

United Nations
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



2085th
PLENARY MEETING

Wednesday, 15 November 1972,
at 3 p.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Organization of work	Page 1
Agenda item 50: Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination: (a) Reports of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolutions 2784 (XXVI) and 2785 (XXVI); 2785 (XXVI); (b) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; (c) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General; (d) Draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of <i>apartheid</i> Report of the Third Committee	1
Agenda item 38: The policies of <i>apartheid</i> of the Government of South Africa: (a) Reports of the Special Committee on <i>Apartheid</i> ; (b) Reports of the Secretary-General Report of the Special Political Committee (part I)	3
Agenda item 25: Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (<i>continued</i>) ..	6

President: Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI (Poland).

Organization of work

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before we take up the items on the agenda for this afternoon's meeting, I should like to draw the attention of members to the recommendations of the Special Committee on the Rationalization of the Procedures and Organization of the General Assembly contained in paragraphs 74 and 76 of annex V to the rules of procedure, which were approved by the General Assembly [*see resolution 2837 (XXVI), annex II, paras. 74 and 76*]. In these paragraphs the Special Committee considered that

"... in explaining their votes, delegations should limit their statements to an explanation, as brief as possible, of their own votes and should not use the occasion to reopen the debate."

The Special Committee further recommended that,

"... a delegation should explain its vote only once on the same proposal, in either a Main Committee or a plenary meeting, unless the delegation considers it essential to explain it in both meetings."

2. The Assembly has already decided to limit to 10 minutes statements made in exercise of the right of reply.

Although such a measure cannot be envisaged at this stage for explanations of vote, I wish to remind members of the recommendations made in this connexion by the Special Committee and I would request members to take those recommendations into account.

AGENDA ITEM 50

Elimination of all forms of racial discrimination:
(a) Reports of the Secretary-General under General Assembly resolutions 2784 (XXVI) and 2785 (XXVI);
(b) Report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination;
(c) Status of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination: report of the Secretary-General;
(d) Draft convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid*

REPORT OF THE THIRD COMMITTEE (A/8880)

3. Mrs. IDER (Mongolia), Rapporteur of the Third Committee: I have the honour to introduce the report of the Third Committee on agenda item 50 [A/8880].

4. On subitem (a), the Committee expressed the view that national and international action to combat racism and racial discrimination should continue and that resolutions 2784 (XXVI) and 2785 (XXVI) should be considered as basic documents expressing the views of the General Assembly in combating these evils and providing a basis for the observance of the proposed Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. The draft programme for the proposed Decade prepared by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities [A/8805, annex] was received as a positive document, but it was considered that it needed to be worked out in greater detail. On this subitem the Committee recommends to the General Assembly the adoption of two resolutions, under the first of which, draft resolution I in paragraph 51 of the report, the Assembly would decide to launch the Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination on 10 December 1973, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To this end the Assembly would invite the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights to give the highest priority to the consideration of the draft programme and to submit it to the Assembly at its twenty-eighth session.

5. Draft resolution II on this subitem deals with the question of discrimination to which foreign workers are subjected in certain countries. This draft can be found in paragraph 51 of the report.

6. On subitem (b), the work of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination was commended and its adoption of the new procedure for the consideration of reports from States parties was welcomed. The recommendation of the Third Committee on this item is contained in draft resolution III.

7. On subitem (c), a request was made to all States which are not yet parties to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination to ratify or accede to it if possible by the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

8. On subitem (d), the importance of an early adoption of an independent international instrument on the suppression and punishment of the crime of *apartheid* was emphasized. The Third Committee recommends the adoption of draft resolution IV, which invites the Economic and Social Council to request the Commission on Human Rights at its twenty-ninth session to consider as an item of priority the revised draft convention and to submit the results of its consideration to the General Assembly at its next session.

9. On behalf of the Third Committee, I commend to the General Assembly the report and the draft resolutions that are contained in paragraph 51 of document A/8880.

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

10. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the vote on any of the four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee. I shall then put each of the draft resolutions to the vote separately.

11. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution II, which appears in paragraph 51 of document A/8880, in order to demonstrate the importance which we attach to improving the living conditions of foreign workers, whatever be the country in which they are received. We request, however, a separate vote on the words "of Europe and of other continents" contained in the fifth paragraph of the preamble. We consider that the problem of foreign workers is world-wide and that it would not be justifiable to lay particular emphasis on Europe.

12. If the words "of Europe and of other continents" were deleted, the paragraph would then read as follows:

"Deeply concerned by the *de facto* discrimination of which foreign workers are the victims in certain countries, despite the efforts made by certain Governments, particularly at the legislative level, to prevent and repress it."

13. Lady ELLES (United Kingdom): My delegation will abstain in the separate vote to be taken on certain words in the fifth paragraph of the preamble of draft resolution II. We consider that the emphasis on Europe is misplaced and seriously imbalances this draft resolution. Migrant and foreign workers are to be found in many countries and continents. My Government is well aware that such workers may face difficulties and naturally welcomes any initiative which assists in overcoming those difficulties. We are not,

however, convinced that migrant or foreign workers in Europe are treated less well than they are elsewhere and we therefore find it unacceptable that Europe should be singled out in this draft resolution.

14. We will, nevertheless, vote in favour of the draft resolution. But I wish to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of those who represent Governments which are parties to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination the fact that, if they believe that foreign nationals are being discriminated against in the territory of another State Party to the Convention, redress is open to them under the terms of the Convention [*resolution 2106 A (XX), annex*]. They should make use of the procedures established in article 11.

15. Mr. BUHL (Denmark): On behalf of my delegation I want to express regret that the report from the Third Committee became available only this morning so that there has been very little time to study it before it comes to a vote.

16. This statement is not meant as an explanation of vote, but as an indication that in my view paragraph 19 of this report, relating to draft resolution II, does not entirely reflect the wording of the draft resolution. I hope this can be worked out with the Rapporteur so that the words "the *de facto* discrimination in certain countries" can be inserted in the text.

17. Mrs. WARZAZI (Morocco) (*interpretation from French*): In connexion with the discussion of the report which is before us, my delegation would like to emphasize that it is very pleased to note that the delegations of France and the United Kingdom have revised their position since it was stated in the Third Committee and that they are in a position today to vote in favour of the draft resolution on foreign labour.

18. Our delegations have raised this problem in conjunction with the discussion on the item on racial discrimination because we thought that the problem was particularly acute and that it was our duty to raise it within the framework of this discussion. If we mentioned European countries in particular it was not in any way to reproach European Governments and we said this quite clearly in the discussions that were held on this item; but we sincerely thought that the draft resolution would enable the Governments of European countries to enforce strict application of all decisions and laws which their Parliaments have enacted to fight racial discrimination. As a consequence this problem was not political and we would once again wish to stress this point. It is a deeply humanitarian problem, the effect of which is in no way to embarrass the European Governments; quite the contrary. We have always emphasized the aspect of the very warm and traditionally hospitable reception of the European countries, but we thought that the draft resolution as it was formulated here, by retaining the words "in certain countries of Europe and of other continents", would enable the European Governments to instruct individuals under their authority to apply the rules and regulations against discrimination.

19. I would not oppose the request for a separate vote put forward by France, but we think it is essential that these words remain in the text.

20. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly will now take a decision on the four draft resolutions recommended by the Third Committee in paragraph 51 of its report in document A/8880.

21. Draft resolution I is entitled "Decade for Action to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination". Since the Third Committee adopted this draft resolution unanimously, may I take it that the Assembly also wishes to do so?

Draft resolution I was adopted (resolution 2919 (XXVII)).

22. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We shall now proceed to draft resolution II, entitled "Exploitation of labour through illicit and clandestine trafficking". A separate vote has been requested on the words "of Europe and of other continents" in the last paragraph of the preamble to that draft resolution. Since there are no objections to that request, I shall put to the vote first the words "of Europe and of other continents".

The words "of Europe and of other continents" in the last paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution II were adopted by 103 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

23. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put to the vote draft resolution II as a whole.

Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 123 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 2920 (XXVII)).

24. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Before putting to the vote draft resolution III, relating to the report of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, I would ask members to refer to the recommendation of the Fifth Committee which appears in paragraph 9 of document A/8891. This paragraph concerns the venue of the eighth session of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. Since the Fifth Committee decided without objection to recommend that the General Assembly should decide that that session should be held at New York, may I take it that the General Assembly also approves this recommendation without objection?

It was so decided.

25. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution III.

Draft resolution III was adopted by 124 votes to none, with 1 abstention (resolution 2921 (XXVII)).

26. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution IV, entitled "Draft Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid".

Draft resolution IV was adopted by 103 votes to 1, with 21 abstentions (resolution 2922 (XXVII)).

27. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

28. Mr. MOUSSA (Egypt): The General Assembly and the United Nations in general have undertaken many measures and deployed many efforts to combat racial discrimination in all its forms. That has been done since the proclamation of the Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

29. However, racial discrimination has persisted. It has even increased and now plagues many areas in many continents. The General Assembly, in the clearest and most positive language, has expressed its determination to continue its efforts against racism and racial discrimination. To this end it expressed its intention at its last session in resolution 2784 (XXVI) to launch a Decade for vigorous and continued action to combat racism in all its forms.

30. The delegation of Egypt has participated in all the stages of the preparation for the Decade and of the programme thereof; consequently we voted for draft resolution I, in which the General Assembly decides to launch the Decade and to inaugurate the activities under it on 10 December 1973, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We believe that the Decade and its programme of education, information, international conferences and funds to aid the victims of racialism will contribute much to the achievement of a better future for mankind. It will prepare the coming generations, through their continued education in the spirit of human rights and fundamental freedoms, to reject any and all forms of racial doctrine and to rise and do battle with racist doctrines wherever they may exist. The Decade and its programme should not be considered as an alternative to the just struggle of the oppressed peoples against racialism, usurpation and oppression. In fact, both measures aim at the same result—the total elimination of racial discrimination and the liberation of peoples living under racial rule and subjugation.

31. Mr. DE LATAILLADE (France) (*interpretation from French*): Things occurred so quickly, Sir, that when you referred to the venue of the eighth session of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination my delegation did not have sufficient time to make its views known. I simply wish to make clear—and the French delegation requests that this clarification appear in the record of this meeting—that my delegation does not share the view that the eighth session should be held in New York rather than in Geneva.

AGENDA ITEM 38

The policies of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa:

- (a) Reports of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*;
- (b) Reports of the Secretary-General

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE (PART I) (A/8879)

32. Mr. AKBEL (Turkey), Rapporteur of the Special Political Committee: It is my privilege to present to the General Assembly the report of the Special Political Committee on its consideration of item 38 of the agenda [A/8879].

33. The Committee devoted 19 meetings to its examination of this long-standing problem, which was described in the very valuable reports submitted to the General Assembly by the Special Committee on *Apartheid* and in the statements made before the Committee by the Chairman and Rapporteur of the Special Committee. The fact that 76 representatives took part in the general debate on the question is indicative of the deep and widespread concern felt by Members of this Organization, which almost unanimously denounced the discriminatory practices of the South African Government in violation of fundamental Charter principles.

34. As is indicated in the report of the Special Committee, five draft resolutions were submitted during the Committee's consideration of the question, all of which were adopted by large majorities. Those draft resolutions, which the Special Political Committee recommends to the General Assembly for adoption, are to be found in paragraph 30 of the report which I have just had the honour of introducing.

35. Taking into account the possibility that the need might arise for adopting further recommendations on this issue during the course of the present General Assembly session, the Special Political Committee did not officially conclude its consideration of this item.

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

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

37. Mr. FONSECA (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution E in document A/8879 entitled "Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid*". We should like to state for the record that it wishes to enter the same reservation regarding operative paragraph 8 as it did at the Special Political Committee's 828th meeting when the text was voted upon.

38. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now vote on the various draft resolutions recommended by the Special Political Committee in paragraph 30 of its report [A/8879].

39. Draft resolution A is entitled "Maltreatment and torture of prisoners and detainees". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq,

Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, 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 Tanzania, United States of America, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Portugal.

Draft resolution A was adopted by 121 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 2923 A (XXVII)).

40. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now put to the vote draft resolution B, entitled "United Nations Trust Fund for South Africa". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: Portugal.

Draft resolution B was adopted by 122 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 2923 B (XXVII)).

41. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I shall now put to the vote draft resolution C, entitled "Pro-

gramme of work of the Special Committee on *Apartheid*". The recommendations of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution appear in paragraph 13 (a) of document A/8890. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

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

Against: Portugal, South Africa.

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

Draft resolution C was adopted by 115 votes to 2, with 8 abstentions (resolution 2923 C (XXVII)).

42. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): We turn now to draft resolution D, entitled "Dissemination of information on *apartheid*". The recommendations of the Fifth Committee on the administrative and financial implications of this draft resolution are contained in paragraph 13 (b) of document A/8890. A recorded vote has been requested on this draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Khmer Republic, Kuwait, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico,

Mongolia, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Upper Volta, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia.

Against: South Africa.

Abstaining: France, Malawi, Portugal, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Draft resolution D was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions (resolution 2923 D (XXVII)).

43. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): Finally, I put to the vote draft resolution E, entitled "Situation in South Africa resulting from the policies of *apartheid*". A roll-call vote has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll call.

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

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

Against: Portugal, South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Uruguay, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Guatemala, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malawi.

Draft resolution E was adopted by 100 votes to 4, with 21 abstentions (resolution 2923 E (XXVII)).

44. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the representative of Israel, who wishes to explain his vote.

45. Mr. DORON (Israel): Israel's opposition to all manifestations of racism, including *apartheid*, is well known and has been expressed in discussions and votes in the General Assembly and in other forums ever since this problem was first considered. My delegation voted in favour of the four draft resolutions, A, B, C and D, appearing in paragraph 30 of document A/8879. My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution E, appearing in the same paragraph, as it has some reservations in respect of certain formulations contained therein.

AGENDA ITEM 25

Non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons (*continued*)

46. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria) (*interpretation from French*): Once again the General Assembly has to take a decision on the question of the non-use of force in international relations. The fact that Austria is not hesitant to express its views once again on this matter is evidence, above all, of the fact that it is particularly receptive to this idea as well as to its realization.

47. For some time now the idea of renouncing force has inspired the best and noblest thinkers. We can find it in the great philosophic and ideological schools of thought of all the world civilizations: in Hinduism, in Buddhism, in the Christian religions and in Islam. It was only after the First World War that this idea became crystallized in a more strictly legal framework: in the Covenant of the League of Nations, in the Briand-Kellogg Pact,¹ and in a large number of international instruments designed to strengthen a peace considered too fragile.

48. Among the numerous texts in this connexion which were drawn up and signed in the period between the wars, I should like to refer to one whose wording is, I think, particularly impressive. Article I of the Briand-Kellogg Pact reads as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties solemnly declared in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another."²

49. Article II of the Briand-Kellogg Pact—which, as representatives know, consists of only two substantive articles—is equally significant. It reads as follows:

"The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."³

50. I should like to note in passing that Austria, which joined the League of Nations in 1920, frequently spoke in favour of the idea of the non-use of force, particularly

when it accepted the Protocol for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes adopted by the League of Nations at Geneva on 2 October 1924, when it voted in favour of the model joint treaty on mutual assistance, and when it voted in favour of the draft convention which was submitted to the League of Nations by the United Kingdom delegation on 13 March 1933 and became known as the MacDonald Plan.

51. The ravages of the Second World War once again led the international community to initiate the idea of the non-use of force—this time in the form of the Charter of the United Nations, our very Organization. And to complete this brief historical review, quite recently the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet Union on the one hand, and the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland on the other hand, in order to settle their problems resulting from the Second World War, adopted this principle to serve as a basis for their future relations in treaties which have frequently been referred to from this rostrum—and the international community has not failed to confer on those treaties the historic importance due them. The Nobel Peace Prize, which was awarded to the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany Mr. Willy Brandt, is symbolical in this respect.

52. Finally, the principle of the non-use of force is undoubtedly one of the main questions to be dealt with by the European conference on security and co-operation, preparation for which will start in a few days in Helsinki.

53. What is the meaning to my delegation of the expression "abstaining from resort to force" in international relations? I could do no better here than briefly to outline some of the ideas which were put forward by the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria, Mr. Rudolf Kirchschlaeger, at the Fifteenth International Diplomatic Seminar, which was held in the Klesheim Castle, Austria, in July and August 1972.

54. "Abstaining from resort to force" in international relations means that a State or a community of States renounces once and for all the use of force in claiming a presumed right or in defending the national or so-called national interests, and also renounces the use of force in imposing, defending or propagating any ideology. Renouncing the use of force also entails renouncing the resort to the threat of force. But since the action of States does not always correspond to Cartesian logic, it is necessary constantly to speak concurrently of both the renunciation of force and the renunciation of the threat of force. Thus it appears from Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter that the use of force and the threat of force are placed on an equal footing. But it is also apparent that the prohibition of force expressed in the Charter is not absolute: it applies only to international relations; it applies only when the resort to force or the threat of force is directed against the territorial integrity or the political independence of a State; and finally, it applies only when the resort to force is incompatible with the purposes of the United Nations.

55. The prohibition of the resort to force is, therefore, not valid in the case of defence; nor is it valid in the case of sanctions decided by the Security Council.

¹ General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy, signed at Paris on 27 August 1928.

² See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. XCIV, p. 63.

³ *Ibid.*

56. The Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations [resolution 2625 (XXV), annex], prepared after many years of effort and adopted at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly, confirms the legally binding nature of Article 2, but also indicates, in conclusion, in the part dealing with the renunciation of force:

“Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall be construed as enlarging or diminishing in any way the scope of the provisions of the Charter concerning cases in which the use of force is lawful.”

57. In practice, the United Nations follows the same policy, as can be seen when the General Assembly declared, in its resolution 2649 (XXV), on the universal realization of the right of peoples to self-determination and of the speedy granting of independence, that it:

“Affirms the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples under colonial and alien domination recognized as being entitled to the right of self-determination to restore to themselves that right by any means at their disposal”.

58. This legalization of the use of all means, including force, appears also in those resolutions concerning South Africa, the policy of *apartheid* of the Government of South Africa, and on the question of Namibia—specifically, resolutions 2671 (XXV), 2775 (XXVI) and 2871 (XXVI), to mention only a few.

59. Consequently, it should be seen that present-day international law does not recognize any absolute prohibition of the resort to force. The renunciation of force or prohibition of the resort to force, as imposed by the Charter of the United Nations and incumbent upon Member States, therefore, is limited. These restrictions recall the exhortation which was given by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans: “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.” [Romans 12:18]

60. Knowing ourselves as we do, does this ever depend on us?

61. The relativity of the renunciation of force should not, however, make us lose all hopes of peace, but should rather impel us to recognize that the methods and means used are always inadequate. What other means do we have? Still another point: in view of human nature, is an absolute renunciation of force conceivable in the abstract and does it constitute a value in itself?

62. If I may continue to refer to ideas expressed by the Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria, I should like to say that the renunciation of force is rather an element of moral value. Its scope is, however, broader; it resides in the preservation of peace. But it must be noted that neither the renunciation of force itself nor simply a balanced reduction of military potential—since it is unlikely that this will lead to a universal agreement on defensive arms as well—is a guarantee of the preservation of peace.

63. Abstaining from resort to force or the threat of force in international relations should be accompanied by ma-

chinery that would make it possible to settle international conflicts by peaceful means. The function, which was partly exercised by war in the past, should now be performed in a peaceful way and under international control. It was very perspicacious of Thomas Opperman to say:

“In the national sector, which was pacified a long time before and much more intensively than the area of international relations and which is subject to all sorts of prohibitions on the use of force, it is unanimously recognized that all is not calm and order, but that procedures which can be used at any time—such as elections, legislative and executive measures—must be set up if it is generally desired to promote peace in the case of a State which is looking forward to the future. In the same way, in international relations the significance of the prohibition of the use of force cannot reside in a sort of factitious peace which simply crystallizes the *status quo*. The fundamental condition and prerequisite for avoiding armed conflicts is the preparedness of States for ‘peaceful change’ in their external relations, as well as their being disposed to order reforms in the internal sphere.”

64. For there to be any prospect of peace in this process which gives it genuine meaning, the renunciation of force therefore relies on supplementary measures: a machinery for protection and the evolution of an established order, based on law. It is obviously on the basis of this judgement that the German-Soviet treaty of 12 August 1970⁴ speaks both of the renunciation of force and of the threat of force and the obligation to settle disputes exclusively by peaceful means. The same is true of the German-Polish treaty of 7 December 1970.⁵

65. To make it abundantly clear, the thrust of any supplementary international machinery relating to the renunciation of force must be that it is intended exclusively for the peaceful settlement of disputes. If I have also referred to the evolution of established law, it is because nothing can remain petrified with impunity. No juridical, economic or political evolution can escape this law.

66. The purpose of supplementary machinery to govern the renunciation of force must also take into account the need for security of each State and each people. In his study on the concept of international security in the Charter of the United Nations, Stephan Verosta, professor of international law in the University of Vienna, very clearly expressed the idea that objective security can only be maintained and restored if the United Nations and particularly the Security Council ensure that there is a balance of power in each region of the world and throughout the world.

67. In our world Europe is perhaps the continent that at present offers the best conditions for peace and the relaxation of tension. Europe is at present engaged in the process of relaxation of tension, which we hope will also

⁴ Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, signed at Moscow.

⁵ Treaty between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland on the Bases for the Normalization of Relations, signed at Warsaw.

lead to security and to peace. I have already referred to the planned conference on European security and co-operation, which we hope will provide a major opportunity to establish the prohibition of the resort to force and renunciation of force in the European context. But perhaps I may also at the same time voice the hope that other continents, even the entire world may profit from the present atmosphere of détente in Europe, détente which should not be confused with indifference to the problems in other continents, nor considered as self-satisfaction or insensitivity to the struggles and problems that beset other continents. Furthermore, in this context of European security, I would also draw attention to another proposal which was made for the first time in 1968 by Mr. Brandt, then Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany, at the Conference of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States,⁶ a proposal to link the principle of non-resort to force with the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons—an idea which recurs in the item we are discussing.

68. It would not suffice simply to recall the obligations contained in Article 2, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations or the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, adopted in 1970. We also should discuss the supplementary legal and political machinery which, for the first time in history, would make it possible to consider the renunciation of force and the threat of force as a promise worthy of trust from all points of view, and to make of it the basis for the policies of other States. We have to start peace, as others start war—as the great Austrian writer, Stefan Zweig, said some time ago.

69. No era on our continent has been so propitious as the present one for the quest for peace, an era of which it has been said quite rightly that the next war will only leave us the choice of dying with guilt or with innocence. But all our efforts at conferences such as the conference on European security and co-operation and others will succeed only if it is possible for us to find a new and more humanitarian concept of force.

70. In conclusion, I should like to quote our former Secretary-General U Thant, who was obviously correct when, overburdened by his responsibilities, he said:

“There is only one reply to the resort to force and the practice of coercion and intimidation among States. This reply can only be given by a categorical refusal of violence and by a fierce resistance on the part of men and women throughout the world”—he did not say “States” but “men and women”—all those who aspire to a peaceful life and a life bereft of fear. This would be a movement of mankind for the purpose of saving mankind. To be successful, such a popular movement should be linked with the efforts of Governments to apply effectively on an international scale measures which are available to them to serve the cause of peace and progress.”

71. I shall conclude my remarks with these words of U Thant, that great champion of the cause of peace and non-resort to force.

72. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*interpretation from French*): The principle of the non-use of force in international

relations is of particular importance for peace-loving States and for international peace and security. The need for strict observance of this principle today has become even more urgent for the imperialist Powers, and in the first instance the two super-Powers have made the threat and use of force the corner-stone of their foreign policies and have created a dangerous situation for the freedom of peoples and world peace.

73. My delegation would like at the outset to demonstrate that the authors of this proposal are actually not guided by interests of the defence of peace and international security but seek purely demagogic and propaganda objectives. We cannot fail to reject the claim that recourse to force in relations among States continues today because its prohibition is not sufficiently confirmed in United Nations documents. This principle is well known and it is enshrined in many international treaties, in many documents of the United Nations and in particular in the Charter, which commits all Member States to refrain from having recourse to the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. It is closely linked with the principles of sovereign equality of States and non-intervention in their domestic affairs, principles which are at the foundation of the very existence of independent States and the development of their relations.

74. The Albanian delegation, like several other delegations, harbours no illusions about the idea put forward here that through the adoption of a decision by the General Assembly we would end once and for all imperialist aggression and all forms of the use of force against sovereign peoples and States. Such fairy-tales can never cause the peoples to relax their vigilance, particularly since it is known that whenever the interests of their policies so dictate the imperialist Powers, and primarily the United States and the Soviet Union, violate brutally and without any hesitation whatsoever not only United Nations resolutions but also bilateral and multilateral agreements which were signed with pomp and ceremony.

75. In our opinion, the cause of the use of force in international relations resides not in the absence or weakness of United Nations resolutions but rather in the policy of aggression, imperialism and social-imperialism. Imperialism is a source of wars, and the peoples make a clear distinction between just and unjust wars, between imperialist, colonialist, neo-colonialist and racist violence and the struggle of peoples for liberation and the safeguarding of their national independence. The liberation struggle of peoples, in all its forms, including armed struggle, is a legitimate struggle which is absolutely justified. We must reject the efforts of the Soviet revisionists, who, by their demand that the use of force be prohibited without distinction, as recommended in their draft resolution [A/L.676], actually are seeking to sabotage the liberation struggles of peoples and to deny the right of peoples and States to oppose aggression.

76. The sponsors of this proposal have linked the question of the non-use of force in international relations to the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and have stated that in our era peaceful coexistence is the sole alternative open to the international community, which is tantamount to saying that the overriding need in the face of nuclear

⁶ Held at Geneva from 29 August to 28 September 1968.

danger is the subjugation of the peoples of the world to the control of the two super-Powers.

77. By attempting to speculate on the legitimate concerns and the sincere desires of peace-loving States to put an end to the nuclear arms race of the two super-Powers and the danger which it constitutes for the freedom of peoples, peace and international security, the Soviet Union seeks to replace the commitment not to resort to the use of nuclear weapons and the prohibition of the production and the complete destruction of those weapons, by a declaration which is devoid of any meaning and value and which is actually designed to confirm the supremacy and the nuclear monopoly of the two super-Powers. We should point out that when on 2 November [2078th meeting] the Soviet representative in this Assembly introduced his draft resolution on the non-use of force in international relations and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, that very day his country was engaged in tests for the subsequent perfecting of those weapons.

78. The delegation of Albania considers that the proposal on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is part of the combined efforts of the United States and the Soviet Union to create the impression that in the world today the general trend is towards a relaxation of tension and that, therefore, everything should be settled by peaceful procedures, without resorting to the use of force in any of its aspects, including the right of self-defence of States or the national and social liberation of peoples. In other words, everywhere "peace" should prevail, that is peace between the aggressor and his victims, the occupier and the occupied, the colonialist and the slave, the exploiter and the exploited. The two super-Powers, under the false pretext of the prohibition of the use of force, intend to consolidate the *status quo* and to condemn oppressed peoples to perpetual enslavement and to impose their *diktat* on sovereign peoples and States.

79. It is a fact that these allegations are advanced whenever the imperialist and colonialist Powers have recourse to aggression and the use of force in all its manifestations, including the use of weapons of mass destruction, when the two super-Powers commit acts of aggression and threaten the independence of freedom-loving peoples and States, and when their war budgets have reached record heights since the Second World War. Actually nothing has changed in the policy of aggression and war pursued by the United States and the Soviet Union and, in the first instance, it is precisely those very countries which use force in international relations, which use atomic blackmail and which are the source of the tension existing today in various parts of the world.

80. For years the United States has continued its armed aggression against the people of Viet-Nam. It is committing the most serious crimes against the people of Viet-Nam in the southern part of that country. It is savagely bombing the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and has organized a military blockade against that sovereign, freedom-loving country. In its imperialist aggression against the three countries of Indo-China, it has used the most destructive weapons; it has bombed indiscriminately using napalm and other means of chemical warfare. In the Middle East, the

Arab peoples are exposed to acts of aggression and to the use of force. In large parts of the Arab countries, victims of the imperialist-Zionist aggression of June 1967 are still under the occupation of the aggressor. The Palestinian people and many other peoples suffering under colonial domination are forcibly deprived of their right to self-determination. In Europe, as is known, Czechoslovakia is still under the occupation of the Soviet Union, and the policy of positions of strength continues to be applied against other States. In Asia, the United States has stationed its military forces in many countries for aggressive purposes; while the Soviet Union has deployed great military forces in Mongolia, with obvious designs against the People's Republic of China. In the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent, there is a continuation of the tense situation created as a result of Indian aggression against Pakistan, an aggression which was instigated and supported by the Soviet Union. In many regions of the world the two super-Powers maintain dozens of military bases and their navies are cruising the oceans and seas thousands of kilometres from their national territories, threatening the freedom and independence of peoples. Military manoeuvres in the proximity of other States are current common occurrences. In addition, in order to attain their objective of world domination, the two super-Powers, parallel to recourse to armed force, also use other forms of violence, and intervene in the domestic affairs of other peoples and other States. Pressure; blackmail; diversion; political, economic and military blockades; as well as efforts to organize coups d'état, are the customary practice of those countries.

81. These facts, as well as several others reflected in the current world situation, hardly need comment. They concretely demonstrate that the policy of the United States and the Soviet Union is based on the use of force in all its forms and that it has created a dangerous situation for the sovereign rights of peoples, for their freedom and independence, and for international peace and security.

82. In the opinion of the delegation of Albania, peoples and Member States have no need for a simple confirmation of the principle of the non-use of force in relations among States. A new resolution on this question would add no new element and would change nothing in the present situation. We consider that in the present circumstances the duty of the General Assembly is to confront the imperialist States with their responsibility—and I refer in the first instance to the United States and the Soviet Union—for violations of that principle. If the General Assembly wishes to make a constructive contribution along these lines it should not allow itself to be deluded by the manoeuvres of the authors of this initiative, but should condemn the use of force and the policy of aggression and war pursued by the imperialist Powers against the freedom and independence of peoples.

83. The People's Republic of Albania, a socialist and profoundly peace-loving State, has been the object of pressures, blockades, blackmail and brutal intervention by the imperialists and the social-imperialists, but it has staunchly defended its freedom and its independence, it has thwarted all these plans and it has marched forward along the path of building socialism. It has always respected the independence of other States and has developed its relations with countries of differing social systems on the basis

of the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality, respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutual non-intervention in domestic affairs and reciprocal advantage. Albania has supported and will always support whole-heartedly and without reservation the just struggle of the oppressed peoples for national and social liberation and also the struggle of other peoples and other States for the defence of their rights and their national independence against foreign intervention. Acting together with freedom-loving States, it will continue to make its contribution to the great struggle of peoples for the strengthening of international peace and security and against the aggressive policy of the imperialist Powers.

84. Mr. HARMON (Liberia): My delegation, encouraged by certain positive trends which have developed in international relations during recent months, attaches historic importance to the question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, as introduced by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

85. History requires us to refer to the past in relation to the present and the future, and seek to profit by history in adopting and accepting those principles which we can, with confidence, build upon in the future.

86. Going then into history, in so far as Liberia's consistent position is concerned, I would wish to refer on this historic occasion to the statement made by the late President of Liberia, Mr. Tubman, on 26 July 1961—a policy statement which my delegation regards as potent and of great significance in connexion with the debate on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Mr. Tubman said:

"There is a wise proverb of Solomon which says, 'a wise man foreseeth evil and hideth himself'; this, I opine, should be made to apply to the present threatening and dangerous international situation"—at that time—"over Berlin, Germany. The great Powers have all taken positive positions in this matter which has created a crisis of imminent danger.

"Most wars and conflicts have been the result of nations manoeuvring themselves or permitting themselves to be manoeuvred into positions where negotiations and compromises were rendered impracticable because of national honour. They closed the doors behind them and therefore had no alternative in such circumstances but to plunge themselves into war.

"The consequences that would necessarily follow in case a conventional or nuclear war were to erupt at present would be so tremendously devastating that no nation, great or small, could withstand their paralysing onslaught. In my opinion it behoves all tribes, people and nations of the earth to express themselves strongly on the delicate issue of whether they are aligned with the Western or Eastern blocs or whether they consider themselves non-aligned, and thus prevent a head-on collision over the Berlin crisis, which would probably engulf the world in another global war, far more destructive than any war in history.

"I am pleased to note that while some of the Powers have stated in no uncertain terms their position on the question, they have not closed the door to negotiations, but have expressly made known their willingness to negotiate. We appeal to those nations having any special interest and responsibility in Berlin and the German question to avoid, in any case or circumstance, the resort to force or armed conflict and to settle that question within the bounds of rationality. Humanity deserves and demands that this be done, reason and common sense dictate it; religion, morality and materialism require it.

"We appeal to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the Security Council to intervene immediately while the door remains open for negotiations, and to take such actions as will lead to a settlement of this most provocative question by means of negotiation, thereby enabling the great Powers involved to find a just, reasonable and peaceful solution to the impending crisis.

"The conferences held on the African continent have all had the same objectives: striving to bring more and better understanding among African nations, creating a working formula, and working toward world peace. These conferences showed in unmistakable terms the common concern of the participants for the problems which plague Africa"—our continent—"and the rest of mankind, and the need to resolve them. Those who truly love Africa and are dedicated to the ideals of peace, prosperity and progress need to combine their material and spiritual resources towards the attainment of these desired objectives. On this, our national independence day, we call upon the peoples of Africa to join in the epic struggle.

"An interesting issue is currently being debated in international circles. It is the question of alignment and non-alignment, for which, at present, we have no commonly accepted definition. While I am not certain of the precise interpretation, however, I affirm that Liberia will stand for the great pragmatic principle—the greatest good for the greatest number.

"Liberia will always stand for the great principle and cause of justice, tolerance, liberty, equality before the law and regard for international treaties.

"We will stand for the great principle and cause of universal peace and amity among men and nations.

"We shall stand for the great principle and cause of the sacredness, the rights and dignity of the individual, and respect the sovereignty of all nations, great and small alike.

"We stand for the great principle and cause of putting an end to any other global cataclysm which 'twice in a generation has brought untold suffering to mankind'.

"These are some of the principles that guide us, and they are principles, not necessarily the special blocs or ideologies, with which we associate ourselves."

87. Happily, President William Tolbert, Jr., who succeeded to the presidency of Liberia after the death of Mr. Tubman, is as deeply committed to these principles and is already

regarded as a thinker and an up-coming great leader, both at home and abroad.

88. My colleague from Austria, who spoke earlier in this meeting, has already referred to the Briand-Kellogg Pact, to which I shall now refer. I should like to say that we did not compare notes. I am only happy that we share our mutual interest.

89. Again, in 1965, the later President of Liberia, as an expression of deep concern for the outlawing of force and recourse to war, said:

"We will prepare and submit to the United Nations and to the Organization of African Unity proposals, similar to the principles contained in the Briand-Kellogg Pact, which will propose the outlawing of force and the recourse to war to be applied as a fundamental principle on a universal basis."

90. The Briand-Kellogg Pact, as we all know, was signed in Paris on 27 August 1928 by the plenipotentiaries of 15 Powers. It contained two substantive clauses, which read as follows:

"Article I.

"The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

"Article II.

"The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means."

91. Despite the fact that this pact condemned recourse to war and renounced it as an instrument of national policy, yet it is to be admitted that hardly 10 years after it came into being the world was plunged into a holocaust never before witnessed by man in the history of the world. This conflagration was ignited by some of the very signatories to the Briand-Kellogg Pact. It was out of this dreadful war—the Second World War—that the atom bomb was born, and it was out of the ashes of this war that the United Nations came into being with its Charter that, in the very first words of its preamble, says: "... to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ...".

92. Therefore, in its Charter and in many resolutions of the General Assembly this international community has rejected, renounced and condemned the use of force and called upon its Member States to settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

93. Why do I take the time to refer to this part of man's history? It is because my delegation feels that more and more emphasis should be placed on the responsibility of this world Organization to hold always sacred its collective duty of assuring peace and security as outlined in Article 1 of the Charter.

94. To maintain international peace and security is one of the United Nations basic purposes, and to that end to take effective and collective measures to prevent and remove threats to the peace, to suppress acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law adjustments or settlements of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

95. We should seek to require all Member States to endeavour to settle their international disputes by peaceful means and in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered. We should make it an instrument of national policy to reject, renounce, condemn and outlaw war. We should call upon all Members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, should first of all seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement. They should also resort to regional conciliatory agencies or other peaceful means of their own choice as a national policy.

96. Having offered these as basic conditions for guaranteeing succeeding generations from the scourge of war and allowing our world to move towards a more positive peaceful coexistence within the framework of the Charter, and thereby reassuring the hopes of mankind for a better and safer world in which to live, I shall now revert to a few comments on the Soviet Union's proposal [A/8793], and draft resolution [A/L.676].

97. The Soviet proposal and draft resolution, in the opinion expressed by many previous speakers, are designed to put into practice the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter: the peaceful coexistence of States with different social systems, non-aggression, non-interference in international affairs, and the sovereign equality of all States. My delegation accepts this premise.

98. Nevertheless, being extremely concerned and seized as we are with this important question in relation to international peace and security, we are, on the other hand, troubled by the basic problems which arise in this debate. The categorical non-use of force in international relations, as covered in the Soviet draft resolution, is implicit in the United Nations Charter, and it was out of the ashes of the Second World War that the United Nations was born. With this repugnance to the use of force the Charter, therefore, was not intended to set up a pacifist organization. Quite the contrary; the founding fathers have established, with considerable skill and design, an enforcement organization: the Security Council, armed with its own international police force. This is where the problem seems to lie. The Soviet proposal, in fact, recognizes this by its reference, firstly, to Article 25 as an exception to the non-use of force; secondly, by its reference to Article 51, and the right of self-defence; and, thirdly, by accepting the right of peoples to fight for their freedom.

99. Having, therefore, removed these exceptions, what, then, is left of the non-use doctrine? Here is what seems to be left. Firstly, the vast majority of nations do not have sufficient power to embark on the use of force because approximately 90 to 95 per cent of the world's force is in the hands of the five great Powers. If those nations should find themselves in the dilemma of pre-emptive force, it would seem more appropriate for the five big Powers, as a demonstration of their desire to ensure a lasting peace, to enter into a five-way repudiation of ever using force contrary to the Charter. The non-use of force could therefore become the welcome legacy of the other nations. If these five big Powers would not agree to such a commitment, the question which then arises in the mind of my delegation is: of what value would a commitment of powerless nations be in so far as the non-use of force is concerned?

100. My delegation, on the other hand, does not intend to minimize the great importance of the initiative of the Soviet Union, but in making this suggestion we are endeavouring to raise the earnest appeal of smaller nations to the five big Powers, reminding them of their responsibility to the international community to do everything within their power to ease international tension, to strengthen mutual understanding and trust among all States—particularly among themselves—and, of course, to take significant steps on the path to sizeable disarmament, thereby encouraging and giving real meaning to the high hopes of men everywhere for lasting peace and goodwill.

101. As a corollary to my delegation's unresolved problem of clarity as to what would happen after the adoption of the draft resolution over the negative vote of some of the nuclear Powers in trying to implement its provisions, I must again revert to the Charter of the United Nations, and to some of the numerous resolutions on the question of peace adopted by the General Assembly.

102. While the actual words "renounce", "condemn" and "outlaw" are not used in the Charter, if we refer to General Assembly resolution 2131 (XX), the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty, we read:

"1. No State has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. Consequently, armed intervention and all other forms of interference or attempted threats against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements, are condemned."

That resolution was adopted at the 1408th plenary meeting on 21 December 1965.

103. Again, at the 1499th plenary meeting, on 19 December 1966, a similar resolution was adopted entitled "Status of the implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty", in which we read that:

"The General Assembly,

"...

"Deems it to be its bounden duty:

"(a) To urge the immediate cessation of intervention, in any form whatever, in the domestic or external affairs of States;

"(b) To condemn all forms of intervention in the domestic or external affairs of States as a basic source of danger to the cause of world peace;

"(c) To call upon all States to carry out faithfully"—note that word "faithfully"—"their obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the provisions of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty and to urge them to refrain from armed intervention or the promotion or organization of subversion, terrorism or other indirect forms of intervention for the purpose of changing by violence the existing system in another State or interfering in civil strife in another State." [Resolution 2225 (XXI).]

104. With the strong wording of those two resolutions, and again from a comparison of the Briand-Kellogg Pact with the Charter; it is to be noted that, whereas the Pact contains only two principles, without the machinery for their enforcement, the Charter goes further and establishes the machinery to deal with the violation of its principles on peace. Even with that strong position, the United Nations has not prevented wars from breaking out, but—and thank God for this—it has been able to contain them and thus avoid their escalation into a world conflict. This, again, was brought about by the machinery established by the Charter, previously referred to: the Security Council and the international police force. Let us then, as members of this world community, use those possibilities which are available to us to move away from dead centre, accepting those principles by which we can with confidence build a new world.

105. The United Nations, in its 27 years of existence and with the present provisions of its Charter, has prevented a third world war. The problem of peace does not, in the opinion of my delegation, lie in any inadequacies of the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The problem lies with the Members themselves, and in particular the permanent members of the Security Council.

106. The question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, raised by the Soviet delegation, raises in turn many other questions worthy of deep study. If the submission of this draft resolution by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is designed to give tacit evidence of its commitment to and deep concern for world peace and security and for the further strengthening of mutual understanding among the nations of the world, thereby giving renewed hope of survival to mankind, my delegation wishes highly to commend the Soviet Union, and it will be prepared to give whatever support may be necessary in the furtherance of that supreme objective.

107. Mr. ISMAIL (Democratic Yemen): My delegation welcomes the initiative of the Soviet Union in proposing the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of the item on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [A/8793]. Since the dawn of history mankind has aspired to create a world of peace and prosperity. Nevertheless the struggle between the haves and the have-nots—classes and States—has become the order of the day. With the advent of the industrial age, the production of sophisticated goods and weapons, the further alienation of the working masses, the birth of colonial empires and the degradation of the colonized peoples, the struggle between the adversaries assumed new, far-reaching dimensions. Now the use of force and nuclear weapons is tantamount to nothing less than the total obliteration of mankind. However, from the introduction of the stick and the spear to the contemporary sophisticated weaponry, the exploited masses, the poor and the weak nations, have been the victims of the use of force. That is all the more true because force means power, and both have always been the monopoly of the strong.

108. If we refrain from unfolding the untold miseries of the two world wars and cast a glance at the family of nations today, what do we see? A benevolent document—the Charter of the United Nations—and a number of petty wars. Petty though those wars might seem, they are the cruellest and most atrocious of all. In Viet-Nam the arch-imperialists of the United States have dropped on the people and all other living things a tonnage of explosives three and a half times greater than the total used by the Allies during the Second World War. In Palestine and the adjoining Arab countries the Zionist bandits are raining bombs and rockets on men, women and children. In South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies millions of fellow Africans are exposed to genocide, terrorism and the most inhuman form of discrimination. But those are only the atrocities we read about in the daily news. What about the silent subjugation of the developing countries by the imperialist camp? What about the pillage and destruction of the natural resources of the developing countries? What about the economic aggression which the representative of Chile mentioned the other day [2081st meeting]? What about the imperialist policies of embargo subversion, sabotage and intimidation?

109. The word “force” does not mean only military force: it embraces all sorts of force—military, economic, political, social and so on. If the use of military force by the imperialist is only a daily routine, their use of political, economic and social force against the developing countries is no less dangerous. We are adamantly against the use of force by the colonizers and imperialists. But we hail the use of force by the colonized people and the oppressed masses. The first is a perpetration of a wrong, the latter is an attempt to rectify the wrong.

110. My delegation listened with appreciation to what Ambassador Malik of the USSR said about the legitimacy of the struggle of the victims of aggression. He said:

“Thus, no one is in a position to cast doubt on the inalienable right of States and peoples subjected to aggression to use any means necessary to repulse the

aggressor. In this connexion, we have made direct reference to examples of aggression which are before our eyes: Indo-China and the Middle East”. [2078th meeting, para. 37.]

111. Again, we would like to emphasize the right of the oppressed and colonized peoples to take arms against their oppressors and colonizers. Those peoples are in fact only fighting back in order to achieve their human rights and independence. We have learned from our experience with colonialism that the independence and rights of peoples cannot be voluntarily granted one beautiful morning. For what has been taken by force can only be taken back by force.

112. As for the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, who would be happier to see that come to pass than those who do not own them and who are probable victims of them? We therefore firmly support the prohibition of all forms of nuclear, chemical, toxic and bacteriological weapons.

113. In principle, we would support the draft resolution tabled by the USSR.

114. Mr. GROZEV (Bulgaria) (*translation from Russian*): The thousand-year history of mankind has been marked by wars and conflicts of annihilation, and by mass destruction and oppression. Destruction, human sacrifice and incalculable suffering, especially the suffering caused to peoples during the Second World War, have forced us all to seek ways and means of finally saving mankind from the horrors of war. That was the reason for the establishment of the United Nations, whose Charter sets out the great aim of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. That Charter expressed the aspirations of millions of people throughout the world and a firm determination to restrain aggressors once and for all and to place relations between States on a new basis, excluding the use of war as a means of settling international problems.

115. The period since 1945 has been marked by a continual and difficult struggle to counter the opposition of those who saw in the implementation of the principles of the United Nations a danger to their own policies of conquest, intervention and oppression. More than once, world peace has been threatened. In the dark days of the cold war, there was a real danger that the newly formed United Nations would encounter the same fate as the League of Nations. Theories were persistently circulated to the effect that peace and friendship between peoples was a Utopian idea, and that efforts to establish a genuine and lasting peace on the basis of new principles which had been borne out by life itself were useless. The efforts of all peoples and all peace-loving States which would not accept the continued domination of the law of the jungle or the principle that might should remain a synonym of right were necessary in order to expose the proponents of those theories and practices and lay down new principles in international relations. It would be difficult for any reasonably unprejudiced man to deny the decisive role played by the socialist community in the struggle to uphold those new principles and to prevent a new world conflict. We all well remember that, over a period of many years in succession, here, in this Organization, in this very hall, a

difficult and persistent struggle had to be waged to ensure that one General Assembly resolution included the principle of peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems. Today we are all witnesses to the triumph of the concept of peaceful coexistence, which was proclaimed by the great Lenin. And it is no accident that, at the present session of the General Assembly, representatives of a huge majority of countries have welcomed recent favourable trends in international relations and have at the same time stressed the need for further efforts to consolidate that process. *Détente* among a number of States in Europe and in other areas of the world, the establishment of contacts, the holding of successful negotiations, and the signing of bilateral treaties and agreements on practical measures to strengthen regional security are essentially nothing other than the realization of the principles of peaceful coexistence and the non-use of force in international relations. It is hardly necessary to point out these facts, which are well known to all. However, one cannot but note with a feeling of satisfaction the newest and most important result of the application of these principles—the establishment of normal relations between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, which opens the way to their simultaneous admission to membership in the United Nations.

116. In view of the favourable and encouraging development in international relations, the timeliness and urgency of the new Soviet proposal concerning the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons [A/8793] are quite obvious. After a number of bilateral treaties have reaffirmed the principle of the non-use of force in relations between individual States, the next step must be taken, namely, to establish that principle as a law in international relations between all States Members of the United Nations. In that connexion, we attach particular importance to such documents adopted by the General Assembly as the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security [resolution 2734 (XXV)], the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations [resolution 2625 (XXV)], the resolution on the strict observance of the prohibition of the threat or use of force in international relations and of the right of peoples to self-determination [resolution 2160 (XXI)], and a number of other documents.

117. Now our Organization is called upon to adopt new and more effective measures to strengthen peace and international security.

118. "The question of peace is a vital question, a sore question for our modern times", V. I. Lenin, the founder of the first socialist State, once wrote. The words of V. I. Lenin, in our opinion, also apply to present conditions. That is so because, despite the relaxation of tension that has begun, dangerous military conflicts resulting from the aggressive desires of imperialist forces are still a reality today. However, after an objective analysis of the existing situation and the alignment of forces in the world, it may be stated with confidence that the prevention of war and the strengthening of peace and international security in the age of nuclear missiles are both possible and essential. At the present time and under existing conditions, it is quite

feasible to avoid a fatal military clash between two world systems or between individual States.

119. For that reason, the delegation of the People's Republic of Bulgaria regards the new initiative of the Soviet Government as an exceptional opportunity to consolidate further the achievements of the peace-loving forces and to apply the principles of our Organization in a new and creative way. The initiative is aimed at strengthening security throughout the world, and for that reason it cannot but be in the interests of all countries. That was demonstrated in a convincing and clear manner in the statement made by the distinguished Ambassador of the Soviet Union, Y. A. Malik, when he said:

"In putting forward the proposal on the non-use of force in international relations and permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, the Soviet Union has not sought, and does not seek, any gain or advantage for itself. Our proposal is not directed against anyone or against anyone's interests. It is a constructive, positive initiative—an undertaking which is in keeping with the vitally important interests of all peoples, all States and the whole of mankind." [2078th meeting, para. 18.]

120. In our opinion, the Soviet proposal is particularly valuable since it throws new light on, and makes more specific, the obligation provided for in the United Nations Charter that all States should refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force, and at the same time envisages the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. In serving "the supreme interests of international security", in the eloquent words of the distinguished representative of the Polish People's Republic, Ambassador Kulaga, in his statement here [2079th meeting, para. 27], the proposal is closely linked with one of the most important problems of our time—the problem of disarmament.

121. As is well known, there are still arguments as to the connexion between, and the relative priority of, the problems of security and disarmament. At one time, the formula "Security first, and then disarmament" prevailed in the work of the League of Nations. However, the development of international relations, especially after the advent of nuclear weapons, categorically disproves the validity of that formula, and life and experience show that the problems of security and disarmament cannot be considered separately. For that reason, the solemn acceptance of the obligation to prohibit nuclear weapons permanently, within the context of a general obligation to refrain from the use or threat of force in international relations, would be of extremely great political and practical importance for the further favourable development of the international situation. It would considerably facilitate a solution to the question of the cessation of the production of nuclear weapons and the destruction of all stocks of such weapons. In that connexion, I should like to associate myself with the following words of the distinguished representative of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia:

"The Yugoslav delegation is therefore of the opinion that the reassertion of the prohibition of nuclear weapons, within the context of renunciation of all forms of the use of force and the creation of favourable conditions

for the security of all countries, could provide a fresh incentive for efforts in the sense of the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons and general and complete disarmament under effective international control." [2080th meeting, para. 73.]

122. All the work that has been done in recent years towards removing the danger of the use of nuclear weapons confirms the view that the security of peoples should not be based on the so-called "balance of terror", but can and should be built on the basis of a balance of good sense, goodwill and positive action by all Governments in switching over from the arms race to progressive and effective disarmament.

123. When disarmament is discussed, arguments arise as to the relation between so-called conventional weapons and nuclear weapons and as to which weapons should first be the object of disarmament. Nuclear weapons are unquestionably the most dangerous weapons for all living beings, and for that reason they are justifiably placed first in discussions on disarmament. However, that can in no way justify underestimating the constantly increasing destructive power of conventional weapons. Who can wave aside and forget the shattering lessons of the Second World War? Who can ignore the countless sacrifices of struggling Viet-Nam and of other heroic peoples against whom conventional weapons are being used? Incidentally, conventional weapons were used to commit aggression in the Middle East, and are now being used to retain the fruits of that aggression. Moreover, the use of either type of weapon is basically a violation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations between States, obstructs the present relaxation of tension and might produce a world conflagration which would leave hardly anyone alive to continue the discussion as to which weapons were used first, and by whom.

124. Precisely because of this, it is proposed that the question of the prohibition of the use of force in relations between States and the question of the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons should be settled as an organic whole. Only thus will it be possible to ensure the same degree of security for all States.

125. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic was quite right when he said in his statement:

"No one can any longer justify opposition to the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons on the basis of the alleged disadvantages of a purely conventional and therefore inadequate deterrent." [2081st meeting, para. 78.]

126. The obligation to refrain from the use of force in international relations, inseparably linked with the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, would make the struggle of peoples for their national liberation easier and would be an obstacle for aggressors. That right of peoples to individual and collective self-defence, which is so clearly and unambiguously set out in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, is inalienable and sacred. Abstract reflection here is more than groundless. A very clear bias can be seen in such remarks as, for example, the illusory claim that prohibiting the use of force in international

relations would also imply prohibiting the struggle of peoples for their freedom and national independence and prohibiting the struggle against colonialism and aggression. The struggling peoples can themselves determine who are their enemies and who are their friends, not only on the basis of words but also, and primarily, on the basis of the genuine help which is given to them always and everywhere in the struggle against colonialism and neo-colonialism.

127. The international situation today makes it not only possible but absolutely imperative that we should pass beyond the stage of verbose declarations and find firm guarantees against the violation of principles established in the Charter and reaffirmed in one form or another in other United Nations documents. Those principles must be turned into an international law binding on all States.

128. In our opinion, the draft resolution, in consolidating the principle of the non-use of force in international relations as an obligation in international law and simultaneously prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, takes the only correct and realistic approach to the question of the strengthening of international security. For that reason, the Bulgarian delegation supports the proposal that this declaration—which, we are sure, will be adopted by the General Assembly—should be confirmed by the Security Council, too, in accordance with Article 25 of the United Nations Charter. The Security Council would thus be acting in accordance with the functions vested in it as the United Nations organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and international security. In that way, the solemn declaration adopted by the General Assembly on the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would become an obligatory standard of conduct for all States.

129. It would be naïve to believe that at the present time such an important undertaking would not meet with opposition. When such opposition is expressed by militarist and monopolist imperialist circles, it is easy to explain it without justifying it. All the more inexplicable and inexcusable is the opposition on the part of a great nuclear Power, the People's Republic of China, whose lawful rights in the United Nations were restored after many years of persistent struggle, attended by such great hopes for positive and constructive action in the cause of peace and international security. However, in practice, the representatives of that country have, with regard to many decisive problems of the present time, taken up positions identical with those of their former greatest enemies. That has been demonstrated during the consideration of questions relating to disarmament and the convening of a world disarmament conference, during the conflict on the India-Pakistan subcontinent, and in other cases. It has appeared particularly clearly during consideration of the new Soviet proposal concerning the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. But, while some are silently rubbing their hands, the representative of China is consciously or unconsciously acting as the spokesman and messenger for reactionary circles in the world which are opposed to any initiative aimed at *détente*.

130. Once again the statement by the representative of China, both during the general debate [2051st meeting]

and now [2083rd meeting], during consideration of the new Soviet proposal, has sounded a clear note of discord by comparison with the statements made by the overwhelming majority of delegations which have participated in the debate on this item. While other representatives have described the Soviet proposal as timely, useful, correct, realistic, objective, and an urgent necessity for our times, the representative of the People's Republic of China has affirmed that it is "reactionary" and "a downright fraud". While the majority of representatives have stressed that the proposal takes into account and defends the interests of all peoples, that same representative has asserted that it is a "betrayal of the interests of the people of the world". While the former have stated their conviction that the proposal is directed against aggression and aggressors, the same representative has stated that it obliterates "the demarcation line between aggression and the victims of aggression". While the majority of speakers have pointed out that the proposal is in full accord with the principles of the Charter and a number of other fundamental documents of the United Nations, and also with numerous decisions adopted by the non-aligned countries, that representative has attempted to show that it is not in accordance with the Charter. It is appropriate to ask: are the principles of the Charter not being violated by the very party which opposes the renunciation of the use or threat of force in international relations and wishes to retain full freedom of action?

131. While the representatives of a large number of States from different parts of the world have congratulated the Soviet Union on its initiative and expressed their gratitude to it, as one of the greatest and most powerful countries in the world, the representative of China, who is blinded by inveterate anti-Sovietism, has, in a language and tone which are alien to our Organization, spouted completely unjustified slander against the State which is the standard-bearer of peace.

132. Is there any need to recall certain well-known truths in order to see how unjustified and biased the accusations against the Soviet Union are? Does the world still not know—is there any need to repeat again—who were the first to produce and use nuclear weapons and against whom, in essence, they were directed? Is it not well known that it was that which led the Soviet Union to master the production of nuclear weapons in order to maintain peace and ensure the independence of its own peoples and the peoples of the socialist countries, including China? Need I recall that the Soviet Union spoke out in favour of disarmament before it became a nuclear Power, and that the Soviet State has favoured and still favours general and complete disarmament since it has become a nuclear Power? If anyone has forgotten that, let him take the trouble to find it in the archives of the United Nations and the Geneva Conference of the Committee on Disarmament!

133. The argument that "You have acquired nuclear weapons—now wait for us to arm ourselves adequately, and then we can talk about nuclear disarmament" is unconvincing and illogical. After that Power, another Power could quite justifiably say that we must wait until it has armed itself—and then a third Power, a fourth, and so on. And who could guarantee that during that long waiting period nuclear and other weapons would not be perfected and

would remain unused? To require the peoples of the world to wait would be not only illogical, but also tragic for them, for peace and security throughout the world.

134. When accusations are made against those who favour nuclear disarmament, it is quite natural to ask: who has the greater interest in such disarmament—those who possess such weapons, or those who do not? The answer is clear: everyone has an interest in it, but primarily those countries which do not possess nuclear weapons and do not intend to acquire them. Those are the countries which constitute a majority of States in the world and, since that is so, those who obstruct concrete and effective steps towards disarmament are in fact opposing those countries and the peoples of the entire world.

135. It is quite obvious that such an important question cannot be decided and the decision put into effect without goodwill and agreement on the part of all countries, especially all the nuclear Powers. For that reason, those who oppose the settlement of problems which are of such vital importance for all mankind bear a great responsibility before history. The peoples of the world have a genuine interest in the subject, and they must ensure that those who possess nuclear weapons renounce their use for ever.

136. Franklin Roosevelt once said:

"I am sure that the cause of peace throughout the world would stand to gain considerably if the nations of the world could obtain an honest statement of the present and future policies of their Governments."

137. Let every Government now openly and honestly declare its attitude to the question before us concerning the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

138. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria wishes to state openly and with conviction that a favourable solution of this question would undoubtedly have a beneficial effect on the future political and economic development of relations between all countries which sincerely desire to maintain peace and international co-operation. Such a solution would promote the consistent implementation of the principles of the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, create even more favourable conditions for a successful world disarmament conference and facilitate the settlement of a number of other bilateral and regional problems. In addition, it is not difficult to foresee the favourable effect which such a solution would have on the activities of the United Nations itself, in enhancing its authority, and on the work of a number of United Nations bodies, such as the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament, the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction, and the Special Committee on the Question of Defining Aggression, as well as on efforts to draw up a number of conventions relating to humanitarian and other questions of international life.

139. A joint Bulgarian-Polish communiqué, issued on 11 November 1972 on the occasion of a visit to Bulgaria by a

delegation of Polish Party and Government officials, states the following:

“Being deeply convinced that the strengthening of international security is a primary concern and duty of Governments of all countries, the delegations of Bulgaria and Poland firmly support the proposal of the Soviet Union aimed at reaching agreement among all Powers on the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.”

140. The Bulgarian people, like the other peoples of the Balkan peninsula, are well aware of the tragic consequences of the policy of force, the policy of “divide and rule” which certain imperialist Powers have followed towards them, setting one country against another. The Balkan peninsula used to have the unfortunate reputation of being a powder keg, and its name was regarded as a synonym for insecurity, discord and constant tension. War and the use of force resulted only in destruction and countless victims in our part of the world. Having learned the grave lessons of history, the Balkan peoples are now following a different path—the path of peaceful coexistence.

141. The Government of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria consistently implements those principles and persistently strives to make the Balkans into an area of lasting peace and security. This is no temporary phenomenon, but a firm and constant policy determined by the very essence of Bulgaria’s socialist foreign policy.

142. “The future—the near future”, as the President of the State Council of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria, Todor Zhivkov, said, “does not belong to nuclear weapons and missiles and the ‘cold’ war, but to peace and mutual understanding between States, irrespective of their social systems.”

143. For that reason we are convinced that the adoption of the proposal now under consideration by the General Assembly would have an extremely beneficial effect on the favourable development of relations and co-operation and on the strengthening of peace and security in various areas of the globe, including Europe and the Balkans. The delegation of the People’s Republic of Bulgaria is also convinced that the unanimous adoption and implementation of the declaration on the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be an act of political wisdom and far-sightedness on the part of the United Nations and all its Members. It is thus that we would truly meet the demands of the present age for a guarantee of lasting peace and security throughout the world.

144. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would first of all like to express its sincere gratitude to the delegations of those countries which have participated in the debate on the question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and which have supported the Soviet Union’s initiative. As the discussion has shown, States Members of the United Nations attach exceptional

importance to this question. The fact that the delegations of a large number of countries, representing all the major geographical regions of the world, took part in the debate, bears eloquent witness to that. The discussion leaves no doubt that the proposal on the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons enjoys wide support among States.

145. Speakers have referred to the timeliness of the submission of this question for consideration by the General Assembly and to the need for new efforts to be made, taking into account the present international situation, to enable the United Nations to promote favourable trends in the world towards further *détente* and the development of co-operation among States. It has been pointed out that the adoption of a decision by the General Assembly on this important question would undoubtedly strengthen peaceful coexistence between States with different social systems as an important principle governing relations between them. Delegations have stated that the adoption by the General Assembly of a decision on the non-use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons would be an important action on the part of the United Nations directed against aggression, colonialism and all forms of international arbitrary action and violence.

146. The statements of representatives have reflected the need for a comprehensive solution to the problem of the non-use of force involving both conventional and nuclear weapons.

147. During the discussion it was pointed out that the proposal concerning the non-use of force and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons is entirely based on a fundamental principle of the United Nations Charter—the principle of the non-use of force in relations between States. Delegations have stressed that the adoption of a decision on this matter would be not only a solemn reaffirmation by Members of the United Nations of that most important principle of the Charter, but also an important means of ensuring its implementation, everywhere and by everyone, in the conditions of the nuclear age. Statements by representatives have demonstrated a sincere desire on the part of many States to contribute jointly to the solution of this major international problem of our time—the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Statements by representatives have clearly illustrated the feeling of deep responsibility among States Members of the United Nations for the fate of peace and their concern for the strengthening of international security.

148. The discussion has provided new and convincing confirmation of the fact that the Soviet Union and all the countries of the socialist community are united, hand in hand with the non-aligned and other peace-loving States which comprise an overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations, in the common struggle of the peace-loving forces for the peace and security of peoples. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries share with those countries a common approach to the most important problems of strengthening peace and international security. They stand together with the non-aligned countries both on

the question of strengthening international security and in favour of the convening of a world disarmament conference, and in support of a solution to the question of the non-use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The common position of the non-aligned countries on this matter was reflected in the well-known Statement on International Security and Disarmament, adopted by those countries at the Georgetown Conference. In that important international document, the non-aligned countries stressed that: "In particular, States must refrain from the threat or use of force in their international relations".⁷ The Soviet Union fully shares the position of the non-aligned countries on this important matter.

149. The principle of the non-use of force in international relations for purposes of aggression, the annexation of foreign territory, the enslavement of colonial peoples and the maintenance of domination over them has been embodied and reaffirmed in a number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions adopted in recent years as a result of the joint and active efforts of the socialist and non-aligned States and other peace-loving States Members of the United Nations.

150. The time has now come to take a new step forward and to direct efforts towards finding the most effective solution possible to the problem of the non-use of force in international relations, while simultaneously prohibiting permanently the use of nuclear weapons. This approach, as has been pointed out in the statements made by many delegations, is not detrimental to the security or interests of any country or group of States, but corresponds with the interests of all States, large and small, developed and developing. It provides for equal security for all States, and does not place any one of them in a privileged position. The need for the General Assembly to reaffirm the principles of the Charter is dictated by the whole development of international life, and by the fact that by no means all States are guided by the provisions of the Charter in their activities in international relations. There should be no cause to fear such a reaffirmation. In its resolutions, the General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed many important provisions of the United Nations Charter. There can be no justification for failing to do that in regard to such an important provision as the non-use of force in international relations.

151. We note with satisfaction that the Soviet Union's proposal enjoys wide support among States Members of the United Nations.

152. Only the statement of the representative of China [2083rd meeting] was different. It contained nothing positive, only pure negativism, groundless accusations and distortions of the policies and position of the Soviet Union.

153. To repeat assertions that the Soviet proposal refers to the prohibition of the use of force completely "indiscriminately" is, after the thorough explanations of the Soviet

delegation, a patently premeditated distortion of the aim and the sense of the USSR proposal.

154. Whatever attempts might be made to justify opposition to the adoption of a decision by the General Assembly concerning renunciation of the use of force, it is in essence nothing other than opposition to the most important and fundamental goal of the United Nations, proclaimed in its Charter, namely, to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. The Chinese delegation is in fact opposing the adoption by the United Nations of any practical steps aimed at ensuring that the principle of the non-use of force should be once again reaffirmed by the General Assembly as a law of international relations and that the use of force, involving either conventional or nuclear weapons, should become impossible.

155. In the statement of the Chinese representative an attempt was made to show that China is opposing aggression and, particularly, aggression involving the use of nuclear weapons. It is the USSR proposal whose fundamental aim is to prevent the use of nuclear and any other types of weapons for the purposes of aggression. If China was opposed, not in words but in deeds, to the use of armed force and nuclear weapons for aggressive purposes, then the Chinese representative would not have needed to oppose the Soviet proposal. On the contrary, he would have been the first to support the proposal, and would have been at one with the delegations of the socialist and non-aligned countries on this question.

156. In the discussion in the General Assembly, China was seen to be virtually isolated. China spoke against the USSR proposal and thus showed the whole world the true colours and intentions of China and its leaders. It is now obvious to all that China favours the continuation of the use of force in international relations and, by opposing the permanent prohibition of nuclear weapons, is in fact supporting their use.

157. China's proposal about not being the first to use nuclear weapons does not remove the threat of a nuclear war, and can only lull the vigilance of the peoples of the world and create the illusion that such a threat does not exist. The time has come to prohibit the use of force in international relations, and simultaneously to prohibit permanently the use of nuclear weapons.

158. The Chinese representative talked as if Peking favours the destruction of nuclear weapons. That, too, does not correspond with reality. The Soviet Union proposed that a conference of the five nuclear Powers should be convened to study the question of nuclear disarmament.⁸ Who opposed that? China. The USSR put forward a proposal for the convening of a world disarmament conference,⁹ which was unanimously supported by the States Members of the United Nations at the twenty-sixth session of the General Assembly. Even those who opposed it did not decide to vote against the proposal at the last General Assembly session. Who at that time opposed and still

⁷ See *The Georgetown Declaration, the Action Programme for Economic Co-operation and Related Documents*, adopted by the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries (Georgetown, Guyana, 1972), p. 33.

⁸ See *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-sixth Session, Annexes, agenda items 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 98, document A/8328.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, agenda item 97, document A/8491.

continues to oppose the convening of such a conference? China. Consequently, China is opposing all initiatives which would lead to a solution of the question of disarmament and the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and their destruction. It is obsessed by the idea not that such weapons should be prohibited and eliminated, but, quite the contrary, that production of such weapons should be intensified and that stocks of them should be built up. In order to conceal that policy, it has resorted to pathological anti-Sovietism.

159. The USSR, unlike China, is striving to ensure that neither nuclear nor any other weapons are used by anyone for purposes which are inconsistent with the United Nations Charter. China is in fact supporting the arms race, both in nuclear and in conventional weapons. That is the fundamental difference in the position of the USSR, and its advantage. We stated that in our last statement [2078th meeting], and we stress it now. In Peking they see that clearly, they know it and they understand it. And all the delegations in the General Assembly see it, know it and understand it clearly. For that reason, in order to conceal and seek to justify China's unpopular and barely defensible position, which is contrary to the United Nations Charter and is manifestly intended not to improve but rather to worsen international relations, on the basis of the principle "the worse the better", the Chinese delegation has had to resort to an unlawful and improper approach in discussions in the Assembly, and use for that purpose the language of the market-place. It has embarked on a course of distorting the facts, grossly misrepresenting the peace-loving position of the USSR and attempting to turn everything upside down.

160. The slanderous attack of the Chinese representative was convincingly refuted by the representative of the Mongolian People's Republic, Ambassador Puntsagnorov, in his statement at the 2083rd meeting.

161. We, the Soviet people, consider it our duty to defend socialism and the national liberation movements, and we are proud of it.

162. The fabrications of the representative of China concerning some sort of "deal" between the USSR and the United States bear witness to the fact that it is in Peking that they think in terms of deals and intrigue—unworthy behaviour for responsible State leaders.

163. It is well known to all that abuse and slander have never been convincing arguments in the discussion of important international problems. Slanderers have ignominiously ceased to exist or been forgotten by the world. Throughout almost the entire period of the existence of the Soviet Union, beginning from the earliest days following the Great October Socialist Revolution, slander and fantastic fabrications concerning the country and its peace-loving policies have flowed in a turbid stream from the forces of imperialism and fascism. Today, the unseemly role of slanderers of the USSR and its policies has been taken up by latter-day slanderers. But, as the old Russian proverb says, "slander has never soiled anyone's collar". The statements of the Chinese delegation during the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly are evidence that the Peking leaders, feeling the weakness of their position,

have raised abuse and slander of the Soviet Union to the level of State policy.

164. Our first statement gave replies to all the points raised by the representative of China.

165. The Soviet people and Government, under the leadership of the glorious Leninist Communist Party, have for more than half a century been following the path shown to them by the great Lenin, the path of the struggle for the strengthening of peace and international security, disarmament and the development of friendship and co-operation among peoples on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence, equality, non-interference in internal affairs, mutual respect and friendly co-operation.

166. As the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, said the day before yesterday, on 13 November, at a dinner in the Kremlin to honour a delegation of Bulgarian Party and Government representatives:

"... true to Lenin's precepts, we are conducting an active struggle to ensure that everywhere in international relations the principles of peaceful coexistence between States, irrespective of differences in their social systems, become firmly established and that disputes between States are settled through negotiations, without the use of force. And we are sure that, in defending the cause of lasting peace on earth, the countries of socialism are expressing the will and aspirations of the peoples of the entire world."

167. We are also following Lenin's precepts in disarmament questions. It is not our fault if greater results have not been achieved in the field of disarmament. However, the Soviet Union, as in the past, is conducting and will continue to conduct an untiring struggle for peace and security and for disarmament. In that great struggle, it stands firmly with the overwhelming majority of States, and rejects any fabrications directed against it.

168. The Soviet Union is ready to build its relations with the People's Republic of China, too, on the basis of the adoption of mutual obligations not to use force or the threat of force in settling disputes between the two countries. The policy of the Soviet State is aimed at preserving and strengthening the Soviet people's feeling of profound respect and friendship for the people of China.

169. As is well known, the Soviet State's position of principle on the question of Soviet-Chinese relations was set out in a clear and detailed manner in documents prepared for the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Firmly rejecting the slanderous fabrications of Chinese propaganda and of Chinese representatives in the United Nations concerning the policies of the Soviet State and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union at the same time supports the restoration of normal relations between the USSR and the People's Republic of China and the restoration of good-neighbourliness and friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples. We are convinced that an improvement of relations between the USSR and the People's Republic of China would serve the fundamental long-term interests of both

countries, the interests of all peace-loving States, and the cause of strengthening the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. The Soviet Union not only declares its readiness to develop good-neighbourly relations between the USSR and China, but is also translating that readiness into the language of highly concrete and constructive proposals. The ball is in China's court.

170. The Soviet delegation would not like to indulge in polemics on the question under discussion. We would hope that the efforts of the delegations of all States Members of the United Nations would be directed towards seeking a constructive solution.

171. It is inadmissible that the attention and the efforts of delegations should be distracted from the substance of the proposal under discussion and be lost in debates which can only make it difficult to reach agreement.

172. The Soviet delegation notes with satisfaction that the discussion which has taken place has been constructive and businesslike and has shown the readiness of States Members of the United Nations to seek a solution to the question of the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. During the discussion, and also during consultations between delegations, a number of concrete proposals were put forward which, in our opinion, could be appropriately reflected in the resolution to be adopted by the General Assembly on this matter. A proposal was made that the draft resolution should reflect more clearly the right of States to self-defence against armed attack and their right to eliminate the consequences of aggression in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The view has also been expressed that any decision to be taken should reflect the fact that the United Nations has recognized the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples for freedom and independence. It has also been proposed that references should be made to the Declaration on the Strengthening of International Security, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States, and the Declaration on the Occasion of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the United

Nations, [resolution 2627 (XXV)], which were adopted unanimously at the twenty-fifth anniversary session of the General Assembly as a result of active joint efforts on the part of the countries of the socialist community and the non-aligned States, and which reaffirmed the principle of the United Nations Charter concerning the non-use of force in international relations, as well as some other resolutions. The Soviet delegation is ready to give favourable consideration to all those ideas, while the delegation of China is attempting to cast a slur on those documents, thereby insulting all the Members of the United Nations which voted in favour of those declarations and resolutions.

173. During the debates and in consultations between delegations, other constructive ideas were also put forward. The Soviet delegation is prepared to consider those proposals, too, in a spirit of co-operation. It will work in close co-operation with all interested delegations, especially the delegations of the non-aligned countries, in order to draw up a draft resolution which would receive the widest possible support from States Members of the United Nations. The Soviet delegation will strive to do its utmost to ensure the adoption by the General Assembly of a decision on the question under consideration, namely, the renunciation of the use of force and the permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, which would serve the genuine interests of all States and all peoples. The adoption by the General Assembly at its twenty-seventh session of a decision on such an important question would be an impressive demonstration of the collective will and determination of States Members of the United Nations to ensure the implementation of the principle of the non-use of force in international relations and the simultaneous permanent prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons.

174. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from French*): The General Assembly has concluded its debate on agenda item 25. As Mr. Malik has just said, consultations are proceeding regarding draft resolution A/L.676, submitted by the Soviet Union. Voting will take place in a plenary meeting on a date to be announced later.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.