38. This is a warning that next year we should think very seriously of retrenchment, of hewing down the dry branches of this tree lest the dryness spreads from the branches and the stem falls down, meaning the United Nations.

39. Documentation is proliferated by the creation of new posts and committees that are abortive. Therefore please, my good friend from the United States, do not tie the hands of the Secretary-General by stating a figure. Is this a five-year plan? Are not five-year plans extended to 10 years? They say that in five years they want to do such-and-such. We cannot say arbitrarily that \$1 million could be eliminated from the budget because the documentation is prolific.

40. But if my colleague from the United States does not heed my appeal and wants to keep his amendment, may I suggest a small sub-amendment—that after “\$1 million” we should add “if possible”. That would, I think, bring the document in line with the facts. It is all right to say \$1 million. The United States mission has probably figured out the cost of documents, they have computers, they have machines. We do not have these things in our small countries. They are very technical about such matters. But I think we would humanize the amendment by incorporating this sub-amendment to add the words “if possible” after “\$1 million”, although I would rather the United States withdrew its amendment. I will, of course, vote on my sub-amendment if they retain it and I will abstain on the amendment so as not to take sides, because I believe in economies but the economies should be effected in the retrenchment of seminars, in cutting off the dry branches of the tree, in the elimination of drones and in having fewer political appointees in the Secretariat. We should have a well-knit Secretariat consisting of people dedicated to the work of the United Nations who do not, as the United States has done, try to bring before us projects like the Council for Namibia—that is one of the creations of the United States—or the abortive creation of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights which would end up by costing us millions, leave aside the documentation which in itself would increase the budget of the United Nations.

41. Therefore, I will vote for the amendment submitted by India and other countries. I put forward my sub-amendment to add the words “if possible” after “\$1 million” to the amendment of the United States. I will abstain on the United States amendment, but I am wholeheartedly in favour of the amendment of India and other countries.

42. The PRESIDENT: May I suggest that all speakers on this item try, if possible, to limit themselves to discussing the present amendment and not matters that are not related to the budget.

43. Mr. FINGER (United States of America): The representative of Saudi Arabia, my good friend and colleague Ambassador Baroody, has made an appeal to the United States concerning its amendment and I think that in courtesy I should reply. In doing so I wish to take up briefly his comments about our amendment.

44. First, he suggested that it would tie the hands of the Secretary-General as to where to apply the axe. I do suggest that that is the farthest thing from the intention, or indeed the wording, of the amendment, which leaves entirely in the hands of the Secretary-General and of the committees and organs concerned the matter of how they should try to achieve this economy of approximately 5 per cent in documentation. And let us bear in mind, of course, that it is a target and not a mandatory figure.

45. Secondly, he suggested that the Secretariat members would be influenced by this directive in making arrangements. Again there is nothing in this amendment which would exercise such an influence as to which activities to encourage and which to discourage.

46. Thirdly, there is the matter of the interest of the small Powers. I believe that this is not a small-Power versus a big-Power controversy. My own experience in some fourteen years here—although I admit that I am many years junior to Ambassador Baroody in experience—has been that it is the small delegations which have the greatest difficulty in keeping up with the existing documentation and few really are able to digest it all. So it is no kindness to give them unnecessary documentation and, of course, our amendment does specify “without detriment to the work programmes of the United Nations”. Nothing in this amendment would be against the interests of small countries. On the contrary it would be in their interests both by making the documentation load more manageable and by saving them money—because again, in proportion to income the burden on smaller countries is just as great as it is on the larger countries and they have just as much interest in economy.

47. As for other ways of economizing—such as the elimination of unnecessary committees—we are in favour of that too and we hope that at another time this point can be pursued.

48. Finally, Ambassador Baroody has suggested a sub-amendment: to add the words “if possible” after the figure of “\$1 million”. We are quite happy to accept that sub-amendment because again it only makes explicit what has always been implicit in our mind. We do believe that there is value in setting a target figure. Ambassador Baroody is aware that in connexion with the financing of the World Youth Assembly we set a target figure. We had no guarantee of whether we would reach it. Still, there is value in a target.

49. For those reasons we shall maintain our amendment but we shall accept the suggestion of Ambassador Baroody to incorporate the words "if possible" after the words "\$1 million".

50. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now proceed to the vote. Under rule 92 "When two or more amendments are moved to a proposal, the General Assembly shall first vote on the amendment furthest removed in substance from the original proposal . . ." . In my opinion, there can be no doubt that the proposal furthest removed in substance from the original proposal is that submitted by the delegations of Brazil, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines and the United Republic of Tanzania.

51. We shall therefore now vote on the amendment set forth in document A/L.623/Rev.1.

The amendment was adopted by 78 votes to 17, with 19 abstentions.

52. Under rule 92, "Where . . . the adoption of one amendment necessarily implies the rejection of another amendment, the latter amendment shall not be put to the vote." That means that the United States amendment shall not be put to the vote.

53. The draft resolution recommended by the Fifth Committee is set forth in paragraph 6 of document A/8226. I now put to the vote that draft resolution, as amended.

The draft resolution, as amended, was adopted by 118 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 2732 (XXV)).

54. The report of the Fifth Committee on agenda item 12 [A/8246] relates to the chapters of the report of the Economic and Social Council [A/8003 and Corr.1] referred to by the Committee.

55. In paragraph 2 of its report the Fifth Committee recommends that the General Assembly take note of chapters XII and XIII (sections A, B and E) of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

56. If I hear no objection may I take it that the General Assembly adopts that decision?

It was so decided.

57. We shall be unable to complete our work on agenda items 80, 82 and 73 today because the documents are not yet ready.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council (concluded):

(a) Note by the Secretary-General;

(b) Chapters considered directly in plenary meeting

58. The PRESIDENT: I should like to invite the attention of Members to document A/8030/Corr.1, which states that the note by the Secretary-General

contained in document A/8030 has been temporarily withdrawn and will be resubmitted, as appropriate, at a later stage. No action can be taken, therefore, on this particular subject.

59. We turn now to the parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council which have been assigned to the General Assembly without reference to a Main Committee. I refer to chapters XI (section E), XIV and XV, concerning primarily questions of teaching, constitutional and organizational questions and non-governmental organizations.

60. If there is no objection I shall take it that the General Assembly notes those parts of the report of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so decided.

61. I call upon the representative of Rwanda on a point of order.

62. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (*Rwanda*) (*interpretation from French*): I am raising this point of order on behalf of the African group which, having studied the Assembly's agenda, has noted that an item which it considers of paramount importance for Africa might well be overlooked if we proceed to other items without dealing with it. It concerns a note by the Secretary-General [A/8030]. The African group would have wished that the Assembly take note of this document and endorse it. If the President so decides, the African group will be very obliged to him. Therefore, Sir, before we proceed to the next item we should like our request to be acted on by the Assembly.

63. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Burundi has asked to speak on the same question.

64. Mr. TERENCE (*Burundi*) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, thank you for giving me the floor at this late hour. Nevertheless, the importance of the point raised by the representative of Rwanda on behalf of the African group has led my delegation to support him. Indeed, the coincidence of the presentation of this problem with the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Organization requires special attention, because the question of the economic development of the countries of the third world, and especially Africa, must have priority.

65. Thus, Mr. President, we would ask you and this Assembly to be good enough to take a decision on this problem and to endorse the note by the Secretary-General. It is important that such a decision be taken so as to allow Africa to avail itself of its rights in this field of the economy.

66. The PRESIDENT: I call on the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs.

67. Mr. STAVROPOULOS (*Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly Affairs*): I shall explain what has caused this extraordinary situation.

68. Document A/8030, the note by the Secretary-General, was introduced under agenda item 12, which relates to the report of the Economic and Social Council. The attention of the Secretariat was subsequently called to the fact that the subject-matter of document A/8030 was not referred to in the Economic and Social Council's report—indeed, that there was no agenda item on the Assembly's agenda under which that document could be discussed. Therefore the note by the Secretary-General had to be withdrawn for technical reasons.

69. A request has now been made for the Assembly to take up the subject-matter of document A/8030. But that would mean taking up an item which is not on the Assembly's agenda and which has never been before the General Committee.

70. Since the note by the Secretary-General has been withdrawn, as explained earlier in this meeting, there is nothing before the Assembly on which it could take a decision.

71. The representative of Rwanda has just said that this matter might be overlooked if it is not dealt with today. I can promise him that that will not be the case. The present postponement does not mean that the question will be forgotten. The Secretariat will do its best to ensure that a decision is taken at the appropriate time.

AGENDA ITEM 26

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8250)

72. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the first Committee on item 26 [A/8250].

73. This item was discussed in the First Committee at its 1790th to 1793rd meetings from 9 to 11 December 1970, and draft resolution A, B, C and D are contained in paragraph 21 of the report.

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

74. The PRESIDENT: I shall first put to the vote draft resolution A.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 118 votes to none (resolution 2733 A (XXV)).

75. We shall now vote on draft resolution B.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 108 votes to 8, with 2 abstentions (resolution 2733 B (XXV)).

76. We shall now vote on draft resolution C. The report of the Fifth Committee on the financial implica-

tions of this draft resolution is contained in document A/8262.

Draft resolution C was adopted by 110 votes to none, with 9 abstentions (resolution 2733 C (XXV)).

77. Finally, we shall vote on draft resolution D.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 121 votes to none (resolution 2733 D (XXV)).

78. I call on the representative of Czechoslovakia, who wishes to explain his vote after the voting.

79. Mr. HULINSKY (Czechoslovakia): During the deliberations of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space which took place this year my delegation had the opportunity to come to the unequivocal conclusion that the Committee had not by any means exhausted the possibilities open to it for a reconciliation on the two last and so far unresolved problems concerning the draft convention on liability for damage caused by objects launched into outer space. From the course of those deliberations my delegation also reached the conclusion that the attempts aimed at shifting, at the present stage, our discussion on the draft convention from a level of experts to a political one cannot be in any way beneficial. Consequently, my delegation does not share the view expressed in the course of the debate in the First Committee to the effect that for a successful termination of the work on the draft of the liability convention there is no need for the efforts of experts but a readiness by all negotiating parties to take a political decision, namely, to accept the kind of convention that could be agreed to at this stage by a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

80. The attempts aimed at exerting pressure instead of efforts towards mutual understanding may, rather, have adverse effects. This should be borne in mind if there is a genuine interest in the elaboration of a generally acceptable convention.

81. It would be unrealistic to expect that a universal agreement should include legal concepts or institutions which would be unacceptable for various reasons to some of the potential parties. If all States, particularly all space Powers, are to become parties to the convention, then a solution acceptable to all States in accordance with their legal régimes, irrespective of their social systems, must be sought.

82. From the point of view of the two last unresolved questions pertaining to the draft convention on liability, it is necessary to concentrate our efforts on finding a generally acceptable compromise; that is necessary, of course, if we proceed from the assumption that there is real interest in the successful termination of our activities.

83. For those reasons and because of our interest in the fate of the draft convention on liability now under consideration in the Legal Sub-Committee of the outer space Committee, my delegation considers as unreasonable the initiative which in the First Com-

mittee materialized in the form of draft resolution B. We cannot endorse the position underlying that draft resolution.

84. In that situation, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the USSR submitted in the First Committee an amendment [A/8250, para. 9] draft resolution C. The wording of the amendment was simple: it called upon the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space "to complete a generally acceptable draft convention on liability in time for final consideration by the General Assembly during its twenty-sixth session". It was not a procedural manoeuvre; the intention of its sponsors was to show the readiness of the socialist countries members of the outer space Committee to conclude successfully the negotiations on the convention on liability in light of the fact that they could not vote for draft resolution B. As a matter of fact the wording of the amendment could easily have been accepted even by those countries voting in favour of draft resolution B. After all, we can expect a satisfactory outcome of the forthcoming negotiations of experts concerning the draft of a liability convention at Geneva only in the event that all the interested parties will be ready to listen to each other's views and will try mutually to understand their problems.

85. The outcome of the vote concerning the proposal that the joint amendment submitted by Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics be not voted upon in the First Committee—35 votes in favour, 23 against, and 37 abstentions—clearly shows what has been involved here. The authors of this approach, not common in recent years in the United Nations, have won. However, the interest of successfully terminating the work of the drafting of a liability convention has lost. Indeed, we have all lost.

86. Let us hope that a more realistic approach during negotiations of experts in the Legal Sub-Committee of the Outer Space Committee to be held at Geneva in June 1971 will be taken so that a generally acceptable draft convention could be submitted to the General Assembly at its next session, as suggested in the joint draft amendment sponsored by Czechoslovakia, Hungary and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

AGENDA ITEM 32

Consideration of measures for the strengthening of international security: report of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE FIRST COMMITTEE (A/8096)

87. Mr. CERNIK (Czechoslovakia), Rapporteur of the First Committee: I have the honour to present to the General Assembly the report of the First Committee on item 32 [A/8096]. This item was considered in the First Committee at its 1725th to 1739th meetings held between 28 September and 13 October 1970, and at its 1795th meeting and its 1797th meeting on 12 and 14 December 1970.

88. In connexion with the item four draft resolutions and subsequent amendments expressing the positions

of individual groups of Member States in the United Nations were submitted in the First Committee. At first, in the period between 13 October and 12 December, the Chairman of the First Committee, Mr. Aguilar, arranged for a number of informal consultations with the sponsors of the draft resolutions which had been submitted in an effort to obtain a joint text. Later on, an informal working group, composed of representatives of the sponsors of the four draft resolutions and the authors of the amendments thereto, as well as other interested delegations, was established. In the course of its deliberations the Working Group created an eight-member drafting committee which, after intensive work, elaborated a joint text of a draft declaration which later was approved by the informal working group and submitted for the consideration of the First Committee at its 1795th meeting on 12 December 1970.

89. At its 1797th meeting on 14 December, the First Committee discussed and then adopted the draft declaration on strengthening international security contained in paragraph 20 of the report, and the First Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of that draft resolution.

90. The PRESIDENT: According to rule 68 of our rules of procedure, the discussion of a report of a Main Committee in a plenary meeting of the General Assembly shall take place if at least one third of the Members present and voting consider such a discussion to be necessary. Five delegations have asked to be allowed to speak, and I think that that might be interpreted as a proposal to have a debate. According to the rules of procedure, we must immediately take a vote on that proposal, and if at least one third of the Members present and voting consider the discussion to be necessary the discussion will take place. I shall now put to the vote the proposal to discuss the report on the item at present before the Assembly.

The proposal was rejected by 57 votes to 9, with 44 abstentions.

91. In accordance with the decision just taken I shall now call on those who wish to explain their votes before the vote.

92. Mr. WARNER (United Kingdom): Our meeting today marks the end of nearly 15 months of study, of discussion and of negotiation on the question of international peace and security. It is a matter of very great satisfaction to the United Kingdom that these long months of labour have ended successfully and that we have been able to define what we have in common on this subject and what we believe should be done in future in order to avert the threat of war and of conflict.

93. When we first began to discuss this matter at the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly, the position taken by my delegation in the First Committee was that in order to fulfil the purpose of strengthening world security any declaration must have the following characteristics: first, it must accurately

reflect all the causes of international tensions and not be based on some arbitrary selection. Secondly, it must indicate all the main steps which are required to be taken and not only those which suit a particular State or group of States. Thirdly, it must reflect the policies and views of our membership as a whole. Fourthly, it must reflect our Charter and extend its application in a way that is agreeable to all.

94. My delegation believes that the document on which we are about to vote today does, broadly, have these characteristics, and it is for that reason that we welcome it and shall vote for it.

95. Many members of the First Committee have said that the Declaration is not what they would have drafted themselves or that it leaves out ideas to which they are attached. Of course that is true; we all know that the document is a compromise. I should be surprised if there were a single delegation in the room today which did not have some reservations on the text. I myself had to make reservations in the First Committee on Monday [1797th meeting], pointing out, for instance, that paragraph 18 of the draft Declaration [A/8096, para. 20] makes no mention of the right of dependent peoples to express their own free will on their future, and that in the opinion of the United Kingdom Government this right should be clearly and freely stated on all occasions on which the matter is a subject of resolutions.

96. I drew attention to the confusion between legal and moral or political terms which is inherent in paragraph 23, and stated our view that this paragraph has no legal implications. Further, I do not believe that the amendment that was made on Monday to paragraph 18 was a good one because it could be taken to suggest that the position in all dependent Territories, even those whose status accords fully with the wishes of the peoples concerned, is indistinguishable from that of territories which are forcibly occupied and held down by constraint. This is an implication which we could not accept, and I therefore maintain the reservations which I expressed in the First Committee on Monday before that amendment was adopted.

97. However, when all that is said, the document as a whole represents a balance of views and requirements all across the world.

98. Finally, reviewing our work on this question I should like to venture two thoughts. The first is that no harm came from the fact that it took us many, many months, and the attention of two sessions of the Assembly, before we could reach agreement. On the contrary, I think that if we had rushed this through in the three months of last year's session of the Assembly we should have had a very poor Declaration by comparison with that which is before us now. We have certainly moved a long way from the text presented for our consideration when this item was first introduced. While impatience to get results is natural, I believe that this case shows the value of a careful, methodical and, if necessary, lengthy approach. We also saw the importance of this in the preparation of

the Declaration on Friendly Relations where time again yielded such remarkable results. Secondly, we have reached our agreement by consensus. One representative, who is famous for his trenchant thoughts, said in the course of our debate that he had always disliked the veto but that if we had to proceed by consensus that was even worse. I suppose that he meant that a consensus gives every Member of the United Nations a veto. But that does not seem to me to be unfair in a matter which is of such absolutely overwhelming importance to every Member of the United Nations. After all, the very existence of each one of us depends on the maintenance of international peace and security, and everyone should have his say in the matter.

99. The fact that our agreement has been almost unanimously arrived at by consensus offers a promise that the recommendations in the resolution will be more widely and more faithfully carried out than has been the case with some resolutions achieved by a narrow majority vote. That is what we must all hope for.

100. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): The report of the First Committee [A/8096] has been presented to the plenary Assembly by the Rapporteur, the representative of Czechoslovakia.

101. As may be recalled, the last meeting in the First Committee on this question was a lengthy one and the procedural manoeuvrings took about five hours of the Committee's time. Since my delegation was not responsible for the initiation of the procedure or for the amount of time consumed, it is not the desire of my delegation to engage now in another procedural battle in the plenary Assembly.

102. When the First Committee voted on the draft Declaration at the 1797th meeting, my delegation decided not to participate in the vote and I explained my delegation's position in the following terms:

“The Thai delegation did not participate in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.558 as amended. That non-participation should not, however, be interpreted as an indication of a negative attitude towards the draft declaration. I can state quite unreservedly that my delegation subscribes fully to all the paragraphs of the draft declaration, and would have been in a position to vote for it but for the fact that our amendment was subject to some strenuous procedural manoeuvrings that resulted in the prevention of a vote on the Thai amendment. We are confident that in the absence of that procedural device our amendment would have received majority support from delegations in the First Committee and would accordingly have been incorporated into the draft declaration.

“It was, therefore, on the basis of its disagreement with that procedural device that my delegation decided not to take part in the vote in the First Committee.”

103. Lest there be any misunderstanding of my delegation's motivations in proposing the amendment,

I would like to summarize our viewpoint on this subject. First, the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security is indisputable. Such responsibility is given to the Council by the Charter of the United Nations. Secondly, whilst the Charter does not specifically refer to the special role of the permanent members of the Security Council, the fact that the permanent members possess veto power, in accordance with the Charter provisions, makes it clear that this primary responsibility of the Council falls more on the shoulders of the permanent members than on those of the others. The recognition of this fact is also related to the realities of international life. Thirdly, Thailand is strongly opposed to conferring special powers on any Member State, including the permanent members. However, we interpret the primary responsibility as a special obligation and duty of the permanent members to make every effort to maintain and strengthen international peace and security. On that basis my delegation believes—and the same view has been expressed by many other delegations in their replies to the Secretary-General or in their statements in the First Committee—that the attention of the permanent members should be drawn not to their privileges and special rights but to their special obligation to maintain international peace and security. If any direct reference to the permanent members were to be construed as highlighting the role of the permanent members, the highlighting would be directed to their obligation and duty and not to their special right. Fourthly, the efforts, collective or otherwise, that my delegation envisages refer only to those which are made in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. It is beyond my delegation's comprehension that the permanent members, whoever they may be, could be asked to take extra-legal measures in pursuance of their own national interests or objectives. To attribute the desire for such an absurd step to my delegation would be completely unfounded and categorically rejected.

104. Those are the factors which moved my delegation to submit on 5 October its amendments [*see A/8096, paras. 5 (b) and (d)*] which, in the light of subsequent developments and taking into consideration the views expressed by some delegations, appeared later—with a few changes of wording—in A/C.1/L.599/Rev.1 [*ibid.*, para. 10] as an amendment to the draft declaration.

105. That amendment, subsequently revised orally in the First Committee, was not voted upon in that Committee on Monday and the so-called sub-amendment of the delegation of India [*ibid.*, para. 11]—sub-amended further but rather constructively by the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia [*ibid.*, para. 12]—was adopted by the First Committee.

106. After further and careful consideration of the wording of paragraph 13 of the draft Declaration which was adopted in place of the Thai amendment, my delegation is of the opinion that the substance of the present wording is basically not different from that of the original amendment presented by Thailand. The fundamental point as reflected in that document is kept

intact and, in a spirit of compromise and mutual accommodation, the Thai delegation is now in a position to give its support to paragraph 13 of the draft Declaration. Consequently, my delegation approved the recommendation of the First Committee and will wholeheartedly vote for the draft Declaration.

107. Mr. KUŁAGA (Poland) (*interpretation from French*): The twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly began its work by a debate on ways and means of strengthening international security. After consultations and negotiations which were lengthy and difficult, but constructive, its efforts culminated in the adoption of a draft declaration on the strengthening of international security.

108. In this draft declaration we see more than a mere document commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations. We see in this document a reflection of the concern of a world in which the forces of peace and progress have made it possible to avoid a new world war, but a world which has not secured stable and universal peace, a world in which so-called local conflicts, forcible occupation of foreign territories and the armaments race all continue to maintain international tension. We see in this concern the reflection of the need to eliminate existing conflicts and their consequences by solutions based on the legitimate interests of peoples, and on international law and by the need to slow the armaments race and to move towards general and complete disarmament, to put a definitive end to colonialism in all its forms and to join efforts towards co-operation in all fields on the basis of mutual understanding and reciprocal advantage.

109. No dilatory tactics, no reservations and no resistance can stem this powerful current which owes its strength to the objective it aims at, namely, the establishment of a political basis for the efforts deployed by many United Nations Member States, efforts which they consider essential to strengthen international security.

110. The Polish delegation in the statement it made during this debate, in the draft Declaration that it submitted together with other socialist States [*A/8096, para. 5 (a)*] and as in negotiations within the drafting group in which it participated, has submitted its position with respect to this fundamental problem.

111. The draft Declaration submitted to the Assembly [*ibid.*, para. 20] defines the most urgent tasks and the priorities to be adopted in international policy. That is the political significance of this document as we see it.

112. The draft Declaration is based on the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations. It states clearly the need to put an end to existing conflicts, it stresses the principle of the inadmissibility of the occupation of foreign territory by force and it calls for respect for and the implementation of the decisions taken by the Security Council in this area. The draft Declaration condemns all forms of colonialism

and demands their prompt elimination. It condemns racism and, in particular, *apartheid*. It raises the fundamental problems of disarmament and economic development. It comes out in favour of the universality of this Organization and, finally, it stresses the role which the Security Council, the main body of the United Nations responsible for international peace and security, can and must play in strengthening international security.

113. The preparation of the draft Declaration with the active participation of such a large number of Member States of the United Nations shows the scope of the initiative taken in this field by the Soviet Government during the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly. The preparation of this draft Declaration fully justifies the efforts and the attention it devoted to this problem during the present session. It reflects the common aspirations of a great majority of Member States with respect to international peace and security and the interest shown by those States in building a durable system of international security. The adoption of this draft Declaration and its implementation will be a very important step forward in this direction.

114. The draft Declaration also corresponds to the efforts undertaken by a large number of European States in order to promote stable conditions of security in Europe which would permit the development of co-operation amongst all European States and which would be an essential contribution to international peace and security.

115. Before concluding I should like to express my thanks to the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Aguilar, for the interest he has shown in this matter, for the skill in which he directed our work and also for his great courtesy shown even during the most difficult moments. I should like also to mention the very constructive role played by Ambassador Araujo Castro in preparing this draft Declaration.

116. The adoption of the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security on which we are about to vote is, in the view of my delegation, the essential final culminating point of this twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly.

117. Mr. ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): We have indicated in quite unequivocal terms our disappointment at the shortcomings and deficiencies of some documents issued in the course of the commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary. But we should state that we view the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security, which we are about to adopt today, as one of the most important and far-reaching documents to emerge in the United Nations since the Charter of San Francisco.

118. The Latin American nations are happy to see that they have contributed to this significant common achievement through the presentation of a joint document, dated 7 October 1970, to the First Committee. I refer to document A/C.1/L.517 [*ibid.*, para. 5 (e)], which represents the common stand taken by 23 Latin

American nations on the whole range of international problems and questions. In this document we have reaffirmed our joint conviction that for our nations peace is identified with justice, that justice is identified with development and that peace, justice and progress are conducive to the full exercise of freedom. When we say peace, justice and security we mean peace, justice and security for all nations.

119. In this document we have reasserted—and the General Assembly endorsed our assertion—that there is a close and intimate interrelationship between the concepts of international security, disarmament and the economic development of developing nations. We are convinced that international security cannot be over-simplified to the point of being a mere chapter of *détente* and of being considered as a mere relaxation of tensions between the super-Powers, no matter how such relaxation may help in our efforts to avoid a new world war.

120. For the Latin American nations and for the developing countries in general, international security means security for all nations irrespective of their size, geographical location and political and social systems. We remain convinced that all efforts towards peace and towards *détente* will be lasting and irreversible only if and when they are in keeping with the purposes and principles of the Charter. We consider that the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security represents a formal repudiation of all current theories of power politics, balance of power and spheres of influence. We adhere to the terms of the draft Declaration which we are about to adopt and interpret its clauses and paragraphs as firm commitments, not as a pious hope or empty words. We are determined to take this solemn draft Declaration at face value. A new right is now recognized and proclaimed by the United Nations: the right to security, which will be the corner-stone of the evolving law of international security.

121. Furthermore, we view the draft Declaration as a new pledge to diplomacy. Apart from the text of the decisions and recommendations adopted, the mere fact that through diplomatic negotiations we have been able to reconcile different points of view and adjust discrepancies is by itself a very auspicious event. As we said in the First Committee, this is proof that diplomacy is alive and the draft Declaration is the initial step in the long-needed diplomatic reactivation of the United Nations.

122. The process of reactivation has thus started. My delegation considers that the two-month-long negotiations which led to this common draft Declaration are one of the best instances and examples of diplomacy at work in the United Nations. We had the opportunity of collaborating in the drafting group set up by Ambassador Aguilar, Chairman of the First Committee, and we can testify to the fact that this was really a collective joint effort of all regional and political groups of our Assembly. That is proof that, if we have not been able to agree on everything, we have been able at least to agree on peace and security and, what is more impor-

tant, we have been able to agree on survival. This draft Declaration does not belong to anyone in particular. It is now part and parcel of the Organization as a whole, in the best use of those words.

123. For all those reasons we consider that this session of the Assembly is a turning-point in the life of this Organization. So we have a feeling, not of satisfaction with what we have achieved, but of determination to face the tremendous tasks of the future, a future based on the concept of justice, not on the concept of power; a future in which political realism will not be invoked to freeze the aspirations of the smaller nations; a future in which peace among nations will mean something more than a tolerable state of warfare; a future in which disarmament will mean something more than a tolerable arms race; and a future in which economic development for all nations will become a reality, and not only a tolerable state of poverty.

124. As we have said, a new right is being proclaimed today, the right to security. It is a right that nations will not easily part with.

125. Mr. TEJA (India): The silver jubilee session of the General Assembly is about to conclude its work with the adoption of the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security. The delegation of India considers it entirely appropriate to make a few observations on this historic occasion.

126. The prevention of war and the maintenance of peace are the primary functions of our Organization now as they were a quarter of a century ago. India's approach to international security is governed by this fundamental consideration to prevent the threat or use of force by States in their international relations. Like the great majority of nations born after the Second World War, India seeks to build an international order where the strong and the weak can live together in peace and harmony on the basis of equal rights and dignity. That is why the non-aligned nations have striven so hard to erect effective barriers against war, aggression, attack, coercion, subversion and political and economic pressures from outside.

127. Hence also our concern with the general principle of the non-use of force in international life. The delegation of India is glad to note that this principle has been amply reflected in the draft Declaration on the strengthening of international security. Paragraph 1 reaffirms the universal and unconditional validity of the purposes and principles of the Charter, the breach of which cannot be justified in any circumstances whatsoever. Paragraph 2 gives pride of place to the principle of the non-use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of States. Paragraph 4 reaffirms that States must fully respect the sovereignty of other States and refrain from any attempt aimed at the partial or total disruption of the national unity and territorial integrity of another State.

128. Similarly, paragraph 5 is aimed at preserving and safeguarding the territorial integrity and political independence of States against military occupation or

territorial acquisition by the threat or use of force. It also reminds States of their duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State. In paragraph 6 Member States are urged to make full use of the means and methods of the Charter for the exclusively—I emphasize: exclusively—peaceful settlement of any dispute or situation which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. At the same time, the principle of free choice in selecting a particular means of peaceful settlement as envisaged in Article 33 has been fully preserved and is kept intact.

129. In short, the draft Declaration reflects the concern of the membership of the United Nations with devising rules of behaviour which would eliminate force from international relations. This is an entirely welcome development. It accords with the Lusaka Declaration of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Nations, which, *inter alia*, states that a declaration on strengthening international peace and security should be based on scrupulous respect for the observance in practice on the principles of the Charter, peaceful coexistence and friendly relations among the States and would particularly emphasize the renunciation of the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, non-intervention in the internal affairs of any State, inviolability of established frontiers, prohibition of aggression and the non-recognition of territorial acquisition by conquest, respect for the sovereign equality of nations, peaceful settlement of disputes, disarmament including nuclear disarmament, and the promotion of economic and social development, in particular of developing countries.

130. My delegation notes that some of the basic concepts of non-alignment relating to development, disarmament and decolonization have been reflected in the declaration on international security, although we would have naturally preferred a more concise and clear-cut formulation on decolonization and economic development. Having been privileged to participate in the intensive negotiations among the original sponsors my delegation can say quite candidly that the declaration is the product of compromise among the four main viewpoints on international security as reflected in the four draft resolutions in the First Committee. In this process there was no victor and there was no vanquished. The draft Declaration represents the common basis of agreement on matters of common concern to all of us, that is, the fundamental issue of the security of nations.

131. That does not and should not mean that some of the basic ideas of the draft Declaration cannot be developed further in the future. One such area is the promotion of an effective system of universal collective security without military alliances. Indeed, the draft Declaration recognizes the need to take effective, dynamic and flexible measures to prevent and remove threats to the peace, and to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace. It cannot however be

denied that the Charter's original purpose of assuring the security of all nations has not been fulfilled. The period since the end of the Second World War has been replete with so-called small wars and local conflicts. While the great Powers and their allies have achieved a semblance of security through what is usually called a balance of nuclear terror, the security of many small or weak nations is still imperilled.

132. Over one million people killed or wounded in the 55 wars or local conflicts since 1945 are a stark reminder that the United Nations must pay greater attention to fulfilling its basic purpose of maintaining peace and security. While the international community has developed a vast array of procedures and techniques of peaceful settlement of disputes, there has been, regrettably, no comparable progress in the suppression of organized violence by States. Little has been achieved in the way of concluding agreements under Article 43, to develop the United Nations capacity for enforcement action. Even more significantly, the whole constitutional area of Articles 39, 40 and 41 remains at best under-developed and under-explored. I believe that the development of a system of determining aggression and the application of effective economic and other sanctions would contribute towards bridging this gap and might compensate, to some extent, for the lack of agreement under Article 43.

133. That is all the more necessary as the development of modern technology places at the disposal of States new techniques of international coercion, which are not easily detectable or at any rate are not apparent. My delegation trusts that the subsidiary organs of the Security Council envisaged in paragraph 10 of the draft Declaration would give priority to this aspect of the new and more insidious threats to the peace. It must however be emphasized that the Security Council cannot delegate its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security either to any subsidiary organ or any of its members, whether permanent or non-permanent. The Security Council exercises this responsibility collectively as a body and according to the procedures and provisions laid down in the Charter. There can therefore be no question of assigning any special responsibility, individual or collective, to any one or more members of the Security Council, permanent or non-permanent. That would be a violation of the letter and the spirit of the Charter, as well as the principle of the indivisibility of peace. The Security Council's primary responsibility under the Charter is therefore only collective responsibility, and is qualified neither by the membership's status nor by geographical location of problems.

134. The link between international security, disarmament, development and decolonization is almost axiomatic. We welcome its formal recognition in the present draft Declaration. We also note that paragraph 20 of the draft Declaration urges all States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to make urgent and concerted efforts for the cessation and reversal of the nuclear and conventional arms race the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction

and the conclusion of a treaty on general and complete disarmament under effective international control. We also note with satisfaction that the same paragraph urges all States to ensure that the benefits of the technology of the peaceful use of nuclear energy shall be available to all States without discrimination.

135. I have briefly outlined our views on the security provisions of the draft Declaration. That does not in any way reduce the significance of its other provisions, such as those relating to economic development, decolonization, *apartheid*, racial discrimination, universality, bilateral and regional co-operation, as well as other provisions, one of which refers to the Declaration on the Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV)], which my delegation would have liked to see more clearly spelt out, as originally suggested in the non-aligned draft.

136. My delegation believes that the present draft Declaration is an important beginning of the process of development and application of the law of international security, including universal collective security. We look forward to further collective efforts towards ensuring the security of all nations. The present draft Declaration does not achieve this objective, but it is a right step in the right direction and at the right time.

137. The PRESIDENT: Before calling on other speakers may I gently, but still with a certain firmness, draw the attention of representatives to the fact that the General Assembly has decided that we should not have a discussion on this matter, but only explanations of vote.

138. It is difficult for the President—and even discourteous—to stop a speaker in the middle of his statement, but I should be very happy if representatives would try, in kindness and in consideration to all their fellow representatives, to restrain their eloquence and engage only in explanations of vote, since that is the decision of the Assembly.

139. Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, in view of your remark, I will simply explain why we intend to vote for this draft Declaration, on which we have collaborated.

140. The draft Declaration adopted by the First Committee and submitted to the General Assembly for adoption is a compromise between the various points of view. That is why it cannot obviously be entirely satisfactory to all parties, as has already been said. Undoubtedly, this document leaves something to be desired on many important points; that is the weakness of any compromise.

141. The importance of this question, which was introduced last year by the Soviet delegation,² has however been emphasized by the great interest that it aroused in the delegations of all countries. It would

² See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-fourth Session, Annexes*, agenda item 103, document A/7654.

be impossible from now on for anyone to try to deny the importance of the problem under consideration.

142. Paragraph 11 of this important document reads as follows:

“*Recommends* that all States contribute to the efforts to ensure peace and security . . . and to establish . . . an effective system of universal collective security without military alliances;”.

143. That paragraph is of particular importance at a time when efforts are being made by peoples to avert the danger and the threat of new conflicts. The tension in international relations is reviving for the generations which have undergone the atrocities of the Second World War the spectre of the devastations that a new conflict could impose on all mankind. Constant efforts are being made at the present time by the peoples of Europe to eliminate security based on mutual understanding and co-operation among all States regardless of their economic and social systems.

144. The efforts to create the necessary conditions for the organization of European security are only a part of those which peoples have made to ensure the security of every country on our planet.

145. We should have preferred this paragraph to be much more precise and explicit. However, as it stands it gives a definite orientation and represents a positive contribution to the orientation of world public opinion as well as European opinion towards earnest efforts to attain European security.

146. Special mention should be made of the provisions of paragraph 5. It reaffirms that:

“ . . . the territory of a State shall not be the object of military occupation resulting from the use of force in contravention of the provisions of the Charter, that the territory of a State shall not be the object of acquisition by another State resulting from the threat or use of force, that no territorial acquisition resulting from the threat or use of force shall be recognized as legal . . . ”.

147. Now that military force is being used by certain States in various regions of the world—in Indo-China, the Middle East, etc.—this paragraph is of special importance. World public opinion cannot, in effect, accept the idea of the military occupation of the territory of another State, still less the acquisition by another State of a part of such territory and the legalization of that act. This opinion was reflected in the almost unanimous adoption on the draft resolution on the strengthening of international security.

148. It goes without saying that international security cannot be contained in separate compartments, so to speak. Any threat to the security in one region of the world has immediate repercussions on universal security. That is why we find in paragraph 24 of this document an expression of the conviction that “the achievement of universality of the United Nations, in

accordance with the Charter, would increase its effectiveness in strengthening international peace and security”

149. We have mentioned the special importance of certain paragraphs in the operative part of the draft resolution, but, as a whole, the document emphasizes the special role of the Security Council and makes recommendations with a view to strengthening its effectiveness in the field of international security. Certain countries would have preferred it, as they said, had the efforts and the talent devoted to the preparation of this document been better deployed, and in more specific fields. They qualified the declaration as a “new and very general exhortation of the aims and principles of the Charter”.

150. One could not fail to be astonished by such statements. There is no more important, fertile and useful field in which the efforts of all countries could have been deployed, and this was shown by the almost unanimous vote in the First Committee. To sum up, the document which the General Assembly is requested to adopt is a compromise and, therefore, it cannot be entirely satisfactory to all. But it is of the greatest importance for the development of international relations and the strengthening of international security in general. It lays down the general lines on which efforts and energy can be mobilized in order to achieve a more secure world—the world of tomorrow.

151. Mr. DRISS (Tunisia) (*interpretation from French*): In my opinion, eloquence can be associated with brevity. I shall therefore try to explain my delegation's vote on the draft Declaration by referring to paragraph 5, and particularly the following words which appear there: “. . . that every State has the duty to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in acts of civil strife or terrorist acts in another State”.

152. My delegation voted for the Declaration in the First Committee in a spirit of international solidarity but we would point out that paragraph 5, and in particular the words that I have just read, should in no case be applied to colonial situations wherever they may exist in the world.

153. Aggression remains to be defined. Paragraph 14 mentions the question of the definition of aggression. We have always felt that a people struggling for its freedom must use all means at its disposal, including armed force, and that is the duty of its neighbours and even of the United Nations itself to assist it if this means of obtaining freedom and independence is the only one available to it.

154. Paragraph 18 deals with colonial situations and as I have said, we consider that paragraph 5 cannot be applied to such situations. However, in making these reservations, I would reiterate that my delegation will vote in favour of this draft declaration which has been the result of difficult negotiations. And we thank the Chairman of the First Committee and the Working Group which prepared the document. Acting in a spirit

of human solidarity, we should like to see this document adopted unanimously, by acclamation, despite our problems and difficulties, because, after all, our task here is to serve the cause of the United Nations. Despite transitory difficulties, we must look to the future, to the day when even those who, when the draft was put to the vote in the Committee, abstained or who voted against will be at our side.

155. Mr. IDZUMBUIR (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (*interpretation from French*): I shall be very brief. My delegation, for certain technical reasons, was not in a position to participate in the vote which took place in the First Committee on the draft Declaration which we now have before us. I should like, since those difficulties have now been overcome, to explain my vote.

156. My delegation will vote in favour of this Declaration which reflects the feelings of the international community inasmuch as it is the expression of the profound aspirations of the international community for peace and international security. This Declaration is at the same time a commitment by States to respect the principles contained therein. The declaration emphasizes both the responsibility of each Member as well as the responsibility of the institutions—the General Assembly and the Security Council—to seek and maintain international peace.

157. However, my delegation would like to indicate what it understands paragraph 13 to mean, the wording of which it considers somewhat unfortunate. It seems to establish the permanent members of the Security Council as an institution or even a corps. My delegation recognizes that an important role is to be played by the permanent members in the maintenance of international peace; but we believe that that role should be played by every Member in co-operation with all the other members of the Security Council so as to allow that organ to discharge its principal responsibility under the Charter.

158. Mr. SHAHI (Pakistan): Although the General Assembly decided that there should be no debate on the draft Declaration, certain statements have been made which were in the nature of interpretations of its text, or even tilted its balance, or injected into it a nuance or selective emphasis which is unwarranted if the text of the draft Declaration is considered in its entirety.

159. Accordingly, it has become necessary for me to explain that in voting for the draft Declaration my delegation stands by the statements on this item that were made in the First Committee on Monday.

160. The PRESIDENT: The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft Declaration recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 20 of its report [A/8096].

The draft Declaration was adopted by 120 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 2734 (XXV)).

161. One delegation has requested to explain its vote after the vote, and I now call on the representative of the Soviet Union.

162. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translated from Russian*): The work of the anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly is coming to an end. In these last hours the Assembly is concluding its work by taking a decision on one of the most important items on its agenda: the question of the strengthening of international security. Since, as everyone is aware, it was on the initiative of the Soviet Union that this question was considered in the United Nations, the Soviet delegation considers it appropriate, in connexion with the adoption of that decision, to make the following statement in explanation of vote.

163. In bringing the question of the strengthening of international security before the twenty-fourth session of the General Assembly and in submitting, together with other socialist countries, a draft declaration on this question at the Assembly's twenty-fifth session, the Soviet Union was basing itself on the need to make, together with other States, active efforts to fulfil the central purpose of the United Nations, namely, the maintenance and strengthening of international peace and security, on which will depend to a very great extent the successful solution of many other problems facing mankind not only in the political field but in the economic, social and other fields as well. This problem is particularly acute and urgent because the international situation continues to be unstable and tense and hotbeds of armed conflict which constitute a threat to international peace still exist in many parts of the world. The struggle to eliminate the existing dangerous tension in the world and to settle and prevent international conflicts requires a maximum joint effort by all countries, large, medium-sized and small, and by their peoples for the strengthening of world peace and security. All the countries of the socialist community consistently stand for the strengthening of international security.

164. The declaration on the strengthening of security and the development of peaceful co-operation in Europe which was adopted at Berlin on 2 December 1970 at a meeting of the Political Consultative Committee of the States members of the Warsaw Pact states the following:

“The participants in the meeting have expressed the determination of the parties and Governments of their countries to continue to take agreed joint action at the international level in the interests of ensuring genuine security in Europe and throughout the world. To that end, each of them will continue to pursue an active policy of peace, relaxation of tension and broad international co-operation.”

165. It was precisely this consideration which guided the socialist countries when they called on the Governments of all other States Members of the United Nations to give due attention at the anniversary session of the General Assembly to the problems of the

strengthening of international security, and it was essential that the Assembly should adopt a declaration on that problem, which is of paramount importance to all peoples.

166. It is particularly gratifying to note that this initiative of the socialist countries has received the broad support of all States Members of the United Nations and especially of the States of three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America—which are interested in maintaining and strengthening international peace.

167. Of very positive significance in this regard is the decision of the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held at Lusaka from 8 to 10 September of this year concerning the need to adopt a declaration on the strengthening of international peace and security at the twenty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly.

168. The extensive discussion at this session of the strengthening of international security and the replies of Governments to the Secretary-General's questionnaire on the subject [*A/7922 and Add.1-6*] have shown that the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations attach paramount significance to this important question. The very active participation of the delegations of so many States in the debate on this highly important problem of contemporary international politics and the desire of the overwhelming majority of States to work out effective measures for the strengthening of international security have played a decisive role. In particular, this could not help but have a sobering influence on the delegations which were obviously trying at the current session of the Assembly, just as they did at the preceding session, to arrange matters so that the United Nations would take no action with respect to the maintenance of peace and security, would not prevent the aggressors from using force to occupy and annex land belonging to others and would not oppose the policy of seizing territory in violation of the Charter and in defiance of Security Council decisions.

169. The attempts to delay—indeed, had it not been for the firm stand of the peace-loving States, to prevent—the elaboration by the Assembly at its present session of a far-reaching decision on the substance of the problem under discussion have failed completely. As a result of the concerted efforts of all groups of States represented in the United Nations, a declaration on the strengthening of international security was drafted on the basis of the proposals made in the First Committee and has just been adopted by the Assembly.

170. The corner-stone upon which this Declaration is based is constituted by the provision concerning the duty of States not to permit the acquisition of territories by the threat or use of force in contravention of the Charter of the United Nations and the non-recognition of the legality of such territorial seizures, and the request that all States Members of the United Nations should implement the decisions of the Security Council

in accordance with their obligations under Article 25 of the Charter.

171. The proclamation and confirmation by the General Assembly in its declaration of these lofty principles and of the inadmissibility of such actions must be considered a decision of great and even historic significance, calling upon States as it does to put an end to such illegal acts in international relations and to the flouting of the key provisions of the United Nations Charter aimed at ensuring peace and international security.

172. The inclusion of these principles in the Declaration on the strengthening of international security will assist the peoples in their national liberation struggle against foreign invaders and in their struggle for the liberation of territories occupied as a result of aggression by imperialist forces.

173. We must express our deep satisfaction that the Declaration which has been adopted fully reflects all the fundamental ideas set forth in the draft declaration of the socialist States, above all the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by the use of force in defiance of the Charter of the United Nations and the request for the implementation of the Security Council's decisions, which go to the core of the problem of the security of peoples.

174. In conclusion, we must express our deep satisfaction at the fact that, thanks to the efforts of the overwhelming majority of delegations, their representatives, the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Aguilar and the brilliant eight, as we called the drafting group which prepared the draft with the active participation of Mr. Castro, Mr. Tarabanov, Mr. Kulaga and others, it has been possible for the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly to conclude its work by adopting such an important document as the Declaration on the strengthening of international security. Because of the urgency and importance of the question it deals with and in view of the particular significance of its provisions for safeguarding the vital interests of all peoples, this Declaration can justly be considered one of the main documents of the anniversary session of the United Nations General Assembly.

175. That is why the Soviet delegation actively supported the Declaration and voted in favour of it. Our task now is to ensure that the Declaration which has been adopted is implemented by all States.

176. The PRESIDENT: The adoption of this Declaration is a great contribution to peace. It was a result of prolonged consultation and its adoption augurs well for the future of our Organization.

177. We have four items on our agenda for tomorrow morning, which were all postponed from today; that is, agenda items 80, 82, 73 and 25. If I hear no objection,

I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to start its next meeting at ten o'clock tomorrow morning, and also to continue that meeting until it has concluded the agenda.

178. May I also ask the representatives please to co-

operate with me. If they prepare explanations of vote, they should be explanations of vote and not long statements of a general debate.

The meeting rose at 6.35 p.m.