

GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

Friday, 22 September 1972,  
at 12.15 p.m.

NEW YORK

*Chairman:* Mr. Stanisław TREPCZYŃSKI  
(Poland).

**Adoption of the agenda: memorandum by the Secretary-General (continued) (A/BUR/179/Rev.1, sect. III)**

## ITEM 99 (continued)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited members to resume consideration of the inclusion in the agenda of item 99 as it appeared in paragraph 14 of document A/BUR/179/Rev.1.
2. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius) withdrew the proposal which he had made at the 201st meeting that consideration of agenda item 99 should be postponed until the twenty-eighth session of the General Assembly. That proposal had been a personal one and had not reflected exactly the views of the regional group to which Mauritius belonged.
3. Mr. GIAMBRUNO (Uruguay) expressed his delegation's firm support for the inclusion of item 99 in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session. His country, like many others, had suffered from the activities of terrorists who showed a complete disregard for human life. Despite the delicate political and philosophical questions involved, he believed that the international community could and must reach a consensus on measures to prevent terrorism and other forms of violence, as it had done in the case of aerial hijacking. It would be quite unacceptable to take no action at all on the matter for fear of its political implications when the international community was afflicted by acts of violence. Uruguay, a country whose citizens enjoyed the full range of human rights and democratic freedoms, had been obliged to take action to combat that phenomenon, which had jeopardized its position as a free democratic State and compromised its relations with other countries. While not wishing in any way to undermine the position of legitimate national liberation movements, his delegation did not believe that the use of the reprehensible methods applied by terrorists could possibly be condoned.
4. His delegation also supported the suggestion that item 99 should be referred to the Sixth Committee, a forum where political considerations were less in evidence than in some others and where there was a greater possibility of some consensus emerging on specific measures to be taken to combat terrorism.
5. Mr. EL HASSEN (Mauritania) said that he wished to pay a tribute to the Secretary-General for his desire to bring about a world characterized by peace and understanding between peoples, which was one of the fundamental objectives of the Charter. It was clear that terrorism in any form must be strenuously combated, since there could be no justification for taking the lives of innocent people. However, a fundamental question arose as to what constituted a terrorist. The expression could hardly be held to apply to persons who were denied the most elementary human rights, dignity, freedom and independence and whose countries objected to foreign occupation. Their actions were merely the logical and inevitable consequence of political situations, and any attempt to prevent terrorism without examining its root cause was foredoomed to failure.
6. The truth was that resistance to occupation had always been described as terrorism by those primarily responsible, namely the forces of invasion. For instance, the Nazi invaders had described the European resistance movements as terrorist movements, yet the latter's courage and determination were universally recognized and admired. Recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of national liberation movements against unjust policies of enslavement, deportation, displacement and exploitation was one of the most hallowed principles of the United Nations, which had been reaffirmed in many resolutions. For the United Nations to go back on its commitments to subject peoples and to alter its stand on the legitimacy of their struggle would be contradictory. In southern Africa, the Middle East and parts of Asia there were peoples whose very right to existence, dignity, freedom and equality was being denied. In the circumstances, such peoples could not be blamed for committing desperate acts which in themselves were reprehensible; rather, the real culprits were those who were responsible for causing such desperation—those who devised political systems based on inequality, perpetrated barbarous acts, sought to impose racist minority rule, opposed self-determination and independence, expelled people from their homes, destroyed peaceful villages and massacred innocent people.
7. In the circumstances, he felt that to include item 99 in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session would be tantamount to encouraging further acts of terrorism and would leave liberation movements no alternative but to resort to violence. The liberation movements would draw the conclusion that the only way they could win their freedom and independence would be by taking matters into their own hands.
8. The realistic and consistent approach would be for the United Nations to seek to extirpate the causes of the acts of violence under consideration. Accordingly,

his delegation opposed the inclusion in the agenda of item 99, a position that he believed was shared by the African Group as a whole.

9. Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea) recalled a remark made by Amílcar Cabral, Secretary-General of the Partido Africano da Independência da Guiné e Cabo Verde (PAIGC), who had once observed that Guinea (Bissau) was an independent country part of whose territory was occupied by Portuguese terrorists. That remark was also relevant to the situation in Angola and Mozambique and, by extension, to that prevailing in South Africa and Rhodesia. The term "terrorism" had in the past been used mainly by those responsible for the conquest and subjugation of other peoples and the spoliation and exploitation of their territories to describe the legitimate struggle for freedom and independence of the peoples under their domination. All the States represented in the General Committee had at some time been subjected to domination and had exercised their right to fight for their freedom. It would not be just to deny to peoples in Africa, Asia and elsewhere a similar right to combat that form of terrorism, which was the scourge of mankind.

10. As presently applied, the term "terrorism" was ambiguous, and no clear distinction was drawn between those inflicting terror and those subjected to it. It would be difficult if not inconceivable for the United Nations, on the pretext of re-establishing world order and morality, to go back on the principles enunciated in General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, which had recognized the right of subject peoples to self-determination and independence. Accordingly, despite the esteem in which they held the Secretary-General, it was not possible for his delegation or for the African Group as a whole to support the proposal for the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of an item on measures to prevent terrorism.

11. Mr. KELANI (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation, while appreciating the humanitarian motives underlying attempts to end terrorism, violence and the loss of innocent lives, felt that the concept of terrorism required precise definition in order to distinguish acts of terrorism from acts of national liberation. The Secretary-General's suggestion for the inclusion in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of an item on terrorism was ill-defined, and the proposed measures to prevent terrorism could be held to apply to the national liberation movements struggling for independence, self-determination and freedom from the colonial yoke. There had never been a national liberation movement which had not employed all the means at its disposal. Colonialism was itself an extreme example of terrorism inflicted on peoples who had been colonized or expelled from their homeland. Colonialism was in fact an extreme form of violence which needed to be combated by all available means. The imprecision of the Secretary-General's suggestion in its present form would open the door to colonialism, official terrorism and violence by colonialist régimes which, claiming legal justification, would intensify their efforts to crush the national liberation movements so as to strengthen

their hold and protect their own interests. Furthermore, the Secretary-General's attitude towards the problems to which he had referred had not been clarified by any in-depth study or documentation of the kind required. Accordingly, his delegation opposed the inclusion of item 99 in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session.

12. Sir Colin CROWE (United Kingdom) said that his Government had consistently made clear its abhorrence of the use of all forms of violence which threatened or destroyed innocent human lives. The occurrence of such violence had become distressingly frequent and widespread and his delegation therefore supported the Secretary-General's proposal to include in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session of the General Assembly an item on measures to prevent terrorism.

13. His delegation, however, was not unaware of the forces which led people to resort to violence or of the need to find solutions to the underlying problems. In his address to the General Assembly at the commemorative session in 1970 (1881st plenary meeting), the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had said that the resort to violence was a legacy of past errors, the product of desperation and frustration at the failure of society to make room for legitimate aspirations. That could not excuse violence, though it placed a heavy responsibility on those who had the duty to rectify injustice. However, the Prime Minister had observed, the use of violence had increasingly become, not the last resort of the desperate, but the first resort of those whose simple, unconstructive aim was anarchy, achieving nothing but the suffering of innocent men and women.

14. The question was how much longer the United Nations and the world could afford to wait for a solution to the problem. He had hoped that the Secretary-General's statement would allay the anxieties of those delegations which had questioned the desirability of the inscription of an item of such importance. He still hoped that they would reconsider their attitudes and participate in the search for agreed measures to help reverse the current trend towards terrorism and senseless violence.

15. His delegation shared the Secretary-General's view that Members of the United Nations should make a concerted effort to work out agreed practical measures and that the most appropriate body to pursue the task would be the Sixth Committee. That Committee had already done useful work on the associated questions of hijacking and the protection of diplomats and should provide the most favourable atmosphere for a careful and constructive examination of the more general issue which was the subject of item 99.

16. Mr. ESPINOSA (Colombia) said that his delegation supported the Secretary-General's proposal concerning international terrorism, but was well aware of the difficulties which that complex subject entailed. Efforts should be undertaken immediately to rid the world of a form of activity which is totally incompatible with the spectacular scientific and technical progress

of the second half of the twentieth century. The United Nations must not appear to be indifferent to one of the worst scourges of the present day.

17. Colombia had always condemned violence as an internal or international political weapon and it deplored the sacrifice of innocent lives which terrorism entailed. The Secretary-General's proposal that the item on terrorism should be discussed in the Sixth Committee was logical and acceptable, and would obviate the danger of seeming to condemn genuine liberation movements in colonial areas which the United Nations was bound to support under General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) and the purposes and principles of the Charter. In the Sixth Committee a detailed analysis of terrorism could be carried out and agreement could be reached on suitable procedures for its elimination, while at the same time considering measures to remedy the underlying causes of many acts of violence and terrorism.

18. Since under the rules of procedure, he could not discuss the substance of the item in detail in the General Committee, his delegation would merely support the Secretary-General's proposal to include item 99 in the agenda for consideration by the Sixth Committee. It would not be opposed to consideration of the item in the Special Political Committee or elsewhere, but thought that the Sixth Committee would be the most appropriate forum. The important point was that the United Nations should begin without delay consideration of a subject which was rightly of grave concern to the whole world.

19. Mr. BUSH (United States of America) said that his delegation strongly supported the inscription of the important and urgent item on terrorism on the agenda of the twenty-seventh session. The tragic occurrences of the past months left no doubt that the dangers to international relations and to innocent civilians everywhere were immediate and serious. The Secretary-General, in his explanatory memorandum (A/8791) and his clarifying statement at the 199th meeting (A/8791/Add.1 and Corr.1), had set forth the facts which made it imperative to give immediate consideration to the problem. While national measures and bilateral co-operation to prevent the occurrence of terrorist acts were indispensable, the world-wide nature of the problem required action by the community of nations.

20. There might be differences of opinion as to the relevance of alleged causal factors and precisely what measures the international community should adopt to deal with the problem, but there should be no difference among men of reason as to its urgency, magnitude and world-wide scope. The proper, and indeed, the only forum for dealing with global problems of such magnitude was the United Nations. To oppose discussion of such a problem was to strike at the *raison d'être* of the Organization. If the nations of the world could not debate the pressing global problems of the day and seek their solution, what purpose did their discussions

serve? World opinion was seriously concerned about terrorism which struck at the very heart of an ordered society in an ordered world. Was the United Nations prepared to try to solve the problem by inscribing the item under consideration on the agenda of the General Assembly or was it going to demonstrate an ineffectiveness which could shake the very foundations of the Organization itself? In his delegation's view, the item was so serious that it could possibly be a turning point in the history of the United Nations.

21. He enjoined members to read the Secretary-General's clarifying statement and realize that the item was not directed against any individual country, area or group. Delegations must support the Secretary-General in his efforts to demonstrate to a doubting world that the United Nations might be able to take a step to save mankind from a terror to which no one was immune. For those reasons, his delegation strongly supported the inscription of item 99 as an urgent matter requiring priority attention.

22. Mr. KRÖYER (Iceland) said that the world was well aware that the Secretary-General had asked the General Assembly to consider terrorism and measures to combat it during the current session. In his delegation's view, the General Assembly would be shirking its duty if it did not come to grips with that problem. Wanton terrorism, the hijacking of aircraft and the killing of innocent people must be combated at all levels by Governments and the international community. His country, like all the Nordic countries, would be both shocked and disillusioned if the United Nations failed to comply with the Secretary-General's request. His delegation agreed with the French representative that the United Nations should not only condemn terrorism and seek measures to combat it, but should also seek the underlying causes of such desperate acts. Therefore, his delegation strongly supported the inclusion of item 99 in the agenda of the General Assembly for consideration by the Sixth Committee.

23. Mr. MAGHUR (Libyan Arab Republic) said that the General Committee had been asked to approve the inclusion in the agenda of an item which called for measures to be taken against a matter that had never been defined. Whenever an attempt had been made to define it, the matter had only become more complex and controversial, for delegations differed widely in their views as to what constituted terrorism. It was therefore evident that what was required was careful and quiet deliberation rather than a sense of urgency. Discussion of the item had been postponed several times for further consultations, which was further proof of its complexity and ambiguity. The Secretary-General himself had said that it would be unrealistic to suppose that quick solutions to such a large and complex problem could be agreed upon. His delegation therefore could not agree that the matter should be discussed at the current session.

24. The protection of diplomats was included as one of the aspects of the proposed item. That question had

been before the International Law Commission and was therefore not new. It had been and still was before the United Nations (item 85).

25. There was a trend in favour of preventing liberation movements from continuing their legitimate struggle which had previously been internationally recognized. The inclusion of item 99 in the agenda would constitute yet another attempt to classify the legitimate struggle of peoples under the yoke of colonialism and alien domination as terrorism. Had the international community withdrawn its support for national liberation movements and was it trying to restrict their activities?

26. No one condoned the killing of innocent people or the violation of fundamental freedoms, but generalizations should be avoided. The General Committee was already divided on the inclusion of the item and it would therefore be impossible to agree on it. He proposed that the item should be set aside and that attention should be given to the more important problems facing mankind, namely exploitation, colonialism, discrimination and poverty. The agenda for the General Assembly was already heavy with complicated issues. He appealed to members to refrain from adding yet another controversial item which could only lead to a deadlock.

27. Mr. NKUNDABAGENZI (Rwanda) said that his delegation wished to commend the Secretary-General for his initiative in requesting the General Assembly to consider the question of terrorism. Its position was based on unconditional respect for human beings and their fundamental rights. His country had always condemned the terrorism exercised by the authorities of Pretoria, Salisbury and Lisbon against the innocent and defenceless peoples of southern Africa and had supported true liberation movements while condemning subversion. In his delegation's view, a legitimate end could not justify immoral means such as the kidnapping and murder of innocent people.

28. His delegation shared the view that the root cause of terrorism was colonial occupation. However, one evil could never be used to justify another, such as terrorism or subversion. While reaffirming its solidarity with all freedom fighters, his delegation remained faithful to the moral principles which guided his country's domestic and foreign policy.

29. He had just received instructions from his Government to support the inclusion of item 99 on the agenda for consideration by the Sixth Committee.

30. Mr. RANKIN (Canada) said that his delegation fully supported the inclusion of item 99 on the agenda. In a statement issued on 14 September, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada had welcomed the Secretary-General's initiative and any discussions which would help to reduce the violence prevailing in the world today. His delegation realized that there were conflicting views on the question, but wished to stress that, in supporting the initiative, it was not taking any position on specific issues. He hoped that the

twenty-seventh session of the Assembly would proceed calmly and constructively to propose specific measures to prevent acts of violence against innocent people, in addition to those that had already been taken or were under discussion in the Assembly and other places. The emphasis, under item 99, should be on the search for practical measures where the international community could act in concert to meet an international problem. It should be left to the judgement of the General Assembly and the Sixth Committee, if it was decided to allocate the item to that body, to determine the particular focus or scope of those concerted efforts. The General Committee should not attempt to enter upon the substance of the question and prejudge the outcome of deliberations in the General Assembly.

31. His delegation could not accept the suggestion that the item should not be considered by the General Assembly because it was too difficult. It fully agreed with the Secretary-General that the item was most important and urgent. It did not minimize the complexity of the issue or the difficulties involved in moving towards agreed and effective measures against terrorism, but it believed that a problem which aroused such widespread concern and affected the lives of innocent people should be faced without delay. No one could predict how many people might die or be maimed through indiscriminate violence in the future. Surely no representatives or Governments were prepared to have those deaths and mutilations laid at their door because they could not decide to face the issue squarely.

32. The Secretary-General had also spoken of the causes of terrorism. Those, too, must be faced. Terrorism was not a threat that would disappear of its own accord, it was a threat posed against all Governments and peoples, any one of which might be the next victim. It could only be dealt with by sober and practical consideration and the application of specific agreed measures, and it must be dealt with soon.

33. Mr. CHEN Chu (China) said that his delegation had never supported the adventurist activities of terrorism carried out by individuals divorced from the masses, because they were harmful to the cause of national liberation and people's revolution. However, a distinction should be made between military aggression and violent repression by oppressors on the one hand and the struggle of the oppressed to resist oppression on the other. Those two kinds of violence were entirely different in nature. Wherever there was aggression and oppression, there was resistance and struggle. Imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism and Israeli zionism were largely responsible for reactionary violence in the world of today. It was entirely just for oppressed nations and peoples to take up arms to resist counter-revolutionary violence with revolutionary violence. The item under consideration failed to distinguish between the oppressors and the oppressed. It referred to the prevention of terrorism and violence in ambiguous terms which might be used by Israeli zionism against the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples, by the Portuguese colonialist authorities and by the

South African and Rhodesian white racist régimes—in short, by imperialism and colonialism.

34. For those reasons, his delegation shared the opinion of the representatives of Mauritania, Guinea, the Syrian Arab Republic, the Libyan Arab Republic and other African and Arab countries to the effect that item 99 should not be included in the agenda of the General Assembly.

35. Mr. SCOTT (New Zealand) said that his delegation firmly supported the Secretary-General's urgent and important proposal that an item on terrorism should be included in the agenda of the current session. Although it respected the point of view of those who had drawn attention to the problems involved, and recognized that the subject bristled with legal and political difficulties, it was strongly in favour of dealing with an item which had perhaps aroused more popular and genuine concern among the people of the world than any other single issue during the current year. Certainly in New Zealand revulsion had been felt at the killings which had taken place since the twenty-sixth session, and like many others his delegation felt it must express concern at the danger to innocent and unsuspecting people that those incidents represented. There was therefore a pressing need for the Assembly to consider what action it could take to curb acts of terrorism, which appeared at present to be escalating and further prejudicing both international relations and the security of the daily life of ordinary people everywhere. His delegation felt that the Secretary-General had acted in the best spirit of his office and in accordance with his proper responsibilities in proposing discussion of the issue. The Assembly should not evade its own responsibilities by giving way in face of the existing difficulties before they were even assessed. His delegation therefore supported such disposition of the item as seemed best calculated to having terrorism thoroughly discussed in as objective and dispassionate a manner as possible. That would probably best be achieved by allocating it to the Sixth Committee, which would appear to have the skills that were most relevant to the subject. Although no one saw an instant solution to the problems of terrorism, the United Nations should at least make a start in a dispassionate way. The world expected no less of it.

36. Mr. OGISO (Japan) said that, faced with the increasing incidence of terrorism and other forms of violence throughout the world, his delegation had consistently expressed its abhorrence of acts of violence against innocent citizens. It censured in the strongest terms all acts of violence and terrorism regardless of their origin or motive. He hoped that the United Nations would play a constructive role and take effective measures against such acts. His delegation supported the Secretary-General's proposal and stressed that, in acting on it, the United Nations should take full account of world public opinion, which strongly opposed terrorism and violence. It favoured the allocation of the item to the Sixth Committee and hoped that before embarking on its substantive debate the Committee would agree

upon a procedure by which it could avoid acrimonious argument and produce constructive results.

37. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the problems of international terrorism raised in the note by the Secretary-General (A/8791) did indeed exist and were of late becoming increasingly acute. The Soviet Union had condemned and continued to condemn terrorism, understanding it to include the assassination or attempted assassination of Heads of State or Government, diplomatic representatives or other foreign citizens in the country where they resided for the purpose of influencing the policies of States and provoking international complications and armed conflicts. The Soviet Union had participated in the preparation of and had signed the 1937 international Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Terrorism.<sup>1</sup> His delegation was also prepared to participate in the consideration at the twenty-seventh session of a draft convention on the protection and inviolability of diplomatic agents and other persons entitled to special protection under international law. It likewise supported and continued to support Security Council and General Assembly decisions aimed at halting air piracy and was a party to a number of international conventions and bilateral agreements on the matter.

38. It could not be overlooked that Zionist extremist organizations hostile to the Soviet Union and containing Fascist elements had repeatedly had recourse to acts of terror against Soviet citizens and citizens of other countries in the United States and were at present threatening to broaden such activities. The question of terrorism by Zionist extremists had been included in the agenda of the twenty-sixth session at the initiative of his delegation and had been considered in detail. The reason the item had been placed before the Assembly had been a terrorist act by Zionist extremists against the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations. Zionist terrorists had fired four bullets into a room at the USSR Mission where there had been four children at the time and had placed a powerful bomb at the main entrance to the grounds of the Mission's summer residence. They were also continuing to threaten acts of terrorism against both Soviet diplomats and diplomats representing other countries at the United Nations. His delegation, having thus been a victim of Zionist terror, categorically opposed terrorism. In that connexion he drew attention to the extremely strange fact that not one of the perpetrators of terrorist acts detained by the United States authorities had yet been punished as a terrorist.

39. The title of item 99 was worded in such a way that it might provide the basis for differing and arbitrary interpretations, including interpretations which might be conducive to results diametrically opposed to those expected from the inclusion of the item in the agenda. In its present wording the item could be used to justify various barbaric forms of terror and violence which

<sup>1</sup> League of Nations document C.94.M.47.1938.V., p. 5-17 (Geneva, 16 November 1937).



were currently being applied in several parts of the world where dangerous armed conflicts were taking place. The vagueness of the wording might also be used by imperialists, colonialists, neo-colonialists and racists as a pretext for suppressing national liberation movements which were waging a just struggle—approved by the United Nations—for their freedom and national independence. His delegation was also opposed to exploiting terrorist actions by irresponsible individuals as a justification for aggressive acts and barbaric piratical attacks against neighbouring States under the pretext of the “right of retaliation”, in other words, for international lawlessness and the application of the law of the jungle, which was condemned under international law and which was all too often resorted to by the aggressor in the Middle East.

40. His delegation wished to stress again the legitimacy of the national liberation struggle, which had been recognized by the United Nations in numerous decisions. His delegation had participated in the formulation of those decisions and had voted in favour of them. The raising of the question in its present form could be used by those wishing to cast doubt on the justice and legitimacy of the struggle being waged by the peoples for freedom and national independence against imperialist colonial rule and against racist oppression and *apartheid*. Clearly no one was entitled to deprive peoples of their right to struggle for freedom and independence and against colonial rule. Nor was anyone entitled to cast doubt on the legitimacy of the struggle of peoples of occupied territories against foreign usurpers. The Soviet people had upheld that right by fighting for freedom and independence against the Fascist usurpers during the Second World War. The inclusion of item 99 in its present form would be at variance with a number of United Nations decisions on the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of colonial peoples for their liberation and on the granting of moral and material assistance to national liberation movements of colonial peoples. Unfortunately, his delegation's doubts had not been dispelled by further explanations regarding the item. In determining its position, his delegation also took account of the serious doubts and criticisms which had been expressed by the representatives of Arab and African countries. His delegation could therefore not support the inclusion of the item in the agenda in such a general form.

41. Mr. BUSH (United States of America), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that his Government had condemned the incident at the Soviet Mission. His Government had also condemned threats against Arab diplomats and condemned the current threats against Israeli diplomats.

42. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said he was aware that the United States authorities had condemned such incidents. However, that was not what he had been speaking of. What he had said was that none of the criminals had yet been punished.

43. Mr. SUY (Belgium) congratulated the Secretary-General for including item 99 in the agenda. No one

could dispute the fact that the modern world lived under the threat of terror and fear. The number of innocent victims increased every day and it was the duty of the United Nations to consider measures to eliminate acts of international terrorism and blind violence directed against citizens who only wished to live in peace. His delegation agreed that the Assembly, and specifically a competent Committee, should carefully study the deep-rooted causes of international terrorism. As the representative of a country which had often experienced foreign occupation and oppression, he understood and fully shared the concern expressed by several African and Arab speakers. The position of his country with regard to the liberation movements was well known and he recalled that it was through the joint efforts of the Belgian political parties that a conference of Namibian liberation movements had been held at Brussels several weeks previously.

44. He urged the members of the Committee not to misinterpret the lofty purpose of the Secretary-General as expressed in the proposal that the General Assembly should consider the problem of terrorism. It was the duty of the General Assembly to study that important and urgent question impartially and courageously. The United Nations could not remain deaf to the appeals of millions of families throughout the world who legitimately hoped that it would take practical action. World public opinion expected the United Nations to take action with regard to terrorism. A decision which left the world uncertain would have the gravest results for the Organization and would seriously detract from its credibility. In view of the world dimensions of the problem of terrorism, there was only one conceivable choice: that the United Nations should consider the problem, on the basis of the proposal by the Secretary-General, in an objective manner and a serene atmosphere.

45. Mr. SOLANO LÓPEZ (Paraguay) said that his delegation supported the proposal by the Secretary-General and would vote in favour of the inclusion of item 99 in the agenda of the twenty-seventh session. In doing so, it was considering the problem in general and not referring to any particular situation. It had also noted the Secretary-General's clarifications and intentions. Terrorism was an international scourge which was having an increasingly serious effect on the whole international community and no State Member of the United Nations or its citizens were exempt from the threat. While recognizing that terrorism was often only a manifestation of situations which needed to be corrected, it saw no reason why the United Nations should not discuss the problem. He agreed that the item should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.

46. The CHAIRMAN said that the representatives of Saudi Arabia and the Sudan had asked to participate in the discussion of the item. If there were no objections, he would invite them to the Committee table.

*At the invitation of the Chairman, Mr. Baroodi (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Abdulla (Sudan) took places at the Committee table.*

47. Mr. ABDULLA (Sudan) said that his delegation did not doubt the sincerity or the humane intent underlying the Secretary-General's proposal. It was, however, most regrettable that the proposal had been made in the wake of the Munich incident and of Israel's plan, as announced in the current issue of *The New York Times*, to mount a "major military effort" in the Middle East to destroy the terrorist organizations, by which were meant Palestinian refugees and freedom fighters, and to take preventive measures against terrorists throughout the world.

48. South Africa had already attempted to exploit the mere proposal to include the item in the agenda as a cover for its racist activities, and it was certain that that trend would continue. The United Nations, which was responsible for promoting the ideals of freedom and self-determination, could not be instrumental in enabling racist, colonialist countries to escalate their massacre of civilians and freedom fighters under the pretext of pursuing terrorists.

49. His delegation was convinced that the item as proposed could not serve its intended purpose. If the item were accepted, those who were already responsible for malicious attempts to use it as a cover for terrorism would continue their efforts in both the General Assembly and the Sixth Committee. His delegation, together with those of the other African and Arab countries, was opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly.

50. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia) said the long discussions had shown that opinions were almost evenly divided on the item. He recalled that he had shown in the statement he had made at the 201st meeting how complex and controversial the question could be and had asked the Secretary-General to consider certain suggestions or options which might provide a way out of the impasse. If the item were placed on the agenda in its present form, it would inevitably create the unfortunate and totally false impression that the Secretary-General favoured the Western Powers. Furthermore, the discussions in the General Assembly would undoubtedly be long and acrimonious, while the Sixth Committee, in considering the item, would be transformed into a forum for political debate. At a time when there were indications of a process of *détente*, it would be regrettable if the rift between the Asian and African countries and the Western Powers were deepened.

51. He suggested that the Committee should not precipitate a vote on the question of referring the item to the General Assembly. It should rather, as he had suggested the previous day, ask the Secretary-General to establish, with the aid of the Chairman, an *ad hoc* committee of experts to study the question and prepare a preliminary report. The proposed committee should study specific forms of terrorism, thereby allaying the fear that it was intended to include national liberation movements among the bodies against which measures to prevent terrorism would be taken.

52. The SECRETARY-GENERAL said that he felt he owed the members of the Committee and the representative of Saudi Arabia a reply, lest the impression be created that he had done nothing to reconcile the differing positions. For the last few days, and, indeed, that very morning, he had been working very hard contacting numerous delegations on all sides. He had considered the suggestions made by the representative of Saudi Arabia and others in an attempt to find a unanimous approach to the problem. To his great regret, the attempts had been unsuccessful. Having examined all the possibilities, including the establishment of an *ad hoc* committee and a change in the title of the item, he saw no basis for further efforts on his part. He had done his duty and there was no more that he could do.

53. Mr. RAMPHUL (Mauritius), speaking on a point of order, said he wished to explain his delegation's position before a vote was taken on the item. He felt that the Secretary-General's initiative had been rather hasty and that there had been insufficient consultation before the item had been proposed. The Secretary-General's explanatory memorandum and his latest statement should have been more specific, since it was still uncertain that the item did not cast aspersions on the valiant liberation movements in Africa. As a representative of an African country, he would be obliged to support the African group in voting against the inclusion of the item in the agenda.

54. Mr. FÉNÉLON (Haiti) said his delegation considered the question to be very important. It warmly congratulated the Secretary-General on his initiative in putting forward the item and welcomed the support of it shown by a number of representatives. At the same time, in view of his country's long history of struggling for its freedom, he could appreciate the position of those who were opposed to the item. He hoped that a just and satisfactory solution could be found. His delegation would support the inscription of the item on the agenda of the General Assembly and the proposal to allocate it to the Sixth Committee.

55. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the proposal to include item 99 in the agenda of the General Assembly.

*The General Committee decided, by 15 votes to 7, with 2 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly that item 99 should be included in the agenda.*

**Allocation of items: memorandum by the Secretary-General (*continued*) (A/BUR/179/Rev.1, sect. IV)**

56. The CHAIRMAN said that, if there were no objections, he would take it that the Committee approved the proposal of the Secretary-General in paragraph 16 of his memorandum to allocate item 99 to the Sixth Committee.

*The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that item 99 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.*

*Mr. Baroody (Saudi Arabia) and Mr. Abdulla (Sudan) withdrew.*

#### ITEMS PROPOSED FOR ALLOCATION TO THE SIXTH COMMITTEE

57. The CHAIRMAN invited members of the Committee to consider the other items proposed for allocation to the Sixth Committee as listed in paragraph 23 of the Secretary-General's memorandum and modified by decisions already made by the General Committee.

58. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled the statement he had made at the 201st meeting to the effect that his delegation was opposed to the consideration of item 89 concerning the review of the Charter of the United Nations. Indeed his delegation considered that any proposals to review the Charter were entirely inadmissible. It was opposed to the inclusion of the item in the agenda and requested a separate vote on that matter.

59. Mr. ESPINOSA (Colombia) recalled that the item had been included in the provisional agenda under an agreement reached at the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly. That decision had already been confirmed by the General Committee on the previous day and the Committee's task was now to vote on the Secretary-General's proposal to refer the item to the Sixth Committee.

60. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that his delegation had expressed its opposition to the inclusion of the item in the agenda of the General Assembly at meetings of both the General Assembly and the General Committee. It now intended to vote against the allocation of the item to the Sixth Committee since it considered that any review of the Charter would be wholly inappropriate.

61. The CHAIRMAN invited the members of the Committee to vote on the proposal to allocate item 89 to the Sixth Committee.

*The General Committee decided, by 15 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions, to recommend to the General Assembly that item 89 should be allocated to the Sixth Committee.*

*The General Committee decided to recommend to the General Assembly that the other items proposed for consideration by the Sixth Committee in the Secretary-General's memorandum should be allocated to that Committee.*

62. The CHAIRMAN announced that the General Committee had completed its consideration of the Secretary-General's memorandum on the organization of the twenty-seventh session, the adoption of the agenda and the allocation of items.

*The meeting rose at 2.45 p.m.*