



Chairman: Miss Maria GROZA (Romania).

**AGENDA ITEM 47**

**Respect for human rights in armed conflicts: report of the Secretary-General (continued) (A/7720, A/8003, chap. IX, Sect. E; A/8052, A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5, A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, A/C.3/L.1809/Rev.2, A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1, A/C.3/L.1815, A/C.3/L.1816)**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS  
(continued)**

1. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) introduced a revised version (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1) of his amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1. He had had to make some changes in his original text in view of the amendments introduced into the draft resolution by the United States delegation at the previous meeting.

2. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, he maintained that the United States was trying once more to use the United Nations for its own selfish ends. Under the guise of protecting human rights, it was trying to have war legitimized and so to influence public opinion, ignoring the root of the problem, which was the prohibition of war and aggression.

3. The United States representative did not accept the phrase "the innocent victims of war and armed aggression" in the second amendment (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1, para. 2), on the grounds that it was impossible to determine who was innocent. At all events, it was possible to determine who was guilty, since the Charter of the United Nations acknowledged the guilt of the aggressor. The fact that the United States delegation accepted some of the Hungarian proposals did not change the purposes of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1. The Hungarian proposals were a complete whole and reflected the interest of the Committee; hence he could not accept the sub-amendments proposed by the United States at the previous meeting.

4. Mr. RATTANSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said he unreservedly supported draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5, which tackled the problem properly by condemning and trying to eliminate acts of aggression, which were the cause of armed conflicts. Furthermore, it aimed at safeguarding the rights of freedom fighters and members of resistance movements and called upon nations to give them the same treatment as prisoners of war under the Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949. It must be remembered, in that connexion, that the United Nations had often affirmed the right of peoples to

self-determination, for which reason the freedom fighters could not be considered aggressors; rather, they were defenders of the inalienable rights of their peoples. Finally, the draft resolution clearly condemned massive bombardment of civil populations and the use of chemical, bacteriological or biological weapons.

5. Turning to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, sponsored by the United States of America and eleven other Powers, he could not help being amazed at the attitude of the United States Government. It did not hesitate to use armed force against a foreign country, and yet, when its soldiers became prisoners, the victims of an armed conflict which was of their Government's own making it came to the United Nations to appeal to the international community to intercede on behalf of those prisoners. There was no doubt that they should be granted humanitarian treatment, but it must not be forgotten that they had been the instruments of an act of aggression. His delegation would do all it could to help to find a solution, and it supported the Hungarian amendments (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1), under which the innocent victims of war and armed aggression would be granted the treatment to which they were entitled under the Geneva Convention of 1949.

6. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2 seemed acceptable, although he would like to ask the sponsors to clarify operative paragraph 4, concerning the creation of a universally recognized and guaranteed identification document for journalists on dangerous missions. He would only be able to support the draft if it was understood that it would be at the discretion of the Governments concerned to recognize the document envisaged. Furthermore, if the United Nations should decide to create such an identification document, journalists should travel unarmed and should not wear any uniform. If those conditions were met, his delegation would have no difficulty in voting for that draft resolution.

7. Mr. ČALOVSKI (Yugoslavia) said that his main objection to the draft resolutions before the Committee was that none of them reflected the debate in the Committee, but all had been prepared before the Committee had even begun its examination of item 47.

8. Almost all the delegations had insisted that the United Nations should not be used as an instrument for the promotion of policies or practices that would serve the interests of a few. Obviously, if that should happen, the Organization would disappear. Decisions should therefore be the outcome of common efforts of the Member States and not measures imposed upon the international community by a few. That was why many delegations did not yet know what stand to take on the draft resolutions before

the Committee. That would not be the case if the members had not been obliged to state their opinions on matters which the Committee should not, in principle, be considering. The great Powers had to realize that the United Nations was not at their beck and call. The number of proposals introduced in the Committee showed that no one wanted to renounce his own draft resolution, despite the appeals made by a number of delegations. He was certain that most of the delegations would have preferred not to have to examine so many draft resolutions, and he was aware that many of them would prefer that the adoption of the proposals should be postponed until the twenty-sixth session.

9. Of the draft resolutions before the Committee, only those contained in document A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5 and A/C.3/L.1809/Rev.2 did not create difficulties for his delegation. It would not hesitate to support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1, provided it was understood that no final decision was implied as yet. Finally, he felt that the other two drafts were of a controversial nature and full of political overtones, and it would therefore be best if they were not put to the vote.

10. Mr. ZEILEISSEN (Austria) said he could not support draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5, since the text still contained provisions that were unacceptable. With regard to the Hungarian amendment (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1) to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, he had reservations on paragraphs 2 and 6, which entailed the granting of different treatment to different categories of prisoners of war. Humanitarian concern for prisoners of war was independent of any consideration regarding the country to whose forces they belonged. If a United Nations resolution was to adopt a principle differentiating between the prisoners of the so-called aggressor country and those of the country considered to be a victim, that would be a retrograde step in the development of humanitarian international law. Bearing in mind that prisoners of war were in the power of a hostile force, the acceptance of such a criterion would deprive prisoners of war of the protection they currently enjoyed.

11. Leaving aside the question of war criminals, it was imperative to distinguish between the State—whether an aggressor or not—and the individuals who fought in its armed forces. His delegation therefore appealed to the members of the Committee not to adopt a proposal that would prejudice the future elaboration of the principles of respect for human rights in armed conflicts.

12. Mr. BUDAI (Hungary) said he thought that the representative of Austria had misconstrued his comments; he had at no time referred to innocent or guilty prisoners of war, but only to the criterion of innocence or guilt under the terms of the Charter. Furthermore, his delegation's second amendment (see A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1) alluded only to the innocent victims of war and armed aggression.

13. Mr. ZEILEISSEN (Austria) maintained that the second Hungarian amendment (see A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1), in referring to the innocent victims of war and aggression, implied the existence of other victims who were not innocent and drew a distinction between them. In virtue of the principle of general responsibility recognized by inter-

national law, where a State committed a transgression, the blame fell on the State, not on its individual citizens, except in the case of war criminals. The Hungarian amendment would extend the culpability or innocence of a State in time of war or aggression to the individuals making up its military forces and establish different treatment for them on an individual basis of innocence or guilt. The Austrian delegation considered that to be an extremely dangerous concept, and to approve it would be a retrograde step in the development of international law.

14. Mr. TORRES (Philippines) reiterated his country's support for the legitimate struggle for independence and self-determination of peoples under colonial domination. A careful analysis of operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5 revealed that its provisions would be of moral assistance to many people, from the members of the resistance movements in southern Africa to the freedom fighters in territories under "foreign occupation". While it had no objection to including the members of resistance movements in southern Africa or in territories under foreign domination, it did not accept the inclusion of territories under foreign occupation. The draft resolution should not include participants in conflicts in territories under foreign occupation, since the norms applicable to them were different and ought not to be modified by the provisions of a General Assembly resolution. Thus, his delegation would abstain if the words "foreign occupation" in operative paragraph 4 were put to a separate vote. Since the phrase "should be treated" in the same paragraph could be interpreted in several different ways and since it would be unwise to use words that could involve the amendment of existing international legal instruments, the sponsors should replace that phrase by "should be accorded the same treatment". He would therefore abstain if a separate vote was taken on operative paragraph 4.

15. It would seem that the purpose of operative paragraph 5 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5 was to give the General Assembly the task of interpreting the provisions of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and the Geneva Conventions of 1949. While his country firmly opposed the bombardment of civil populations and censured such acts as inhuman, it could not vote in favour of a provision which would assign to the General Assembly a task outside its sphere of competence. It would therefore abstain if a separate vote was taken on that paragraph.

16. Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), after drawing attention to the Pakistan amendment (A/C.3/L.1815) to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5, reaffirmed his view that the draft resolution as a whole was satisfactory, even though he had reservations concerning some of its provisions. He regretted that the sponsors had taken up his delegation's suggestions with regard to operative paragraph 4, since the wording employed there in referring to participants in resistance movements and freedom fighters was rather vague, whereas the Pakistan amendment was more specifically worded. He hoped that the sponsors would decide to incorporate his delegation's amendment, thus obviating the need for a vote on it.

17. Mr. COVACI (Romania) said that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5 would be a positive contribution to securing the observance of human rights in

armed conflicts. Draft resolution A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1 also found favour with his delegation, since it represented a positive move toward the formulation of the basic principles underlying such observance. In that connexion, the provisions of the operative part were important.

18. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1809/Rev.2, his delegation shared the opinion expressed by several of the Committee members that it was inopportune at present to lay down a specific procedure for the development of humanitarian law applicable to armed conflicts, which the tenth preambular paragraph seemed to imply. With that reservation, it considered the proposal as a whole to be acceptable.

19. Commenting on draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, he stated that his country had consistently advocated the observance of existing conventions on the protection of human rights in armed conflicts and had pressed for the progressive development of humanitarian international law, taking into consideration all new techniques for waging war. The debates in the Committee on prisoners of war, including the statements by the representative of the United States, the political atmosphere created around the issue, and the recent action of the United States armed forces in the territory of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, had revealed a tendency to link draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1 with the armed conflict in Viet-Nam, which was a consequence of United States armed action against the Viet-Name people. His delegation once again passed censure on that aggression and called for it to cease forthwith. The people of Viet-Nam and the other peoples in that part of the world should be allowed to order their own existence without foreign interference; such a framework was essential to the solution of problems arising from the Viet-Nam conflict, including humanitarian problems. In the light of the foregoing, his delegation would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, but would support the Hungarian amendments to it in document A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1.

20. Mr. LISITSKY (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic), referring to the observations by a number of representatives concerning an identification document for journalists, said that the Committee was dealing with an item on respect for human rights in armed conflicts in which thousands of people suffered and died, and it was unseemly that such a trivial detail as an identification document should command its attention. His delegation did not endorse the way in which draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2 approached the problem; there was no justification for reducing the entire question merely to the protection of journalists. The Third Committee had no reason to attach particular importance to journalists, let alone to adopt a resolution to that effect. It was true that journalists were sent on dangerous missions and that some met their death in consequence, but that fact in itself was not sufficient to prompt a draft resolution specifically concerning their welfare. After all, they entered the area of armed conflict of their own free will, whereas thousands of human beings were involved in such conflicts against their will. Furthermore, the protection of journalists was a question which could be considered in connexion with the subject of freedom of information. The item now before the Committee was the human rights of all people involved

in armed conflicts, and the Committee had to find a solution which accurately reflected the true dimensions of the problem.

21. Mr. BAHOLLI (Albania), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, declared that the main concern of the United States with regard to the item under consideration—as the representative of that country had openly stated at the 1781st meeting of the Committee—was to ensure that United States citizens reported as missing or captured in South-East Asia would be treated as prisoners of war in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949. Yet the United States imperialists, who were waging wars of aggression in several countries, were those least entitled to talk of humanitarian treatment for prisoners of war in armed conflicts. Everyone knew that the United States was waging a pitiless war of aggression in Viet-Nam and South-East Asia; it had occupied South Viet-Nam and was exploiting the population and pursuing policies of oppression and terror there. Furthermore, for many years it had been ruthlessly bombing the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, killing innocent citizens and inflicting tremendous material damage. Under the pretext of sponsoring a supposedly humanitarian draft resolution, the United States was seeking to use the United Nations as a cover for its criminal acts against the Viet-Name people.

22. For those reasons, his delegation was firmly opposed to the draft resolution, which was intended to hoodwink world opinion. The attitude of his delegation coincided in all respects with the revolutionary policy of the Albanian Government, which offered its unreserved support to the heroic struggle of the peoples of Indo-China against the United States aggressors.

23. Mr. STILLMAN (United States of America) said that the new operative paragraph contained in paragraph 7 of the Hungarian amendments (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1), which his delegation had agreed to accept, should be placed after operative paragraph 5 of the text of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1. Thus, if that new paragraph was adopted, it would become operative paragraph 6 of the draft resolution.

24. Mr. MANI (India) expressed his appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1809/Rev.2 for having taken up some of his suggestions in their new text, particularly in the first preambular paragraph. Having heard the United Kingdom delegation explain at the 1799th meeting why the phrase “pending the earliest possible termination of such conflicts”, which he had initially considered redundant, should be retained in the second preambular paragraph, he had decided not to insist on its deletion. However, the use of the term “all” to qualify the expression “armed conflicts” in the same passage, caused him considerable difficulty, and in that respect he referred the sponsors to the reports of the Secretary-General (A/7720 and A/8052), which dealt with that point in detail and contained relevant comments, particularly in paragraph 165 of document A/8052. In his delegation’s view it followed from that that, without any doubt, the expression “all armed conflicts” in the draft resolution should be interpreted to mean all conflicts of an international nature and could not cover internal conflicts. Furthermore he could not accept the wording of the tenth preambular

paragraph, because he did not think it appropriate to hold costly plenipotentiary diplomatic conferences to deal with a question which the International Committee of the Red Cross had to consider at the same time. The other passages of the draft resolution did not call for comment.

25. With regard to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2, on the protection of journalists, he was glad that the sponsors had incorporated into the revised text some of the changes proposed orally by his delegation at the 1798th meeting. Although the title had been somewhat improved, the word "dangerous" had been maintained and that did not seem to him right, because journalists might also carry out dangerous missions that were not directly related to armed conflicts, as might happen for example in an area affected by an epidemic. However, he would not press his reservations if it was agreed that "dangerous missions in the case of armed conflicts" meant hazardous missions. Constructive changes had also been made in the fourth preambular paragraph, but it still did not entirely satisfy his delegation. However, although he preferred the wording he had suggested at the 1798th meeting, he would not object to that passage because he felt that the sponsors had understood his delegation's point of view. With regard to operative paragraph 3, his delegation did not object to the protection of war correspondents who were not directly involved in the hostilities, but he pointed out that the relevant provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, on which the passage was supposed to be based, did not expressly refer to the non-participation of journalists in combats. Hence his delegation insisted that the words "who accompany armed forces but are not actually a part of them" should be replaced by the phrase "where they are not actually engaged in combat". If that suggestion was not accepted, it would find it very difficult to support that paragraph. Although he recognized the value of the invitation to the Commission on Human Rights in operative paragraph 5, he felt that in that case also there was a need to specify that what was meant was protection of journalists who were not actually engaged in combat. As a compromise solution, he would withdraw his objections to operative paragraph 3 if that reference was incorporated in operative paragraph 5.

26. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the United States and eleven other Powers (A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1), he said that he was glad that the former operative paragraph 3 had been reinstated and that the points of view expressed by his delegation and that of Hungary had been taken into account. However, in view of the vital importance of the question of prisoners of war, he felt that no hasty decision should be adopted on the subject and suggested that the Committee should take more time to study it.

27. Lastly, he referred to the revised draft resolution of Norway (A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1) and recalled that, as he had already indicated, he found difficulties with respect to operative sub-paragraph 5. It was necessary to clarify the meaning to be given to the expression "other installations", since otherwise the distinction between the services of the civilian population and the military installations could become too vague, thus defeating the purpose of protecting the human rights of the civilian population. He could not approve the text as a whole unless that point was clarified.

28. Mr. OULD HACHEME (Mauritania) said that the draft resolutions submitted on item 47 indicated the Committee's interest in the question and reflected the humanitarian concerns of the delegations sponsoring them. However, although he recognized the good intentions of the sponsors, his delegation did not agree with all the ideas expressed in the draft resolutions, and hoped that there would be enough time to find more generally acceptable formulas by introducing changes or adopting amendments. With those considerations in mind, he proposed that the Committee should decide during the present meeting only on the texts which did not present too many difficulties for the majority of the Committee, such as draft resolution A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5, which his delegation had no difficulty in supporting.

29. The problem with which the Committee was dealing was essentially a humanitarian one and primarily affected the life and the well-being of peoples under colonial domination or oppressive régimes, who were being denied the right to freedom and dignity or who were victims of racial segregation and *apartheid*. In many parts of the world there were always cases where civilian populations were being oppressed or expelled by the action of foreign armed forces; the Committee, which bore witness to that general situation, seemed to be more responsive to one or two isolated cases, showing that its good intentions were not informed with sufficient objectivity. It should be borne in mind that the concept of humanity was universal and indivisible and that a humanitarian attitude should not be adopted with regard to anyone unless it was valid for all human beings.

30. Mr. ALARCON (Cuba), referring to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1, introduced by the United States, said that it was nothing more than a continuation of the manoeuvre initiated by that country with the statement of Senator Pell to the Committee at its 1781st meeting. It was an attempt to make the Committee abandon criteria that had received majority support, such as those appearing in resolution 2597 (XXIV) in connexion with the struggles of peoples under colonial and foreign rule for liberation and self-determination. The text introduced by the United States was an attempt to place the aggressors and the victims of aggression on an equal footing and to protect the rights of the aggressors, i.e. of those who did not hesitate to violate the human rights of whole populations on an unprecedented scale.

31. While the aggression in Viet-Nam was being intensified, the Government of the United States was attempting to distract the public's attention by talking about the fate of American prisoners. However, it should be recalled that, while the attack against Song-Tay was being planned in flagrant violation of international law, the representative of the United States had submitted a draft resolution that claimed to defend the rights of United States war criminals. For that reason, Cuba categorically rejected that draft resolution, because if it did otherwise, it would become an accomplice of a State whose policy was aggression.

32. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syria) pointed out that when Senator Pell had come to request justice for American prisoners in Viet-Nam, he had said that the United States did not claim to have a perfect record with regard to the

treatment of prisoners of war, but that it allowed its practices to be inspected and that it had attempted to correct the abuses which had been discovered; he had also said that the North Viet-Nameese and the spokesmen of other communist countries of South-East Asia stressed that the prisoners were being treated "humanely". His delegation was not blind to the suffering of many hundreds of American families, but it found it inadmissible that the United States should come before the Committee to demand justice for its nationals who were prisoners while it was organizing a manoeuvre which jeopardized the fate of all such prisoners.

33. He would not support the draft resolution introduced by the United States representative (A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 and Corr.1), which was nothing but political propaganda; he would, however, support the Hungarian amendments (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1) and agreed with other delegations that it would be better to defer the vote on the draft resolution introduced by the United States representative.

34. Mr. FARAH (Somalia) said that some changes would have been desirable in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2, because under the existing text the General Assembly would be obliged to sit in judgement on the conduct of journalists. The words "conscientious" and "objectively" in the fourth preambular paragraph both seemed very subjective. The same was true of operative paragraph 2 which read: "*Expresses its deepest regret that some of them have paid . . . with their lives.*" While that fact was regretted by all, it was not sufficient reason for the Committee to adopt a resolution.

35. In operative paragraph 4 the Economic and Social Council was invited to request the Commission on Human Rights, at its next session, to consider the possibility of preparing a draft international agreement. No study had yet been made on the subject and it was essential that the Secretary-General should analyse the missions and conduct of journalists in armed conflict before there could be any talk of concluding an international agreement.

36. He fully supported draft resolutions A/C.3/L.1798/Rev.5 and A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1, and was glad that Norway had accepted the revision of operative sub-paragraph 7 of its draft resolution (A/C.3/L.1806/Rev.1). Although he entertained some doubts about it, draft resolution A/C.3/L.1808/Rev.2 was, on the whole, acceptable; the Hungarian amendments (A/C.3/L.1814/Rev.1) would help to balance the text. In conclusion, he said that he would have no difficulty in supporting draft resolution A/C.3/L.1809/Rev.2.

37. Mr. PAOLINI (France) expressed satisfaction at the interest with which members had considered the question referred to in draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2. He hoped to allay the fears of the representative of the United Arab Republic who, at the previous meeting, had said that, despite his misgivings about certain of its provisions, he would vote in favour of the draft resolution. According to the United Arab Republic representative, it should be understood that the journalists referred to in the draft were those who carried out their mission objectively, not persons engaged in dubious activities. That was logical and fully in keeping with the spirit of the draft.

38. The text of the fourth preambular paragraph had been modified to make it clear that the mission of journalists was to provide the public with objective information. Mention was also made in operative paragraph 4 of the possibility of preparing a draft international agreement which would provide for the creation of a universally recognized and guaranteed identification document; the purpose of the provision was to ensure that no one could claim to be a journalist without being one. Of course, the sole purpose of the document would be to protect journalists; it would not be an international passport. He hoped that with that clarification he would also have dispelled the doubts of the Tanzanian representative.

39. He confirmed the United Arab Republic representative's understanding that the information referred to in the third preambular paragraph should be press information only. The representative of the United Arab Republic had also commented on the seventh preambular paragraph. The sponsors had recognized that the original text of that paragraph—the fifth preambular paragraph of document A/C.3/L.1797—could be interpreted as a criticism of the Geneva Conventions and had therefore revised it.

40. The text had been revised in order to take account of the suggestions made by the Indian representative at the 1798th meeting. The use of the word "dangerous" in the title of the draft was solely a question of translation. The final words of operative paragraph 3 had been included to reflect the Indian representative's comments and had been taken from article 13 of the first Geneva Convention, article 13 of the second Convention and article 4 of the third Convention; it did not seem necessary to complete the sentence, since the text was clear. In conclusion, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be put to the vote immediately and would be voted on first, because it had been the first submitted to the committee on agenda item 47.

41. Mr. GARBA (Nigeria) said that many lessons had been learned from the conflict in his country about the conduct of journalists. There were journalists who went to Africa to serve the interests of the persons who sent them rather than those of the world at large. Some of those journalists could even be described as mercenaries, for they did not transmit objective news and information but interpreted the situation incorrectly. His delegation was not opposed to the sending of world-renowned journalists to report on conflicts but was opposed to sending those who took advantage of their status as journalists in order to misrepresent facts. Those who had been in Nigeria had cabled confused reports on the conflict, thus aggravating the difficulties of the situation. He wondered how such journalists could be treated in the manner suggested by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2. There should be a listing of the categories of journalist who should enjoy protection and the provisions of the draft should be further clarified. Unless that was done, his delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft.

42. Mr. GANDA (Sierra Leone) said that he still reserved his position with respect to draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2. After hearing the comments of the Indian representative he had suggested to him and to the sponsors of the draft that the word "dangerous" should be deleted from

the title. The adjective was superfluous since the situation was always dangerous in areas of armed conflict.

43. He shared the Somali representative's reservations concerning the word "conscientious" in the fourth preambular paragraph; it should be deleted. He also fully endorsed the opinion expressed by the Nigerian representative.

44. Mr. RATTANSEY (United Republic of Tanzania) said that although he appreciated the French representative's clarifications, his difficulties with respect to the words "a universally recognized and guaranteed identification document" in operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2 had not been removed. It should be made clear whether the document was to be an automatic passport which every country would have to accept, even against its sovereign wishes, or whether the country concerned would have the right to refuse entry to the bearer.

45. Mr. M'BENGUE (Senegal) said that the eloquent explanations of the French representative should dispel some of the doubts expressed about the intentions of the

sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2 and prevent misunderstandings. The Nigerian delegation had shown convincingly with reference to a specific situation that it was necessary to establish categories of journalists in order to prevent people from masquerading as correspondents as a means of engaging in activities other than information missions; the operative part of the draft resolution showed that the sponsors shared that concern for they had made provision for it in paragraph 4. The idea of giving priority in the voting to non-controversial draft resolutions was unacceptable, for it was doubtful whether all delegations would agree on the meaning of "controversial" or classify the same texts as controversial. The draft resolution which caused the least difficulty was the one contained in document A/C.3/L.1797/Rev.2; it was based on humanitarian considerations and its sponsors had been willing to accept all suggestions and endeavoured to reflect the comments made. Other texts, on the contrary, appeared innocuous but concealed political implications. In any event, the draft resolutions should be put to the vote in the order in which they had been submitted, not on the basis of their content.

*The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.*